

## **Excursus: A Response To Common Pro-Choice Arguments**

Last Lord's Day we had a message introducing the topic of the Bible and Abortion in remembrance of Sanctity of Human Life Sunday. We began by answering the question of when does life begin based on a secular scientific viewpoint and based on the testimony of pro-abortion activists themselves. We saw from these sources alone that human life begins at conception. Then I shared with you several current abortion statistics so that you could get some idea of where we are in America today. We talked about what abortion was, what the act involved. We talked about the root of the problem in abortion and then I shared with you the first and foundational principle that the Bible has related to this question. I want to take a few moments to respond to the arguments that are commonly made for the pro-abortion position not from the perspective of the Bible, but from the discipline of Ethics. Some of them you may have heard and some you may not have.

1. The first argument that is commonly made is the right to choose one's own morality. Pro-abortionists will commonly say, "Don't impose someone else's morality on me." The response to that is, of course, if it is not right to impose morality on others, then no objective morality is possible to govern society at all and the only legitimate society is one of complete anarchy. If this idea is correct, then there can be no criminal laws, no laws providing order (such as traffic laws) or any law whatsoever, because all such laws represent the moral choices of society as a whole. We believe that it is morally right to stop burglars, so we throw them in jail. We believe that it is morally right to keep children safe, so we require car seats. We believe it is morally right for people to keep their word, so our courts enforce contracts. Every law has some moral basis behind it, which you can discover with only a moment's reflection. If you don't believe it ask the nearest attorney (that's me by the way). Further, we can turn this argument around and simply and say to the pro-abortionist, "What right do you have to impose your morality on the human life in the womb?" So this argument fails as a matter of reason.

2. You will commonly hear the argument that society should not force women to bring unwanted children into the world. The most loving thing to do for an unwanted child, then, is to end its life, since the woman obviously does not want and will not love the child. The truth is, however, that the worst case of child abuse is the one that ends life, and it is utter nonsense to define loving action as that which takes life. Ending life is not a "kinder alternative." This argument recognizes the intuitive truth that children need to be loved. This truth indicates what the parent's duty toward the child should be, rather than suggesting abortion. What the argument really points to, is the fact that parents in this situation need to have a change of heart. Moreover, if someone's lack of desire to love another person justifies killing, who's next? If I do not desire to love the elderly and I don't want them around, should I now have the freedom to kill them? What about those with different ethnic backgrounds? Incidentally, since Roe v. Wade child abuse against infants and toddlers has risen over 1000% per capita in this country. Abortion has done nothing to help children or bring about more loving families. It has done the exact opposite. The argument fails as a matter of reason.

3. A third argument is that we must have legalized abortion in order to keep it safe. "If abortion becomes illegal, we'll return to the dangerous days of back alley butchers." "Keep abortion safe

and legal” says the bumper sticker. I addressed this last week also, and as I said prior to 1973 90% of all abortions were performed by licensed physicians, though I certainly don’t object to calling them “butchers.” Further, since that time on average six to seven times more women die every year from complications due to legalized abortion than died from complications due to illegal abortions prior to 1973. So the bare fact is that more women die because abortion is legal than died when it was illegal. This argument fails as a matter of reason.

4. Then there is the argument that requiring women, especially poor ones, to keep their children creates overwhelming financial hardship and forces them into a life of poverty. Therefore, making abortion illegal is a form of economic discrimination against the poor. The response to this argument is simple. If this is a sufficient reason for killing infants, then we should be really be killing a lot more people who create financial burdens for us, such as the homeless or the elderly who are overburdening our health care system. If economic hardship is a sufficient reason to kill others, then we should certainly be killing all criminals, along with IRS representatives, Congressmen who vote to increase taxes or large spending programs, and bureaucrats in general. The truth is the right-to-life knows no economic or racial boundaries, and the answer for such women is clearly personal responsibility for their sexual conduct rather than killing babies. This argument fails as a matter of reason.

5) Some will argue that society should not force women to bring handicapped children into the world. Beloved, if a child is unwanted because of a handicap, this says a lot more about the character of the parent than the value of the child. Moreover, the logical consequence of this argument is once again that there should be a lot more killed in addition to the child in the womb, if it is true (those confined to wheelchairs, the deaf, the blind, the mentally handicapped, those that become handicapped after accidents or through disease, etc.). They are all a burden to society. Further, who determines what a handicap is? Is it enough to be near-sighted? What if a parent decides that being blonde is a handicap? So we start having abortions because of eugenics! Unfortunately this is something that is already happening. This argument also fails as a matter of reason.

6) It is often argued that the woman’s right to bodily self-control is more important and significant than the life of the child in the womb. But the truth is, the sanctity of life is a more important and weighty moral principle than choice, simply because choice as a moral principle depends upon and is protected by the sanctity of life as any sane ethicist will tell you. This truth is fundamental to all human societies, which constantly limit free choice in order to preserve order, function and life itself. Neither men or women are ever given the right to unlimited bodily self-control, because other things (such as life itself) are necessarily more valuable. If choice is more valuable than life and this argument is correct, then we should legalize all drugs, prostitution, robbery, assault, violation of “stop” signs, wholesale murder and a whole lot of other things. Once again, the argument fails as a matter of reason.

These are all inane and thoughtless arguments, thrown out by people haphazardly without any consideration of logic and consequence. All these attempts to justify abortion fail simply as a matter of reason long before we ever even get to the Bible. Such arguments, though, reveal to us what is really going on in the abortion debate. Simply this: The arguments commonly used to

justify abortion are sham arguments from self-deceived hearts used to salve the guilty conscience. Why? Because the true reason for abortion in our society is idolatry, as people selfishly bow to the false gods of money, convenience, pleasure, sexual license and personal comfort. They cannot salve their conscience by these, however; and they cannot be self-justified by admitting the truth, so they have to come up with lame excuses which somehow sound a little better, more compassionate and get them where their sinful and willfully wanton hearts want to be.