

**LET'S THINK THROUGH THAT**

**“It doesn't really impact me.  
Why should I care what  
another person does?”**

- You don't think the extermination of what is essentially a generation's worth of people impacts you? There are about 72 million American Millennials. Since Roe vs. Wade in 1973, at least 50 million abortions have been performed (some believe the number is much higher). Around 1 million abortions occur in the US alone every year. From the Revolution through Vietnam, around 1.2 million Americans were killed in combat.
- Abortion represents not only inhumanity in the present action, but also the loss of incredible potential in the future. Taking the life of the innocent is an abomination (Proverbs 6:16-17). Sin that is sanctioned by a nation affects everybody (Prov. 14:34, Psalm 9:7, Jeremiah 18:8-11, Leviticus 18:24-25).
- God's people have an obligation to save, not turn a blind eye (Prov. 24:11-12).
- The one who concludes that life is only worth saving or helping if one is directly impacted by it will have a rude awakening on the judgment day (Matthew 25:34ff, Luke 10:25-37, 16:19ff).

**“A fetus isn’t a person. It has  
no rights. It’s just a speck.”**

- **As was addressed in another lesson from last year, the concept of personhood is just a convenient way to attach subjective value to one human or another. What really determines personhood? Mental capacity? IQ? Full autonomy? Full physical development? It's not a huge leap from fetuses to those who are medically dependent on others for life or for those with mental and physical disabilities. And, just like the founder of Planned Parenthood Margaret Sanger was an outspoken advocate of eugenics and race suppression, subjective definitions of personhood lead to some ghoulish conclusions.**
- **Either all humans have an inherent right to be alive, or there is no moral or ethical constraint on subjectively valuing one life over another.**
- **We are created in God's image (Genesis 1:26-28) masterfully crafted in the womb with a sense of identity before birth (Psalm 139:13-16). The words used to describe an unborn infant in both the Hebrew (yeled in Exodus 21:22) and Greek (brephos in Luke 1:41, 44) are also used in other contexts (both secular and Biblical) of born children (Acts 7:19).**

**“But aren't you valuing one life  
over another when you force a  
woman to be pregnant?”**

- **There is a huge difference, ethically speaking, between imposing something unnatural on a person and insisting that an entirely natural process be allowed to carry itself out. Pregnancy is a natural consequence of sex. What the body does in providing the environment, safety, and sustenance of an unborn baby is unconscious and by design. It is, in fact, the abortion that is unnatural – a violent interruption of a natural and life-fostering biological process.**
- **Besides, we must accept that the “I have rights!” calculation is complicated by the addition of another party. The life of a genetically unique human individual begins at conception, so there is another set of rights that runs alongside the rights of the mother.**
- **“Rights” are inviolable only as long as the rights of another are not infringed. I do not have universal “carte blanche” approval to do whatever I want. My rights only extend as far as another person’s body. And, in the end, *none of us have the right to kill an innocent life.* Feeling imposed upon by another is not an ethical justification for destroying that person.**

**“Ok, but you wouldn’t force  
someone to donate blood or a  
kidney. So why can I be forced  
to have a baby?”**



- **This is actually a very old argument, similar to “Thomson’s Violinist Argument.” Essentially, the argument is that it would be wrong to forcibly take a healthy organ from one person to save the life of another. We all have “ownership” of our bodies. A woman has a right to her uterus, and nobody, including a fetus, has a right to take what she does not want to give.**
- **These things are not analogous, though, since the argument really only proves that it would be wrong to forcibly impregnate a woman. Transferring an organ or blood to another person is not a natural process. An injured person will die without it, but the blame does not rest on those unwilling to donate. Pregnancy, however, is a natural process. Ethically, allowing someone to die and killing are not parallel. Besides, hypotheticals that don’t actually happen in real life only prove so much!**
- **Adjust the analogy a bit and ask if it still works... would a woman, forced to donate a kidney against her will, be allowed to retake ownership of her kidney by murdering the recipient? Similarly, then, once a pregnancy happens, does she have a right to kill the fetus to retake her uterus?**

**“So you’re going to pay for all  
the childcare, adoptions,  
foster care, health insurance,  
daycare, etc., etc., right?”**

- **This argument is really just a smokescreen. According to the Guttmacher Institute (a pro-abortion organization) almost 75% of women who elected to have an abortion stated their main reason was "Having a baby would dramatically change my life." A third of women claimed to have considered adoption as an option, but concluded it was wrong to give up one's offspring to another.**
- **Even if it is true that having a baby would be cost-prohibitive to a woman (for a variety of reasons, many of which are certainly worth considering), it still does not address the central ethical and moral problem surrounding abortion.**
- **Complain about healthcare costs, daycare, inconvenience, not feeling ready, dramatic lifestyle changes, etc., etc., and we are still left with the same conclusion. Murdering the innocent is wrong.**
- **Cost of parenthood and healthcare is an important conversation that our country needs to have. Biblical teaching consistently advocates for the support of the poor, orphans, widows, and other vulnerable groups. There are areas of compromise to be explored. But none of that is related to the central ethical and moral problem.**

**Pro-life position: "I agree that we should explore ways to help new mothers, lower healthcare costs, and make parenthood accessible for all. I'd be willing to compromise on a lot! Can we just stop killing babies?"**

**Pro-choice position: "No. I want ALL of the things you mentioned, plus more stuff, AND the right to abortion will remain absolute."**

**Some Quick Hits**

- ***“What about medically necessary abortions?”*** This has never been the issue. The vast majority of abortions are performed because women do not want to have a baby, do not want lifestyle change, or do not feel ready. Some estimate only 1% of abortions are medically necessary.
- ***“The fetus is like an acorn or blueprint. It’s a potential human.”*** Not so. A fetus is more like a sprouting oak. It is a genetically unique human who, if allowed to progress naturally, will develop. Identity begins at conception (Ps. 139:13–16).
- ***“Stop imposing your religion on a secular society.”*** It’s not about religion, but ethics. Because abortion is an unnatural interruption of a biological process, with the main goal being the ending of a life, the burden of proof rests upon the abortion proponent – it is just as much an ethical decision to commit abortion as it is to prevent it, and pro-choice advocates are on the wrong side of that debate.
- ***“You’re just sentencing babies to life in poverty, raised in less-than-ideal environments.”*** Who determines this? What standard is being used to define value and meaning? Eliminating possibility, potential, and volition is not an act of compassion, but a severely twisted case of god-complex (Ps. 82:3, 94:6, 94:21, 106:38).