

## **LIFE AND PEACE ARE ALWAYS THE RIGHT CHOICES**

1. The taking of innocent life is called murder.
2. Take a look at the pictures of aborted babies, murdered babies, lying without legs or arms, in a pile of blood with their little fingers and face features in pain, or listen to what an ex-abortionist doctor says about when they were doing the "PROCEDURE", and how the baby moved away and tried to hide in the walls of the uterus, or that its head moved when the aborted baby was placed a few seconds still alive in the lab desk. Such direct evidence is very powerful. A current strategy of propaganda by the pro-abortionists is that they attempt to dissuade or prevent anyone from viewing the actual abortion procedure on the grounds that all medical procedures are grisly. However, consider the difference between viewing a medical procedure designed to save, such as a heart transplant, and a partial-birth abortion, where the child's skull is crushed or pierced, and then followed with the suction and removal of its brain. Which is clearly horrifying?
3. Abortion is not a matter of choice, it's a matter of life and how we value life. Certainly the person who is aborted is not being offered any choice.
4. Life begins at conception Each individual has a very neat beginning at conception. This is not a metaphysical contention, it is plain experimental evidence. If a fertilized egg is not by itself a full human being it could not become one, because nothing is added to it. That is, life begins when the sperm and egg get together at conception to form a full set of DNA, without which human life would not begin and progress (Dr. Jerome LeJuene). Dr. M. Matthew Roth, of Harvard University, said "It is scientifically correct to say that individual human life begins at conception."
5. The Fourteenth Amendment states, "The State shall not deprive any person of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."
6. No clearly defined point at which to state an embryo is human or is not has ever been empirically established by pro-abortionists. If this point is not defined, then how can one with any validity make the argument that abortion is not killing a person.
7. Abortion takes away the right of a human being to live.
8. Pro-abortionists like to say that the child is only a "potential" human. That the child IS something is obvious. Calling her a "potential" human doesn't say what she is, it only speaks to what she will be. I have never heard a pro-abortionist say what the child IS. The reason for that is obvious. They know the answer and that answer is that the child is human. No person or animal has ever been observed to change into some other kind of creature during their lifetime. If something is a cat, it has always been a cat, and will always be a cat. If someone is a human being then they have always been and will always be a human being.

9 Unborn persons are dependent on their mothers for survival just as newborn babies and young children are, and indeed, as many elderly and ill persons are. Being dependent does not make one not human or not a person.

10. Having the freedom to choose whether or not an unborn person is to be killed is not a right which can be justified morally or legally. No person has right to destroy the life of another person.

11. The unborn person is human and physically distinct from the mother and not just part of her own body. The unborn child often has a blood type different from that of the mother. If the differing blood types were to mix, one or both of the mother and child could die. Half of all babies are male. During the pregnancy, is the mother temporarily part male? Without the protection provided by the amniotic sac the unborn child would be expelled from the mother's body as a foreign object. Clearly, the unborn child IS IN the mother's body but IS NOT PART of the mother's body.

12. Just because every child may not be wanted by their parents, is not reason enough to justify killing the child because parents have a responsibility for the life they helped to create, and because an unborn person has a right to live which outweighs another person's right to kill and to avoid raising a child they created.

13. Even if women continue to have illegal abortions, this is no logical argument in support of keeping abortions 'safe and legal'. First, even legal abortions are dangerous to the mother physically and psychologically. Second, it is a fallacy to argue that a law should be changed because some persons will break it.

14. It is a fallacy to argue that pro-life laws are an effort to legislate morality since all laws are passed to restrict or encourage behavior, and hence have some kind of moral view of the world being promoted.

15. Pro-abortionists argue that abortion should be allowed in cases of rape and incest. Again, a quick answer is "Why?" A woman who has been raped will not be 'unraped' after an abortion. Abortion will not take away the incestuous violation of a young girl. In fact, in the case of incest, abortion helps protect the abuser by helping to hide his crime. Secondly, when rapists are jailed, we do not also jail their children. Killing a child who is a product of rape or incest punishes the child. It does not punish the rapist or abuser. No civilized society punishes a child with death because of the sins of their parents. I can understand that a woman who is pregnant due to rape or incest may not want the child. However, killing the child just puts the woman in the position of responding to violence with another act of violence. There are millions of couples eager to adopt babies. There are couples willing to adopt any baby, not just healthy white babies. This allows the woman to not have to forever be reminded of her violation without having to live with the physical and psychological consequences of abortion.

16. The truth is that no conclusive evidence has been provided which proves that an unborn baby

is not a person. Since the number of cases concerning the abortion issue involves millions of lives, no sane or humane society would risk committing millions of murders.

17. Pro-abortionists argue that abortion should be allowed in cases of severe 'fetal deformities'. Words are powerful weapons. When we want to provoke feelings of compassion we speak of 'handicapped children.' When we want to advocate killing we speak of 'fetal deformities.' Since when do we deal with a person's physical problems by killing them? If that is the case then why not advocate burning down all of the nation's nursing homes with the residents still inside? A second consideration is that many forms of prenatal testing for handicaps are flawed and unreliable. Do we risk killing a baby for an ailment that she may not really have?

18. Pro-abortionists argue that pro-lifers are concerned with unborn babies, not women and born children. This is an irrelevant argument since it does not address the issue of whether unborn babies are human or not. However even so, it is still patently absurd. If that were the case then pro-lifers would not be running crisis pregnancy centers all over the country. If that were the case then pro-lifers would not be more active in charities than the average person. If that were the case then pro-lifers would not be giving help to both child AND mother during and after pregnancy. If that were the case then pro-lifers would not be trying to adopt children.

19. Pro-abortionists argue that abortion prevents unwanted children and therefore prevents child abuse. First, I would suggest that abortion is the ultimate child abuse. To what greater abuse could a child be subjected than be ripped piece by piece from her mother's womb? Secondly, if this argument were true then the rate of child abuse in the country would have gone DOWN since abortion was legalized in 1973. On the contrary, though, child abuse has gone UP since then. The nonchalant way in which the nation accepts abortion has led to a devaluation of human life that has led to more abuse, not less.

20. Pro-abortionists argue that most people favor legal abortion. Let us for the moment assume this is true. I still respond, "So what." Does majority support for something make it right? If it did we would still have slavery. In any case, this argument is not true. Polls can be taken that show some support for legalized abortion. However, it is a known fact that poll results can be skewed by the way a question is answered. If people are asked "Should a women be allowed to make her own medical decisions without governmental interference?" then they typically answer yes. However, if they are asked "Should unborn children be protected from being ripped apart in the womb?" they will also answer yes. Neither question does a good job of determining public opinion. To determine public opinion, questions must be worded in an unbiased way. When people are asked "Do you oppose abortion on demand?" better than 2/3 say "YES." More than 78% would ban all but the "hard cases" (rape, incest, life of the mother).

21. Pro-abortionists argue that pro-lifers aren't willing to support the greater number of children who would be born due to the ending of abortion. This is an irrelevant argument since it does not address the issue of whether unborn babies are human or not. But there's something else that's

wrong with this argument and it's something that's wrong with the argument itself. It's something that's functionally wrong with the thinking. It can't work even if none of the pro-lifers want to support the children saved from abortions. The argument doesn't work. Once again, we'll restate the argument. "It sounds to me like you're saying that it is not appropriate for a person to object to the killing of unborn children if they are not willing to provide for the unborn children that are allowed to live." That's the argument. Having restated that and getting an affirmative nod from the person I'm talking with, I want to ask another question. "What would you say if I suggested that we solve the homeless problem in this way. We herd all of the homeless together, who are really a drag on our resources, and inject them with a poison or gas them. Let's just kill them and get them out of the way. Would you object to that?" I presume the answer would be yes and then the response that I would offer would be "What if I told you that you have no right to object to killing the homeless unless you're willing to take some of the homeless into your home or help to pay for them out of your own pocket. Your moral objection isn't sound if you aren't willing to take care of the needs that accrue as a result of letting them live." Obviously in a circumstance like that the person is going to say that it's not an appropriate kind of argument for the same reason that it's not appropriate to say that the United States couldn't object to the killing of Jews in Nazi Germany unless we were willing to take all six million Jews onto our own soil. The reason is because we're talking about human beings. We're talking about people's lives and you don't make a trade off like that. If a person's life is in jeopardy it doesn't matter whether you're willing to care for that life or not for you to have a legitimate moral objection against the taking of that innocent life. That's the point.

<http://robertbayer.tripod.com/ProLifeStatements>