

Pro-Life Answers to False Pro-Choice Arguments



The "fetus"-----human life or not?

As pro-lifers, we need to educate ourselves and have answers to pro-choice arguments and rhetoric. Over the next few weeks, we will highlight the typical pro-choice claims and we will arm you with good and accurate information to refute their misleading and false arguments.

For many years, their most significant and basic argument has been that the so-called fetus is not a human life; it's just a simple mass of tissue or part of the pregnant woman's body. They also claim that the question of when human life begins is uncertain and a religious issue.

However, medical textbooks and scientific reference works consistently agree that life begins at conception, when a genetically distinct individual is brought into existence. Some of the world's most prominent scientists and physicians testified to a U.S. Senate committee that human life begins at conception. At these same hearings, pro-abortionists, though invited to do so, failed to produce even a single expert witness who would testify that life begins at any point other than conception.

From the moment of conception, the unborn fetus is not simple, but very complex. The newly fertilized egg contains a staggering amount of genetic information, sufficient to control the individual's growth and development for an entire lifetime. The key word is development. Like a toddler or adolescent, the term fetus does not refer to "non-humans", but to humans at a particular stage of development. It is scientifically inaccurate and untrue to say a fetus is not a human being simply because he or she is at an earlier stage of development than an infant.

Being inside something is not the same as being part of something. The mother and the unborn child are two separate individuals and half the time, they are not even the same sex! The child has its own DNA, fingerprints and blood type, distinct from the mother's. The unborn child even takes an active role in his or her own development, even controlling the course of the pregnancy and the time of birth.

A woman's right to "choose"?

The word "choice" (as used on the subject of abortion) is probably the most misleading and deceptive term in the English language.

While it might sound good to say that government should allow people to make all their own choices, that is neither practical nor desirable. Some choices are crimes. All crimes are choices.

Once a woman is pregnant, barring a miscarriage or an induced abortion, she will have a baby. Therefore, her only "choice" is, "How is the baby going to come out?" Will he or she come out alive and crying, or dead and in pieces? Truly, her choice is between life and death---a live baby, or a dead one.

Consider this hypothetical situation. A group of young men have just started a "Right to Rape" organization. They argue that they have the right to choose to rape women. The real question, they tell us, is, "Who decides, us or the government? We believe that the government should stay out of this very private matter." Furthermore, they want the state to set up tax-funded centers where they can rape women in a safe, legal fashion.

Clearly, our response would be, "Absolutely not; rape is wrong!"

Note carefully that the real and overriding question is not, "who decides" but a question about the action itself. We must first ask ourselves, "Is rape right or wrong?" Only then can we answer the question of who has the right to choose to do it.

And so it is with abortion. No one should have the "right to choose" abortion because it involves taking the life of a separate, innocent human being and is therefore an atrocity.

"Every child a wanted child."

Prior to the legalization of abortion over 40 years ago, advocates for abortion held out the panacea of the elimination of "unwanted children" if only abortion was legal. In fact, it was Planned Parenthood, which led this charge, coining the familiar slogan, "Every child a wanted child." Despite the fact that some 57 million "unwanted" babies have died in the intervening period, the pro-choice lobby still uses this argument to justify abortion.



In the 1960's and 70's the pro-choice position was that legalizing abortion would drastically reduce child abuse. America legalized abortion and during the next 40 plus years, child abuse has skyrocketed (from 167,000 cases in 1973 to 1,694,756 cases in 2002). Yet, despite this staggering increase in child abuse, the pro-choice lobby continues to tie itself in knots by now arguing that making abortion illegal would cause an increase in child abuse!!! How many more millions of children do we have to kill before their scheme starts to work?

We all agree that every child should be wanted. This is an idealistic goal, but sadly we do not live in an idyllic world. Wouldn't it also be a wonderful world if there were no unwanted wives, no aging unwanted parents, no unwanted Jews, blacks or Catholics or anyone else who is devalued or persecuted?

Moreover, since when does anyone's right to live depend upon someone else wanting them? Women rightfully resent that the value of a woman is sometimes determined by whether a man wants her. How can anyone possibly insist that the value of an unborn baby is to be determined by whether a mother wants him or her at any given time? To use being wanted by someone as a measure of whether a human life is allowed to live is a truly frightening concept. Its converse logically awaits us --- that the unwanted can be eliminated. Don't forget that Hitler's Germany was ideal for wanted Aryans.

To make sense, the slogan: "Every child a wanted child" has to be completed "and if not wanted, aborted." To complete the sentence removes the mask from this misleading slogan and reveals it for the evil that it is!

"You cannot legislate morality or force your religious views on others!"

To say that laws cannot make an immoral person moral is correct. To say that we do not legislate morality is nonsense. Virtually every law is based on an idea of what is right or wrong.

Laws are not passed to control thought, but to control behavior. For example, we impose our morality on rapists. We do not care so much why rapists rape, or what their moral and religious views are, or the reason why rapists disrespect women. Rape is evil and when



people want to do evil, it is clearly correct for the government to impose its morality on them. Similarly, pro-lifers do not care so much what people think about babies, as long as they do not kill them.

Indeed, if laws should not be based on morality, what on earth should they be based on? The reality is that laws are based on our collective moral values and is the way society decides which activities it will and will not tolerate.

If we are going to reject a law simply because it is supported by religion, then we would have to abolish most laws. A person does not have to be especially religious to say that it is wrong to abort a child, any more than they would say it is wrong to steal money. Certain activities are unacceptable to civilized people regardless of religious beliefs. Abortion is one of those issues. In reality, abortion is a civil rights and a human rights issue.

Let us not forget that the black civil rights movement was dominated by pastors and was often headquartered in churches. That did not make civil rights a religious issue!

"How can you make a fetus more important than a grown woman?"

Abortion is a human rights issue, but politically speaking, it does involve competing rights. On the one hand, you have the mother's "right" not to be pregnant. On the other hand, you have the baby's right not to be killed. The question that must therefore be answered is which right is more fundamental?



Abortion advocates argue that outlawing abortion would, in essence, elevate the rights of the unborn over and above those of the mother. However, in reality, outlawing abortion would not be giving unborn children more rights; it would simply re-establish for them the most fundamental right that no one can live without, namely the right to life.

If a baby is not to be aborted, then the pregnant mother must remain pregnant. This will also require of her sickness, fatigue, reduced mobility, an enlarged body and some new clothes. Fortunately, it is not a permanent condition. On the flip side, for a pregnant woman not to be pregnant, her child must be killed (unless she is past 22 weeks of pregnancy, in which case the baby may well survive outside the womb). Abortion costs the unborn child his or her very life and it is a thoroughly permanent condition. That is

what's at stake, both for the child and for the mother. It is not an issue of who is more important, but rather who has more on the line.

Any time there are competing rights, the government must protect the more fundamental right. For example, the law requires the driver of a car to slow down and stop so a pedestrian may cross the road in front of him. This is not because the pedestrian is more valuable or important than the driver, but rather because, if the driver does not stop, it might cost the pedestrian his life.

Obviously, for a woman to remain pregnant, she gives up far more than a few minutes of drive time, but she gives up far less than her baby who would otherwise be killed. This is what it comes down to. Since the child has far more at stake, the more fundamental right to life must be upheld.