

Abortion: Biology and the Baby

By: Ben Jones

Where is the most dangerous place on earth for humans? Not a play on words, the most dangerous place on earth is in the womb. If you can just make it those 9 months, you have a real shot at having a full life. In the United States, 1 out of every 5 babies are killed in the womb. In black communities, the number is far higher. In New York, 37% of all pregnancies end in abortion. In China, the number is far higher. These statistics are from the two most reliable sources on abortion... the CDC and the Guttmacher Institute. What should be the safest, most secure and comfortable place on earth for a human being has literally become the most dangerous.

Let me give you one more statistic that is the most eye-opening. 30% of aborting women identify themselves as Protestant Christian. The need to understand this issue and give a caring, intelligent apologetic response to this issue is vital in our church today. And why we need to do whatever we can to be Christians who make a stand and invoke change in regard to the recognition, celebration, and protection of life at all stages.

Remember, we are up against a multi-billion dollar industry. Planned Parenthood, which accounts for less than 20% of abortions in the US, has received billions of dollars in government grants and contracts, approach a billion dollars in revenue each year, and profit nearly \$100 million each year. This isn't an argument against abortion; it just shows that the industry has a strong incentive for abortions to continue and increase.

Appeal to Logic: Logic should make it readily apparent that a baby in the womb is simply a person at an earlier stage of development.

"Fetus" - Latin for "little one"

[Photo of me and Norma]

History (1973): **Roe v. Wade (TX)** and **Doe v. Bolton (GA)**

- Roe v. Wade legalized abortion itself (until viability), or rather, disallowed states from being able to ban abortions. Doe v. Bolton allowed it for any reason at any point in pregnancy, including partial-birth abortion.
- Since then, over 58 million children have been killed by abortion (surgical abortions). This does not include chemical abortion or abortifacient contraceptives
- Jane Roe = Norma McCorvey. Norma dropped out of school when she was 14, and married into a very abusive relationship. After she got pregnant, she left him, she moved back in with her mother. Soon after, she admitted to her mother that she was sexually attracted to other women, and her mother disowned her, took custody of her child. In 1969, Norma discovered she was pregnant with her third child and wanted to abort the baby. She came home to Dallas, TX where she was convinced by friends to falsely claim that she had been raped so that she could legally obtain an abortion (rape and incest were only exceptions). The scheme failed because there was no police report documenting alleged rape, and later she officially admitted to lying about the rape. She tried to get an illegal abortion, but

the site had been closed down by police. She was then referred to some attorneys. (She had baby before case was decided). Went to Supreme Court without her permission.

- Three basic rulings... 1) woman's right to privacy included the right to determine the outcome of her pregnancy, 2) an unborn child is not considered a “person” within the meaning of the Constitution, 3) States could only ban abortions in cases where child had reached viability and there is no health threat to the mother.
- She also came out soon after about a long-term lesbian relationship with her steady partner. In 1994, she converted to Christianity, and was a pro-life activist until her death. She also stated decades before her death that she was no longer a lesbian.

From her second book, “Won by Love”:

I was sitting in O.R.'s offices when I noticed a fetal development poster. The progression was so obvious, the eyes were so sweet. It hurt my heart, just looking at them. I ran outside and finally, it dawned on me. 'Norma', I said to myself, 'They're right'. I had worked with pregnant women for years. I had been through three pregnancies and deliveries myself. I should have known. Yet something in that poster made me lose my breath. I kept seeing the picture of that tiny, 10-week-old embryo, and I said to myself, that's a baby! It's as if blinders just fell off my eyes and I suddenly understood the truth — that's a baby!

I felt crushed under the truth of this realization. I had to face up to the awful reality. Abortion wasn't about 'products of conception'. It wasn't about 'missed periods'. It was about children being killed in their mother's wombs. All those years I was wrong. Signing that affidavit, I was wrong. Working in an abortion clinic, I was wrong. No more of this first trimester, second trimester, third trimester stuff. Abortion — at any point — was wrong. It was so clear. Painfully clear.

Norma McCorvey (Jane Roe) and Sandra Cano (Mary Doe) say they were lied to by attorneys and both were pro-life Christians advocating against abortion until their recent deaths. McCorvey never gave permission for the case to go to the Supreme Court, and never had an abortion. Sandra Cano claims she had no idea she was even the plaintiff in the case- having never had an abortion, wanted an abortion, or believed in abortion (see book *Supreme Deception*).

Sandra Cano- Extremely poor and uneducated woman. She was living in poverty and became pregnant with her 4th child. At the same time, she was going through divorce, and wanted full custody of her child. She was referred to an attorney Margie Pitts Hames. Little did Cano know, Hames was fighting for the pro-choice cause, and Cano was the perfect candidate. So she tricked Cano in a mess of files, knowing that she wouldn't know better, got her to sign an affidavit about wanting an abortion. Greatest injustices ever... Cano never stepped foot into the court room even though she was technically the plaintiff in the case. In fact, Cano never even knew she was the plaintiff in the case until much later. This case allowed abortion for basically any reason at any time:

Part of Supreme Court decision was redefining the “health” of the mother: *“Whether, in the words of the Georgia statute, "an abortion is necessary" is a professional judgment that the Georgia physician will be called upon to make routinely. We agree with the District Court, 319 F. Supp., at 1058, that the medical judgment may be exercised in the light of all factors - physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman's age - relevant to the well-being of the patient. All these factors may relate to health.”*

To put the basic pro-life argument is clear and to the point, so let me put it in Dr. Craig terms:

Premise #1: It is wrong to intentionally kill innocent human beings.

Premise #2: Abortion intentionally kills innocent humans beings.

Therefore,

Conclusion: Abortion is morally wrong.

It's important to always come back to this, because most pro-choice objections and arguments do not refute the two premises and therefore are irrelevant to refuting the conclusion.

Three Pro-Life Fallacies

- 1) Most anti-abortionists argue the wrong point. They immediately say “Abortion is wrong because murder is wrong.” Then they go on to quote contemporary and biblical law against murder. However, this argument does NOT help us. Many Pro-choice advocates argue that the fetus is not a person, so laws against murder do not apply.
- 2) Shock Tactics: Many pro-lifers use explicit or gruesome pictures and language to get their point across. To a certain extent, this is unavoidable, as the procedure is quite brutal no matter how it is described. This is one of my greatest internal debates, as to whether to use some of these photos in my presentation. People intentionally turn a blind eye to the horror of abortion. And it probably should be used with a woman *as a last resort* in order to save the life of her baby. However, if this is the primary tactic used, many will refuse to look or listen to you at all.
- 3) Confusing human value with human function. Some pro-lifers will argue that abortion is bad because we might abort someone who could benefit us. Surely we have aborted countless babies who would have been the next Einstein or Mother Teresa, countless intelligent and talented people who could have made the world a better place. Don't get me wrong, this is a true statement! However, this is not the reason abortion is wrong. Humans are valuable because of what they are, not what they can do. The homeless man's life is just as valuable in God's eyes as the CEO of a Fortune 500 company, as we are all made in God's image. This argument is also easily countered by abortion advocates who could say we may have aborted the next Hitler, terrorist, serial killer, or rapist. Defenders of abortion actively use a version of this by giving value to a child based on what they have achieved (consciousness, self-awareness, viability, etc), instead of cherishing the unborn because of the kind of thing they are, living humans! Also, when a pro-lifer uses this, it focuses on what the killing of the unborn costs us, not what it costs those who are aborted! It is wrong because it unjustly ends the life of an innocent human being. You can imagine the world systems, made clear in world history and many a movie, when people are valued only by what they can do and not who they are. There are so many GOOD arguments, we don't want to steal this defective worldview to defend ours.

First, what is at the heart of the issue? The heart of the issue is the value of life. When God breathed life into Adam and Eve, he gave them something indescribably valuable and precious. He gave life to humans made in the image of God. Your life is inherently valuable to God. My life is as well. No matter your race, your status, your size, your level of development... no matter what you do in your life, every single person's life is priceless to God.

We find this throughout Scripture. In fact, look at the first law given to Noah when he came off the ark in Genesis:

*“Whoever sheds man’s (in Hebrew- “a adam”) blood,
By man (in Hebrew- “adam”) his blood shall be shed,
For in the image of God He made man.”*

God's Word from beginning to end makes no distinction between the child in the womb and the child outside the womb. We'll look at examples of this if we have time at the end.

On the same token, the minute mankind starts to place value on someone's life for a reason other than the inherent value God has given every person, the greatest atrocities known to man will occur.

“Quality of Life” Ethic- “human beings are valued only to the extent that they experience a certain level of quality of life and are productive to the rest of society” What road does this mentality lead us down?

The greatest atrocities ever committed in human history were due to a disregard for human life. Many times, this disregard is founded in the de-humanization of another person. Racism and slavery were based on people thinking African-Americans were less evolved, “less human” than other races so white people could treat them as they wished. With the Holocaust, we wonder how the Nazis could have ever killed so many Jews in cold blood. But they were able to do so because it had been ingrained in their minds that Jews were less than human, calling them 'rats' and 'roaches.' Once Jews were de-humanized, the Nazis could do anything they pleased without a shred of conscious. This is what is happening with abortion...

We have de-humanized the unborn child. It's the only reason we feel as a society that we can do anything to them that we wish. But even then, we have all kinds of contradictory laws surrounding unborn children because instinctually, we know there's a value to that life.

- Physician story
- Some laws condemn the killing of a fetus as murder, while other laws condone the killing of that same fetus through abortion!
- At Federal level, the “Unborn Victims of Violence Act” (known as “Laci and Conner’s Law”) recognizes that any ‘child in utero’ who is injured or killed during a federal crime of violence is considered a legal victim

- Under the “Born Alive Infant Protection Act,” every infant born alive, regardless of developmental stage is considered a ‘person’ under federal law with legal rights.
- Majority of states give some degree of protection for unborn victims of violence through fetal homicide laws. Most states allow for civil penalties, state intervention, and even criminal prosecution for women who use drugs/alcohol or otherwise harm their unborn babies in utero!

This leads us to the first faulty way pro-choice advocates argue, and you'll find this in most of their arguments. **They will “assume”** that unborn children are not human.

In celebrating Roe v. Wade, President Obama said we need abortion because “this is a nation where everyone has a right to pursue their own dreams.” But who is everyone... he just assumed this didn't include the unborn. Take the back-alley argument... “We can't outlaw abortions because women will be forced to get dangerous illegal ones.” This assumes the unborn are not humans. Otherwise they are saying, because some people can be hurt or die when killing other people, the states should make it legal and safe to do so. Arguing that we should keep abortion legal, simply because people will do it anyway, except in less safe ways (in back alleys, etc), make no sense! If something is wrong, then you criminalize it, just like murder or rape. Besides, the VAST majority of women said they would not have had abortions if it was illegal.

They attack: Many times pro-choicers will attack you personally rather than responding to your arguments or points. “Men can't get pregnant, so they shouldn't be able to weigh in on the issue”: Pro-life women have the same arguments, they aren't gender-specific. And if that's true, Roe v. Wade should be overturned since it was decided by nine men. Or you'll hear that you don't have a right to oppose abortion unless you adopt unwanted children: This is just an attempt to change the subject. How does my alleged unwillingness to adopt a child justify an abortionist intentionally killing one?

They assert: Let's say you lay out your pro-life position using science and philosophy, which we'll be talking about today. And they simply respond: “Well, woman have a right to choose.” Is this an argument or an assertion? It's an assertion because no argument and no evidence is offered to support the claim. 'Choose what? Where does that right to choose come from?' So you can respond with, “Why do you believe that?” More intellectual example: Professor responds to your case with “The embryo is not self-aware and has no desires, so abortion should be okay.” The hidden premise here is that self-awareness and desires give us the right to life, and he presents no evidence or argument for this. “Why does self-awareness or having desires matter? What would having these attributes determine who lives and who dies?”

But you see at it's base, we must look at the humanity of the unborn, so let's look at that.

Development (not a blob of tissue)

Week 1: Conception, the embryo is smaller than a grain of sugar, but the instructions are present for all that the person will ever become.

Week 2: The baby attaches and burrows securely into the wall of its mother's womb. Fastest growth happens during first 2 weeks, then slows. If it continued at that rate, it would be born the size of 2 elephants (28,000 lbs).

Week 3: The baby's blood vessels and sex cells form. Foundations of the brain, spinal cord, and nervous system are laid.

Week 4: The baby's heart has begun to beat, pumping the baby's own blood through his circulatory system. Arms, legs, eyes, ears, and lungs begin to form. (find out pregnant) *4-week baby heartbeat video... (Endowment for Human Development)*

Week 5: Arms and legs are more easily visible, as well as the baby's face. The baby's blood is now separated from the mother's.

Week 6: Tiny fingers and toes develop. The baby's brain is divided into three parts for emotion and language, hearing and seeing. Brain begins functioning enough to generate EEG impulses (brain waves)

Week 7: Buds of the baby's milk teeth appear. Ninety-nine percent of the muscles are present, and brain activity is detectable. Responds to some touch sensations.

Week 8: The baby begins spontaneous movement and is now well proportioned, about the size of a thumb. Every organ is present, but immature. The skull, elbows and knees are forming.
Our 8-week old photo...

Week 9: If prodded, hands and eyelids close. Genitalia become visible, indicating whether the baby is a boy or a girl. Muscle movement begins. Thyroid and adrenal glands are functioning.

Week 10: The baby's fingerprints begin to form. Nerve and muscle connections have tripled. Eyelids fuse together temporarily to protect the baby's delicate developing eyes.

Week 11: The baby "practices" breathing and facial expressions, even smiling. The baby can also urinate and stomach muscles can also contract.

Week 12: The baby is now 3 inches in length and weighs 1-2 oz. with fine hair on the face. The baby is able to swallow and responds to skin stimulation. He has fingernails, sucks his thumb. The child will often struggle for life two or three hours if removed from the mother at this point.
12-week old model...

Our 16-week ultrasound...

SO, “If it looks and acts like baby, it is a baby”- this may be good enough for the uninformed woman, but not enough for the pro-choice advocates... we still need to make a scientific case based on biology.

What is abortion?

Primary Methods

Suction Curettage: The force of suction pulls the limbs and body apart, tearing the placenta from the uterine wall, and is then vacuumed out (most common)

Dilation and Evacuation: The fetus' skull is crushed, and then typically decapitated and dismembered before being pulled out with forceps

Other- Manual Vacuum Aspiration, Dilation and Curettage

Partial-Birth Abortion is when a child in the 2nd or 3rd trimester is partially removed from the uterus and killed by crushing the skull or puncturing the skull in order to suck the brains out. Many are even brought to term. Official Definition: “any abortion in which the baby is delivered past the navel... outside the body of the mother or in the case of head-first presentation, the entire fetal head is outside the body of the mother... before being killed”

(President Bush banned- 2003, but there are a lot of loopholes).

[Think about this for second: What is the most wrong and horrifying thing that you can possibly imagine? Probably ripping the arms and legs off of an infant baby and crushing his skull. We can't even imagine this ever being done to a baby. Yet a week or two earlier, while that same baby was living inside his mother, its completely legal to do the exact same thing for any reason we see fit.]

Since abortionists stress the health risk associated with having a baby, we must also be sure not to overlook the documented effects that abortion has on a mother:

- 1) Just as with giving birth, there is also a great amount of physical pain accompanying an abortion.
- 2) There are a number of potential physical complications resulting from an abortion, including: hemorrhaging, **perforation of the uterus (explain)**, cardiac arrest, endotoxic shock, infection requiring hospitalization, convulsions, future ectopic pregnancies, cervical laceration, permanent sterility, uterine rupture and death. These are all documented possible complications.
- 3) Potential damage to the uterus and reproductive organs decreases chance of being able to have children later. (i.e. vacuum suction closes Fallopian tubes)
- 4) Multiple medical studies have shown a significant link between women who have first trimester abortions and the development of breast cancer (as high as 50% increase). The requirement of placing “increased risk of breast cancer” on abortion consent forms is still in legislation.
- 5) PAS, or Post Abortion Syndrome, or Post-Abortion Trauma, is a well-documented clinical condition observed in women following elective abortions. It has been likened to Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome and symptoms most frequently are

shame, heartache, and a deep regret that most women deal with the rest of their lives. Other symptoms are depression, guilt, anger, emotional numbness, sexual problems, eating disorders, low self-esteem, drug and alcohol abuse, nightmares, thoughts of suicide, panic attacks and flashbacks. The abortion industry still refuses to acknowledge the existence of PAS.

These conditions do not help us in the argument of the personhood of the fetus, but cannot go unmentioned.

There is **forgiveness, cleansing, and healing for those who have had abortions.** A healing that can only come through Jesus Christ. (The Women's Clinic of John's Creek, Abortion recovery hotline)

Can the fetus/child feel this?

Pain receptors are one of the first developments of a fetus. The fetal pain system is fully developed at 20 weeks. This is an extremely modest timetable, as neuropeptides such as Substance P and Enkephalin (chemical pain messengers), are present many weeks prior to this. Also, distorted pain can be felt at 15-20 weeks as pain system develops (like a beta-version of pain system [use microphone analogy]). Fact is, at 20-35 weeks (5-7 months), the unborn child has more pain receptors per square inch than at any other time, before or after birth. Pain inhibitors do not start to develop until 30-32 weeks! This makes the pain experience before this time worse than that of an older child or adult. (This is why parents cannot touch the skin of a preemie) Of course, fetuses get no anesthesia. Even livestock are protected from undue pain by the Humane Slaughter Act.

Pain-Capable Child Protection Act- Passed in Georgia but stopped by the ACLU

Unborn are protected after 24 weeks, or second trimester in GA.

But, this does not help us in our case. The fact that the child/fetus can feel pain does not answer the necessary question...

The question we must answer is...

Is the unborn fetus a person with rights? If we can answer this 'yes', then the rest is easy. Again, we needn't argue whether murder is wrong (Many abortionists will agree with this), but what makes abortion murder.

From the moment of conception, is the fetus...

Alive? YES.

Yes, it is a biological mechanism that converts nutrients and oxygen into energy that causes its cells to divide, multiply, and grow. Abortion advocates must agree with this, but state that plants and amoebas are also alive. What is the difference? To use a popular pro-choice phrase, the embryo is a "potential person." All that is needed is TIME and NUTRITION for that embryo to grow into everything it will be.

Note: This alone allows us to be able to use the word “kill” when talking about abortion. We are causing something (or someone) to go from being ‘alive’ to ‘not alive’ which by definition is ‘killing.’

Human? YES

Yes, The DNA is that of a human. The full set of DNA needed to grow into a full human person is there. *It is genetically complete.* It is unique and distinct from both parents. Abortionists agree, but state that something such as a single hair follicle also has a full set of human DNA.

Another question...

Can we properly refer to the embryo from the moment of conception as male or female?

Yes. We each get 23 chromosomes from our mother and 23 from our father. One of the chromosomes is the XX or XY pair, which dictates gender and is determined by the father.

TDF (testes determining factor)- hormones play a factor, and may change genders, but it is never gender-neutral

Law of Biogenesis- “Living things reproduce after their own kind only.” Humans can't get together and produce anything less than a human being. When else would a fetus become a human?

The most logical explanation of when a child becomes a person:

Each of these alone do not work, but the KEY is the combination:

ALIVE + Gender-specific Human DNA

If this does not constitute being a person, what does? At this point, the burden of proof should land squarely on the pro-choice person because this is as objective and scientific as it gets.

What does the pro-choice advocate believe the unborn needs to acquire before becoming a person whose life we value?

Before we even look at some of these attributes, remember that we are already entering dangerous territory. That human beings are valued only based on their function rather than their nature. We talked about the Quality of Life ethic earlier. Giving value based on function results in gross inequality in our society. Functions, like self-awareness, desires, etc, come in degrees, so this would result in a graded system of how worth or value each human has. Which again leads to some of the worst atrocities against mankind in our history.

But let's look at some of the functional qualities that pro-choice advocates put forth, nevertheless...

Consciousness:

Some will talk about consciousness being the factor, but this falls apart from the very beginning. What is consciousness? One definition is *the ability of being self-aware and able to 'think about themselves.'* The problem they face is that people who believe this also know that this type of consciousness doesn't occur until months, even years, after a baby is born. Also, they run into problems concerning when a person is *asleep* or *in a coma*.

Another, possibly better definition of consciousness: *the cognitive ability to recognize and react to something or someone outside himself*

There is a strong argument that unborn fetuses have this ability:

Luke 1:36-57

Mary is in her 1st trimester, Elizabeth is in her 3rd

Baby shows awareness and cognition when he recognizes and reacts to Jesus' presence

The small miracle here is NOT that the baby was given the ability to recognize and react in general, but that nothing but the presence of another being was able to be recognized by John

We see this ALL THE TIME with pregnant women!! Pregnant women regularly report that their babies in the womb react to certain voices or music or movement.

This type of cognition is certainly there.

What we do know is: Whether "consciousness" is obtained months or years *after* birth or *before* birth, certainly there is NO argument that consciousness is attained at the moment the child passes through the birth canal.

If consciousness obtained AFTER BIRTH → supports neither pro-life or pro-choice view

If consciousness obtained BEFORE BIRTH → supports the pro-life view

Pro-choicers have no response, so they fall back onto the next point...

Viability:

For many years, **viability** was the defining point of when a fetus had a right to life.

Viability- the ability of a fetus to survive outside the uterus (see chart)

No definite time- about 50% chance of survival if removed from mother at Week 24

(Month 6). If after, the chance goes up. If before, the chance of survival goes down. It's a moving scale. But even if there is a 2% that we might be committing murder, we couldn't do it. Viability is a game of percentages and certainly cannot be used as the defining factor in allowing abortion. In fact, this means that the value of life and determination of someone being a 'person' is based on our *advances in technology*, not in anything inherent to the fetus itself.

Physically Independent? NO

Both views agree that a small child is dependent upon another for his existence both before and after birth. No one argues that it is okay to kill someone because they are completely dependent on something (medical device, pacemaker) or someone... so... some pro-choicers try to make a distinction between:

1) *Social Dependence* and 2) *Physical dependence*

Social Dependence- a child's dependence on others to meet physical needs, such as feeding him, clothing him, etc

Physical Dependence- when one life form depends solely on the physical body of another life form for its existence.

Pro-lifers will agree that this type of "physical dependence" is true for fetuses only while inside the womb. Can the transition from physical to social dependence adequately draw the line on abortion's morality? Why does the abortion-choice advocate think this should be the distinction that makes abortion okay?

[Abortionists sometimes use a popular illustration by Judith Jarvis in 1971: A woman is kidnapped, wakes up to find she's surgically attached to a world-famous violinist who, for nine months, needs her body to survive. After nine months, he is fine on his own:

Is the woman morally obliged to stay connected to the violinist living off her body? (Note that this particular example precludes that the violinist is a person)]

To support this argument, the pro-choicer always turns to the rights of the mother. It's not fair. She has a right! They will argue that it's not fair for a woman to be **forced** to carry a baby she does not want.

Notice! They have CHANGED THE QUESTION! No longer is the question, 'What is the unborn?' or 'When does the fetus become a person?' The question of personhood is swept under the rug and it now becomes, "Is a woman morally obligated to keep the fetus alive? Does she have the right to terminate it?"

This is so important! THIS is the primary factor and issue when it comes to the abortion debate now, politically or otherwise. As medical knowledge increases, fighting for abortion rights from a biological perspective (i.e. the unborn is simply a 'blob of tissue' or less than a person) has become more futile. As this is a battle they cannot win, the pro-choicer will begin to argue on behalf of female rights as opposed to the nature of the unborn.

REMEMBER, this is not so much a Pro-Choice argument concerning the personhood of the fetus, but rather the moral obligation to keep the fetus alive.

Side Issue: If the primary argument is that a woman has right to do whatever she wants with her body ("my body, my choice"), why is prostitution illegal?

Before addressing the "rights" issue, we must see if it applies by seeing how pregnancies/abortions come about:

Abortions:

93%- Convenience

3%- Mother's Health (take issue with this)

3%- Child's Health (potential deformities, etc)

<1%- Rape or Incest (0.5%)

So here, we see that over 99% of abortions (and about the same for pregnancies in general) are the result of a choice:

Conception is either a direct choice (someone who wants to get pregnant) or an indirect choice (someone who has sex knowing that there is always a possibility that a conception could result).

Quote from Melissa Brunner's Abortion essay:

"The choice of the mother begins and ends with the choice to have sexual intercourse. If a woman is in control of her own body, she has the "choice" to choose abstinence if she is so opposed to carrying a separate human being to term. For every cause there is an effect, and if a woman engages in sexual intercourse and becomes pregnant with life, she has made her "choice" willingly, knowing the effect. A woman's body may be her own, but the body of the child that grows within her is not her own body."

SWAT Program: I teach sex ed and the benefits of waiting on sex to middle/high schoolers. I ask if they know where babies come from, etc. One thing I always tell them is that there is no safe sex. 1 in 3 sexually active people will get pregnant or get a girl pregnant by the time they are 20. And most are shocked and surprised when it happens. If you have sexual intercourse and get pregnant, no one has a right to be shocked or surprised because that's where babies come from. No matter the methods they use.

Ultimately, the argument about a woman's right to do what she wants with her body, is a argument for sexual freedom. This quote by David Kupelian is one of the best I've ever heard regarding this.

"The deception-based world of abortion is rooted in our devotion to what has become a near-sacred belief – total sexual freedom. We have determined as a modern, secular, post-Christian society that we have the absolute right to engage in sexual relations with whomever we want and whenever and wherever we want, and we repudiate the notion that we have to take responsibility for the natural result of sex – which is children. Having committed so deeply to this proposition, it matters not how barbaric and inhuman abortion is, how many gorgeous children we see with their throats cut, heads cut off, chemically burned alive, brains sucked [out], or spinal cord "snipped" with scissors. We must allow for abortion on demand or our sacred right to sexual freedom ceases to exist." -David Kupelian

So, when they say the woman shouldn't be forced to carry the child and you are not allowing her choice; in actuality, a woman can guarantee prevention of pregnancy by not having sex.

What about when conception is not the result of the mother's choice? The fact that she is 'forced' to carry the child *does* apply to the 0.5% who get pregnant due to rape... so let's look at this... even though it less than 0.5% of abortions, it is the argument used 90% of the time.

- 1) ***Understand the Playing Field*** (Who is asking?): Two types of people bring up rape: the inquirer and the crusader. The former can be a person who has experienced rape or know someone who has, or they could be an honest inquirer who is trying to think through the emotional and philosophical difficulty of the issue. But more often it is used again pro-lifers to make us look insensitive by pitting us against rape victims. Remember, if we grant the rape exception, we undercut the foundational principle of our position, that *all human beings matter*. If we deny the rape exception, we appear calloused toward women. This alone has single-handedly neutralized countless pro-life advocates, even pro-life politicians who don't know how to handle the issue. I'll handle the crusader more at the end.
- 2) ***Respond with Sensitivity and Compassion***: We cannot underestimate the emotional turmoil and physical pain of a pregnancy caused by rape. And we need to acknowledge this. If you are talking to someone with whom the rape issue is very personal, it requires we respond not just with love, not just a sound argument. And love being more important. The assumption made by most is that the child will be a persistent and hurtful reminder to the woman who has been raped, and this may be true in many or most circumstances. The pain I feel when I hear of this brutal act is like almost no other evil. Women understand this better than men, but as a man, we can't imagine the horror of our wife or daughter being victimized in this way. Compassion for women in these circumstances should and does come naturally for us. Express that.
- 3) ***Clarify the Moral Issue***: After, we need to refocus the discussion on the nature of the unborn. When a woman is raped and conceives a child, the question is not "How was one conceived?", but "What was conceived?" The circumstance under which any human comes into being does not alter his or her nature or intrinsic value, it has no bearing on their worth. Pro-lifers are perceived as insensitive for recognizing the humanity of the her child, but by allowing the mother to kill her child perpetuates the idea that hardship justifies violence. The tragic violence of rape does not justify the tragic violence of abortion. Abortion is wrong for the same reason rape is wrong: both are unjust acts of brutality against innocent human beings. Both rape and abortion take something that is not theirs to take: the woman's body and the child's life. Should an innocent child die because of the sins of the father? If an unborn child has a right to life, can we justify killing him because of the horrific circumstance under which he was conceived? How is that fair to the child? Your fall-back position can usually always be the toddler. Should we be able to kill a 6-month-old baby who was conceived due to rape because of the hurtful memories that he represents? If not, the question remains... what is the difference between killing in the womb and after birth? Many women even report that their abortion was more traumatic than the rape itself.
- 4) ***Be Confident in the Pro-life Position***: When one accepts the consensus of human embryology, that a distinct, living, and whole human being comes into existence at conception, it becomes clear that pro-lifers are not the insensitive ones. It is those who propose the death penalty for an innocent human being because of the sin of a rapist. The pro-life position is rooted in love. It recognizes the unimaginable pain of rape, but its also rooted in truth, insisting that one human should not die so that another can feel better.

Also, be aware that many people who believe in abortion on demand choose to argue the rape situation because it's easier. They hide behind the hard cases, and want to paint the pro-lifer as an extremist. You can ask them... "If I granted abortion in the case of rape, would you join me in opposing all other abortions?" He won't, because he wants all abortion legal. They aren't arguing that it's only okay in cases of rape, so want it legal for any reason the mother wants, so they need to defend that position rather than hiding behind rape victims. So unless they are arguing that abortion is only okay in the situation of rape, then they haven't defended their position.

Francis Beckwith says, "Arguing for the abolition of all abortion laws because of rape is like arguing we should get rid of all traffic laws because you might need to run a red light rushing a loved one to the hospital"

What about when the pregnancy causes a health risk to the mother? Some abortionists claim that physical dependence always presents a risk to the health or life of the mother. However, if you delve more deeply into this statement, one can see that in order to say this is true in 100% of cases, they must be referring to pain associated with pregnancy and childbirth. But this was part of the curse put on the woman in Genesis (Gen. 3:16) and certainly not cause to kill the child in the womb.

(Keep in mind that it is nearly impossible in most cases to KNOW whether a woman will live or die if she gives birth → possible scenarios)

Remember, all these cases account for 3% of abortions.

What about the 3% that are done due to potential deformities or baby's health?

To abort a deformed child in the womb rather than to allow him to live is an affront to the thousands of people born with severe handicaps who live happy and productive lives, and the families that care for them. There are numerous examples that could be given of people who made a huge difference in the world despite handicaps. There are plenty of mentally and physically handicapped children who bring great joy to others' lives despite their dependency, and have a part to play in this world. KEY is: In the majority of cases, deformities and handicaps are possibilities, or probabilities, but not definites. So... is it right to abort a child because of a possibility, or even a probability?

Some argue that abortion would be better than them living the life they would have had if they were born. How can we know? How is it our prerogative to decide that? How is it our right? What about all the people who made so much of their lives coming out of a poor or broken home? Again, we could kill the toddler or homeless man using this argument. ("Quality of Life" Ethic)

Human Rights?

Most pro-choice advocates believe that the fetus has rights of some sort based on the fact that he is 1) alive, 2) Human, 3) Potential Person, BUT that his rights are trumped by the rights of the mother.

What are these rights? The rights of **Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.**

The basic pro-choice argument is as follows: Two entities with equal rights cannot occupy one body, therefore one has veto power over the other. In other words, a baby in the womb has no rights before birth because they would interfere with, and thus are trumped by, the mother's rights to 'liberty' and 'happiness.' Here's the *major flaw* in the argument: For them, priority of rights is based on who is more developed, whereas priority *should* be placed on which right is more important. Consider a scenario where I am a single dad, and my 6-month-old son cries uncontrollably every single night. Let's say that suffocating my baby would make me happy by giving me a good night's sleep. No matter who is older or more developed, that baby's 'right to life' trumps my 'right to the pursuit of happiness.' Clearly the child's right to life is foremost.

Many pro-choicers claim that the “right to life” of the child automatically cancels out the mother’s right to Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. To the contrary, in the majority of cases, the act of having a child brings more happiness to a mother than anything.

IMPORTANT: Again, the issue of “rights vs. rights” tells us nothing of the physiological question of *when* a fetus has rights. I am simply arguing that it is a logical fallacy to say that a fetus only has rights outside the womb *solely* because those rights are trumped by the mother’s while inside the womb.

Certainly the most logical and objective point at which to bestow human rights upon someone is when:

- 1) Alive
- 2) Human DNA (gender-specific)

And these characteristics are all present at the moment of conception.

[Based on time, either end with the following, or skip below this and continue presentation, coming back to the below summary at the end]

A living human being exists at conception, and EVERY life has inherent value.

[Think about this: What if the general public recognized the personhood of the pre-born? I mean, truly saw the baby in the womb as no different from the infant or toddler. How utterly horrified would we be that we allowed almost 60 million of these innocent be brutally killed for any reason we saw fit? Can you imagine the shame we would feel as a nation? A civilized, developed nation! Our view of the Holocaust would pale in comparison... we can't imagine how we used to think slavery and racism were okay, but can you imagine looking back on a time when we thought there was no moral problem with the murder of tens of millions in their mother's womb? This is the reality we live in, and it's up to our generation to stand up for the unborn who have no voice. As Christians, or even just human beings, we should be up in arms over this! And I do want you to know, if you are in a tough situation with a pregnancy, there are resources that you can use that will guide you every step of the way. I work with A Beacon of Hope or the Women's Clinic of John's Creek. Countless women we have talked to who had considered abortion, but

decided to carry the baby look back and can't imagine if they'd made a different decision. But countless girls I've talked to who did decide to abort their babies live with that decision the rest of the lives and all that comes with it. Even though there is healing and forgiveness through Jesus Christ, I don't want this to be you, or any of your friends.]

No matter how small, no matter how developed, no matter how dependent, no matter what age, no matter what race, no matter what status, ALL humans have inherent value given to them by God Himself having been made in his image, and should be protected and defended. We should treat others with this mentality, and we should see the unborn the same way.

----continued----

Now, let's look at what the Bible has to say...

The Bible

Sometimes Christians are criticized for being “one-sided” on the issue of abortion. However, with the exception of one or two potentially difficult verses, Christians are typically one-sided because the Bible is one-sided.

First, let's look at a couple of verses that I personally choose not to focus on, but are popular among pro-lifers:

Ex. 20:13, and similar verses- As explained earlier, these verses against murder are not very helpful in a debate concerning abortion because whether murder is wrong is not the issue.

Ps. 139:13-16, These are great verses about how God formed us in the womb, but though it shows how God played the largest role in our formation, it does not really help us. The fact that God formed our parts in the womb do not tell of our personhood during our development. We can glean a small bit of evidence when we see how David refers to his earlier stage in the womb as “I”, making himself as a fetus just as much ‘him’ as he was presently.

Jeremiah 1:5- This refers to a time before Jeremiah was conceived, so this does not help us.

Let's look at verses that are helpful:

[Many references can be made to verses that talk about the sanctity of life given by God, and God hating the shed of innocent blood.]

Bible makes no distinction between the born and unborn.

Luke 1:39-44

- We've already shown cognition of the fetus in this passage
- Luke 1:36 vs. 1:57 (same Greek word used in both passages for 'son')
- Luke 1:41 vs. 2:12,16; 18:15 (Same Greek word- “brephos” used in all passages
- Luke 1:43- Mary addressed as ‘mother’ before Jesus was born

Numbers 12:12- Even if baby dies before birth, woman who conceived is still considered “mother.”

Mother → Heb. EM, Greek METER. In context, refers to physical human reproduction, refers to one who has procreated a separate and distinct individual from mother.

Luke 1:15- “filled with the Spirit while in womb”

Angel talked to Mary about her unborn CHILD

Angel talked to Elizabeth about the CHILD in her womb

Ruth 1:11, “sons in womb”

Gen. 25:21-22, Esau and Jacob interacting in womb

2 Kings 19:3- “children in womb”

Romans 9:11- “the twins” or “children” not yet born

In reference to pregnant women, “with child” occurs 26 times in the Bible, NOT ‘what will become a child’

Throughout Scripture, the same word is used for a child inside and outside womb → refers to him as “man, woman, child, son, daughter, baby”

Gen. 5:3-4, 28-30; Acts 7:29- “Begot sons and daughters”- “begat” refers to conception and fertilization

Job 3:3- A “man-child” conceived (Heb. GEBER). This word *strongly* always denotes a person, usually a fully mature man. Compare with Job 10:5, Ps. 127:5, 128:4. Used 66 times in OT.

All these show that a baby is not just a part of a woman’s body, but a separate human individual.

1 Cor. 6:19-20 (our body is not our own, it is a temple)

Job 10:8-12 (person in womb was not something that might become Job, but someone who was Job)

[Some Christians may make an argument that, biblically, “Blood = Life”

It can be argued that a fetus is a person once it has its own bloodstream.

Lev. 17:11, Deut. 12:23

Fetus has bloodstream approximately 17 days after conception.]

Alright, now let’s deal with a couple of potentially difficult passages that many Pro-choicers pose to the Pro-lifers:

Ex. 21:22-23

*“If men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child so that she [**‘gives birth prematurely’ or ‘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.
²³But if there is [any further] injury, then you shall appoint as a penalty life for life.”*

As mentioned, this is one of the potentially difficult passages to explain in the Bible (and that many pro-choicers use). In this verse, most translations say either one phrase or the other, referring to the bold phrases above. For instance, older NASB translations say the latter, whereas newer editions of the NASB say the former. The Hebrew word used here is “yalad,” which means literally “her children have come out” or “cause her offspring to be brought forth.” This Hebrew word refers to a live birth 11 other times in the OT. It never refers to a miscarriage, although it is once referred to as a stillborn. The bracketed word “further” was added by later translators. There’s a few possible explanations to this:

- The simplest way to understand this is that the baby was ‘brought forth’ prematurely. Then, if there is no injury, the punishment is a fine, but if there is injury, either to the mother or if the baby dies, then the death penalty is mandated.
- Some pro-choicers will claim that the reference to ‘further injury’ only applies to the mother. Though their argument is faulty that the phrase should definitely refer to a miscarriage, it **is** true that the vast majority of preemies would die as they did not have the modern technology to keep them alive. So, for the sake of the pro-choice argument, let’s assume that this passage refers to the death of the child. Look at the case at hand. This is a struggle between two men, and implies that the striking of the woman was an accident. Accident or not, if the woman dies as a result, the death penalty is required. However, the death of the baby would be considered “involuntary manslaughter,” which deserves a lesser punishment than “pre-meditated murder.” In both cases, a human life was lost. The man who accidentally struck the woman may or may not have known that she was with child, and in this case, certainly didn’t have the pre-meditated intention of killing the unborn child. The whole conflict was between two grown men in the first place.

Eccl 6:3-5

...Then I say, “better the miscarriage than he...”

This verse is sometimes used in the pro-choice argument to show that abortion should be okay in light of a potentially futile and poor quality of life. There are many things wrong with this. First of all, a miscarriage cannot be helped. There is certainly no argument that KILLING the baby is okay because upon retrospect it would have been better for him to have died in the womb. This is a major logical fallacy. Secondly, this is the author’s soliloquy on the futility of life if he did not know anything about God and his purpose in life. This is not God speaking, which is made even more obvious by the words “then I say.” So in actuality, the author KNOWS that what he is saying is not true.

[Eccl. 4:1-3

“So I congratulated the dead who are already dead more than the living who are still living. But better off than both of them is the one who has never existed, who has never seen the evil activity that is done under the sun.”

This doesn’t have anything to do with abortion. Also, it refers to “never having existed” whereas fetuses DO exist. Also, as mentioned earlier, these are the author’s words of how he would feel if he knew nothing about God.

Job 3:2-4, 11-19; 10:18-19, These verses talk about the hopelessness Job felt when he had everything taken away from him.

- 1) Job cries “why did I not die?” **not** “why was I not killed?” There’s a big difference. A miscarriage is unavoidable death, very different from someone making the arbitrary decision to kill the baby/fetus.
- 2) Job has a right to regret his own life, but this does not imply a right for someone to have killed him before his birth.
- 3) If Job’s wish had come true, we would not have the powerful story of Job’s faith. Job said this in the depths of despair, not knowing that in the near future God would restore everything and more to him. And he could only appreciate this newfound joy and blessing because of the season of despair he had to endure. This is Job talking out of depression, and is not to be taken literally, whether for him personally or especially as a practice on the whole.
- 4) Is this passage, there is a reference to a “boy” being conceived.

Lev. 27:6, Numbers 3:15

This refers to the fact that a child did not have a monetary value placed upon him until they reach the age of one month. Unless a person is arguing that killing any child under the age of one month is fine, then this argument is useless.

Ezekiel 37:8-10, Gen. 2:7

With Adam, God created him from inanimate dirt, and such an occurrence was a once-in-history event. A fetus is not an inanimate thing. Adam was never a fetus, so of course, he came alive when God made him. In Ezekiel, God is doing the same thing out of inanimate bones, not to mention this is only a vision. If one wants to argue that “breathing” is what gives life, then we know that the process of respiration (i.e. transfer of oxygen) begins at conception.

Gen. 38:24

This is about the woman being condemned to death despite being pregnant. This does not say anything about God’s approval of such a decision. This was not any kind of law.

Hosea 13:16

This text says that the judgment upon the Samaritans will include 'their little ones being dashed to pieces' and 'their pregnant women ripped open.' Somehow, some pro-choicers believe it follows that this condones or even mandates abortion to correct errors of an undesirable conception. How does this possibly follow?? There may be some kind of question about God's willingness to allow these unborn to die which may arise, but certainly it doesn't follow that this gives us the mandate or right to conduct abortions. Keep in mind that God has a right to give life and take it away as He sees fit, and that He only allowed this to happen to this people group. One person's sin has unfairly affected the innocent throughout history.]

SO...if biologically and biblically, we can show that the fetus is a separate, distinct individual with rights from the moment of conception, then laws and commands in Scripture apply.

And now, we can say that technically, ABORTION IS MURDER.

APPENDICES: ADDITIONAL SUBJECTS CONCERNING THE ABORTION ISSUE

Abortifacients or Chemical Abortions

RU-486 (Mifepristone) or “The Abortion Pill”: (used 4-7 weeks after last menstrual period). Pill given to block the hormone progesterone, preventing the embryo from staying implanted and growing. Two days later, misoprostol is given to contract the uterus and expel the embryo.

Methotrexate: Approved by the FDA for cancer treatment, it is also used to end pregnancies by attacking the growing cells of the newly formed human and stops embryonic cell division.

Emergency Contraceptive or “Morning-After Pill”: Taken within 72 hours of having sexual intercourse, this prevents the implantation of an already-fertilized egg.”

[Abortifacients have come to the forefront with ObamaCare which mandates that businesses must offer these in their health coverage. (HOBBY LOBBY, etc)]

RESPONDING TO OBJECTIONS:

“Well, it's legal, so its fine”

- Very easy to respond to this one. What is legal does not automatically equal what is morally right. If that were true, then there can and could have never been reformation, such as the outlawing of slavery. And it was certainly legal to kill Jews, so under that thinking, it was right.
- But even our own laws are not consistent... (see beginning of notes)

“If re-criminalized, how should women be punished if they have an abortion?”

Appropriate Punishment for Abortion (both women and doctors)

Pro-choicers always think they stump the pro-lifers by asking how women should be punished if they obtained the procedure when abortion was re-criminalized. This is worth examining.

What if we ask ourselves what penalty should be prescribed by law if a mother deliberately murders her 2-year-old child? What if her child is 7 years old? We know that this would be considered, at the very least in our liberal society, as manslaughter, which is punishable by a jail sentence. If we know that the child in the womb at the time of conception is just as much a child as the child of 2 years old, we must not allow mis-directed compassion for the mother suggest that she and the person she hires to kill her baby be above the law and receive no jail time.

“Once it's illegal, women could no longer claim that they were un-informed that it was wrong. Doctors would be sued for medical malpractice for performing abortions and serve jail time. And as doctors could not longer legally perform the operation without

permission based on the mother's health, then this would make it even more obvious its wrong and more difficult for a woman to get an abortion.

Penalties in law are designed to discourage criminals from carrying out actions that are illegal. Laws do not change hearts, but they control the heartless. The desire for justice demands that severe penalties be given for crimes against the lives of defenseless people. Our society has denied justice for unborn children who are killed daily in their mothers' wombs at the request of the mother. We need to correct this and return that protection to the unborn. It then follows that jail time for those who commit the crime of abortion is not only just, but absolutely necessary."

One of the greatest saints of our time, Mother Teresa, who is known for her kindness and compassion to everyone she met, was asked the question regarding jail time for women who sought abortions and she answered unequivocally that a jail term would be necessary, because the life of a human being had been deliberately taken.

Note: Of course, punishment should not be retroactive. A woman/doctor could not be punished for having/performing an abortion while it was legal.
