

January 20, 2013

Defending Life: Arguing against Abortion

Tomorrow, January 21, is Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. Tomorrow is also the time when President Obama will be publicly inaugurated for his second term in office. I'm sure that the name of the Rev. Dr. King will be invoked many times. But I wonder what King would think about America today.

Let's consider what King wrote in his famous "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" in 1963:

A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law.¹

If King were alive today, and he really believed what he wrote, he would see that in America, we have man-made codes that do not square with the moral law of God. We have unjust laws that are out of harmony with the moral law. One of those laws is legalized abortion.

This Tuesday, January 22, marks the fortieth anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court decision that made abortion legal in the United States. On the same day, another case decided by the Court, *Doe v. Bolton*, had the effect of making abortion legal throughout the nine months of a woman's pregnancy. Since that time, there have been approximately 55 million abortions in this country. Though the numbers have decreased slightly from their highs of two to three decades ago, there are still over one million abortions each year.² Twenty-two percent of all pregnancies end in abortion each year.³ In 2008, 1.96 percent of all women aged 15-44 had an abortion.⁴ That's one out of every fifty women of child-bearing age. This is a matter of great evil, great injustice. It's no wonder that King's niece, Alveda King, who had two abortions when she was a young woman, now speaks out against abortion. And it's what I'll be speaking about today.

¹ Martin Luther King, Jr., "Letter from a Birmingham Jail," in *The Book of Virtues*, ed. William Bennett (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993), 260, quoted in Douglas Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011), 337.

² http://www.nrlc.org/Factsheets/FS03_AbortionInTheUS.pdf

³ http://www.gutmacher.org/pubs/fb_induced_abortion.html

⁴

http://journals.lww.com/greenjournal/Fulltext/2011/06000/Changes_in_Abortion_Rates_Between_2000_and_2008.14.aspx

Before I dive into this topic, I should say that today I have a heavy heart. It is not a joy to research this issue, to think about it, to see pictures of aborted babies. I would rather not speak on this issue. But we must. It is necessary. If you are visiting this morning, I want you to know that we don't normally pick a controversial topic and speak on it. We usually examine what one passage of the Bible says and consider how it affects our lives. However, the Bible touches on all aspects of life, including this one. So, this is an unusual day, but we must not pretend that this issue has nothing to do with God and his Word.

I also want to say this up front: though the Bible says that killing innocent people is wrong, and the Bible affirms that those in the womb are people, we must remember that each one of us has broken the moral laws of God. We are all sinners. Christians are those who have been saved by God's grace, not because they are particularly moral. Abortion is a sin, but it is not an unforgivable one. Moses murdered a man, and he is a saint. David had a man murdered and tried to cover it up, and he is in heaven. Paul approved of the killing of Stephen, the first Christian martyr, but God changed him and he was forgiven, and today we read the words that the Holy Spirit inspired him to write. Now, the statistics tell us that by age 45, 30 percent of women will have had an abortion.⁵ We must remember that when we're talking to people about this issue. We must tell them about the forgiveness that is available to them in Jesus Christ.

What I want to do today is to remind you why abortion is wrong, show you the ideology behind abortion, and equip you to tell people why abortion is wrong. Whether it is legal or not, it is wrong. We must vote, we must act, and we must speak prophetically to the world about this issue.

I must admit that I don't have all the answers to this issue. I wish I did. But I do know the One who does have all the answers. Let's take a moment to pray to him.

Father, we know there is great evil in this world, and we know that you, your Son, and your Spirit are our only hope. We cry out with the Psalmists who ask, "How long?" How long will this evil continue? Please help us to know that you are greater than this evil, and that nothing is beyond your reach. Show us what to do. Show us how to speak the truth in love. And we ask that you would bring this gross evil to an end. We pray this in Jesus' name. Amen.

I'll try to address a number of issues in a succinct way. The first question I'll answer is: Does the Bible say abortion is wrong? Genesis 1:27 says that God created men and women in

⁵ Ibid.

his image. I think that means a lot of things, but one thing is clear: human life is unique and inherently valuable. Because human life is valuable, it is wrong to murder. This is what God said to Noah after the flood, in Genesis 9:6: “Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image.” Of course, the sixth commandment is “You shall not murder” (Exod. 20:13).

But what about the unborn? Rather famously, David writes in Psalm 139:13-14:

For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother’s womb.
I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made. Wonderful are your works;
my soul knows it very well.

The Bible doesn’t address all these issues in modern-day scientific terms, but we see here that God makes life in the womb. God is the primary and ultimate cause behind all of life.

In the first chapter of Luke, Mary, carrying Jesus in her womb, meets her cousin Elizabeth, carrying John the Baptist in her womb. Luke 1:41-44:

And when Elizabeth heard the greeting of Mary, the baby leaped in her womb.
And Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit, and she exclaimed with a loud cry,
“Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb! And why
is this granted to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For behold,
when the sound of your greeting came to my ears, the baby in my womb leaped
for joy.

Notice the text says “baby.” The Greek word for baby is βρεφος, which is the same word used for baby Jesus in Luke 2:12 and 16. It’s also the word Luke, who was a doctor, used in Acts 7:19, when he talks about Pharaoh’s attempt to kill the Hebrew babies.

Speaking of Exodus, we see that the Law protected the unborn. This is what Exodus 21:22-25 says:

When men strive together and hit a pregnant woman, so that her children come out, but there is no harm, the one who hit her shall surely be fined, as the woman’s husband shall impose on him, and he shall pay as the judges determine.
But if there is harm, then you shall pay life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth,
hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.

Notice that if there is harm to an unborn baby because the mother is accidentally hit during a fight, the penalty is most severe. If the child died, the one responsible had to die: life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth. In other words, even the accidental killing of an unborn child is considered murder.

Let's consider one more bit of Biblical evidence, this time from the New Testament. This is something I learned for the first time this week. In Galatians 5, beginning in verse 19, there is a list of vices, what Paul calls "the works of the flesh." These things are against the Holy Spirit (vv. 16-17). Among the items listed is "sorcery" (v. 20). The NIV says, "witchcraft." The Greek word is φαρμακεια, which sounds a bit like *pharmacy*. This is what Timothy George says about this word:

These words correctly convey the idea of black magic and demonic control, but they miss the more basic meaning of drug use. In New Testament times *pharmakeia* in fact denoted the use of drugs with occult properties for a variety of purposes including, especially, abortion. As J. T. Noonan has written, "Paul's usage here cannot be restricted to abortion, but the term he chose is comprehensive enough to include the use of *abortifacient* drugs." In the early church both infanticide, often effected through the exposure of newborn babies to the harsh elements, and abortion, commonly brought about by the use of drugs, were regarded as murderous acts. Both are flagrant violations of Jesus' command to "love your neighbor as yourself."⁶

Abortion and infanticide were also condemned by many of the Church Fathers.⁷

Clearly, the Bible states that murder is wrong, that the unborn are babies, and that killing them is equivalent to murder. But we might want to ask a deeper question: Why do people abort babies? Let me suggest that this is nothing less than spiritual warfare. We know the Prince of peace, but there's another spirit at work in this world. He is called "the god of this world" (2 Cor. 4:4) and "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work in the sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2). I'm talking about Satan, and I believe that in the Bible and in the world, there are types of Satan.

When the unbelieving Jewish leaders confronted Jesus, he said to them, "You are of your father the devil, and your will is to do your father's desires. He was a murder from the beginning, and has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks out of his own character, for he is a liar and the father of lies" (John 8:44). In 1 John 3, we read this:

Little children, let no one deceive you. Whoever practices righteousness is righteous, as he is righteous. Whoever makes a practice of sinning is of the devil,

⁶ Timothy George, *Galatians*, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994), 394.

⁷ For specific citations, see Andreas J. Köstenberger and David W. Jones, *God, Marriage, and Family* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2004), 132-33.

for the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil. No one born of God makes a practice of sinning, for God's seed abides in him, and he cannot keep on sinning because he has been born of God. By this it is evident who are the children of God, and who are the children of the devil: whoever does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor is the one who does not love his brother. (1 John 3:7-10)

Evil is real and Satan is real, and he has a lot of children in this world. I believe there are various types of Satan in the Bible, such as Pharaoh, who wanted to kill the male Hebrew babies (Exod. 1:15-22). People such as Haman, the Persian, who wanted to “annihilate all Jews, young and old, women and children” (Esth. 3:13). People such as Herod, who killed the male children in Bethlehem (Matt. 2:16-18). The book of Revelation says this was the work of “that ancient serpent, who is called the devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world” (Rev. 12:9).

The point is that lies and murder come from Satan, and there are many people who have been blinded by him and do his work. Abortion is Satanic and it is godless.

I mean that last bit quite literally. I think the underlying worldview that supports abortion is naturalism. This is a view of the world that assumes that there is nothing supernatural. That means there is no God, no Satan, no heaven, no hell, and no miracles. It is often associated with Darwinism, the belief that all of life has evolved from a common ancestor. This is the worldview that is prevalent in universities, in the media, and among many people who fancy themselves to be intellectuals. It is literally a godless, atheistic worldview.

Since naturalism denies God, it must deny that there is real design in the world, that there is one true purpose of life, that there is an objective, absolute, eternal moral law. Naturalism is often associated with Darwinian evolution. It assumes that we have somehow evolved from lesser species due to genetic mutations and natural selection. It is a survival of the fittest, and those with better genetics are more apt to survive and procreate and pass on their superior genetics.

Charles Darwin's most famous book is *On the Origin of Species* (1859), but he wrote another work called *The Descent of Man* (1871), in which he proposes theories about human evolution. His encounters with the natives of Tierra del Fuego, off the southernmost tip of South America, led him to believe that civilized humans evolved from lesser “savages,” as he called them. These are Darwin's own words about “the civilised races of man”—in other words, white Europeans—and “savages”:

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised races of man will almost certainly exterminate, and replace, the savage races throughout the world.⁸

It's not surprising that Darwin's cousin, Francis Galton, was a pioneer in eugenics, a term that he himself coined. Essentially, eugenics was a pseudoscience that claimed that better breeding could lead to a better human race. This is how one author described eugenics:

Because eugenics was based on Darwinian theory, many eugenicists feared that modern institutions, such as medicine and social welfare, were spawning biological degeneration among humans. By softening the struggle for existence, modern society allowed the "inferior" to reproduce. The purpose of eugenics was to reverse this degenerative trend so humans could foster evolutionary progress instead.⁹

So, in order to advance human evolution, it was proposed that some people, such as the mentally handicapped, should be sterilized. Some people took it further; Hitler praised eugenics, forcing people to be sterilized and killing two hundred thousand disabled people by the end of World War II.¹⁰

Eugenics was also embraced by Margaret Sanger, who founded Planned Parenthood in 1916. She was a large proponent of birth control. Though she was advocating contraceptives and not abortion, it's not hard to see a connection between her beliefs and the abortion industry. Planned Parenthood is the single largest provider of abortions in America, performing over 300,000 abortions a year, bringing in over 160 million dollars every year. And our government gives this organization over 500 million dollars each year.

Sanger had some very interesting ideas. This is one thing she wrote: "Through sex, mankind will attain the great spiritual illumination which will transform the world, and light up the only path to an earthly paradise."¹¹ Not only did she think sex was a path to an earthly paradise, but she thought an entirely different human race could be achieved through birth control. She referred to reproductive rights as "voluntary motherhood." This is part of what she wrote in *Woman and the New Race*:

Voluntary motherhood implies a new morality—a vigorous, constructive, liberated morality. That morality will, first of all, prevent the submergence of womanhood into

⁸ <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/2300/2300.txt>

⁹ Richard Weikart, "Science, Eugenics, and Bioethics," in *Evidence for God*, ed. William A. Dembski and Michael R. Licona (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2010), 97.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 99.

¹¹ Margaret Sanger, *The Pivot of Civilization* (New York: Brentano's, 1922), 271, quoted in Nancy Pearcey, *Total Truth* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2004), 143.

motherhood. It will set its face against the conversion of women into mechanical maternity and toward the creation of a new race.¹²

Here's another choice quote:

Birth control itself, often denounced as a violation of natural law, is nothing more or less than the facilitation of the process of weeding out the unfit, of preventing the birth of defectives or of those who will become defectives.¹³

And it gets better:

The relentless efforts of reactionary authority to suppress the message of birth control and of voluntary motherhood are futile. The powers of reaction cannot now prevent the feminine spirit from breaking its bonds. When the last fetter falls the evils that have resulted from the suppression of woman's will to freedom will pass. Child slavery, prostitution, feeble-mindedness, physical deterioration, hunger, oppression and war will disappear from the earth.¹⁴

And here's the kicker:

In their subjection women have not been brave enough, strong enough, pure enough to bring forth great sons and daughters. Abused soil brings forth stunted growths. . . . When the womb becomes fruitful through the desire of an aspiring love, another Newton will come forth to unlock further the secrets of the earth and the stars. There will come a Plato who will be understood, a Socrates who will drink no hemlock, and a Jesus who will not die upon the cross. These and the race that is to be in America await upon a motherhood that is to be sacred because it is free.¹⁵

Take a moment to process that. The worldview that supports abortion is not scientific. And it is religious, though it is not of God. It is Satanic, is filled with lies, and it is murderous.

I share all of these things because I want you all to see how these ideas are connected. Ideas have consequences, and once certain beliefs are embraced, it is natural for certain beliefs and actions to flow from them. We need to see what beliefs are behind the things we see in our world.

We need to know this because I think those who taught that abortion is morally permissible are the most guilty. You can find all kinds of stories of abortion clinics manipulating women and pressuring them into getting an abortion. At 450 to 500 dollars per abortion, it's an industry that's worth about 700 million dollars. There is a great deal of corruption behind all of this. Would it surprise you to know that the majority of women who get abortions are minorities

¹² Margaret Sanger, *Woman and the New Race* (1920), <http://www.bartleby.com/1013/18.html>.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

and are poor? No one is talking about this, of course, but I don't think it's implausible that someone figured out you could weed out these people through abortion. It's no implausible to think that the government figured out it would be cheaper to abort babies than to have them on government dole for several years. There's a reason why Planned Parenthood receives so much funding from the government.

The people who have supported abortion are the ones who are truly evil. The women who have abortions are guilty, but they need to receive our compassion. Most of the women who have abortions are young, unmarried, and in crisis. Seventy-five percent of women who have abortions are under 30. Fifty percent are 24 and under. Eighty-five percent of women who have abortions are not married. Thirty percent of women who have abortions are black. Twenty-five percent of women who have abortions are Hispanic. Forty-two percent of women who have abortions live below the federal poverty level.¹⁶ Women who have abortions are wrong and are responsible for their sins, but they are often sinning while under great pressure.

Of course, some people have abortions because they're selfish and have a low view of life. *Time* magazine recently published an article on abortion. In it, there was description of a woman who came to the abortion clinic:

A 24-year-old patient who drove 80 miles (130 km) alone to reach the clinic [in Fargo, North Dakota] says she and her boyfriend decided together not to continue her pregnancy, which was six weeks along. "Neither of us is anywhere near baby time right now. We argue over who will take the dog out some days, so I don't think the diaper changing would go much better."¹⁷

Apparently, a dog has more of a right to live than a baby. This is another symptom of living in a society where people don't submit to the authority of God.

So, now that we know these things, what can we do? There are a number of things that we can do, but I'm going to focus on only one today. We need to use our minds. There's this phrase in 1 Peter 1:13 that literally says "girding up the loins of your mind." That's what we need to do. We need to prepare to defend life by arguing against abortion, whether this is with friends, in public, or online. We need to understand the issues at stake.

¹⁶

http://journals.lww.com/greenjournal/Fulltext/2011/06000/Changes_in_Abortion_Rates_Between_2000_and_2008.14.aspx

¹⁷ Kate Pickert, "What Choice? Abortion-rights activists won an epic victory in *Roe v. Wade*. They've been losing ever since," *Time*, January 14, 2013: 46.

But first, this means we have to care. And we need to care all year, not just one Sunday in January. I would encourage you all to go to the website abort73.com and watch the videos on the home page. They show a couple of aborted babies. Stare at those pictures. Be bothered. Shed tears. Pray with all your being that God would bring an end to this barbaric practice.

And we need to pray that God would use us to persuade others that life is precious. We need to argue against abortion. If abortion is advocated through lies, we need to bring truth to light. We need to bring truth to the light because the media doesn't portray the millions of women negatively affected by abortion. They act like abortion is just part of a political game. Hardly anyone asks if it is right. To persuade people that abortion is immoral, we need to use good arguments.

The key issue in the abortion debate, the key question, is this: What is in the womb? Is that a human? A person with rights? Or just a blob of cells? That is the key question. Whenever you are talking to someone about abortion, focus on that issue.

When it comes to this question, science is our friend. Leading embryology textbooks affirm that human life begins at conception. This is what one embryology textbook says:

Human development begins at fertilization when a male gamete or sperm (spermatozoon) unites with a female gamete or oocyte (ovum) to form a single cell—a zygote. This highly specialized, totipotent cell marked the beginning of each of us as a unique individual.¹⁸

When sperm fertilizes egg, it is no longer sperm or egg, but a new human life. The zygote, even when one cell, is distinct, living, and whole. Normally, each person has forty-six chromosomes, which contain all our DNA, our genetic information. Each sperm and egg has twenty-three chromosomes, which join together to produce the forty-six chromosomes of the new human life. In other words, the baby has his or her own DNA at the moment of conception. The zygote is not an extension of the mother's body, but a new human body.¹⁹ This new human body doesn't grow by adding parts. Rather, it grows from within. It is not a part; it is a whole.

¹⁸ Keith Moore and T. V. N. Persaud, *The Developing Human: Clinically Oriented Embryology* (Philadelphia: Saunders/Elsevier, 2008), 15, quoted in Scott Klusendorf, *The Case for Life* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2009), 35.

¹⁹ Dianne Irving, Ph.D., "When Do Human Beings Begin? 'Scientific' Myths and Scientific Facts," <http://catholiceducation.org/articles/abortion/ab0027.html>. This information was presented in Wayne A. Grudem, *Politics According to the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2010), 161-62.

As soon as twenty-one days after fertilization, the heart starts beating. Roughly one month after fertilization, the brain starts developing very rapidly.²⁰ At nine weeks, a baby is able to suck his or her thumb and do summersaults. Science shows that a baby in the womb is alive.

Abortion choice advocates know this, of course, so they try to say that the unborn baby is a human life, but not a human person. They say the unborn baby doesn't have the rights of a person. They will often say that a person only has rights when he or she is self-aware, or conscious. This distinction is somewhat arbitrary. It is also very dangerous, because it redefines humanity.

We must argue that a human being has rights not because we possess certain properties like self-awareness, but because we are humans, made in the image of God. People like to talk about human rights and they assume that we should have human rights. But human rights can only be properly understood and defended within a Christian worldview. If we have evolved, we don't necessarily have human rights. I wonder what Darwin thought about the rights of those so-called "savages." You know, the ones civilized races of man will exterminate.

This is what Francis Beckwith writes about the value of human beings: "If one's value is conditioned on certain accidental properties, then the human equality presupposed by our legal institutions and our form of government—the philosophical foundation of our constitutional regime—is a fiction."²¹ Our country's government is based on the idea of human rights granted by God. Take this away, and the country collapses.

To help us understand that there is no difference, philosophically, between the embryo we once were, and the human beings we are today, we'll look at an acronym called SLED. It stands for Size, Level of development, Environment, and Degree of dependency.

As for size, yes, there is a difference between the unborn and those outside the womb. But is our personhood really based on size? Toddlers are bigger than infants. Are toddlers more fully human than infants? Do adults have more rights than children because they're bigger? Human value and rights are not based on size.

With respect to level of development, yes, the unborn aren't as fully developed as we are. But the same is true of infants and children. Do the more fully developed have more value and rights than those less developed? And if we are basing our definition of personhood on

²⁰ http://www.abort73.com/abortion/prenatal_development/

²¹ Francis J. Beckwith, "Politics, Faith, and Church and State," in *Reasons for Faith*, ed. Norman L. Geisler and Chad V. Meister (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2007), 139.

consciousness, what happens to those who are unconscious? Can we legally kill them? If self-awareness is the deciding factor, can we kill people who are sleeping, or are in comas, or who have Alzheimer's? No, of course not.

The unborn are in a unique environment, in their mother's womb. But what does environment have to do with personhood? Is an infant in her mother's arms less of a human?

Finally, the unborn have a high degree of dependency on their mothers. But all of us are dependent on others for survival, and infants and toddlers are very dependent upon their parents.

If we focus on size, level of development, environment, and degree of dependency, we can show that there is not much of a difference between the unborn human person and the infant human person. Both deserve to be protected.²²

If you focus on the scientific facts and SLED, you can show that the unborn is a human and a person. Focus the conversation on these issues.

Once we know that, we can address specific abortion-choice objections. Here are a few common ones. One objection is this: mother's whose pregnancies risk their own lives should have the right to abort. No one objects to this, but we must say two things. One, it is very rare that the mother's life is at stake. This is true in perhaps less than one percent of all cases.²³ In one survey, 2.8 percent of women said they had an abortion because of risk to their health.²⁴ Most of the reasons for having an abortion have to do with not wanting more children, not wanting to be a single mother, or not being able to afford another child. Two, if the mother's life is at risk, doctors will perform an operation to save the mother's life, not necessarily to abort the baby. The goal should be to save lives.

Another objection involves rape. Only one percent of all abortions are due to rape.²⁵ Let us admit that rape is a horrible crime. But rape is not grounds for abortion. It is as simple as this: two wrongs don't make a right. The baby is not guilty and should not be executed for the father's sin. Deuteronomy 24:16 says, "Fathers shall not be put to death because of their children, nor shall children be put to death because of their fathers. Each one shall be put to death for his own sin." Rape is awful, but murder is worse. And God can turn something bad into something good.

²² For more on SLED, see Klusendorf, *The Case for Life*, 28.

²³ Alcorn, *Why Pro-Life?* 76.

²⁴ <http://www.gutmacher.org/pubs/journals/2411798.html>

²⁵ <http://www.gutmacher.org/pubs/journals/3711005.html>

Another objection focuses on women's rights. Lately, abortion choice advocates have said pro-life advocates are waging a "war on women." That's clever. It's effective, powerful rhetoric, but it's wrong. Women's rights have nothing to do with abortion. If men could get pregnant, they would be wrong to abort babies. It's not about reproductive freedom. It's not a choice between a woman and her doctor. Really, it should be a choice between the mother and the father, considering there is a God above and a human person in the womb. We're not against choice, we're against wrong choices.

The idea that abortion is part of women's rights is illogical, but it's powerful. In the same *Time* magazine issue that I mentioned earlier, there was an interview with the novelist Louise Erdrich. She said she was furious at the Catholic Church. She said, "I still feel a sense of fury at the ghastly idea that celibate old men can dictate what a woman does with her body."²⁶ That sounds very powerful, and there's something about it that almost sounds right. Unfortunately, our society responds more to rhetoric and emotion than logic. I don't feel the need to defend the Catholic Church, but it hardly matters whether the group of people who say murder is wrong are celibate old men or promiscuous young women. What matters is what is right and what is wrong. And it is wrong to kill an innocent human person. Unfortunately, our society responds more to rhetoric and emotion than logic.

That is why certain Christian institutions are fighting against the Affordable Health Care Act's mandate that employers provide health insurance that covers contraceptives such as the birth control pill and the morning-after pill. Protestants aren't against all contraceptives, but we are against contraceptives that can cause abortions. That's why the birth control pill is known as an abortifacient. One of the pill's mechanisms is to prevent an embryo—a human person—from implanting on the wall of the uterus, which causes the embryo to die. You can look this information up. Sadly, the drug companies that market birth control have tried to redefine conception as the moment of implantation, and this is wrong.

So, both women and men should have choices regarding their bodies, but no one is free to choose to harm or kill another with his or her own body.

Another statement you'll hear from people is something like this, "I'm personally against abortion, but I don't think it should be illegal." That's the line of the cowardly politician. Another line is similar: "If you're against an abortion, don't have one." That's like saying, "If

²⁶ Belinda Luscombe, "10 Questions" *Time*, January 13, 2013, 60.

you're against rape, don't rape anyone" or, "If you're against bullying, don't bully." "If you're against terrorism, don't be a terrorist." I could go on and on. No one says, "I'm personally against murder, but I don't think it should be illegal." If what is in the womb is a human person, then it's murder and it shouldn't be legal.

A lot of people will try to distract you from the issue. A friend of mine said he was personally against abortion, but he thought that pro-lifers didn't care about those who were born. In his view, pro-lifers don't care about the poor because they don't believe the government should take care of people from cradle to the grave. But his comment is a non sequitur. Literally, it doesn't follow. Those who are pro-life should be consistently pro-life, but we are talking about preventing the murder of innocent people. We're not talking about political philosophy or how to take care of the poor. Don't let people distract us away from the key issue: What is in the womb? A human person.

If you want more information about how to defend a pro-life position, please check out two books in our library: *The Case for Life* by Scott Klusendorf and *Why Pro-Life?* by Randy Alcorn. You can also check out the websites listed in the bulletin.

All of us should get involved in the issue of abortion. Just as we should all be evangelists and apologists, we should all defend innocent life. This is not some issue we can outsource to politicians, hoping they'll do what's right. They haven't. We need to act with our hearts, our hands, and our heads, performing acts of love and speaking truth in love, simply so that others will have a chance to live.

Let's pray.

Father, we ask that you would act. Please, we urge you, stop abortion. And use us, your people, to do your will. We pray your Spirit would be at work in us, to give us love for others and to give us boldness to speak truth in love. Give us wisdom to know how to act. We pray that you would be glorified as we act in your Son's name, in which we pray. Amen.