

Lies Answered

Through the years, pro-abortionists have relied on misconceptions and lies in order to justify killing unborn children. Many of these arguments may appear sound -- that is, until, you discover the underlying truth. The following are some of the more popular arguments.



The Fetus is part of the pregnant woman's body, like her tonsils or appendix.

This is one of the most popular arguments advanced by pro-abortion groups. Its intent is to dehumanize the life growing inside the mother. This is done in an effort to promote abortion. It is a selling point, not an objective medical fact. Furthermore, this argument is disingenuous to the core. If the unborn child was truly just a piece of tissue, why all the secrecy? That's right! **SECRECY!** What other medical procedure refuses to allow a patient to see what is being extracted before the operation? Doctors will show their patients X-rays of ruptured discs, tumors, tonsils as well as an appendix and explain in great detail what will take place during the surgery. When it comes to abortion it is quite different. Have you ever heard of an abortion clinic showing a patient an ultrasound image or letting them hear the sound of the heart that is beating inside of them? If they did honestly disclose such information they would be out of business and their argument would be exposed as laughable.

Additionally, medical documentaries showing a variety of surgeries are shown on television without the slightest protest from pro-choice groups. How silent do you think they would be if an abortion was broadcast? Is a fetus just another piece of tissue? Not hardly. It is quite different and pro-choice advocates are very much aware of this fact.

It is interesting that organizations like Planned Parenthood and NOW contend that abortion is a private matter between a woman and her personal faith. They readily admit that it can be a very difficult decision. Can you imagine abortion advocates talking this way about a tonsillectomy? Do tonsils have a beating heart? Does an appendix have hands, feet and eyes? Was God just being silly when he said He formed man in the womb?

The truth of the matter is that the life growing inside its mother is not simply another body part. A body part is defined by the common genetic code it shares with the rest of its body; the unborn's genetic code differs entirely from the mother's. Being "inside something" is not the same as being part of something. A car is not part of a garage simply because it is parked there. The bottom line is this. Human beings should not be discriminated against because of their "place of residence."

The unborn is an embryo or a fetus – just a simple blob of tissue -- not a baby. Abortion is simply terminating a pregnancy, not killing a child.

Like "toddler" and "adolescent", the terms "embryo" and "fetus" do not refer to non-humans, but rather humans in a particular stage of development. "Fetus" is a Latin word meaning "young one" or "little child." It does not mean "blob" or "tissue." In reality those who advance this argument are suggesting that a person's worth is somehow determined by his stage of development. Does anyone really believe this? In other words, if a fetus is

worth less than an infant, is a two-year old worth less than a 6-year-old? Furthermore, what differentiates a fetus from an infant, an infant from a toddler, a toddler from a child, a child from an adolescent, an adolescent from a young adult, and a young adult from a fully mature man or woman?

From the moment of conception the unborn is not simple, but rather very complex. A newly fertilized egg contains a staggering amount of genetic information, sufficient to control the individual's growth and development for an entire lifetime.

Prior to the earliest first-trimester abortions, the unborn already has every body part he or she will ever have. At 18 days, after conception, the heart is forming and the eyes start to develop. By 30 days, the child has multiplied in size ten thousand times. That young life has a brain and blood flows through its precious veins. By 42 days, the skeleton is formed and the brain is controlling the movement of the muscles and organs. After the first trimester, NOTHING NEW DEVELOPS OR BEGINS FUNCTIONING. The child only grows and matures.

Even abortion advocates are becoming more troubled by what advances in science are revealing about the pre-born. Consider the following statement.

"Probably nothing has been as damaging to our cause as the advances in technology which have allowed pictures of the developing fetus, because people now talk about the fetus in much different terms than they did 15 years ago. They talk about it as a human being, which is not something that I have an easy answer on how to cure." --Harrison Hickman, pollster for the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League

To refer to a fetus as tissue defies common sense and logic. Every child knows the difference. When a picture of a four month old fetus was shown to a class of pre-school children everyone of them referred to it as a "baby."

It is uncertain when human life begins, therefore it's a religious question, not a scientific one.

Even if this was true it does not justify abortion. On the contrary this argument cries out against it. In reality it concedes that it is possible that life does begin prior to birth. That alone should compel all moral people to defer to life. Despite this obvious fact some still advance this argument in defense of abortion. So let's examine it in the context of what we know as well as what we believe.

The question of when life begins can be answered in one of three ways. First, one could answer using religious theory. However, not everyone is of the same religion and some just plain don't believe in religion at all. So answering the question of when human life begins in a religious theory makes it open to much debate.

Another way this question could be answered is via philosophical theory. However, once again not everyone's philosophy on a particular subject is the same. Therefore, the theory of when life begins is once again left open to debate.

There is however, another theory, which can answer the question of when life begins. It is the biological theory. Biological human life is defined by studying the scientific facts of human development. And when it comes to the question of when life begins, this field of study has no disagreements and no controversy. The bottom line is that there is truly only one set of facts on which all can agree. The more knowledge man acquires about human development, the more science confirms that life, biologically speaking, begins at conception. This means that at conception there is a human who is very much alive, complete and growing. The biological fact is not a spiritual belief, nor is it a philosophical

theory. The biological fact is not debatable, not questionable. It is a universally accepted scientific fact.

The unborn isn't a person with a meaningful life. It's only inches in size, can't think, and is less advanced than an animal.

A living being's designation to a species is not determined by the stage of its development, but by the sum total of its biological characteristics – which are genetically determined. Therefore, if an embryo is not human it must of necessity be another species. The question to those who think this is true is: what species is it?

What makes a human "human" is that he or she CAME from humans. A dog is a dog because he came from dogs – both the mother and father were dogs.

The argument here is that size somehow determines personhood. Does anyone really believe this? If so, is an NBA basketball player more of a person than someone half his size? Furthermore, if you lose ¼ of your bodyweight through a diet do you lose ¼ of your personhood?

If personhood is somehow determined by one's current capacities, then someone who is unconscious or sick could have their life terminated because he/she is not demonstrating an appropriate level of intellect or skill. The bottom line is this. Age, size, IQ or stage development are simply differences in degree, not kind. To suggest otherwise goes contrary to every scientific model.

The fetus may be alive, but so are eggs and sperm. The fetus is a potential human being, not an actual one. It's like the blueprint, not a house, an acorn and not an oak tree.

Something non-human does not become human by getting older and bigger -- whatever is human must be human from the beginning.

When the egg and sperm are joined, a new, dynamic, and genetically distinct human life begins. This life is neither sperm nor egg, nor a simple combination of both. It is independent, with a life of its own, on a rapid pace of self-directed development.

A fetus isn't a "person" until it is viable.

Viability (the point when an unborn baby could survive outside of the womb) is an arbitrary concept. It was invented by pro-abortion advocates to buttress their cause. However, even they don't believe this argument. If viability was the standard, there would be no late term abortions. How do think that would set with Planned Parenthood?

Furthermore, why is viability the standard for whether the unborn is a human being anyway? Why isn't personhood associated with heartbeat (begins just 21 days after conception), or brainwaves (43 days after conception), or something else? In reality, the actual point of viability is constantly changing because it depends on technology, not on the unborn baby.

Applying on the same viability logic used by pro-abortion groups, many "born" people are not viable because they cannot survive on their own without the aid of others. Consider a week old baby. How viable is he or she without the care of an adult? The only thing that encroaches on the viability of the preborn is not the child, it is the procedure that attempts to kill it.

No one should be expected to donate her body as a life-support system for someone else.

This is an extraordinarily selfish view on whether one has the right to terminate a pregnancy. Tragically, it has been advanced more often than you might think. With this said it is important to understand that the right to life doesn't increase with age or size; otherwise toddlers and adolescents would have less of a right to live than adults. To those who believe no one has a moral or legal obligation to act as a life support system for their unborn child, ask yourself this: What about the child who is three weeks old? Does the mother have any responsibility toward that child? And if yes, why? What is different between the two?

What is really at stake with this argument is the mother's lifestyle, which is set in opposition to the baby's life. The problem here is that no one has an absolute unconditional right to a particular lifestyle. No matter how hard one wishes to argue the point, there is no provision in any law that entitles a person to a right of "comfort." Our founding fathers had the wisdom to proclaim that the only legal claim to happiness man has is in the pursuit of it—not the attaining of it. As a matter of law our personal desires are actually regulated by their potential impact on others. For example, there are 1,000's of restrictions on us including: no-smoking provisions, noise and zoning ordinances, etc. These laws exist because as citizens we cannot simply inflict harm on others in order to bring comfort to ourselves.

With this said, is it reasonable for society to expect an adult to live with a temporary inconvenience if the only alternative is killing someone, in this case an unborn child?

Every person has the right to choose. It would be unfair to restrict a woman's choice by prohibiting abortion.

All civilized societies restrict individual freedoms when that "choice" would harm an innocent person. Do men have the freedom of choice to rape a woman if that is his choice? After all, it's his body, why do we have a right to tell him what to do with it? Why do we have a right to impose our morals on him? By emphasizing a rapist's right to choose, we clearly are completely ignoring the rights of his victims.

We have laws that restrict false advertising, and others that protect us from tainted foods or bad products. We have laws against discrimination and violence. When other's rights are at stake – particularly when their lives are at stake – society is expected to, and must restrict the individual's freedoms of choice. The fact is that people who are pro-choice about abortion, are often not pro-choice about other issues with less at stake.

Throughout history, nearly all violations of human rights have been defended on the grounds of the right to choose, e.g. "you don't have to own slaves if you don't want to, but don't tell us we can't choose to. It's our right." The civil rights movement fought to take away this "slavery choice," while the woman's movement fought to take away an employer's free choice to discriminate against women. The pro-choice position always overlooks the victim's right to choose. Women don't choose rape. African Americans didn't choose slavery. The Jews didn't choose to be killed in ovens... and babies don't choose abortion.

More Lies Answered

Every woman should have control over her own body. Reproductive freedom is a basic right.

This argument is actually true. A person should have the right to do as they wish with their own body. For example: a person can pierce it, paint it, shave it, or donate organs if he or she wishes. The issue here is that the life growing inside of a pregnant woman is NOT her body. It is a totally unique living being. Its genetic makeup is clear proof of that fact. The point here is that just because something resides inside its mother does not make it the mother. That young life is a child in the most vulnerable stage of its existence. That precious little being depends on his or her mother to nurture it in preparation of its entrance into the world. Additionally, as an infant it will still need its mother's love and care. A baby is not simply something that is subdivided from its mother. It is a person made in the image of its parents not to mention the image of God Almighty.

The real tragedy with abortion is that it insures that 750,000 females each year will actually never have control over their bodies. Why? Because their lives will be brutally snuffed out in the name of choice.

Furthermore, American citizens don't have absolute control over their bodies anyway. There are limitations. For example: a man is not permitted to expose himself in public. In most areas of the country, women are not allowed to sell their bodies through prostitution. We're also not permitted to take illegal drugs.

Too often, the "right to control my life," becomes a right to hurt and oppress others. Whites used blacks to enhance their own quality of life, but did so at the expense of blacks. Men have often used women to live their lives as they wanted, but at the expense of women.

Our great nation extends to its citizens many wonderful liberties. But the freedom to do harm to another is not freedom. It is tyranny.

Abortion rights are fundamental for the advancement of women.

Although this argument is not among the most prominent employed by pro-abortion groups, it is never-the-less a very popular belief of feminist organizations like NOW and Planned Parenthood. However, it too is simply not true. Most people don't know this but the founders of the feminist movement were actually pro-life, not pro-choice. Susan B. Anthony, referred to abortion as "child murder" and viewed it as a means of exploiting both women and children.

Another leading (founding) feminist, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, said "When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women that we should treat our children as property to be disposed of as we wish."

The fact of the matter is that abortion is one of the most oppressive ideas in human history. It isn't liberating. On the contrary, it is one of the most tyrannical acts ever inflicted on the most innocent segment of society, half of which are woman.

"I'm personally against abortion, but I wouldn't take that right away from someone else."

This is one of the most frequent assertions used by politicians when defending their position in support of Roe v Wade. However, it would be interesting to hear them explain why they are personally against abortion. This question never seems to be asked. In other words, what is it about abortion that would lead a pro-choice candidate to oppose it in their own life? What specifically do they personally object to? Furthermore, how strong is their opposition?

The fact of the matter is that these two positions are so radically opposed to each other it is virtually impossible to reconcile them. Therefore, this argument can only be an attempt to have it both ways. However, when it comes to abortion you can't have it both ways.

To be "pro-choice" about abortion is to be "pro-abortion." Although some would disagree with this assertion it is true nonetheless. To illustrate this point consider the following. Suppose drug dealing were legalized and you heard this argument:

"I'm personally not in favor of someone dealing drugs at schools, but that's a matter to be decided between the drug dealer and his conscience. We don't want to go back to the days when drug dealing was illegal, and people died in back alleys from bad cocaine. I personally wouldn't buy drugs or sell them, so I'm not pro-drugs. I'm just pro-choice about drug dealing."

Basically, being personally against abortion but favoring another person's right to one is self-contradictory and morally baffling. It is tantamount to saying, "We're personally against child pornography, but we defend our neighbor's right to have it if that is his choice." As vile as this example may sound, it is perfectly analogous—unless of course, those who are pro-choice but anti-practice don't see abortion as a moral issue. In other words their personal opposition is based on something other than moral or spiritual grounds. And if that is the case, just how strong is their personal opposition to abortion in the first place?

Abortion rights groups may try to defend their position with an appeal to both sides of the issue, but it just doesn't wash. Such a position would only make sense if its proponents' personal opposition to abortion was for the most benign reasons such as: "I wouldn't have an abortion because it is too expensive, it might hurt, it might be dangerous based on my personal medical condition etc."

The idea of pro-choice but anti-practice may be appropriate when it comes to some things, but never to that which affects human dignity and even human survival. Those who were pro-choice about slavery believed their moral position was sound since they personally didn't own slaves. Similarly, most people in Germany did not favor the killing of Jews, but did nothing to stop the killing.

Some people have an illusion that being personally opposed to abortion while believing others should be free to choose it, is some kind of compromise between pro-abortion and pro-life positions. It isn't. Pro-choice people vote the same as pro-abortion people. Both oppose legal protection for the unborn, and both are willing to allow children to die – even if they do not directly participate in the killings.

Abortion is legal. Things that are "legal" are OK, aren't they?

What is legal is not always right. One only has to look at laws concerning slavery or segregation to understand this point. Furthermore, laws change. That being the case, how could anyone base their morality on laws that can be altered? Case in point: was

abortion immoral on January 21, 1973 (one day before Row v Wade was handed down) and moral on January 23, 1973?

In the 1940's a German doctor could kill Jews legally, while in America he would have been prosecuted for murder. Were they both moral because neither broke the law? In the 1970's an American doctor could kill unborn babies legally, while in Germany he would have been prosecuted for murder. Were both of them moral because no laws were broken?

The idea that something is ok (moral) just because a law says it is ok just doesn't cut it. Laws change. However, morality as well as truth and justice, don't.

It's unfair to bring children into a world when they're not wanted.

There's a major difference between an unwanted pregnancy and an unwanted child. The fact of the matter is that there is no such thing as an unwanted child. And all reputable data bears this out. For example: There are currently over 200,000 couples in the United States desperately seeking to adopt. However, there are less than 25,000 babies available for them. Demand is so great in this area, that couples are now being forced to adopt children in other countries such as China and Russia, often spending tens of thousands of dollars to do so. Furthermore, not just "normal" babies are wanted – many people request children with Down's Syndrome and there have even been lists of over a hundred couples waiting to adopt infants with spina bifida.

The argument that abortion addresses the issue of unwanted children is nothing less than a cynical attempt to put a noble face on this horrible atrocity. Tragically this approach is not new. Slave owners once argued that slavery was in the best interest of blacks, since they couldn't make it on their own. Exploiting people and stripping them of their rights is always easier when we tell ourselves we're doing it for their good. And shamefully that is exactly what this argument is doing.

Having more unwanted children results in greater child abuse.

This is an extraordinary assertion based on the alternative that is being offered, but it is advanced none the less. This being the case, consider the following: In the first 10 years after abortion was legalized, child abuse increased by over 500%! And is it any wonder? After all "if it's OK to abuse our unwanted pre-born children by killing them, then why would it be wrong to abuse our "born" children?"

One fact that pro-choice organizations don't want people to hear is that numerous studies have shown that child abuse is more frequent among mothers who have previously had an abortion. Further, most abused children were wanted by their parents. A study conducted by Professor Edward Lenoski of the University of California concluded that 91% of abused children were from planned pregnancies. In society, 64% of pregnancies are planned – concluding that among abused children, a significantly higher percentage were wanted children compared to the percentage of wanted children in society at large.

Abortion helps solve the problem of overpopulation.

Although this argument is often advanced by pro-abortion advocates, it is based on a false premise. The fact of the matter is that the current birth rate in America is less than what is needed to maintain a zero population level. Furthermore, all indications suggest that it will stay that way.

In 1957, the average American woman in her reproductive years bore 3.7 children. Taking into account all causes of death and the increases in average life span, zero population growth requires that the average woman bear 2.1 children. Since 1972, the average in America has been 1.8 children – a figure that is below zero population growth. In fact, any increases since 1972 have been due to immigration.

What about elsewhere? There are now 6 billion people on Earth. The planet's population will most likely continue to climb until 2050, when it will peak at 9 billion. Other predictions have the world's population peaking at 7.5 billion in 2040. In either case, it will then go into a sharp decline. With fertility rates low and anti-foreigner sentiment rising in Europe, the United Nations recently released a study that suggests Europe will need mass migration from the Third World to populate it. The report, written by the United Nations Population Division, states that South Korea, Japan, Europe and Russia are facing population crunches. If Japan continues its current abortion policies and fails to raise its average birth rate of 1.4 children per married couple; it will have fewer than 500 people by the year 3000 . By 2050, the population of Russia will reduce to 150 million. In the 1970s, Russia's population rivaled America's, at more than 225 million people.

Finally, the entire population of the world could be placed in one gigantic city within the borders of the state of Texas (with a population density less than many cities around the world).

If abortion were made illegal, there would still be many abortions.

This might be true but it is not likely there would be over one million abortions every year. Furthermore, there are laws against rape, burglary, armed robbery and illegal drug dealing, yet every one of these crimes continues to happen in our society. Does the fact that these crimes still happen mean we should consider making the legal? Clearly not, as laws should exist to discourage bad things from happening. Laws concerning abortion have significantly influenced whether women choose to have abortions. In one survey, 72 percent said they would definitely not have sought an abortion if having one were illegal.