

ABORTION: A BIBLICAL, ETHICAL, LOGICAL & MORAL EXAMINATION¹

“Open your mouth for the dumb, for the rights of all the unfortunate.” – Proverbs 31:8

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS:

It is my deliberate intention to quote here extensively from such individuals as Dr. C. Everett Koop, M.D. (former Surgeon General of the United States and perhaps the greatest Pediatric Surgeon of his generation), Judge Robert Bork, one of the finest legal minds alive today, and a variety of other highly credentialed medical sources, legal experts, philosophers & thinkers, both Christian and otherwise. I do so to preclude anyone dismissing my arguments and points due to my not being a doctor.

Judge Robert Bork writing in 1996:

“The deliberate taking of the life of an individual has never been regarded as a matter of moral indifference. We debate the death penalty, for example, endlessly. It seems an anomaly, therefore, that we have so easily accepted practices that are the deliberate taking of identifiable individual lives. We have turned abortion into a constitutional right; one state has made assisted suicide a statutory right, and two federal circuit courts, not to be outdone, have made it a constitutional right; campaigns to legalize euthanasia are underway. It is entirely predictable that many of the elderly, ill, and infirm will be killed, and often without their consent. This is where radical individualism has taken us...

“When a society revises its attitude towards life and death, we can see the direction of its moral movement. For that reason, it is necessary to examine the morality of such practices as abortion, assisted suicide, and euthanasia and to try to determine where they are likely to lead.”³

C. Everett Koop M.D. presciently observed four decades ago:

“It is difficult to be a participant in history and understand what is going on with the same depth of perception that one would have if he were able to look back upon the present as an historian. The euthanasia movement—and I use that in the broadest possible sense—is with us today with greater strength and persuasion than ever has been the case before in the history of what we call modern civilization... Semantics can be a preparation for accepting a horror. When abortion can be called ‘retrospective fertility control,’ think of all the euphemisms for infanticide!”⁴

Koop’s comments above are striking because they were made back in 1973-76 when abortion had just been legalized, and before the clever “Plan B” abortifacient had been invented. Now however at this very moment in time, there is a huge debate raging in the United States over President Obama’s current attempt to require (i.e. force) all hospitals, relief agencies, etc, to pay for and provide “contraceptives” [including abortifacients] to every woman on their payroll. This has, not surprisingly, caused a huge uproar and enormous opposition. Various Roman Catholic hospitals, schools & other entities have filed 41 lawsuits challenging it. Christian-owned businesses such as Hobby-Lobby have also filed suit against the United States government, claiming that “Obamacare” attempts to force them to violate their conscience, which is a violation of the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution. It should also be pointed out that Obama’s making a fiat declaration that he would require insurance companies to pay for contraceptives instead of churches & schools didn’t even address the issue at hand. There are many reasons for that, not least of which is the fact that the United States Constitution does not provide for or even mention such, nor is it the government’s business to take every American taxpayer’s money

¹ Compiled by Rev. Mike Edwards for students at the Trinity School of Medicine, & the Campus Bible Fellowship group located there, March & November, 2012. St. Vincent, West Indies. Email: mike.edwards876@gmail.com

² “Literally, *‘sons of passing away.’*” (The New American Standard Bible (The Lockman Foundation: La Habra, CA, 1975 edition), marginal reference note, p. 934)

³ Robert H. Bork, *“Slouching towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline”* (Regan Books/HarperCollins Publishers: New York, NY, 1996, 2003 revised edition), p. 172

⁴ C. Everett Koop, M.D., *“The Slide to Auschwitz.”* This address “first appeared in The Human Life Review, Spring, 1977. It was adapted from his address to The American Academy of Pediatrics, on the occasion of his being awarded the William E. Ladd Medal, the highest honor given to pediatric surgeons in the (United States).” Excerpted from Ronald Reagan, *“Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation”* (Thomas Nelson Publishers: Nashville, TN, 1984), pp. 68, 64. Interestingly, I believe this book was the first published by a sitting U.S. president, while he was serving as president, in history-*mwe*.

and use to pay for abortion as well as contraception, nor is it legal for the president to force the citizens of America to be required to pay for the killing of human beings against their will and conscience.

It is that latter issue that has caused the Roman Catholic Church along with a wide range of Evangelical leaders and colleges, to lead the opposition against it. The reason they are so up in arms (at least the evangelicals) is not because of an objection to contraception, per se. **It is because a number of the so-called “methods of contraception” are not really methods of contraception at all. They are actually abortion procedures, devices or methodologies that simply produce or cause abortions at far earlier stages of pregnancy than had been possible until very recent times.** (e.g. “Plan B” i.e. the “Morning After” pill – of which RU 486 was a predecessor a few years ago & the IUD i.e. intrauterine device, both of which prevent the fertilized egg (zygote) from being able to implant in the mother’s womb, thus producing a “spontaneous” abortion).

“The regulation of fertility through most methods of contraception does not raise the same moral issue as abortion, because they do not permit the joining of the sperm and the egg. Until the sperm and the egg unite, there is no human being. [Professor Peter] Singer goes on to make the unsubstantiated claim that ‘*just as the human being develops gradually in a physical sense, so too does its moral significance gradually increase.*’ That contention is closely allied to the physical appearance argument and is subject to the same rebuttal. One wonders at measuring moral significance by physique. **If a person gradually degenerated physically, would his moral significance gradually decline?**”⁵

KEY QUESTIONS & OBSERVATIONS:

Bork observes: “In thinking about abortion, it is necessary to address two questions.

**Is abortion always the killing of a human being? If it is,
Is that killing done simply for convenience?**

[He then answers] I think there can be no doubt that the answer to the first question is *yes*; and the answer to the second is *almost always*.”⁶

ABORTION IS NOT NEW. IT HAS BEEN PRACTICED THROUGHOUT HISTORY.

CHRISTIANS HAVE ALWAYS BEEN OPPOSED TO ABORTION, BOTH IN THE PAST AND NOW.

Koop tells how he became motivated to speak out on the issue and oppose abortion:

“*It all crystallized for me one Saturday in 1976...* [Note: working paper-unfinished quote, Koop, p. 263]

THE SANCTITY OF HUMAN LIFE:

C. Everett Koop, in his address upon receiving the William E. Ladd Medal (Pediatric Surgery’s highest honor) stated, “I would like to address you today on another...destructive force against mankind...I am speaking of the growing disregard for life itself. I am speaking of what was called in a more moral, or perhaps a more religious generation, **the sanctity of human life**... it is quite possible that when the inevitable swing of the pendulum takes place and life once again becomes precious, it might be too late to stop the slide that will ultimately herald the decline and demise of our civilization.”⁷

“As Mark Twain once wrote, ‘*I know that I am prejudiced in this matter, but I would be ashamed of myself if I were not.*’ There are matters on which neutrality is unthinkable. The sanctity of life is one.”⁸

IS ABORTION THE START OF A SLIPPERY SLOPE? IF SO, WHERE DOES IT LEAD?

⁵ Bork, p. 178

⁶ Bork, p. 174

⁷ Ibid, pp. 42-43

⁸ C. Everett Koop, “*The Right to Live, The Right to Die*” (Tyndale House Publishers: Wheaton, IL, 1976, 1980), p. 73

Interestingly, in 1973, the same year that the U.S. Supreme Court declared that a woman had the right to an abortion on demand, **Koop went out on a limb and predicted where he felt that decision would lead and what fruit it would bring forth. He relates, “In a paper I presented in 1973, I predicted ten consequences of the Supreme Court’s decision on abortion that would remarkably—deleteriously—affect the society in which we live. All ten of these prophetic statements have found realization in historical fact.”**⁹

KOOP’S TEN PREDICTIONS:

“Now I [Koop] would like to say a few things about the days ahead [Keep in mind that Koop initially gave these predictions in 1973, the same year the Supreme Court made it’s infamous Roe vs. Wade decision¹⁰ and he published them in 1976¹¹, which makes the predictions all the more prescient]...

“**First of all, the law will look ridiculous.** Several weeks after the Supreme Court decision, a young woman boarded an airplane in Pittsburgh and flew to Youngstown, Ohio, a flight of thirty-two minutes. During that time **she delivered a baby and left it in the restroom of the airplane. Now, if she had had an abortion in Pittsburgh, before she got on the plane, she would have been the darling of Planned Parenthood. But thirty-two minutes later, with a natural birth of a premature baby in the state of Ohio, she was sought on two charges, child abandonment and attempted murder.**”¹² This ridiculousness has played out time and time again. Women who could have killed their child through abortion with absolutely no penalty, are later tried for murder for dumping their newborns in dumpsters, leaving them exposed, etc.

Other examples: “**Ridiculous from the point of view of the law is the fact that the unborn baby, being a nonperson, is nevertheless eligible at his mother’s request for welfare...**

“An eighteen-year-old woman was sentenced to from four to twenty-five years in a reformatory by a judge in the Butler County Common Pleas Court in Ohio in the death of her newborn. **The woman had given birth to a son last summer at home. Autopsy of the baby showed the child was alive at birth, died of suffocation caused by tissues placed in his mouth, and was then placed in a plastic bag.** The judge said: ‘She took a life which cannot be condoned under an circumstances even though the court has great sympathy for the defendant—this crime has to have some punishment.’ **This unfortunate woman could have had her baby killed before birth without question and perhaps even after if she and her doctor agreed.**”¹³

“**The Supreme Court has declared the unborn baby to be a nonperson. Yet, a paternity action can be brought by a pregnant woman as soon as she knows she is pregnant.** Some states have statutes that say the abortionist must make every effort to resuscitate the baby he has just aborted if born alive.”¹⁴

“On July 2, 1979, **the Supreme Court overturned a Massachusetts law which required unmarried minor females to gain the consent of their parents or a judge before undergoing an abortion.** Said the Court: ‘Every minor must have the opportunity—if she so desires—to go directly to a court without first consulting or notifying her parents.’ ... **Yet...the Boston Globe, March 20, 1975, contained an advertisement for ear piercing for earrings with this statement,** ‘All we ask is that you sign a special consent form. If you are 18 or younger, you must have your parent’s written consent.’”¹⁵

“**Second, liberty leads to license.** Within a week of the decision of the Supreme Court, the New York Medical Society took a stand in reference to the patient’s right to die, but at the discretion of the patient’s family—not at the discretion of the patient. You can imagine what that can lead to.”¹⁶

⁹ Koop, “*Slide to Auschwitz*” in “Abortion & the Conscience of the Nation”, p. 45

¹⁰ *Slide to Auschwitz*, p. 45

¹¹ *Right to Live*, pp. 82-90

¹² *Right to Live*, pp. 82-83

¹³ *Right to Live*, p. 83

¹⁴ RL, p. 72

¹⁵ *Right to Live*, pp. 83, 84

¹⁶ RL, p. 84

“Third, the right to die leads to the right to kill in mercy. In March of 1973, two months after the Supreme Court decision, a Dutch jury found a physician guilty of killing her mother when she had terminal cancer. The victim of the mercy killing was not in pain, but she was just tired of it all. **The sentence was a one-week suspended sentence in prison.**

“A Washington DC grand jury refused to indict a woman who confessed to entering the hospital room of her father in order to terminate his life. She had concealed a pair of scissors in her purse and cut the tubes providing oxygen and intravenous fluids. After his death she presented a two-page confession, but **the jury refused to bring her to trial since the man was ‘expected to die soon anyway’.**

“The murder charges against a nurse who killed four patients in the intensive care unit of the hospital where she worked by disconnecting the respirators **was dropped by the Baltimore city prosecutors.**”¹⁷

“Fourth... the action of the Supreme Court in reference to abortion... will contribute first to the process of depersonalization and secondly to the process of dehumanization. [e.g. the Holocaust; the Dred Scott decision & American slavery, etc.]

“Fifth, there will be enormous numbers of abortions.

“Sixth, there has been and there will continue to be a change in sexual attitudes.

“Seventh, the door is open to a number of things that, like abortion, are disturbing to a large segment of our population ...homosexuality, sodomy, prostitution and adultery...

“Eighth, the newborn infant who is not perfect is probably the next target.... Time Magazine reported a quotation by ...James D. Watson, the same man who discovered the double helix DNA in the genetic code. Time quoted Dr. Watson’s statement that appeared in Prism magazine, which is a publication of the American Medical Association: ‘If a child were not declared alive until three days after birth, then all parents could be allowed the choice only a few are given under the present system. The doctor could allow the child to die if the parents so choose and save a lot of misery and suffering. I believe this view is the only rational, compassionate attitude to have.’”¹⁸

“Ninth, abortion is back in the hands of the abortionists.

“Tenth, and finally, the phrase of the pro-abortionists that annoys me most is the term ‘meaningful life.’ It was said that non-viable babies had no meaningful life. Well, they do. For these small, living products of abortion that look just like you and me were used for scientific experiments until recent legislation forbade it.”

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS & ISSUES:

“MEANINGFUL LIFE?”

“In any discussion in a social realm concerning abortion you will be exposed to some smoke screens; things that people set up to hide behind as they talk about abortion. One of these will be a discussion of ‘*meaningful life.*’ **Who can say whose life is meaningful?** You must be careful that some critic does not come along and consider our lives to be ‘without meaning.’ Think of people such as **Franklin Roosevelt, Napoleon, Helen Keller,** or perhaps someone in your own family who was thought at one time not to have a meaningful life, yet, with the passage of time, made fantastic contributions to history.”¹⁹

WHEN DOES LIFE BEGIN?

¹⁷ RL, pp. 84-85

¹⁸ RL, pp. 87-88

¹⁹ Koop, Right to Live, p. 74

Bork: **The question of whether abortion is the termination of a human life is a relatively simple one. It has been described as a question requiring no more than a knowledge of high school biology.** There may be doubt that high school biology courses are clear on the subject these days, but consider what we know. **The male sperm and the female egg each contains twenty-three chromosomes. Upon fertilization, a single cell results containing forty-six chromosomes, which is what all humans have, including, of course, the mother and the father. But the new organism's forty-six chromosomes are in a different combination from those of either parent; the new organism is unique.** It is not an organ of the mother's body but a different individual. This cell produces specifically human proteins and enzymes from the beginning. Its chromosomes will heavily influence its destiny until the day of its death, whether that death is at the age of ninety or one month after conception...

“The cell will multiply and develop, in accordance with its individual chromosomes, and, when it enters the world, will be recognizably a human baby. From single-cell fertilized egg to baby to teenager to adult to old age to death is a single process of one individual, not a series of different individuals replacing each other. **It is impossible to draw a line anywhere after the moment of fertilization and say that before this point the creature is not human but after this point it is. It has all the attributes of a human from the beginning, and those attributes were in the forty-six chromosomes with which it began.** Francis Crick, the Nobel laureate and biophysicist, is quoted as having estimated that ‘the fertilized human egg is equivalent to about a thousand printed volumes of books, each as large as a volume of the Encyclopedia Britannica.’ **Such a creature is not a blob of tissue or, as the Roe opinion so infelicitously put it, a ‘potential life.’ As someone has said, it is a life with potential...**

It is impossible to say that the killing of the organism at any moment after it originated is not the killing of a human being. Yet there are those who say just that by redefining what a human being is. Redefining what it means to be a human being will prove dangerous in contexts other than abortion.”²⁰

Ankerberg: (Note: Working paper-Incomplete at this time. -mwe)

Koop: “As recently as 1967, at the first international conference on abortion, a purely secular group of people said, **‘We can find no point in time between the union of sperm and egg and the birth of an infant at which point we can say that this is not a human life.’** Now if that had been a theological group it would have been easy to understand the statement. But when one considers that this was a secular group of people, representing thoughts from many cultures all over the world, that statement is worth listening to.”²¹

Whatever happened to the human race: “

“I should try to follow the advice of M. J. Sobran and use the language that has been understood since the beginning of time. When I say a woman is pregnant, I should refer to her as a woman ‘with child’, because that is indeed what she is. When a woman wants an abortion it is because she does not want a baby. If a woman is pregnant and is asked why she wants an abortion, she says, ‘Because I don’t want a baby.’ **If that ‘thing’ that is within her is not a baby, then what is it? When my scientific colleagues might refer to the product of conception, or embryo, or fetus, I should call it a developing baby or the unborn baby because that is what it is. When my colleagues might refer to the termination of the unborn baby, I should call that what it is, namely killing.**”²²

BUT WHAT ABOUT “TWINNING” AS THE BEGINNING OF LIFE? (Note: Working paper, unfinished at this time-Add quotes from Meilander)

THE BIBLICAL EVIDENCE & POSITION:

Ps. 51:5

Ps. 139:13-16

Jer. 1:5

²⁰ Bork, pp. 174-175

²¹ C. Everett Koop, “*The Right to Live, The Right to Die*” (Tyndale House Publishers: Wheaton, IL, 1976, 1980), p. 47

²² RL, pp. 47-48

Ex. 21:

PLAYING “WORD GAMES” (i.e. Framing the Abortion Debate via Semantics)

Any moderately intelligent individual soon comes to realize what lawyers, politicians, public relations officers, and virtually everyone in the print or electronic media have always known; that whoever chooses and shapes the terms and descriptions in any issue or controversy, controls the thinking of the masses. Advocates of abortion on demand clearly understand that and they, along with the concerted and consistent help, effort & support of the mass media, have clearly done so in regard to this issue. Frankly, they are very good at it and have made themselves come across as positive and open-minded, and those who are for the life of the unborn look negative, backward & old fashioned. Notice how the debate is almost invariably framed or described as “*Pro-Choice*” &/or “*for a woman’s right to choose*” versus “*Anti-abortion*” &/or those who “*would restrict a woman’s rights.*” Those who are concerned about the rights of the unborn child are meanwhile virtually always described as “*anti*” as in “*Anti-abortion*”, rather than “*Pro-Life.*” There’s a reason for that. In today’s culture the worst possible thing is to be “*against*” instead of “*for,*” “*negative*” instead of “*positive.*” So the “*Pro-death*” advocates, knowing this, work very hard at portraying those concerned about the millions who never get a “choice” regarding life, as being *negative, anti & against.* **If we are to win the battle over this issue, we need to turn the tables and play their game.** For instance they should always be described not as “*Pro-Choice*” but as “*Anti-Life*” or “*Pro-Death.*” And those in the Pro-Life movement should describe themselves as exactly that i.e. “*Pro-Life*” rather than “*Anti-abortion.*” **We are for life, they are for death. The term “Pro-Choice” is an oxymoron that borders on total absurdity, since the child in the womb gets no choice whatsoever.** Likewise, the phrase “*a woman’s right to choose*” is a bitter half-truth, **since half the babies in the womb are female and those women get no say in the matter but are simply sentenced to death, even though completely innocent.**

Koop has observed, “In this war of semantics, **liberal thinking has somehow switched the truth that the unborn child is the victim of the abortion to the idea that the mother who does not want a pregnancy is the victim of pregnancy...** Another strange turn of semantics is the one-sidedness of the belief **that abortion is a ‘private’ matter.** If we were to say it is a ‘religious’ matter we would be laughed to scorn. On the other hand is there anything more private than one’s religion?”²³

“In all of these social discourses you will be introduced to the war of semantics. In 1974, in December, Donald P. Warwick, chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of York University, Toronto, wrote on the ‘Moral Message of Bucharest,’ which was a report on the International Congress on Population. He called attention to the fact that “*population studies*” is a euphemism of family planning research; ‘*family planning,*’ a cover for birth control; *abortion* (itself a euphemism of *feticide*) is called a ‘*retrospective method of fertility limitation.*’ Reporting further on the conference, he said: ‘Donors claim to be supporting program aimed at helping couples to obtain their own reproductive goals, when, in fact, most of the money goes for limiting birth. Social scientists carry out methodically dubious knowledge-attitude-practice surveys with the frank intention of generating data to show the need for family planning programs and draw totally unwarranted conclusions from their findings.’”²⁴

“You will be told that doctors favor abortion on demand. As a back-up to this statement you will be told that the AMA approves abortion. Perhaps you do not know that [in 1976] only 42 percent of our nation’s 386,000 doctors pay dues to the AMA.”²⁵

“Many who favor the abortion right understand that humans are being killed. Certainly the doctors who perform and nurses who assist at abortions know that. So do non-professionals. Otherwise abortion would not be smothered in euphemisms. Thus, we hear the language of ‘*choice,*’ ‘*reproductive rights,*’ and ‘*medical procedures.*’ **Those are oddly inadequate terms to describe the right to end the life of a human being.** It has been remarked that ‘pro-choice’ is an odd term since the individual whose life is at stake has no choice in the matter. These are ways of talking around the point that hide the truth from others and, perhaps, from one’s self.

²³ RL, p. 49

²⁴ RL, pp. 69-70

²⁵ RL, p. 67

President Clinton [spoke] of keeping abortion ‘safe, legal, and rare.’ Why rare, if it is merely a choice, a medical procedure without moral problems?”²⁶

THE RECENT REDEFINING OF WHEN LIFE BEGINS & WHAT IS A HUMAN BEING:

“HUMANNESS” vs. “PERSONHOOD”

Bork ruefully recalls, “I remember a woman at Yale saying, without any disagreement from those around her, that ‘*The fetus isn’t nothing, but I am for the mother’s right to abort it.*’”²⁷ I probably nodded. Most of us had a vague and unexamined notion that while the fetus wasn’t nothing, it was also not fully human. **The slightest reflection would have suggested that non-human or semi-human blobs of tissue do not magically turn into human beings.**²⁸

“It is impossible to say that the killing of the organism at any moment after it originated is not the killing of a human being. Yet there are those who say just that by redefining what a human being is...

One of the more primitive arguments put forward is that in the embryonic stage, which lasts about two months after conception, **[a] the creature does not look human**. One man said to me: ‘*Have you ever seen an embryo? It looks like a guppy.*’ A writer whose work I greatly respect refers to ‘*the patently inhuman fetus of four weeks.*’ A cartoonists made fun of a well-known anti-abortion doctor by showing him pointing to the microscopic dot that is the zygote and saying, ‘*We’ll call him Timmy.*’ **It is difficult to know what the appearance of Timmy (or Theresa) has to do with the humanity of the fetus.** I suspect that appearance is made an issue because the more recognizably a baby the fetus becomes, the more our emotions reject the idea of destroying it. But those are uninstructed emotions, not emotions based on a recognition of what the fetus is from the beginning.

“Other common arguments are that **[b] the embryo or fetus is not fully sentient**, or that **[c] it cannot live outside the mother’s womb**, or that **[d] the fetus is not fully a person unless it is valued by its mother**. These seem utterly insubstantial arguments.

“A newborn is not fully sentient, nor is a person in an advanced stage of Alzheimer’s disease. There are people who would allow the killing of the newborn and the senile, but I doubt that is a view with general acceptance. At least not yet. We will see that our culture may be on the road to accepting such killings.

“Equally irrelevant to the discussion is the fact that the fetus cannot survive outside the womb. **Neither can a baby survive without the nurture of others, usually the parents. Why dependency, which lasts for years after birth, should justify terminating life is unexplainable.**

“No more apparent is the logic of the statement that a fetus is a person only if the mother values its life. That is a tautology: an abortion is justified if the mother wants an abortion.”²⁹

“The issue is not, I think, one of appearance, sentience, or anything other than the prospective life that is denied the individual by abortion... The characteristics of appearance, sentience, ability to live without assistance, and being valued by others cannot be **the characteristics that entitle you to sufficient moral respect to be allowed to go on living. What characteristic does, then? It must lie in the fact that you are alive with the prospect of years of life ahead. That characteristic the unborn child has.**”³⁰

“MEANINGFUL LIFE?” (Note: Working paper-This section unfinished at this time-mwe)

²⁶ Bork, pp. 178-179

²⁷ This reminds me of the humorous statement pointing out atheism’s militant but bankrupt viewpoint: “*What are an atheist’s two cardinal beliefs? “There is no God and... I hate Him.”*”

²⁸ Bork, p. 173

²⁹ Bork, pp. 175-176

³⁰ Bork, p. 178

“**DEATH WITH DIGNITY?**” (Note: Working paper-This section unfinished at this time-mwe)

IS THE FERTILIZED EGG NOT A LIVING BEING?

IS THE FERTILIZED EGG JUST A PART OF THE WOMAN’S BODY?

“The in vitro fertilization and embryo transfer advances...is one of the best anti-abortion arguments. It certainly proves beyond any shadow of a doubt that the developing fertilized egg is not a part of the woman’s body.”³¹

REASONS ADVANCED IN SUPPORT OF ABORTION:

REASONS ADVANCED FOR ABORTION:

- a) **WHAT’S THE BIG DEAL ANYWAY? IT’S JUST A “POTENTIAL” LIFE.** As Bork has well stated, “Such a creature is not a blob of tissue or, as the Roe opinion so infelicitously put it, a ‘potential life.’ **As someone has well stated, ‘It’s not a potential life, it’s a life with potential.’**”³²

b) **“THE WORLD IS OVERPOPULATED ALREADY”** i.e. **THE OVERPOPULATION MYTH!**
“There are countless other social misrepresentations that may be presented, but the ultimate one will have to do with overpopulation. Overpopulation is certainly a major concern, but it is not overpopulation that is our problem; it is the distribution of the world’s population. I would suggest that when someone talks to you about this subject you ask: ‘What country are you most concerned about?’ He will practically always answer: ‘India.’ Then you can introduce an interesting statistic. New Jersey is twice as crowded as India, and it will take two hundred years of population growth at the rate experienced in the United States in 1970 before these United States will be as uncomfortably crowded as New Jersey.”³³

“A University of California study published in 1974 showed that the world presently uses less than half of its arable land. Countries such as India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are presently irrigating only a third of their land that is capable of irrigation.”³⁴

- c) **IT WILL REDUCE CHILD ABUSE** [Note: Working paper - see RL/RD, p. 56 & Bork, p. 179 for quotes]
- d) **IT WILL PREVENT THE DEATHS OF THOUSANDS DUE TO “BACK ALLEY” ABORTIONS.**

“Thousands of women were said to be dying each year at the hands of criminal abortionists. Some estimated 10,000 women died each year of illegal abortion—others said 5,000. The United States Public Health Service, however, reported from all abortions legal and illegal, 189 deaths in 1966, 160 deaths in 1967. **Obviously inflation had hit the abortion statistics before it hit the grocer’s shelf.**”³⁵

- e) **ABORTION IS NEEDED IN ORDER TO SAVE THE LIVES OF MOTHERS.** Cf. Bill Clinton: “We need to keep abortion safe, legal and rare.”

Koop: “The life-of-the-mother argument surfaces in every debate concerning abortion. **The fact of the matter is that abortion as a necessity to save the life of the mother is so rare as to be almost nonexistent...**Occasionally, not the life, but the health of the mother might be threatened with something such as high blood pressure. Under those circumstances, toward the end of pregnancy, the obstetrician might say to the mother-to-be something to the effect that if her present situation continues, he might have to bring the baby earlier than term either by Caesarean section or induced labor.”³⁶

³¹ Koop, Right to Live, p. 76

³² Bork, p. 175

³³ Koop, Right to Live, p. 70

³⁴ RL, p. 71

³⁵ Koop, Right to Live, p. 36

³⁶ RL, p. 61

f) **ABORTION IS THE ONLY SENSIBLE ALTERNATIVE IN CASES OF RAPE & INCEST.**

“No one could be without compassion for the plight of the woman who is raped. She requires extraordinary counseling and support in every conceivable way. Rape, however, seldom results in pregnancy. A study in Minneapolis of 3,500 consecutive rapes revealed not a single pregnancy. [In addition], will abortion of the innocent product of a rape return the mother to an unviolated, unassaulted state? Will abortion apprehend the rapist? Will abortion restore the raped woman to her pre-raped, state of peace of mind? In a sense, abortion of the unborn baby produced by rape is just as violent an act as the rape itself. In our country the three individuals concerned in the rape should have rights. The raped woman has the legal right to an abortion if she so desires. The rapist has the right to be considered innocent until proven guilty. **Only the unborn child, certainly the most innocent of the three concerned, has his rights abrogated by law.**”³⁷

ILLUSTRATION: ETHEL WATERS. Her mother was raped [by a white man, no less!] at the age of 13. But she carried the child to term. In due time, Ethel Waters became a source of incredible blessing to millions of individuals worldwide who listened to her sing for God’s glory. Probably the song she became most famous for was, “*His Eye is on the Sparrow.*” Had she been aborted, the world would have been vastly poorer.

THE REAL FACTS REGARDING ABORTION via UNBIASED³⁸ STATISTICS:

“**About three of every ten pregnancies ended in abortion in 1977 and 1978** according to a survey by the Alan Guttmacher Institute and published in Family Planning Perspectives magazine. [a rabidly pro-abortion organization & its magazine] The national abortion rate for the years 1969-1978 [indicated that] **approximately 3 percent of abortions [were] carried out for true medical reasons pertaining to the mother, for prenatally diagnosed congenital defects, and for pregnancy resulting from rape.**”³⁹

(Note: Working paper-Incomplete at this time [Nov. 2012]-mwe)

³⁷ RL, pp. 61-62

³⁸ This is clearly the case, since the statistics quoted in this section are almost totally from the Alan Guttmacher Institute which is part of the Planned Parenthood organization. -mwe

³⁹ RL, p. 53