

Is Abortion Ever Moral? Evaluating Ten Claims for the Continued Legalization of Abortion

(From Restoring Truth Ministries, LLC @ RestoringTruthMinistries.org)

The following claims encompass some of the most widely heard pro-abortion arguments for maintaining the *Roe v. Wade* decision. The logic found in the replies can be expanded to address nearly all pro-abortion arguments. Of the following, the replies to Claim #1 and Claim #2 have the greatest impact because they establish that the unborn child is fully human and has the same inherent value and dignity as any other person. Once these facts are established, the entire abortion debate changes, for if the unborn child is fully human and of equal worth as a new born baby or any adult, then it is just as immoral to kill an unborn child as it is to murder any member of society.

Claim #1: Medical science tells us that the unborn embryo is not human, it is simply a mass of tissue in a pre-human stage. If it is not human, it is not wrong to abort.

Reply #1: This pro-abortion claim is a deliberate deception utilizing false and outdated information that is easily refuted. The claim relies upon the scientific knowledge of the 19th century, when science had no idea about the enormous complexity of the cell, nor of the clear evidence that human life begins at conception. In the late 1800's, one of Charles Darwin's most influential disciples, Ernst Haeckel, argued through the use of faked drawings that the unborn child retraces the evolutionary steps as it develops, passing through a fish stage, a reptilian stage, etc. Tragically, this concept of 'recapitulation' is still commonly found in high school textbooks, even though it has been completely refuted for more than 50 years (see chapter 3 of *Repairing the Breach*). Why does the deception remain? Because it is much easier to convince students in health class that abortion does not take an innocent human life when they have just come from a science class that showed them faked drawings of the unborn child in a fish stage. Some pro-abortionists have abandoned this evolutionary concept and now simply state that the preborn child is simply a mass of tissue and not human. Again, this position deliberately ignores the real evidence.

What does the real science tell us? At the very moment of conception (and not implantation), the egg and sperm combine to form a new human being, as indicated by the unique, human DNA that is present in the very first cell (the zygote). The DNA in this first cell is different from the mother's DNA, it is different from the father's DNA; it is the complete DNA of a new human being who has now come into existence. The DNA is incredibly complex and the very first cell contains the individual's entire DNA that will serve as the blueprint for the continued growth and development of the individual for life. From the moment of conception onward, then, the preborn are not merely a blob of tissue, they are not passing through pre-human evolutionary history. The unborn are fully human and have begun a process of physical development that will not be

completed for more than twenty years (mental development will be completed around age forty). Since the unborn are fully human, reason tells us that they are a human person and of equal worth as any other human, and that it is wrong to kill an innocent human being.

Despite pro-abortion claims, all legitimate medical textbooks support the fact that human life begins at conception. This position has been supported, and never refuted, by many expert medical testimonies before Congress, including the following Congressional testimony from Dr. Hymie Gordon, a professor of medical genetics and Mayo Clinic physician:

...we can now also say that the question of the beginning of life—when life begins—is no longer a question for theological or philosophical dispute. It is an established scientific fact. Theologians and philosophers may go on to debate the meaning of life or purpose of life, but it is an established fact that all life, including human life, begins at the moment of conception.ⁱ

Thus, as opposed to the pro-abortion rhetoric that those in the pro-life movement are antiquated in their thinking, modern science shows the pro-abortion position to be, not just based on outdated science, but intentionally deceptive.

In addition to the medical evidence, it is also the consistent opinion of Christian theologians that the human soul is created by God out of nothing at the moment of conception. Therefore, sound science, moral philosophy, and faith are in harmony on the question of the beginning of human life. To intentionally take the life of the unborn at any stage following conception through a direct abortion is to take an innocent, fully human life and is always morally wrong.

The pro-abortion side also achieves a harmony of thinking, of sorts, but it is a harmony of falsehood that progresses as follows: There is no God and there are no moral absolutes; man is merely the most evolved of all animals, the measure of all things. As such, it is acceptable to deny the scientific evidence that human life begins at conception when this serves man's interest, and it is acceptable to kill the unborn in the name of choice.

Claim #2: Even if the unborn are human, they are not of equal worth and are not really human persons since their bodies and brains are not very developed and they cannot feel pain. The unborn can therefore be disposed of without moral consequence.

Reply #2: Not only are the unborn alive, they are fully human and arguments that would justify abortion based on level of development are immaterial to the designation of the unborn as human persons of equal worth as any other person. Being fully human (and a human person) does not depend on the level of development, for if it did, there would be no reason to label the newly born as human, for they are scarcely more developed than the hour or even the day before they were born. For that matter, even children and adolescents continue to grow and develop, so why doesn't anyone argue that because they are not fully developed, adolescents are not human persons and can be killed? The abortionists can't have it both ways with the level of development argument, there is no middle ground. Either no one is human until they are in their 20's and reach full physical development (or even age 40 when mental development is complete), or else humanity is determined independent of the level of development and the unborn are fully human.

Since medical science has established that the unborn are fully human from conception onward, it is wrong to abort the unborn at any time.

[Note: similar logic applies to arguments that the preborn are not human due to size, location in the womb, or the degree of dependency on the mother. The logic also refutes arguments to allow an abortion if the baby is mentally or physically handicapped. All such arguments fail if the preborn are fully human because if the preborn can be killed for any of these reasons, then any human can also be killed for these reasons. For more development of this logic see: The Moral Question of Abortion, by Stephen Schwarz.]

The argument that it is acceptable to abort the preborn who are not fully developed falls apart for many reasons, the most important of which have already been established: human life begins at conception and is independent of the level of development. Several additional comments are appropriate when discussing this claim.

- A. Whether the unborn child can feel pain is not relevant to the determination of whether or not the unborn child is human, or when killing a human is acceptable. If the inability to feel pain is an acceptable criterion for killing a human, then why is it not acceptable to kill an innocent human who is not conscious, who is given an adequate pain killer, or who is killed through a non-painful means such as a lethal injection?
- B. Babies develop rapidly after life begins, which is why abortionists do not want women considering an abortion to have a sonogram. Abortionists cannot allow informed choice; the only allowable choice in their eyes is to kill an innocent baby for a fee. Abortionists do not want the public to know the following facts of medical science related to development:
 1. Within 25 days after conception, the baby's heart is beating, and eyes are developing.
 2. Within 30 days of conception, a baby has identifiable arm and leg buds, and has a brain.
 3. Within 40 to 42 days, brain waves can be measured, and features of the face including the nose, ears, and mouth are forming.
 4. Six weeks after conception, the brain is independently controlling the baby's own movements, and the baby may feel pain at this early stage.
- C. Eighty-four percent of abortions occur after week six of the pregnancy because, should a severed body part of the dead child such as a hand or foot be inadvertently left in the womb, a serious health risk to the mother would be present, and it is easier to reassemble body parts of a larger baby.ⁱⁱ This statistic means that, not only do 100 percent of abortions involve the murder of an innocent baby, but in up to 84 percent of abortions, the baby undergoes a painful, torturous death involving:
 1. the tearing apart of the baby through a powerful suction device that is inserted into the womb (a suction abortion, which is the most common type of abortion);

2. the mutilation of the baby's body in the womb, piece by piece, with a sharp cutting device, and the removal of these body parts through the cervix (a dilation and curettage, or D&C procedure);
3. the burning alive of a baby in the mother's womb over a period of hours following the injection of a strong saline solution into the amniotic fluid that is swallowed and surrounds the baby (saline abortion);
4. the injection of chemicals into the uterus that forces the baby to be expelled before it is viable (chemical abortion);
5. the use of forceps to pull apart the baby, piece by piece, and then removal of these body parts through the cervix (a dilation and evacuation, or D&E procedure); or
6. the stabbing of the skull followed by the sucking out of the brain after the baby is completely delivered except for the head (partial birth abortion, also called a dilation and extraction, or D&X procedure).

D. Finally, we are often blind to statistics and medical data supporting the fact that human life begins at conception. Pictures are sometimes needed to awaken us to the meaning of the raw data. It was true with the Nazi holocaust and it is true with the abortion holocaust. For this reason, if the reader doubts that abortions take the life of an innocent, unborn baby that is completely human, please take the time to go to the following website and watch the video "This is Abortion" (once on the main page of abort73.com, scroll down and click on Abortion Video).

www.abort73.com

This link shows the aftermath of abortions. Be forewarned, the pictures are gruesome, but if the citizens of a nation cannot even look at the holocaust that they failed to oppose, then these same citizens are just as guilty, if not more so, as those in Germany who turned the other way during the Nazi holocaust of WWII.

Claim #3: In a humane society, there must be exceptions, such as in the case of rape or incest.

Reply #3: Approximately one percent of abortions involve those performed to terminate the life of an unborn baby who is the product of rape or incest. If someone argues for abortion in the cases of rape or incest, ask them if they are for the elimination of abortion except in such extreme cases. If the answer is no, then they are using this argument as a wedge to keep the door open for all types of abortion.

The instance of rape or incest—while an evil and violent act that should be met with the punishment of the guilty party according to the full extent of the law—does not create a right to kill an innocent human being, including the preborn. No one would argue that it is lawful to kill a 15 or 30 year old who was the product of rape, so why should it be lawful to kill an unborn child who is also fully human? Again, the issue is not how a human life came into being, but whether a human life has begun. Since medical science clearly establishes that human life begins at

conception, personhood and human rights (the most fundamental of which is the right to life) also begin at conception, and it is just as immoral to kill an innocent preborn child conceived through rape or incest as it is to kill a grown man or woman conceived in the same manner.

Further, two wrongs do not make a right; moral evil cannot be done with the hope that some good will come of it. Killing an innocent human being will not negate the evil of rape or incest. Rather, abortion would involve a second violent and evil act that would change the mother from an innocent victim to one who commits a violent act against her own child. This is not a moral solution; it is not right to punish the innocent child who is conceived through rape or incest with a death sentence. To do so would be to take away the most fundamental right of all, the right to life, from an innocent human being.

For those who think that killing an innocent baby will allow the mother to forget the rape or incest and thereby avoid on-going mental anguish, allowing the mother to kill the child she is carrying will not provide long-term comfort, but will almost certainly create greater long-term anguish (see Reply #4). Adoption is the obvious solution for this circumstance, as it does not result in the taking of innocent human life and allows the mother to be separated from the product of rape or incest if that is her choice. Furthermore, this is often a phantom argument, for victims of rape or incest can be greatly comforted by raising the innocent child who is the product of a violent act.

Claim #4: Abortion must be allowed if the mother's life is in danger or for other health risks.

Reply #4: First, the most liberal abortion laws in the world were passed in the U.S. following the *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* decisions. Virtually any so-called health concern—including any reason related to physical, emotional, psychological, or other health factor—can be used to justify an abortion. Thus, simply claiming that having a child will cause emotional stress or will require a changed lifestyle can be, and often is, the real justification to procure an abortion. In fact, 75 percent of women having an abortion cite interference with work, school, or other responsibilities as a primary factor in their decision, and this is equaled by those citing financial concerns. As with the argument of exceptions for rape and incest, then, the 'health' exception argument is used as a wedge to argue for legal abortion in all instances, and the vast majority of abortions do not involve a legitimate health risk.

For those who have not experienced parenthood and the news that one is expecting a baby, here's a News Flash: finding out that you are expecting a child, even when planned, does cause some stress and a changed lifestyle. So does having adolescents, but even abortionists have not yet begun arguing that teenagers causing stress can be brutally murdered by their parents.

What is the moral solution? If the stress and financial commitments related to raising a child are so great as to cause a mother not to want her baby, then adoption is the answer, mutilating and killing one's own child in the womb is not.

Second, C. Everett Koop, former Surgeon General of the U.S. and a pediatric surgeon for nearly four decades reported that he was not aware of a single instance in which an abortion was actually

necessary to save the life of the mother.ⁱⁱⁱ In the extremely rare instance in which a mother's life is truly at risk and medical treatment is required that, as an unintended side effect, could terminate the unborn baby's life (for example, in the case of a rapidly spreading cancer of the uterus), pro-life ethicists hold that, while treatment may result in the death of the unborn child, this would not be a direct abortion, in that the termination of the baby's life is not the intent of the treatment. Moreover, even if abortions were illegal, medical treatment in such an instance would be allowed because the death of the unborn child is an unintended consequence of providing treatment necessary to save the mother's life. Again, it would not be a direct abortion, which is an abortion willed as an end or as a means to an end.

Similarly, when medical treatment for an ectopic pregnancy results in the death of an unborn child, the procedure is not a direct abortion because the ending of the unborn child's life is an unintended consequence of the medically necessary procedure. Again, because pro-life groups and bioethicists would allow for this type of medical procedure if abortion was made illegal, and because they would not classify this type of procedure as a direct abortion, such objections are unrelated to the debate over direct abortion. To provide additional detail on the ethical issues involved here, the following excerpt is from one of the most widely used and respected books on Christian ethics, *Right and Reason*, by Fr. Austin Fagothey, S.J.:

Medical indications may show that the pregnancy cannot come to term, and that both mother and child will die. What then is to be done? Is it not better to save one at the expense of the other than to let both die? The answer is that it is surely better to do so, if it can be accomplished by means that are not morally wrong. But a direct killing of the unborn is morally wrong like any other act of murder. Mother and child have an equal right to life, and neither may be murdered to save the other...

We are faced with an entirely different situation if the death of an unborn child is only indirect, so that is merely permitted and not willed as a means or an end. This situation of *indirect abortion* arises when the mother has some serious illness...and the only workable treatment, whether medicinal or surgical, will have two effects: the cure of the mother's disease and the death of the child...The child is not directly attacked and its death, even if certain to follow, is an incidental and unavoidable byproduct in the performance of a legitimate act. The mother herself needs the treatment, no matter what effect it may have on the child, and the death of the child is not the means by which she is cured. She has a right to take such treatment and is morally allowed to do so. The doctor has the responsibility of deciding whether the mother's condition is truly pathological and whether the treatment contemplated is the only effective remedy. It seems to be a solidly probable opinion that tubal pregnancies cause a genuinely pathological condition of the tube, because the process of implantation amounts to incipient rupture and hemorrhage.^{iv}

Third, the pro-abortionists' insinuation that they are concerned about the health of the mother while the other side is not, is exposed as a complete fabrication when one learns of the extensive

and long-term health risks faced by women who have had an abortion. The following summary statistics are from the highly recommended book, *ProLife Answers to ProChoice Arguments*, by Randy Alcorn (note: multiple studies establish most risk categories listed; here, we report typical risk factors or ranges of risk factors, see pages 178-184 and pages 192-198 of Randy Alcorn's book for reference to specific studies. Also see chapters 9 and 10 of RTM's *Repairing the Breach*). Alcorn's work references dozens of studies reporting that abortion leads to increased risks of:

- ectopic pregnancy (two times as high, up to four times as high for women who have had multiple abortions);
- pelvic infection (up to 30 percent of all postabortive women) that can lead to infertility and subsequent spontaneous abortions;
- endometriosis and complications from infection (up to 5 percent of postabortive women);
- subsequent miscarriages (up to 10 times as common in postabortive women);
- infertility (up to 30 percent higher for postabortive women);
- premature births and low birth weight of subsequent children;
- deformed children in subsequent pregnancies;
- infant death of subsequent children (2 to 4 times as likely);
- placenta previa in subsequent pregnancies that often requires a C-section delivery (at least 7 times as common);
- breast cancer (multiple studies confirm this risk. It is generally accepted that abortions double the risk, multiple abortions increase the risk further. Some studies have reached counter conclusions, but these very studies have been widely criticized as scientifically flawed);
- drug and alcohol abuse (at least 5 times the risk);
- various types of mental disorders that are part of a now recognized condition called post-abortion syndrome (PAS). PAS can include: long-term guilt, depression, long-term stress, eating disorders, uncontrolled weeping, sexual dysfunction, loss of intimacy, and sleep disorders (multiple studies show that 10 to 59 percent of postabortive women suffer one or more of these aftereffects);
- suicidal attempts (up to 9 times as frequent);
- increased extramarital affairs, child abuse and neglect

Tragically, women are almost never given the factual information when receiving counseling from Planned Parenthood or from other abortionists. Again, abortion providers are putting women's health at risk because of the lure of profits, plus an allegiance to a failed, moral relativistic worldview. Abortionists are anything but pro-women and pro-choice; they survive on a massive campaign of misinformation, fear, and deliberate deception. This approach, like the hideous act they perform, is highly immoral. The parallel with programs of misinformation conducted by Hitler and Lenin are obvious. Lies have consequences.

Claim #5: If abortion were illegal, U.S. citizens by the tens of thousands would be forced into back alley abortions and thousands of women would die.

Reply #5: This claim is a carryover from the lies told by pro-abortionists in the 1970's, when they were using every angle to argue for legalized abortion. Dr. Bernard Nathanson, who was the founder of NARAL (National Abortion Rights Action League) and who has since converted to Christianity, admitted that he and other's trying to make abortion legal made up the figures of 5,000 to 10,000 deaths per year in the hope of convincing law makers and the public that making abortion illegal would save lives of women. Nathanson states:

I confess that I knew the figures were totally false, and I suppose the others did [too]...But in the 'morality' of our revolution, it was a useful figure, widely accepted, so why go out of our way to correct it with honest statistics? The overriding concern was to get the laws eliminated, and anything within reason that had to be done was permissible.^v

What was the real number before *Roe v. Wade* was decided in 1973? In 1972, the last full year before the *Roe v. Wade* decision, 39 deaths occurred due to illegal abortions.^{vi}

Also, we must not forget that whether abortion is legal or illegal, the health risk to the unborn child is certain, it is a lethal procedure. If the nation is really concerned about health issues, the first step should be to stop this lethal procedure and to promote alternatives such as adoption.

Claim #6: I'm personally for fewer abortions, but I don't think I should impose my morality on others.

Reply #6: This is a favorite tap dance of politicians and others who want to appear pro-life, but who really are pro-abortion and do not want to see any restrictions. If someone makes this statement, ask them the following questions:

Why would you be personally against abortion if it does not take the life of an innocent human being? In other words, if abortion merely ends the growth of a mass of tissue and does not end an innocent human life, why would you be morally opposed to it personally?

If abortion takes the life of an innocent human being, would it be morally acceptable to stand by and not try to restrict the murder of innocent humans? Are you aware that medical science has definitively established that human life begins at conception?

If you lived in Nazi Germany during WWII and saw millions of Jews and handicapped killed in the gas chambers, would your position have been that you were all for reduced killings in the gas chambers personally, but didn't feel that you should impose your morality on others?

Do you think that the Nuremburg trials at the end of WWII were correct in condemning those Nazis who did not try to stop the holocaust, or who explained

that they were merely following orders and the law of the land? Since abortion takes the life of those humans who are the most helpless and weak of society, how is your silence and failure to oppose the holocaust of abortion any different from those who did not speak out against the Nazi holocaust?

As these questions imply, the issue of abortion, like the Nazi holocaust, involves the notion that all are obligated to follow the natural moral law and to work for the observation of this law in society. Just as the Nazi soldiers who merely followed orders were under obligation to object to the holocaust, so do all people of reasoning age have a moral obligation to actively oppose abortion or, at the very least, not support those seeking positions of power who are pro-abortion in violation of the natural law.

Politicians, in particular, have a moral duty to pass laws that protect the innocent and helpless from harm. This purpose was clear to the great Congressman Henry Hyde who stated the following in the House of Representatives in 1996, during the debate about partial birth abortion:

The law exists to protect the weak from the strong. That is why we are here...What kind of people have we become that this procedure is even a matter for debate? Can we not draw the line at torture, and baby torture at that? If we cannot, what has become of us?

...The supporters of abortion on demand have exercised an amazing capacity for self-deception by detaching themselves from any sympathy whatsoever for the unborn child, and in doing so they separate themselves from the instinct for justice that gave birth to this country.

...It is not just the babies that are dying for the lethal sin of being unwanted or being handicapped or malformed. We are dying...from the cold, the coldness of self-brutalization that chills our sensibilities, deadens our conscience and allows us to think of this unspeakable act as an act of compassion.

...One of the great errors of modern politics is our foolish attempt to separate our private consciences from our public acts, and it cannot be done. At the end of the 20th century, is the crowning achievement of our democracy to treat the weak, the powerless, the unwanted as things? To be disposed of? If so, we have not elevated justice; we have disgraced it.

This is not a debate about sectarian religious doctrine nor about policy options. This is a debate about our understanding of human dignity, what does it mean to be human? Our moment in history is marked by a mortal conflict between [a] culture of death and a culture of life, and today, here and now, we must choose sides.

I am not the least embarrassed to say that I believe one day each of us will be called upon to render an account for what we have done, and maybe more importantly, what we fail to do in our lifetime, and while I believe in a merciful God, I believe in a just God, and I would be terrified at the thought of having to explain at the

final judgment why I stood unmoved while Herod's slaughter of the innocents was being reenacted here in my own country.^{vii}

Claim #7: The Supreme Court has found it Constitutional to allow abortion and we must respect the law of the land.

Reply #7: First, no one should assume that the Supreme Court is immune from mistakes or that Justices do not have personal bias, as was made clear by the *Dred Scott* decision that effectively made slavery legal in all states and contributed to the start of the Civil War. To put blind faith in any man-made institution is unwise, especially when that institution's rulings have allowed the murder of 50 million unborn Americans.

Second, when studying the logic and Constitutional basis for the *Roe v. Wade* decision, it becomes clear that the Court's decision was highly flawed and completely lacking in legal reasoning. Instead, the Court expanded the "right of privacy" argument, previously invented* in the 1965 *Griswold v. Connecticut* decision, as a means to force the moral relativistic views held by the liberal Court upon the American population in the area of abortion, without ever allowing the people or elected representatives to weigh in on the matter. As stated by legal scholar and former nominee for the Supreme Court, Robert Bork, in *The Tempting of America*:

From the beginning of the Republic until that day, January 22, 1973, the moral question of what abortions should be lawful had been left entirely to state legislatures. The discovery this late in our history that the question was not one for democratic decision but one of constitutional law was so implausible that it certainly deserved a fifty-one page explanation. Unfortunately, in the entire opinion, there is not one line of explanation, not one sentence that qualifies as legal argument. Nor has the Court in the [time] since ever provided the explanation lacking in 1973. It is unlikely that it ever will, because the right to abort, whatever one thinks of it, is not to be found in the Constitution.^{viii}

(* the right of privacy is not a right given in the Constitution; at best, it is vaguely implied in portions of the Bill of Rights. The fact that liberal courts have elevated this so-called pre-existing and fundamental right to trump virtually all other considerations, including the right to life, justifies calling their use of the concept an 'invention' and is evidence of just how far the Justices have strayed from the clear intent of the Constitution in an effort to force their moral relativistic views on society. Even so, the fallacy of the right of privacy argument is clearly seen through the following argument: 1) medical science clearly establishes that human life begins at conception, 2) moral philosophy and theology establish that the unborn are of equal value as other humans, 3) even the most liberal of Justices would not extend the right of privacy to allow a mother to legally murder her adolescent, 4) therefore, it is equally inappropriate to allow the mother to murder her unborn child under the so-called right of privacy; for there is no medical, ethical, or theological reason to differentiate between the right to life of the unborn child and the adolescent. In *Roe vs. Wade*, the Court purposely avoided the evidence from medical science concerning the beginning of human life, because the evidence would clearly lead to the conclusion that abortion was murder. Instead, the Justices invoked the strategy of the ostrich; they simply buried their

heads in the sand and declared: “We need not resolve the difficult question of when human life begins.”)

Third, since the *Roe v. Wade* decision was completely lacking in legal argument, the question arises as to why it occurred in the first place. As explained in *Repairing the Breach*, the decision underscored the Court’s departure from the natural law and from the doctrine of original intent, in favor of an activist jurisprudence whereby the Court assumes the right to transform the law to fit the evolving morality it observes, or hopes to observe, in the nation. Who gave them this right? The answer is that no one gave them this right and it does not appear in the Constitution. This power was usurped, or taken without proper authority. This activist and relativistic approach to jurisprudence is the direct outgrowth of evolutionary science and humanistic philosophy as applied to law and is commonly called ‘legal positivism.’ Because the modern historical foundations of legal positivism are evolutionary science and humanistic philosophy—which are the respective products of false science and flawed reason (see *Repairing the Breach*)—legal positivism lacks a sound basis in science and philosophy, and the *Roe v. Wade* decision it produced lacks a sound basis in science, philosophy, and jurisprudence. The decision is flawed from the perspective of every domain.

Fourth, even if the Supreme Court could have found a legitimate Constitutional basis for its decision, citizens of the United States would be morally obligated to oppose the decision and the resulting laws allowing abortion. The reason is that all humans are subject to the unchanging, natural moral law written upon our hearts. The killing of the innocent is wrong and must be opposed; any civil law in conflict with the moral order is not a valid law. Just as the many German soldiers and citizens in WW II were not freed from guilt for their blind obedience to leaders who so clearly violated the natural law, so are we morally responsible if we fail to oppose the *Roe v. Wade* decision, for the immorality of the decision is as clear as were the Nazi death camps.

On a related point, does anyone really think that the morality of abortion was changed from being wrong on January 21, 1973 to being right on January 22, 1973 with the *Roe v. Wade* decision? Does anyone really think that if only three more Justices on the High Court would have rejected the pro-abortion arguments in *Roe v. Wade*, then the ultimate morality of killing the unborn would be different? No, if abortion was murder and immoral before the Court’s inept opinion, then it was murder after the decision; the matter is settled by the natural moral law known to all, and no opinion of biased Justices can change the underlying truth that it is wrong to intentionally take an innocent human life.

Claim #8: Abortion should be allowed because we face an overpopulation problem.

Reply #8: First, if overpopulation were a real problem, the murder of innocent humans is not an acceptable means of solving that problem. If murder is an acceptable means, then perhaps we have been looking at the 9-11 attacks on the World Trade Centers incorrectly. Perhaps if such acts occur in the future we should welcome them as an effective means to limit population.

Second, this claim is yet another argument—dating to Malthus and made popular by its incorporation into Darwin’s theory of evolution—that is completely out of line with reality. While

it is true that many developed countries do have a population problem, the problem is that these countries are not producing enough children to maintain current population levels, and this will devastate the ethnic populations and economic well being of these nations in the 21st century.

The fallacy of the overpopulation myth is easily seen by looking at basic statistics. As stated by Björn Lomborg in *The Skeptical Environmentalist*:

In 1970, 35 percent of all people in developing countries were starving. In 1996 the figure was 18 percent and the UN expects the figure will have fallen to 12 percent by 2010. This is remarkable progress: 237 million fewer people starving.

...Malthus' theory is so simple and attractive that many reputable scientists have fallen for it. But the evidence does not seem to support the theory. The population rarely grows exponentially...Likewise, the quantity of food seldom grows linearly. In actual fact the world's agricultural production has more than doubled since 1961, and in developing countries it has more than tripled. This means that there has been a steady growth in the amount of food available for each member of the population. According to the UN we produce 23 percent more food per capita than we did in 1961, and the growth in agricultural crops per person in developing countries has grown by as much as 52 percent.^{ix}

Why does the overpopulation myth persist? The Malthus/Darwinian myth continues to be taught as a fact of science and in health class for its utilitarian value. Quite simply, high school students are taught the lies that abortion and 'safe sex' are good solutions to overpopulation, and this is supplemented by values clarification techniques such as the well-known lifeboat example, wherein students have to choose the lifeboat passenger to be killed because there is an inadequate food supply to sustain all. The overpopulation myth was used extensively in the 1960's and early 1970's to argue for the legalization of abortion, and it will remain in vogue as long as deception is allowed to be portrayed as truth in our schools and in the media.

Claim #9: Your arguments against abortion rest on the moral judgment that it is always wrong to take an innocent human life. But we are now in a 'postmodern' era that rejects all notions of truth and moral absolutes, so who are you to tell me what is right or wrong and to force your religious beliefs on me? To state this more formally, arguments invoking the concept of moral absolutes rest on the existence of the natural moral law—the concept that everyone is imprinted with an understanding of what constitutes moral behavior. I question the existence of the natural moral law. At a minimum, I dispute that the concept has any relevance whatsoever for, even if a universal sense of morals existed, such feelings would be attributed to undirected, purposeless evolution. Thus, the natural law would have no ultimate source—it would not emanate from God—and no real obligation to follow the natural law would result since it would be merely a byproduct of random mutations. All this flows from the findings of evolutionary science and modern philosophy, which have shown belief in God to be the product of ancient superstitions. Since God is a myth, any notions of the natural law and of moral absolutes are merely an evolutionary byproduct that need not be obeyed. This means that nothing can be viewed as always wrong, including abortion.

Reply #9: There are many statements in this claim to address. First, the statement that there is no truth is itself a truth claim about the ultimate nature of reality and is inconsistent with the belief that there is no truth. Someone who denies that absolutes exist cannot, at the same time, be absolutely sure that there is no such thing as truth.

To be logically consistent, the furthest that one could go is to state that they are unsure if truth and moral absolutes exist. The use of sound reason in the area of moral philosophy (ethics) can then establish that moral absolutes do exist (see below for brief examples of such reasoning). Further, from a theological standpoint, since Christianity is based on the teachings of Jesus Christ, who claimed to be the source of all truth, the intellectually honest nonbeliever should be willing to investigate whether Christianity is supported by the evidence through the use of sound methodology appropriate to the domains of science, history, philosophy, and theology. If Christianity is supported by the evidence in all domains while non-Christian worldviews such as postmodernism fail under scrutiny, then it is rational to believe that Christianity is true, that truth does exist, and that there are moral absolutes, including the Christian teaching that abortion is always wrong.

Second, while postmodernism and other non-theistic philosophies may conclude that moral absolutes do not exist, such philosophies should be rejected as false and unworkable, for no society could survive if such a conclusion was really applied to every day life. The reason is that no society could survive without laws, and virtually all laws involve a value judgment about what constitutes moral behavior and what is a reasonable restriction on freedom. Now that the dominant worldview in America is postmodern philosophy, which denies the existence of moral truth, should we dissolve all laws? Should we never convict a murderer because such a verdict would involve the imposition of the moral judgment that it is wrong to kill? Should we never give speeding tickets to those who drive 90 miles per hour through school zones, or who sell drugs to 6th graders? No, a well functioning society requires judgments about what is moral and acceptable behavior; passing civil laws that define moral behavior is the only way to avoid chaos and anarchy. The issue is not whether morals exist and should be enforced through the civil law, the issue facing every society is to determine the proper moral basis of civil law.

America's Founders strongly believed in the truth of the Christian worldview and that civil law should reflect the natural moral law placed on the hearts of all persons by God. The result was the creation of the most successful and prosperous nation in the history of civilization, and there is every reason to believe that this was directly attributable to the belief in the Christian worldview. America departs from this perspective at its own peril.

Third, the arguments against the natural moral law presented above are: 1) that it likely does not exist, and 2) even if the natural law does exist, it has no ultimate meaning without God, who is a myth based upon findings from evolution theory and modern philosophy.

Addressing the first possibility, a survey of modern and ancient societies easily establishes that all societies hold common beliefs about what is morally acceptable. Even in atheistic, communist societies, one cannot walk down the street and randomly shoot innocent citizens for sport; all societies recognize that such an action is wrong and immoral. Clearly, there are common morals and principles held by all people, and these morals are part of the natural law. The natural law

includes the view that murdering an innocent person is immoral. This is a philosophical conclusion since it can be reached by reason alone, independent of revealed religion (although strongly confirmed by Christianity), and does not involve forcing one's religious views on another.

Since we know conclusively from science that an unborn child is an innocent person, there should be no reason why any nation allows abortion if the civil law is to be consistent with the common view of morality found in all societies. The fact that abortion is allowed in most countries is not an indication that the concept of the natural moral law is an illusion. Rather, the permitting of abortion merely indicates that the natural law can be suppressed and that consciences will be improperly formed when man's sinful nature is not tamed, but is instead fostered or misled through cultural influences such as the secular media and educational indoctrination.

Concerning the possibility that the natural law may exist, but has no ultimate meaning because God is a myth, even if the theory of evolution was supported by the evidence, the intellect (of which conscience is a part) involves more than the material and cannot be explained merely by naturalistic, evolutionary forces. This means that to dismiss the feelings of conscience and natural moral law as the product of random mutations is wholly inadequate. Further, even if evolution was supported by the scientific evidence, theistic (God-directed) evolution could not be ruled out. That is, were the theory of evolution kept within the proper limits of science, it would have nothing to say about the possibility of the supernatural, nor the source of the natural moral law. Those who extend evolution theory into the domains of philosophy and theology exceed the proper bounds of science. Unfortunately, as made clear in *Repairing the Breach*, the evolution theory taught in public high schools and at the university level is often tainted by materialistic philosophy and is antagonistic toward the possibility of theistic evolution (this was the position of Darwin as well). This means that those who dismiss the evolution controversy as irrelevant to the culture wars are making a serious error, as *every non-theistic philosophy must rely on materialistic evolution for its intellectual foundation*. While truth (in science) cannot contradict (religious) truth, falsehood in the domain of science can appear to falsify religious truth, which is why evolution theory has led multitudes away from the Christian worldview.

The most satisfactory reply of all against the claim that evolution and philosophy have eliminated the possibility of God, natural law, and moral absolutes is that *the real scientific evidence clearly suggests that the theory of evolution is not true, and that the philosophies that are dependent on materialistic evolution (including postmodernism) are unsupportable*. As made clear in works such as *Repairing the Breach*, those who take the time to look at the claims of evolution in light of the real evidence in the scientific literature will quickly see that the theory of evolution involves false scientific claims that continue to appear in high school biology books simply to bolster false worldviews. When the deception behind evolutionary science is realized, the argument that God, the natural law, and moral absolutes can be explained away by evolutionary science and evolutionary-dependent philosophies completely disintegrates.

Finally, those seeking to base their worldview on truth and reality should beware of blind acceptance of what is taught by non-believing instructors. Although higher education is now dominated by postmodern philosophy, it is a mistake to believe that dominance by any

philosophy necessarily means that the philosophy is true and reflects reality. Postmodernism does not represent the final triumph of philosophy. Rather, postmodernism marks the effective death of philosophy and, potentially, of all domains and learning because it denies that objective truth exists. Further, the postmodern worldview is demonstrably false as it is *not* supported by sound reason or the evidence in the domains of science, history, philosophy, or theology (nor, for that matter, is atheism, agnosticism, humanism, the New Age or liberal theology). This means that postmodernism should never be used to comment on morality or to frame civil law, and that it is an extreme form of ignorance, if not intentional self-deception, to state that this or other godless philosophies have disproved the existence of supernatural and of the natural moral law.

For those who seek truth, the book *Repairing the Breach* makes it abundantly clear that only one religion or worldview is consistent with the evidence from all domains and achieves a harmony of truth. This unique faith and worldview is Christianity. If you are interested in finding truth, if you are willing to walk in obedience to the Creator of the universe, you can begin your quest for truth by reading *Repairing the Breach* (RestoringTruthMinistries.org).

Claim #10: People can have honest differences of opinion on controversial issues such as abortion. A reasonable compromise is to allow each person to decide the morality of abortion for their own self. Such freedom should especially extend to a woman because abortion involves a woman's own body.

Response #10: The three sentences in this claim will be addressed in reverse order. Regarding the statement that the expectant mother should be allowed to choose since abortion involves her body, Stephen Schwarz replies in *The Moral Question of Abortion*:

First, the child is not a part of his mother's body. For example, their blood circulations normally do not mix; the child may have a different blood type from the mother; the child may be male, and his male body is obviously not part of his mother's female body. Second, the intimate involvement of the child in his mother's body reflects his dependency on her. But dependency does not affect personhood. He is dependent because he is small and fragile; he needs the protective nest of his mother's womb. This says something about his body, its state of development. It says nothing about his status as a person.^x

Further, building on the conclusion from medical science and reason that human life and personhood begin at conception, Schwarz explains that if there is a right to one's body, then first of all, "...it is a right everyone has; and two, it includes the right not to have one's body destroyed (e.g., by dismemberment), the right not to be killed...if a woman has a right over her body, then the child has that right too."^{xi}

The second sentence claiming that it is reasonable to allow each person to decide the morality of abortion is equally flawed. Abortion involves the intentional murder of an unborn child, and 50 million unborn children have been brutally murdered since 1973 in America—mind boggling statistics that dwarf the number killed in the Nazi holocaust. Allowing the American holocaust to continue and then calling it a reasonable compromise is no compromise and it is not reasonable; it is a failure to oppose a great moral evil, the murder of the most helpless and innocent. All people

and all societies are obligated to oppose abortion because the intentional taking of an innocent life is counter the moral law written upon all hearts.

Finally, given that the scientific, medical, philosophical, and theological evidence and arguments are wholly on the pro-life side, one is justified in asking why any reasoning person would be pro-abortion. The previous responses to ten common pro-abortion claims have illustrated that the continuing legality of abortion is not really about accommodating reasonable differences of opinion. Rather, the pro-abortion movement has been able to dominate the landscape because it has mastered the art of deception; their positions rest entirely on passing off flawed reasoning and false data as legitimate to millions who have not bothered to study the truth about abortion. Those in the pro-abortion movement *must* rely on deception because medical science, logic, and the moral truth are not on their side.

Why do abortionists and those in the pro-abortion movement willingly dupe an apathetic public? First, because abortionists have no interest in truth; they sacrifice the truth in order to collect profits from the killing of the innocent (abortion generates hundreds of millions of dollar each year), and they are very willing to pay for the political influence needed to keep abortion legal. More generally, those in the pro-abortion movement are deeply involved in the war of worldviews. They see the fight over abortion rights as a key battleground through which they can maintain their perceived right to do whatever they please. The need to put forth deceptive science, false medical claims, and flawed philosophical arguments to win this battle matters little to them. The end (moral autonomy) justifies the means (deceptive science and logic). As acknowledged by Aldous Huxley:

I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption...The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics. He is also concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do...For myself as, no doubt, for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation...from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom.^{xii}

4/23/09

Note: the contents of this PDF file can be downloaded, copied, and distributed at no cost, provided recipients are not charged for the distributed copies. Alternatively, these and all other RTM “Tear Sheets” can be purchased for a nominal price from Restoring Truth Ministries, LLC @ RestoringTruthMinistries.org.

ⁱ John M. Wynne and Stephen A. Wynne, *Repairing the Breach* (Brown Books, Dallas TX, 2008), p. 253

ⁱⁱ Randy Alcorn, *ProLife Answers to ProChoice Arguments*, (Multnomah Publishers, Sisters, Oregon, 2000), p. 67

ⁱⁱⁱ *Ibid*, p. 221

^{iv} Fr. Austin Fagothey, S.J., *Right and Reason: Ethics in Theory and Practice Based on the Teachings of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas* (2nd edition, C.V. Mosby Company, St. Louis, 1959), p. 284, 285

^v *Repairing the Breach*, p. 256; originally from Bernard N. Nathanson, M.D., with Richard N. Ostling, *Aborting America* (Toronto: Life Cycle Books, 1979), p. 193

^{vii} *Ibid*

^{viii} *Repairing the Breach*, p. 268

^{ix} Robert H. Bork, *The Tempting of America* (Touchstone, New York, NY, 1990), p. 112

^x *Repairing the Breach*, p. 337; originally from Björn Lomborg, *The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 5, 60-61

^{xi} Stephen Schwarz, *The Moral Question of Abortion*, (Loyola University Press, Chicago, 1990), p. 45

^{xii} *Ibid*, p. 123

^{xiii} *Repairing the Breach*, p. 203; originally from Aldous Huxley, *Ends and Means* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1937), pp. 312, 315-316.