

ABORTION – LESSON 2

(Arguments for Abortion)

- I. Argument 1: Abortion must be legal because a woman has the right to control her own body.**
- A. Basic points of the argument:
1. If a mother must carry a baby, the rights of the baby trump the rights of the mother.
 2. Requiring a mother to carry the baby is unfair because 1) she might have to quit school or work; 2) She might suffer the rest of her life wondering who adopted her child if placed up for adoption; 3) She might face the stigma of “unwed” motherhood; 4) Refusal of abortion rights makes the woman unequal to men.
 3. Pro-abortionist’s conclusion: Abortion rights fix these problems!
- B. What is your reasoning on this argument, its assumptions, etc.?
1. It assumes we have *total* control over our bodies.
 2. It assumes the child in the womb is part of the mother’s body.
 3. It assumes that killing/murdering an innocent life will fix the problems of the mother!
- C. Women, like men, have the right to control their bodies. But, are there any limits to the rights we have in controlling our bodies?
1. The rights/freedoms one has to do certain things become limited when they are so used to harm or infringe on the rights of others.
 - a. One may have the right to swing their arms, but that right ends when one’s arm approaches the end of another’s nose!
 - b. One can scream “I hate liver (in any form),” but that doesn’t mean one has the right to scream “fire” in a crowded theater!
 2. Reason and historic experience teach us that unless we protect the rights of others, our own rights soon diminish as well! What we do to others will soon come back upon us!
- D. What do the following passages teach about our life and bodies?
1. Gen. 1:26-27 – “Then God said, “Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.”²⁷ So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.”
 - a. Our life and body are the result of God’s creation.
 - b. Each individual human being is made in God’s image.
 2. Acts 17:25 – “Nor is He worshiped with men’s hands, as though He needed anything, since He gives to all life, breath, and all things.”
 - a. Life, and all things that allow life to be lived, are from God and dependent on Him.
 - b. Thus, we cannot treat human life as though its continuation is up to our *whim*.
 3. 1 Cor. 6:19-20 – “Or do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you, whom you have from God, and you are not your own?”²⁰ For you were bought at a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God’s.”?
 - a. Our body does not belong to us, but to God. His will must control our actions.
 4. 2 Cor. 5:10? – “For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he has done, whether good or bad.”).
 - a. Although we are allowed by law and by God to do all sorts of things with and to our bodies, these acts are not committed with immunity before God.
 - b. What we do with our bodies will be judged by God and our eternal destiny based on this.
 5. Conclusion: Though society/law may allow people to use their bodies in certain ways, all such actions will be judged by God’s will.
- E. Is the child in the womb a part of the mother’s body? Why or why not?
1. It is scientific fact that from fertilization a baby is a different person, having its own genetic uniqueness, often having a different blood type, sex, etc.
 2. How can a baby be a part of the mother’s body when...

- a. No part of a woman's body can survive on its own when separated from her body.
- b. It has its own body, with all its own parts needed for life on its own?
- c. A baby *in its normal state* cannot continually remain in a woman's body?
- 3. A baby by its very design is for separation and living independently from the mother!
- F. Do the real or perceived difficulties of a mother's circumstances make killing an unborn child both a "right" of the mother and the right thing to do?
 - 1. If a mother's situation, happiness, convenience, etc., give her the right to kill the innocent, helpless baby she is carrying in her womb, why would it not give her the same right to kill the innocent, helpless baby she is carrying in her arms?
 - 2. What other situations that might affect a person's job, schooling, happiness, etc., give that person the right to kill another **innocent** human being?
 - 3. In all arguments presented by pro-abortionists the baby is presented as the enemy of the mother, of her having a happy life, of her rights, and of her having equality with men!
 - a. And, it is assumed that the right to abortion is the cure of all these ills!
 - b. But, how can the normal biological results of a normal biological action that the mother chose to participate in be so detrimental to her, a punishment to her, a means of keeping her from competing with men, and a cause of failure on her part?!
 - c. To argue this is to argue that women are biologically inferior to men, second-class citizens, seeing men apparently do not suffer these consequences!
 - d. Again, the answer is said to be that women must have the right to kill their babies in their wombs to be on par with men, to live happy lives, etc.!
 - e. What we must understand (and help others to see) is that a mother and baby are equal, being both made in the image of God. So, both must be protected by law!
 - 4. If an abortionist asks, "who decides," we must point out that the more appropriate question is, "who dies?"

II. Argument 2: Abortion must be legal for those occasions when the mother's life is in danger.

- A. What is your reasoning or thoughts concerning this argument?
 - 1. The percentage of such cases where abortion takes place because of the "health" of the mother, not necessarily the "life" of the mother, is no more than 3-4% (possibly much lower).
 - a. That this percentage of abortions takes place because of the health of the mother does not indicate that an abortion "had" to be performed or the mother would die or be harmed!
 - b. Endangering the "health" of the mother can be interpreted in many ways. And even if it is recommended by a "doctor," that does not imply that death or real harm would come upon the mother.
 - 2. The circumstances of the baby's mother, although compassion and care must be shown, change nothing about the nature of the baby or abortion's inherent violence and brutality!
 - a. The child in the womb is still a child deserving of all rights of a human being.
 - b. To kill this child violates the child's rights based on the whims of another and is murder.
- B. How do (or do not) the following verses affect our answer to this argument (Jn. 15:13; 1 Jn. 3:16)?
 - 1. Jn. 15:13 – "Greater love has no one than this, than to lay down one's life for his friends."
 - 2. 1 Jn. 3:16 – "By this we know love, because He laid down His life for us. And we also ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."
 - 3. Self-sacrifice and even extreme personal loss have been shown by Christ himself to be the best way of life for oneself and others.
 - a. We honor the spirit of those who willingly sacrifice their lives for the sake of others.
 - b. Yet, many who honor the spirit of those above also honor the spirit of those who refuse to sacrifice anything for the life of their own child in their womb!
 - c. Can it seriously be argued that loss of work/school justifies taking another's life?
 - 4. I have never heard a godly woman say she would take the life of her unborn child to save her own. Godly women rightfully choose to "put it in God's hands."

III. Argument 3: Abortion must be legal because it shows compassion to unborn children that would have to suffer through life with certain diseases and deformities.

- A. What is your reasoning/thoughts concerning this argument?
1. Abortions for this cause make up about a *half percent* of abortions.
 2. This idea of “compassion” has no biblical (or social) basis but is an arrogant assumption that it is somehow *kinder* to kill a baby with a disability or disease before that baby is born than to let that child “live in that condition.”
 3. How do we know unborn babies who have diseases and abnormalities would choose death over what someone perceives to be unbearable suffering?
 4. People born with diseases and disabilities live happy lives and bring happiness to others!
- B. Are there any problems to be faced from allowing “quality of life” issues to determine who should and should not live?
1. Biblical problems?
 - a. People lived valuable lives with physical handicaps (Paul – 2 Cor. 12:7-9) and diseases (Naaman – 2 Kings 5:1ff.).
 - b. According to God’s word, physical characteristics do not determine worth. Being made in God’s image is what matters (Gen. 9:5-6; 1:26-27).
 2. Social problems?
 - a. We do not cure disease by killing the patient—but that is what abortion does! Think of the ramifications this will eventually have on society and healthcare.
 - b. Arguing for abortion of babies because of abnormalities is blatant and deadly discrimination against people with disabilities! Hitler would be proud!
 - c. If “quality of life” is allowed as the standard by which life is judged to be *worthy of living*, it will not stop at the diseases and deformities of the unborn. Euthanasia for the diseased, deformed, aged, etc., will naturally follow, seeing that their future life will also be judged as *not worth living*.
 - d. What is often argued is that abortion keeps babies from being born into very poor circumstances and becoming wards of the state.
 - i. This reasoning places the value of tax money and financial conditions of a family over the value of an innocent life, which is very dangerous!
 - ii. Jesus said, “Take heed and beware of covetousness, for one’s life does not consist in the abundance of the things he possesses” (Luke 12:15).

IV. Argument 4: Abortion must be legal to protect those who are pregnant by rape or incest. To require that the mother carry the baby punishes the mother for the sin of the rapist.

- A. List your reasons for agreeing or disagreeing with this position?
1. We must always seek to understand and express our compassion, concern, support, and care for the innocent women who have been so violently violated!
 - a. Yet, abortion is just another act of violence against another innocent victim—the child!
 - b. The child has done nothing. It is the rapist that has sinned. So once again, abortionist pit the mother against the child rather than against the true offender—the rapist!
 2. I disagree because we are never justified in doing evil because someone else does evil (i.e., is a mother justified in beating/killing her baby because her husband beats her? NO!).
 3. I disagree because abortion doesn’t *help* or *protect* the victim!
 - a. The harm has already been done, so why bring upon the woman further mental anguish that is regularly associated with abortion which often lasts a lifetime?
 - b. Can the mother’s *possible* shame in the minds of others (very little today and unlikely among those that know the circumstances), the discomforts of nine months of carrying a child, schooling or work missed, etc., justify taking another human being’s life? NO!
 - i. We are never allowed to do evil that good may come (Rom. 3:8).
 - ii. The circumstances of pregnancy do not change the status of the child in the womb, his/her rights to life, etc.

4. I disagree because the percentage of abortions for rape/incest is so small, only about 1%, that it cannot justify the other 99% of abortions that take place.
 - a. Abortion is not about these situations!
 - b. Just because it is reported for this cause does not make that the true reason!
 5. Although research in this area is limited, at least two studies have shown that victims of rape who aborted their babies felt twice victimized and angry about the abortion, while others who carried the babies felt they had turned something evil into something positive and good (Mahkom, "Pregnancy and Sexual Assault," *Psychological Aspects of Abortion*, University Publishers of America [1979], pp. 53-72, 182-199 via NRLC.org).
- B. Does life in this world/nation require that live with the consequences of others sin? Explain.
1. Yes. The sins of others affect the quality of life of most everyone!
 2. How much quality time has been lost to the business traveler/frequent flyer because of the sins of terrorists?
 3. How much do we overpay for things/services because people steal and/or not pay their bills?
 4. We face huge amounts of "red tape" because people are dishonest.
 5. We must lock our doors and arm ourselves because certain people are evil/violent.
- C. How does your answer above affect the validity of this argument?
1. The argument isn't valid because the sins of others do not justify further sin on the part of the victim (i.e., a husband beating his wife doesn't justify her abusing/killing her child).
 2. So, although requiring the victim of this crime to carry the baby may be depicted as *punishing the mother* for the sins of her rapist, that is the way of life in a society where everyone's rights must be protected, including that of the unborn child.