

# Stand to Reason

## Shining Light into Dark Corners

Barbara Buzzard

I learned some new and shocking things in these last few months and I feel compelled to share them. I did not know the scope of this holocaust, with over one million babies being murdered each year. We are rapidly approaching 60 million dead babies since abortion was legalized — that would mean over 1,500 dead babies before noon today. If you haven't been utterly appalled by the 11 undercover videos exposing Planned Parenthood's practice of selling infant body parts — please view these so that you know what is going on. It is nothing short of trafficking in human organs, the butchering of tiny human beings and the sale of their remains.

And here's the thing: 75% of women having abortions call themselves Christian. As Randy Alcorn puts it: "For years the prochoice position has had a hot line to our brains. By reading newspapers and magazines and watching TV, we have all earned the equivalent of a doctorate in prochoice thinking."<sup>1</sup> The abortion mentality has so steadily and pervasively metastasized in our society that it has contaminated and infiltrated our culture, reaching every social institution that touches our lives. Abortion is the most important issue of our generation, the defining issue.

It's not about choice. It's about what that choice is. Pro-choice for one means death for the other. We must not say this is not our war. *This is our war.*

The question before the court in the case of *Roe v. Wade* was whether the "tissue" of a pregnancy had any Constitutional rights or protection due to it. The outcome in the case of *Roe v. Wade* was based on the persuasion of Justices that since the Constitution grants its rights and protections to all natural **born** citizens, that babies **not yet born** did not have those rights!!! Five of the seven Supreme Court justices fell for this argument that the unborn child has no rights, not even the right to protection, not even the right to go on living. What a dreadful lack of knowledge about human development they displayed as all of the biology textbooks of the time could have helped them to see the error of their ways. They did precious little research or verification for their argument that a fetus was not the moral equivalent of a baby. A minority morality began to be imposed on this nation. What would have been repellent to previous generations became the norm, a scene in which the strong dehumanize and kill the weak.

**"There can be no keener revelation of a society's soul than the way in which it treats its children."**<sup>2</sup>

If we fail to protect the weak, we fail the litmus test and our society will lose its soul. There is no more defenseless than the innocent child in the womb. There is no compromise possible here – no 80/20. One is either protected or one is not. The right to life is the most important God-given right that we have; to deny it is to rob someone of that right which our Constitution promises us.

Compelling interest is a legal term describing the responsibility states have to protect the lives of their residents. The book *Compelling Interest* has shocked me to my very core. It is the real story behind *Roe v. Wade*, an examination of the landmark Supreme Court case that made abortion legal.

### The Destructive Power of Ignorance

Much of my material comes from the book *Compelling Interest*. What is so shocking is that the decision made as to the morality of abortion was made in *ignorance*. As you well know, this parallels the history of theology. I will not go into the gruesome details, but I *do* want you to be horrified at how

---

<sup>1</sup> Randy Alcorn, *ProLife Answers to ProChoice Arguments*

<sup>2</sup> Nelson Mandela

this came to be and even more horrified that it continues.. As you will see - the illogical fallacies are grim, but understanding how such a travesty came about will help us to right this horrible wrong.

The main message of author Resler is that the logic necessary to legalize abortion on demand was utterly flawed and that the greatest flaw of all was an appeal to *ignorance*. Randy Alcorn is quoted often in the book and I have followed his lead in not writing as a religious zealot, because the case can be argued on a logical, factual, legal basis. It is my hope to equip anyone listening to be able to speak with authority to the wrongness of abortion. The question is ultimately about the value of human life and the taking of that life.

### **Abortion on Demand – The Gospel of Choice<sup>3</sup>**

**“I’ve noticed that everybody who is for abortion has already been born.”<sup>4</sup>**

Let me set the scene of Roe v. Wade which brought us abortion on demand. The year is 1967 in Texas. Sarah Weddington was the pro-abortion attorney who devised, argued and won the case of Roe. She had just graduated from law school at the top of her class, had had an illegal abortion, was not married, was very ambitious and was finding it hard to find employment. She and friends had to search for someone to use in this case as you cannot bring a case without an actual plaintiff. They found Norma McCorvey, who played no active role at all in the case. (She is now pro-life and publicly advocates for the reversal of Roe v. Wade.) The defense consisted of Attorneys Flowers and Floyd. As I read them, I believe that they both were of the opinion that she never had a chance. This was her first case. They did not seem to prepare or feel the urgency to do so. And she did. She came to court anticipating the objections put to her and practiced her responses. She had done a great deal of research and came thoroughly prepared, while her opposition seemed to think that being part of the old boys’ network would work for them.

Sarah Weddington was charging that the 1850’s anti-abortion laws were unconstitutional. The state of Texas was defending them. (*Or not* as the case may be.)<sup>5</sup>

Justice Blackmun who wrote the majority opinion,<sup>6</sup> in later discussion apparently said that basically those seven Justices would have given her anything she asked for. She was very impressive looking and Justice Blackmun admitted that women were asking for this, so we just gave them what they wanted. Only 2 of the seven Justices dissented but they still signed the majority report.

Have you ever wondered what a successful abortion is? It is the intentional death of an innocent child. Otherwise it is not successful. And if it were not alive – it wouldn’t have to be killed. Have you ever wondered what the *plan* of Panned Parenthood is? Is it not premeditated murder? Killing a child is not healthcare. And when you delete a child you delete yourself as the parent to that child.

**“Abortion is legal because babies can’t vote.”<sup>7</sup>**

“Again Weddington argued that since the Texas law viewed the woman as the victim rather than a perpetrator, the fetus, therefore, cannot be the victim.”<sup>8</sup> Attorney Jay Floyd had not done his homework and his lack of knowledge was damaging. He was asked whether there was any state that

---

<sup>3</sup> You will find that the abortion lobby object to the use of the term mother and constantly replace it with woman. Using the term mother would be a dead give-away. She **has** to be seen as a victim - this psychologically frees her from an obligation to her child. But we have to ask: who is the real victim here? According to the abortion lobby’s logic, the woman was the only victim and the fetus had no rights and therefore could not be a victim+

<sup>4</sup> Pres. Ronald Reagan

<sup>5</sup> Sarah handed each Justice a copy of two abortion law articles, handpicked for their support of her. It does not appear that the Justices read the other side. The logic in those articles is now rejected and the information considered inaccurate.

<sup>6</sup> “But when the court misfires, it does enormous damage that is extremely difficult to reverse.” Mark Levin, *Men in Black*, Foreword.

<sup>7</sup> Joseph Bonkowski

<sup>8</sup> Roger Resler, *Compelling Interest*, p. 14. *Compelling Interest* references 36 other books, 41 articles, blogs and videos.

equated abortion with murder. He answered “none.” In fact, 18 states had prosecuted women for crimes of abortion. Whether the opposition was weak, or lazy, or simply inept we don’t know, but this repeated floundering helped to turn the tide for Weddington. A very important point was at stake. U.S. anti-abortion laws had been on the books since about 1850 and it was important that the current Justices understand what had gone before. Attorney Flowers, having *no idea why* the laws came into being, could only agree with Weddington that abortion had been a kind of common law liberty and that it was only for the protection of the mother (woman) that the laws were passed. Flowers was asked if the destruction of a person in the form of a fetus was legal – he agreed that it was, since he was unfamiliar with the history of abortion laws.<sup>9</sup> This was anything but due diligence and it simply was not true!

We have been made to think that abortion was not criminal in England or America before the nineteenth century but a legal scholar and historian says this: “...regardless of how many times these claims are repeated, however, they are not facts; they are myths.”<sup>10</sup>

“In fact, the term ‘unborn child’ was so common to legal language prior to *Roe v. Wade* that even pro-choice Justice Stewart unwittingly referenced ‘unborn children’ during oral arguments.”<sup>11</sup>

Any law that identifies a class of people (unborn babies) that we may kill with impunity is not morally sound.

### Personhood

“The term ‘personhood’ was started by pro-abortion advocates when they finally were forced to concede the fact advanced by the pro-life people that an unborn baby is indeed a human being. So they changed their tune, saying that, well, the fetus may be a human being but it isn’t a ‘person.’ This is another logical fallacy, called ‘moving the goalpost’...The entire *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision rested on this one word: **personhood!** These judges knew and admitted in their decision, that unborn babies are living human beings. **They denied that they are persons.**”<sup>12</sup>

“The Fourteenth Amendment was created in 1866 and adopted in 1868, which places it directly in the time frame when the most important burst of anti-abortion legislation in American

history was occurring...It is more reasonable to conclude that the concept of a ‘person’ was so basic to the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment that it was simply taken for granted to include a person in the womb. There is no indication that legislators in the latter half of the nineteenth century viewed the concept of a ‘person’ to be separable from the concept of a living human being. And yet such a distinction is imperative if we are to accept Weddington’s and ultimately the Court’s logic.”<sup>13</sup>

“**Nature never deceives us; it is we who deceive ourselves.**”<sup>14</sup>

Here is where Mr. Flowers’ ignorance was so damaging: “While protection of the pregnant woman may have been a factor in the enactment of restrictive abortion laws, there is no doubt that protection of the fetus was the primary concern.”<sup>15</sup> The Supreme Court admitted that if the unborn was a person, the case would collapse.

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 21 “The eventual outcome of the case is not surprising given the heavy and uncritical reliance on Prof. Means’ material. For Justice Blackmun to label Means’ s briefs as ‘scholarly support’ is something on the level of classifying an infomercial as objective reporting. Without a doubt, Professor Means had a well-maintained pro-abortion agenda.”

<sup>10</sup> Joseph Dellapenna, *Dispelling the Myths of Abortion History*

<sup>11</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 75

<sup>12</sup> Lynne Balzer, *Advancing the Pro-Life Cause In the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, ChristiansForLife.org

<sup>13</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 41

<sup>14</sup> Jean-Jacques Rousseau

<sup>15</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 22

**“The pro-life slogan ‘Abortion stops a beating heart’ is incontrovertibly true.”<sup>16</sup>**

Words from the 1857 A.M.A. report: “As a profession we are unanimous in our condemnation of the crime [of abortion]. Mere resolutions to this effect, and nothing more, are therefore useless, evasive, and cruel. If to want of knowledge of a medical point, the slaughter of countless children now steadily perpetrated in our midst, is to be attributed, it is our duty, as physicians, and as good and true men, both publicly and privately, and by every means in our power, to enlighten this ignorance. If we have ever been thought negligent of the sanctity of fetal life, the means of correcting the error are before us.”<sup>17</sup> So the premise which Weddington promoted was false for a start. The A.M.A. were very clear that life began at conception and they identified the unborn child as the victim of abortion and not the woman. They refer to abortion as murder (even ‘foul, unprovoked murder’), comparing it to the blood of righteous Abel crying out for vengeance. The doctors themselves campaigned, writing thousands of letters to their state legislatures saying that abortion was morally wrong.

What caused this physicians’ crusade against abortion? The development of microscopes to the point that fertilization of rabbits could be seen. “So with the knowledge that life began at conception/fertilization, medical science moved out of the Dark Ages into the Age of Enlightenment.”<sup>18</sup> How fascinating that in the 1850’s they knew this – that life began at conception. The old adage that seeing is believing was responsible. But then we regressed and we “lost it” under the abortion lobby’s pounding. Interestingly, now that ultrasounds are able to show prospective parents their babies – I am told that 9 out of 10 mothers when shown ultrasound will not choose abortion. But, of course, mothers-to-be are not shown ultrasounds at Planned Parenthood.

**A choice for one means no choice/no life for the other.**

**How Did This Happen?<sup>19</sup>**

**Eclipse of Reason**

Simple answer: we were lied to. How did this unimaginably gargantuan monster enter our society? Dr. Bernard Nathanson: “I am one of those who helped usher in this barbaric age. I worked hard to make abortion legal, affordable, and available on demand. I was one of the three founders of the National Rights Action League. I ran the largest abortion clinic in the United States and as its director I oversaw tens of thousands of abortions. I have performed thousands myself. How could this have happened?”<sup>20</sup>

“The edifice of abortion is built on a foundation of lies.”<sup>21</sup> Nathanson once *not only told those lies, he helped to invent them*. But he became converted to the truth of the Pro-Life position and while as an atheist he produced 2 documentary films: the “Silent Scream” which energized the Pro-Life movement. The second film, “Eclipse of Reason”, shows a 19 1/2 –week –old baby being murdered. Nathanson’s ultimate conclusion: abortion is an impermissible act of violence.

The abortion lobby also gained much public support by arguing that tens of thousands of maternal deaths per year were due to criminal abortions that went wrong. “...former abortionist and early repeal advocate Dr. Bernard Nathanson has subsequently stated that the 10,000 figure was essentially pulled out of thin air since it sounded plausible and made the desired point.”<sup>22</sup> According to Nathanson

---

<sup>16</sup> Naomi Wolf, pro-abortion advocate

<sup>17</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 23

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26

<sup>19</sup> “The product, abortion, is skillfully marketed and sold to the woman at the crisis time in her life. She buys the product, find it defective and wants to return it for a refund. But, it’s too late. Carol Everett, former abortion clinic operator

<sup>20</sup> Dr. Bernard Nathanson, *The Hand of God, A Journey from Death to Life by the Abortion Doctor Who Changed His Mind*

<sup>21</sup> Robert George, *Bernard Nathanson: A Life Transformed by Truth*, The Witherspoon Institute

<sup>22</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 34

himself – he invented the lies, then told and sold the lies. As a young man Nathanson arranged and funded his girlfriend’s abortion. Much later he referred to this as his “introductory excursion into the satanic world of abortion.”

Nathanson and his friends lied—relentlessly and spectacularly—about the number of women who died each year from illegal abortions. Their pitch to voters, lawmakers, and judges was that women are going to seek abortion in roughly equal numbers whether it is lawful or not. The only effect of outlawing it, they claimed, is to limit pregnant women to unqualified and often uncaring practitioners, ‘back alley butchers.’ “<sup>23</sup> These were self-confessed lies, but many/most people still believe them.

### **Sweet Little Lies — or One Big Whopper**

“We fed the public a line of deceit, dishonesty, a fabrication of statistics and figures. We succeeded because the time was right and the news media cooperated. We sensationalized the effects of illegal abortions, and fabricated polls which indicated that 85 percent of the public favored unrestricted abortion, when we knew it was only 5 percent. We unashamedly lied, and yet statements were quoted as though they had been written in law.” Dr. Bernard Nathanson

Abortion was packaged and sold to the public as a remedy for a terrible problem. It was presented as the only logical choice, a kind of neutral position. Our natural and reasonable feelings of compassion for someone in a very terrifying situation were exploited. After all, it was only tissue, and the overwhelming sentiments were for the poor girl or young woman whose life “it” would ruin. Add to that the myth of huge numbers being forced into back alleys and you have a public assenting to killing multiple millions of its citizens. All of the arguments for abortion that appeal to a mother: stress, inconvenience, financial hardship can be made just as persuasively for a two-year old or a teenager.

Weddington and her team gained much popular approval by speaking of abortion *reform*, rather than repeal of anti-abortion law. Many disastrous lies were fed to the American people in order to sway public opinion. Abortion was marketed as little more than an appendectomy. The movers and shakers behind the campaign were tenacious, driven, determined individuals. And there was widespread public ignorance. Pro-choice propaganda was cranked out night and day and we were conditioned by a constant barrage of such thinking as ‘abortion is a personal decision between a woman and her doctor.’ No, it’s not! It’s killing. Killing is not allowed in our society.

### **Things that most people think are true re: Roe v. Wade that are totally false:<sup>24</sup>**

- 1) That when life began could not be determined.
- 2) That the fetus/baby was mere “potential.”
- 3) That abortion was safe. There are both short and long term health risks as shown by reams of evidence, including mental health issues and even suicide.
- 4) That getting an abortion is merely a mother’s decision. It is a societal question – and killing is not allowed in our society.
- 5) It was assumed that the woman and her abortion provider would have a normal, healthy Dr./patient relationship. No such thing exists.
- 6) Roe v. Wade stressed that motherhood was a burden, without taking into account the emotional wounding and long term costs and sacrifices of having an abortion. (Note: every state has Safe Haven laws.)
- 7) That abortion would be informed and voluntary. Informed consent and disclosure of the risks has not been the rule.

*These myths must be purged from any discussion of abortion.*

---

<sup>23</sup> Robert George, thepublicdiscourse.com, Bernard Nathanson: *A Life Transformed by Truth*

<sup>24</sup> S. Dakota resolution

Let's look at the logic of this very commonly expressed opinion – “I'm personally against abortion, but I'm still pro-choice. We shouldn't try to impose our views on others.” First of all, “to be pro-choice is to be pro-abortion. The only good reason for being against abortion is a reason that demands we be against other people choosing to have abortions.”<sup>25</sup>

“Many people say, ‘I'm not pro-abortion, but I am pro-choice.’ In exactly the same way, to be pro-choice about abortion is to be pro-abortion. Some imagine that being personally opposed to abortion, while believing others have the right to choose it, is some kind of compromise between the pro-abortion and pro-life position. It isn't. To the baby who dies, it makes no difference whether those who refused to protect her were pro-abortion or ‘merely’ pro-choice about abortion. Being personally against abortion but favoring another's right to abortion is self-contradictory. It's exactly like saying, ‘I'm personally against child abuse, but I defend my neighbor's right to abuse his child if that is his choice.’”<sup>26</sup>

And what about the logic of killing an unwanted child – what would be most unfair to an unwanted child is to kill it. “The problem of unwantedness is a good argument for wanting children, but a poor argument for eliminating them.”<sup>27</sup> How enormously twisted our thinking has become on these points. We have allowed the other side to frame the debate.<sup>28</sup>

**“To forbid birth is only quicker murder...He is a man who is to be a man; the fruit is always present in the seed.”** <sup>29</sup>

At the same time, the abortion lobby did a thorough job of making all who did not comply look like ignorant, religious zealots whose desire it was to remove freedom from others.

### **The S.L.E.D. test/strategy/tactic**

“The pro-life view is that the unborn are human beings just like you and me. That's why it's wrong to kill them. Although many abortion-choice advocates agree the unborn are human, they deny they are valuable human beings. They think this distinction justifies killing the unborn.”<sup>30</sup> They use these characteristics to justify killing:

- **Size:** a 5 year-old is smaller than a 12 year-old. Does that justify killing her? The unborn is smaller than the 5 year-old. They differ in that characteristic – does that justify killing?
- **Level of development:** does that disqualify? The reproductive system of that 5 year-old girl is not fully developed – therefore, we can kill her!?
- **Environment:** yes, it is a different environment. But what about astronauts and scuba divers? How does a 7 inch journey through the birth canal magically transform one who has no value into a valuable person? Nothing changed except location.
- **Degree of dependency:** this cannot determine value or else a kidney patient or one who relies on oxygen would not be as valuable. What about a toddler who falls into a swimming pool. At that point he depends totally on you for his survival.

The SLED tactic exposes the argument for abortion for what it really is: unjust discrimination, especially to those who are small, vulnerable, and defenseless.

Here is the fallacy: nothing nonhuman becomes human by getting older and bigger.

---

<sup>25</sup> Randy Alcorn, *ProLife Answers to ProChoice Arguments*,

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> “For many people, prochoice thinking is not primarily the result of ignorance but of denial or ignorance-by-choice. What we all know to be true we refuse to admit or act upon as truth because of the difficulty it may create for us. By heaping up argument upon argument—as illogical and inconsistent as they may be—we try to bury the truth so deep that it will not resurface.”

<sup>29</sup> Tertullian

<sup>30</sup> *Stand to Reason*, The S.L.E.D. test, Alan Shlemon

**“The care of human life and happiness and not their destruction is the first and only legitimate object of good government.”<sup>31</sup>**

**From the original transcripts of Roe v. Wade:**

Justice Stewart: “Well, if — **if it were established that an unborn fetus is a person**, within the protection of the Fourteenth Amendment, you would have almost an impossible case here, would you not?”

Ms. Weddington: **“I would have a very difficult case.”**

Justice Stewart: “ You certainly would. You’d have the same kind of thing—you’d have to say that this would be the equivalent — after a child was born, if the mother thought it bothered her health any having the child around, she could have it killed. Isn’t that correct?”

Ms. Weddington: **“That’s correct.”**

“That’s correct” is noteworthy. Essentially her agreement amounts to an acknowledgment that the definition of the word “person” and whether it can or should be appropriately applied to the living, developing human in the womb is the critical moral factor underlying the debate.<sup>32</sup>

### **Biblically Speaking**

Biblically the case is almost too easy. Our mandate is to help “the least of these” and in that way we do service to Jesus. (Mat. 25:45) How abhorrent is violence done to the helpless! (Ps. 12:5a) and evil is praised throughout the land (Ps. 2:8b).<sup>33</sup>

In Luke 1:43 we have the Lord Jesus in the womb!

It is from Scripture that we take the premise of the sanctity of life as a divine law. All human beings (even the handicapped and defenseless) are seen as individuals of value since they are made in the image of God. Abortion is hostility against God’s creation.<sup>34</sup>

### **What about the Right to *Continue* Living?**

This is an amazing phrase. It speaks more sharply than the right to life. It is just this that is being denied a baby — the right to go on living.

**“You can avoid reality, but you cannot avoid the consequences of avoiding reality.”<sup>35</sup>**

**“As long as people believe in absurdities they will continue to commit atrocities.”<sup>36</sup>**

These next two points are extremely key as they come up all the time and are almost universally believed.

---

<sup>31</sup> Thomas Jefferson,, speech, 1809

<sup>32</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 47

<sup>33</sup> Have you noticed that in the Book of Luke, John the Baptist, son of Zechariah and Elizabeth, was to be “filled with the Holy Spirit, *even before his birth*.” This is as wonderful as the Roe v. Wade case was terrible. So - in the eyes of Planned Parenthood and Pro Choice advocates, it would be the “tissue” which was filled with the Holy Spirit and later jumped for joy!

<sup>34</sup> “Child sacrifice is condemned throughout Scripture. Only the most degraded societies tolerated such evil, and the worst of these defended and celebrated it as if it were a virtue. Ancient dumping grounds have been found filled with the bones of hundreds of dismembered infants. This is strikingly similar to discoveries of thousands of dead babies discarded by modern abortion clinics. One scholar of the ancient Near East refers to infant sacrifice as ‘the Canaanite counterpart to abortion.’ Unlike the pagan sacrifices, however, with abortion, child-killing need no longer be postponed till birth. Scripture condemns the shedding of innocent blood (Deut. 19:10; Pro. 6:17; Isa. 1:15; Jer. 22:17. While the killing of all innocent human beings is detestable, the Bible regards the killing of children as particularly heinous (Lev. 18:21; 20:1-5; Deut. 12:31). The prophets of Israel were outraged at the sacrifice of children by some of the Jews. They warned that it would result in the devastating judgment of God on their society (Jer. 7:30-34; Eze. 16:20-21, 36-38; 20:31; compare 2 Kings 21 2-6 and Jer. 15: 3-4).” Randy Alcorn, *Pro-Life Answers to Pro-Choice Questions*, p. 316

<sup>35</sup> Ayn Rand

<sup>36</sup> Voltaire

“While he was the Surgeon general, Dr. C. Everett Koop stated that in 36 years as a pediatric surgeon, he personally was not aware of a single situation in which a pre-born child’s life had to be taken in order to save the mother’s life. To him this extremely common pro-choice argument was nothing more than a smoke screen.”<sup>37</sup>

“Taken together, the three main pro-choice arguments used to justify abortion, the safety of the mother, rape, incest and fetal abnormalities amount to less than 5 percent of all abortions performed in the United States each year.”<sup>38</sup>

Consider please, the logic of killing a child who is the product of rape or incest. Does it not seem that the guilty party should be punished and not the innocent? And since when would abortion bring healing or comfort to a rape victim? We would then have one damaged and one dead. And what about already-born people who came to be because of rape? Are their lives less valuable? There are absolutely marvelous true stories of people who survived abortion or who were the result of rape and yet are wonderful and valuable people.<sup>39</sup>

**“America needs no words from me to see how your decision in Roe v. Wade has deformed a great nation.”<sup>40</sup>**

Another leading abortionist, Dr. Anthony Levatino converted from being an abortionist Dr. to Pro-Life. He says there is “not a chance in hell that I would ever do another one.” He reckons abortion to be one of the worst human rights violations in history. His video is the most watched Pro-Life statement yet: *2<sup>nd</sup> Trimester Surgical Abortion D & E*. 34% of pro-choice women who watched this video have turned against abortion.

### **“Texas, Turn Out the Lights”**

**“The true hypocrite is the one who ceases to perceive his deception, the one who lies with sincerity.”<sup>41</sup>**

“While no analogy is perfect, this one is particularly relevant when considering the conclusion the Roe court eventually came to, in which the court acknowledged that it was rendering its decision despite its inability to answer the question of ‘when [human] life begins.’<sup>42</sup>“The undeniable reality is that what ‘Texas’ was urging—that human life begins at conception—is the consensus from a biological standpoint. Flowers and Floyd simply did not do a good job of either articulating or substantiating this fact and instead made matters worse by agreeing with Weddington on her ‘lack of consensus’ assertion.”<sup>43</sup>

“While attempting to use science to her advantage ... Weddington was simultaneously attempting to forge a rational argument *based almost entirely on ignorance* by asserting that since no one—or more precisely, no group of experts—could agree on ‘when life begins,’ it should therefore be up to the pregnant woman to make that determination.”<sup>44</sup> (Emphasis mine.) This was a tactic too clever for her opposition. It was not true and it was and is even more so today – contradicted by science. You see what is at stake here. IF it could be shown that the fetus or baby was a person-- then that baby would be entitled to and guaranteed directly by the Constitution a right to life, or as I prefer to say – the right to go on living.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 54

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 117

<sup>39</sup> See Gianna Jessen, ‘Media Ignores How I Survived Abortion’ and many many other survivor stories

<sup>40</sup> Mother Teresa

<sup>41</sup> Andrew Gide

<sup>42</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 69

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 73

<sup>45</sup> The Fourteenth Amendment states that no state shall “deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of laws; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

*“And there we have it. With a few strokes of the pen, an entire class of living human beings is arbitrarily defined as nonpersons. If the unborn were not persons, then the unborn were no longer under Constitutional protection.”*<sup>46</sup> (Emphasis mine.) Author Resler astutely notes that the Justices whose job it was to *interpret* the Constitution fell into the trap of *redefining* it. (Any parallels today?) He sees that seven of the nine Justices cavalierly asserted their authority to define who was and who was not a person and then made that the critical test on which it hinged. (Was not exactly the same done in theology in respect of the creeds – believe this or else?)

In quoting from her textbook of Developmental Anatomy (which came out in 1946, so was available to the Justices): “This new individual has never existed before and will never exist again. This has never been disputed; this is the big lie that the opposition has because they don’t want it to be said that they’re killing human beings...So it’s true that it’s intellectual dishonesty.”<sup>47</sup> Resler summarizes that there is no confusion among biologists as to when life begins, only among philosophers and politicians.

**In 1855 the Supreme Court Decided that African slaves were not persons with the rights of citizens.**

**In 1973 the Supreme Court Decided that the unborn were not persons with the rights of citizens.**

The Dred Scott decision of 1857 says this: “Members of the Negro race have never been regarded as part of the people or citizens of the state. Negroes are not included and were not intended to be included under the word ‘citizen’ in the Constitution.” Says Resler: “Just as Roe did not recognize the unborn in the law as persons, Dred Scott failed to regard black people as part of the people or citizens of the state.”<sup>48</sup>

It came as a shock to me to be reminded that women have also been defined as and considered as nonpersons. We were not considered persons in the whole sense and were therefore denied the right to vote and to participate in jury trials. The same mentality prevailed – define them as nonpersons and then they have no rights. This philosophy was also used against the native American Indians.

“The third idea enunciated by the *Roe* majority—that although clearly living, unborn humans were ‘not persons in the whole sense’—was simply a declaratory statement with no rational, real-world support. Essentially, unborn humans were not ‘persons’ because the court said so. Rigging the playing field, the Court had defined personhood as having nothing to do with the ‘well-known facts of fetal development.’ Personhood as used by the Court amounted to little more than a convenient but arbitrary legal label with no underlying basis in the real world. If it had had the courage, the Court might have cited its own prior ‘logic’ as precedent, for, in exactly the same way, it had previously concluded that black humans were not persons in the whole sense under constitutional protection because the *Dred Scott* majority had held it to be so.”<sup>49</sup>

But, ghastly as these decisions were, the fact that the Dred Scott decision was reversed has to give us hope.

**“Either life is always and in all circumstances sacred, or intrinsically of no account; it is inconceivable that it should be in some cases the one, and in some the other.”** <sup>50</sup>

I think Dr. Gerster’s use of the word asinine is appropriate as she asks what magic happens at the moment of birth *to turn what was not a person into a person*. She says: “That’s an asinine

---

<sup>46</sup> Compelling Interest,, p. 79

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 83, 84. Also note that by the end of the first week after conception, there are 7,500 cell divisions which take place.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., p 95

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 216

<sup>50</sup> Malcolm Muggeridge

argument because if it's a human being in the light of day it's a human being in the darkness of the womb 30 minutes before."<sup>51</sup>

### How the Language is Manipulated (Semantic Gymnastics)

#### Words used by Pro-choice advocates:

Product of conception  
Fetus  
Pathological specimen  
Waste products  
Medical waste  
Nondescript cells, tissue  
Reproductive freedom/choice  
War on choice/anti-choice  
Women's rights

#### Words Used by Pro-Life advocates:

Baby  
Pre-born child  
Unborn  
Unborn child Unborn baby  
Human being  
Developing child  
Abortion = killing  
Pro-Love  
Baby: "Where were mine?"

Even the word abortion is not often used by pro-choice advocates as it reminds us of the actual action to be taken. Can you describe abortion without describing its object? It is very necessary for this camp to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing. Euphemisms can cover up the killing part. Resler points out a kind of schizophrenic attitude in that we have substituted a new ethic – the quality of life, but the former ethic – sanctity of life has not been completely erased.<sup>52</sup>

Randy Alcorn will not use pro-choice language because he says there is no such thing, that it's evasive and fraudulent. As he puts it – it is not about the choice; it is about what that choice is. The whole concept of choice is hailed as the highest good. But think about it – a pregnant woman does not have unlimited choices; she only has two: life or death.

After *Roe v. Wade* a 'choose choice or else' mentality developed along with this: "Cease to call abortion wrong, and join them in calling it right. And this must be done thoroughly—in acts as in words. Silence would not be tolerated; all must place themselves avowedly with them. To achieve this, private choice was to assault the structure of the family... alter the law of infanticide and *assert dominion over the meaning of language itself*."<sup>53</sup> (Emphasis mine.)

The BBC actually tell their journalists *not* to use pro-life terminology but to call them anti-choice.

**“Blacks didn't choose slavery, Jews didn't choose the ovens, women don't choose rape. And babies don't choose abortion.” Randy Alcorn**

### When Word Games Take Lives — Dehumanizing the Vulnerable<sup>54</sup> The Gospel of 'Choice'

Abortion was sold as the gospel of choice; choice has always been such a good thing, who would not want a choice? Very few questioned what that choice was. The philosophy live and let live (or more accurately-live and let die) prevailed. Even those who thought they were against abortion bought the 'necessary evil' paradigm. After all, we wouldn't want another child to grow up in poverty,

---

<sup>51</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 99

<sup>52</sup> *Compelling interest*, p. 107 “While technically and legally not murder, abortion is most certainly the killing of a living human being.”

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 229

<sup>54</sup> An entire book has been written on how the strategy of name calling has been used as a sort of linguistic warfare. Stereotypes are readily transformed into accepted truth when they are heard over and over again. If the lies are repeated often enough, they will be embraced. “...90 percent of the news media elite have assimilated 'right to choose' rhetoric as a prominent tenet of their social gospel. An even greater proportion of those in the world of filmmaking—97 percent—hold<sup>54</sup> an identical viewpoint.” William Brennan, *Dehumanizing the Vulnerable, When Word Games Take Lives*, p. 17

would we? And haven't we swallowed that line to this day? But Resler paints a nineteenth century analogy in which a slave owner admits there is something wrong, even evil – about slavery, but still maintains that it is a *necessary* evil. This has, in fact caused us to tolerate a culture of death.

The flawed logic of a woman's right to choose creates an excuse that one can hide behind if one does not consider it too deeply. This slogan created a new abortion on demand orthodoxy. But what if the mother-to-be were to ask herself this: does the Constitution give me the right to say that my child must die? (We, of course, answer to a higher power as Christians.)

“Women must have a choice.” Some of our politicians even shriek this in their speeches. But what about the choice for the little boys as little girls? You can have your own opinions but you cannot have your own facts. The choice for one necessitates the loss of life for another. How does having a choice compare with dismemberment, with tearing off babies' limbs?

**“Whenever a doctor cannot do good, he must be kept from doing harm.” Hippocrates**

“And Margaret Mead said, This is a turning point in the history of medicine. From Hippocrates on, doctors were never again to be killers but preeminently healers. This is a watershed thing that occurred with the Hippocratic oath. And they indicated that the Declaration of Geneva states—and it's a modern reaffirmation of the Hippocratic oath—and it states: “I will maintain the utmost respect for human life from the time of its conception. Even under threat, I will not use my medical skill contrary to the laws of humanity.”

“You notice they said ‘from the moment of conception’ I will maintain the utmost respect for human life, not from viability, not from quickening but from conception. And this was a restatement of this. Now we look at the situation today, how quickly memory fades with the passage of time! Today we have the doctors saying the Hippocratic oath is no longer relevant. They're using the same rationale against the Hippocratic oath today—doctors who favor abortion, infanticide, euthanasia—as the doctors on trial at Nuremberg used to justify their atrocities.”<sup>55</sup> They are maintaining that the Hippocratic oath is a kind of relic, antiquated, and impractical. But can we trust what they want to put in its place?<sup>56</sup>

“I happened to have walked into an operating room where they were doing an abortion on a late pregnancy. They lifted out a small baby that was able to cry and breathe and they put it in a bucket and put it in the corner of the room and pretended it wasn't there.”<sup>57</sup>

It is absolutely remarkable that in this age of ultrasound imagery that there still can be ignorance as to the beginning of life. How do you contradict observable biological facts?! We know that in real estate, the rule of thumb is location, location, location. Perhaps this thinking has wormed its way into our thinking. If an abortion goes wrong and the baby is not killed (and if no opportunity to kill it exists as in partial birth abortions) then everything medically possible will be done to save its life. All due to the location. Inside the womb is dangerous, outside the law is on your side. The appalling logic of this is seen in this: killing a scuba diver under water is as immoral as killing the same individual when he is breathing on land.<sup>58</sup>

Dr. Jefferson believes that abortion will be reversed on an unborn child protection case. And of course, the states do have a compelling interest in protecting the lives of its children. As of March of 2016 Hillary Clinton has admitted that she does not think that unborn babies have any legal rights

---

<sup>55</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 197

<sup>56</sup> Please see the myriad testimonies from Drs. who have done abortions and have changed their minds, e.g. youtube's “Doctor Who Did 1200 Abortions Tells Congress to Ban Them.”<sup>56</sup> Why did Sarah Weddington react so badly to late term abortions? Because they *so* resemble infanticide, which is now legal in The Netherlands

<sup>57</sup> Congressman Ron Paul, taken from *Advancing the Pro-Life Cause in The 21<sup>st</sup> Century*; see “Ron Paul Gives a Strong Argument Against Abortion.” (5-min YouTube video).

<sup>58</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 211

before birth and I believe, is still defending partial birth abortion.<sup>59</sup> Hillary's litmus test for a Supreme Court justice is that they must uphold unlimited abortion access. She claims that it is a right guaranteed under the Constitution. We need to do everything possible to educate as many people as possible about her extremist abortion position. And partial birth abortion is beyond unbearable. I would not be able to describe it to you.

Very much headway has been made this year, but abortion is not going away without the most enormous struggle. "We can defeat this monster."<sup>60</sup> Perhaps this is not the end but the end of the beginning.

### **The Crux of the Matter<sup>61</sup>**

**It is NOT a war on choice. It is a revulsion against killing.**

It is being honest with what the choice is – the choice to end life (which in all other circumstances we call murder) or to allow life to continue.<sup>62</sup> I am not opposing a right; I am opposing a wrong. The question should be: do you think people should have the right to choose to kill children? Every single evil thing that has ever been done by one individual to another is a choice.

### **The Sin of Silence**

**"To ignore evil is to become an accomplice to it."** Dr Martin Luther King, Jr.

When we say nothing at all, we are still saying something or as has been said, "I used to think that if I didn't say anything, I wasn't saying anything. Now I know better." When we don't speak, our silence speaks for us

"We, too, have known the evil from its start. In this great nation, where for [43] long years the innocent unborn have been slaughtered, we have grown accustomed to the killing and have gone on with our business, with our lives, and our ministries, while the little ones have perished, every day, ... {3,700} a day. This is what we have come to in America. The Supreme Court of our land [has sanctioned] the horror of partial birth abortion, this most barbaric and grotesque killing of a child in the midst of its birth.

"And yet even in the face of this abomination, the churches of America, the pastors of America, are silent. Where is the cry of outrage? Where is the indignation of the people of God? We, too, have known the evil from the start. {Body parts being trafficked} stand in mute testimony to our failure and to our guilt."<sup>63</sup>

**"If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear."** George Orwell.

I very much want us not be tongue tied or feeble in our witness, not knowing how to shatter the many stereotypes that we face; there is so much information and there are so many different ways to present a witness. I submit this one to you; it literally takes 1 minute as a most concise and incisive testimony. Most people will allow you to speak for one minute.

---

<sup>59</sup> Interview with Bret Baier

<sup>60</sup> Lynne Balzer, *Advancing the Pro-Life Cause in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

<sup>61</sup> In order to be pro-abortion, you must be convinced that what is being killed is not a human being. Many years of biological science and medical expertise state exactly the opposite.

OR you must be able to say that it is permissible to kill what we know is biologically to be a living human being.

AND you would have to believe that the Constitution has this liberty to kill hidden deep within its Amendments and emerging during the 1960's.

<sup>62</sup> You have all seen the stickers are cars saying 'Baby on Board' or pregnant mother's T shirts which read 'Baby under construction.' You will never have heard a woman say, 'my fetus is kicking. We know instinctively that a fetus is a baby. Mothers know that they are carrying a child. In the case of the murder of Laci Peterson, it was actually considered a double murder as "baby" Connor, (unborn) was also murdered.

<sup>63</sup> Excerpt from an address by Dr. Lawrence White

## A One-Minute Testimony<sup>64</sup>

If the unborn is growing, it must be alive. If it has human parents, it must be human. Humans like you and I are valuable. From conception, all that is added to the unborn is the correct environment and proper nutrition – the same things we all need. We all know that racism and sexism are wrong because they focus on external differences. The unborn has the same human nature that we do. Shouldn't we protect them from discrimination just as we protect minorities?

### Conclusion

**“It is a poverty to decide that a child must die so that you may live as you wish.”**<sup>65</sup>

Could anything be clearer? This unspeakable homicide, this scourge on the conscience of the nation, this holocaust of the unborn surely is the darkest chapter in our history.<sup>66</sup>

“...the writers of the Declaration [of Independence] viewed it as fact that each human life is not only created, but endowed by the Creator (as opposed to Supreme Court justices) with certain unalienable rights, chief of which is the *right to life*. This fact was so obvious to our Founding Fathers as to be proclaimed *self-evident*. These basic, unalienable human rights superseded the government. They superseded the Constitution. They superseded the Supreme Court.”<sup>67</sup>

“Abortion has led us into complete moral subjectivism in which we are prone to justify as ethical whatever it is we want to do.”<sup>68</sup>

Abortion should be viewed as *unthinkable, immoral, a violation* of our every natural sentiment. Destroying our own progeny is godless, a morally repugnant extermination of innocents.

May God work in us with both fact and emotion to cause the appropriate response in us. **The unborn are human beings just like you and me. That is why killing them is wrong.** A counselor who has spoken with thousands of women has said that he has never heard anyone say that they are sorry to have given birth, but he has heard thousands and thousands of heart wrenching pitiful regrets by women who have had abortions.<sup>69</sup>

We *should* allow ourselves to be broken-hearted. Abortion necessarily involves the act of killing. To say otherwise is a denial of truth. The entity inside the womb is the same entity as that on the outside. Abortion should be as unthinkable as walking over to your neighbor's house and killing him.

**“Morality cannot be legislated, but behavior can be regulated. Judicial decrees may not change the heart, but they can restrain the heartless.”**<sup>70</sup>

Do not be fooled by the jargon. No, it is not a question of choice, it is a question of killing. We have to face this reality.

**“In a time of universal deceit, telling the truth became (becomes) a revolutionary act.”**<sup>71</sup>

How totally incredible it is that although we have everything on our side; we have science; we have biology; we have medicine and psychology; we have theology; we have technology/visuals; and we have legal history as well as passionate testimony by doctors and mothers who have had abortions – and yet we have been railroaded into this. Evil has been victorious to the tune of nearly 60 million lives.

---

<sup>64</sup> Idea taken from Focus on the Family

<sup>65</sup> Mother Teresa

<sup>66</sup> All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self evident

<sup>67</sup> *Compelling Interest*, p. 220

<sup>68</sup> Randy Alcorn, *ProLife Answers to ProChoice Arguments*

<sup>69</sup> “He who denies that human life begins with conception does not need to contend with religion, but science. To deny this certainty of biology is not to express a lack of faith, but a lack of basic knowledge of human genetics, something that is even known by the general public.” Ecuadorian Federation of Societies of Gynecology and Obstetrics

<sup>70</sup> Dr. Martin Luther King

<sup>71</sup> George Orwell, *1984*

And now for the good news. We must oppose this culture of death. And it is a blessed thing to do so. To stand and be hated, and to return love and prayers is a holy activity. All of those dedicated to abortion are possible allies who could be won for the cause of life. And more good news: 50% of the American public are on the fence; that means that they can be spoken to, reasoned with, persuaded. And it means that we might help to save lives. "Mere waiting and looking on is not Christian behavior. Christians are called to compassion and action."<sup>72</sup> Please engage, be challenged, and challenge others. Again, this is our war. We must take up the cross on behalf of the innocent and defenseless. It is past time for boots on the ground. There was a 750,000 strong pro-life rally in Lima, Peru recently. Why is it so quiet here? "Have the courage to have your wisdom regarded as stupidity. Be fools for Christ. And have the courage to suffer the contempt of the sophisticated world."<sup>73</sup>

**Abortion is always wrong because it is always killing.**

### **Confessions of an Ex-Abortinist**

by Bernard Nathanson, M.D.

I am personally responsible for 75,000 abortions. This legitimizes my credentials to speak to you with some authority on the issue. I was one of the founders of the National Association for the Repeal of the Abortion Laws (NARAL) in the U.S. in 1968. A truthful poll of opinion then would have found that most Americans were against permissive abortion. Yet within five years we had convinced the U.S. Supreme Court to issue the decision which legalized abortion throughout America in 1973 and produced virtual abortion on demand up to birth. How did we do this? It is important to understand the tactics involved because these tactics have been used throughout the western world with one permutation or another, in order to change abortion law.

**THE FIRST KEY TACTIC WAS TO CAPTURE THE MEDIA** We persuaded the media that the cause of permissive abortion was a liberal enlightened, sophisticated one. Knowing that if a true poll were taken, we would be soundly defeated, we simply fabricated the results of fictional polls. We announced to the media that we had taken polls and that 60% of Americans were in favor of permissive abortion. This is the tactic of the self-fulfilling lie. Few people care to be in the minority. We aroused enough sympathy to sell our program of permissive abortion by fabricating the number of illegal abortions done annually in the U.S. The actual figure was approaching 100,000 but the figure we gave to the media repeatedly was 1,000,000. Repeating the big lie often enough convinces the public. The number of women dying from illegal abortions was around 200-250 annually. The figure we constantly fed to the media was 10,000. These false figures took root in the consciousness of Americans convincing many that we needed to crack the abortion law. Another myth we fed to the public through the media was that legalizing abortion would only mean that the abortions taking place illegally would then be done legally. In fact, of course, abortion is now being used as a primary method of birth control in the U.S. and the annual number of abortions has increased by 1500% since legalization.

### **THE THIRD KEY TACTIC WAS THE DENIGRATION AND SUPPRESSION OF ALL SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE THAT LIFE BEGINS AT CONCEPTION**

I am often asked what made me change my mind. How did I change from prominent abortionist to pro-life advocate? In 1973, I became director of obstetrics of a large hospital in New York City and had to set up a prenatal research unit, just at the start of a great new technology which we now use every day to study the fetus in the womb. A favorite pro-abortion tactic is to insist that the definition of when life begins is impossible; that the question is a theological or moral or philosophical one, anything but a scientific one. Fetology makes it undeniably evident that life begins at conception and requires all the protection and safeguards that any of us enjoy. Why, you may well ask, do some American doctors who are privy to the findings of fetology, discredit themselves by carrying out abortions? Simple arithmetic at \$300 a time, 1.55 million abortions means an industry generating \$500,000,000 annually, of which most goes into the pocket of the physician doing the abortion. It is clear that permissive abortion is purposeful destruction of what is undeniably human life. It is an impermissible act of deadly violence. One must concede that unplanned pregnancy is a wrenchingly difficult

---

<sup>72</sup> Dietrich Bonhoeffer

<sup>73</sup> Justice Antonin Scalia

dilemma, but to look for its solution in a deliberate act of destruction is to trash the vast resourcefulness of human ingenuity, and to surrender the public weal to the classic utilitarian answer to social problems.

#### AS A SCIENTIST I KNOW - NOT BELIEVE - KNOW THAT HUMAN LIFE BEGINS AT CONCEPTION

Although I am not a formal religionist, I believe with all my heart that there is a divinity of existence which commands us to declare a final and irreversible halt to this infinitely sad and shameful crime against humanity. [Dr. Nathanson has since converted to Catholicism, being baptized in 1996.]

Many people say, "I'm not pro-abortion, but I am pro-choice." But how would you respond to someone who said, "I'm not pro-robbery, I'm just pro-choice about robbery"? In exactly the same way, to be pro-choice about abortion is to be pro-abortion. Some imagine that being personally opposed to abortion, while believing others have the right to choose it, is some kind of compromise between the pro-abortion and pro-life position. It isn't. To the baby who dies, it makes no difference whether those who refused to protect her were pro-abortion or "merely" pro-choice about abortion. Being personally against abortion but favoring another's right to abortion is self-contradictory. It's exactly like saying, "I'm personally against child abuse, but I defend my neighbor's right to abuse his child if that is his choice."

It's not about choice. It's about what that choice is. Pro-choice for one means death for the other. Let's look at the facts; we must employ both reason and emotion. We must not say this is not our war. This is our war.

Knowing these things has changed me. Please don't let this information die in this room. The only value it will have is outside this room. Perhaps the following will resonate with you as it has with me. I no longer accept the things I cannot change. I try to change the things I cannot accept.

Anyone who can casually discuss tearing children to shreds while having lunch is a victim of the father of lies. Anyone who traffics in abortion loses a vital and beautiful spark of humanity.