

The Beginning of Life

Life Events

Currently, just **21** weeks after conception, babies can survive outside the womb.

9 weeks after conception, all the baby's structures that are necessary for pain sensation are functioning.

A baby's brainwaves can be detected at **6** weeks from conception.

21 days from conception, the baby is making and pumping her own blood through a closed circulatory system but **18** the baby's heart first began to beat at just **18** days.

The baby's genetic makeup which includes gender, physical characteristics, facial features, body type, hair color, eye color, skin tone, etc. are determined at **the moment** of conception.

*prolifeaction.org and other sources

**But what makes a baby a person?
Is it when he can survive on his own?
Is it her ability to feel pain?
Is it when he can think?
Or when her heart starts beating?
Or is it simply when a unique life-form with
it's own human DNA comes into existence?**

If a baby is considered a person when he can survive on his own, why are infants, children, the elderly, and disabled granted human rights of personhood when they depend on others to survive? And does traveling from one place to another change the definition of what makes someone a person? Does going from the womb to a room or from a room to someplace else change anything? No, clearly this is not what makes someone a person.

If someone cannot feel pain, through medical intervention or by natural means, does this change anything? Are humans categorized by their ability or their inability to feel? No, this is not what makes someone a person.

Does brain function or ability define personhood? If someone is in a coma with an excellent chance of survival, are they automatically discarded or is that just a state of being? Clearly a temporary lack of brain function does not make someone less of a person.

The same goes for the heart, do we consider someone who needs a medical device to temporarily pump his blood for him to not have rights of personhood? No we do not, this is not what defines a person.

So we are left with the moment of conception, when it can be scientifically shown that a new life-form has begun. It is either a boy or a girl from the first second it exists and it's characteristics are already mapped out. How can it be argued that this is anything but a person with a right to live?

The Supreme Court's Decision to Legalize Abortion (Appeal to Authority Fallacy)

“One of the more frequently used arguments to defend abortion goes like this: The United States Supreme has settled the issue. Because the Court has ruled that abortion is legal, it must therefore be a correct and moral act beyond challenge.

In an 1857 court case, known as the Dred Scott decision, the Supreme Court ruled that slaves, even freed slaves, and all their descendants, had no rights protected by the Constitution and that states had no right to abolish slavery. Where would Blacks be today if that reasoning had not been challenged?

The reasoning in Dred Scott and Roe v. Wade is nearly identical. In both cases the Court stripped all rights from a class of human beings and reduced them to nothing more than the property of others. Compare the arguments the Court used to justify slavery and abortion. Clearly, in the Court's eyes, unborn children are now the same "beings of an inferior order" that the justices considered Blacks to be over a century ago.”

*www.nrlc.org/archive/news/1999/NRL699/slave.html

Protection of the Mother

It's often argued that abortion is necessary because of health concerns for the mother, be it to save a mother's life or because there are complications but what most people don't realize is that "mental health of the mother" is what is most often used as the reason for health concerns and that term is very subjective. When broken down, it is likely that the percentage of women who get abortions because of the physical health of the mother is only **1%** while the actual physical life of the mother is only **0.1%** although some would question if it is even that much.

*www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/abortion/abreasons.html

“In my 36 years in pediatric surgery, I've never known of one instance where the child had to be aborted to save the mother's life.”

-C. Everett Koop
U.S. Surgeon General, 1982-89

But what about ectopic pregnancies which, if left alone, are commonly believed to be fatal to both the mother and baby? Consider this article by Dr. Wallace:

"found an ectopic gestation in the left tube," which was "enlarged to the size of a walnut... Knowing their anxiety for raising a child, I decided to try, at least, the only thing at hand -- to transplant the ectopic pregnancy. ... I carefully opened the tube and dissected the pregnancy out intact, being careful not to injure the sac in any way by keeping wide away and including part of the tube-wall. It came out very easily and was in size about equal to a large olive. It was at once placed within the cavity of the opened uterus... The tube was closed in like manner and left in place. The patient was watched carefully... for two weeks with no symptoms whatever. ... The pregnancy went on normally to full term and resulted in the natural birth of a fine boy, fully developed and without a scar, May 2, 1916."

*Harvard Medical Library in Volume XXIV of the medical journal Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics

The Beginning of Life

So what can we take away from this? While a mother's safety and protection is often used as a primary reason for the need for abortion, it is very rare that a woman's life be in danger due to the baby and even the supposed hopeless conditions like ectopic pregnancies could be treatable if our culture pursued it.

Incest and Rape (Two Wrongs Make a Right Fallacy)

While the statistics for physical health and life of the mother as a reason for abortion seem to be grossly misrepresented, the number of women who get abortions because of incest or rape are likely even smaller. A compiled estimate for rape as a reason why women get abortions is only about **0.3%** while incest as a reason is only **0.03%**.

*www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/abortion/abreasons.html

The question that needs to be asked in the cases of incest and rape is "Why should an innocent child pay for the actions of her father?" Two wrongs don't make a right. So many women who get abortions regret their decision for the rest of their lives. Abortion not only kills babies but it emotionally scars the millions of mothers who get them.

"Many people believe that women who are victims of rape and become pregnant by this violent act is a good reason for them to have an abortion. In *Victims and Victors* (Acorn Books, 2000), a book written by David Reardon, Amy Sobie, and Julie Makinna, 192 women were interviewed. These women had had abortions after they became pregnant from rape. **Nearly all the women said that they regretted the abortion, and over 90% said they would discourage other rape victims from choosing abortion.**"

*www.angelfire.com/nj3/rebekah8370

Many women who get pregnant, not just due to rape, are either not able to afford a child or are unable to take care of a baby for some other reason. This still does not justify ending that child's life. There are so many couples that cannot conceive and are waiting to adopt a baby and even couples who already have kids would love to adopt more. Adoption is far less destructive to mothers simply because they chose not to abort.

Overpopulation

Another argument that is sometimes used for abortion is that it is necessary to keep human population under control. That there is not enough room or food on the earth. Examples like China and India may be presented as evidence for this but what is the reality of the situation? While some areas of the world are poverty stricken, we have so much food to go around "... enough to make most people fat!" that it is actually quite alarming that more is not being done to get it where it is needed. Also, simple math will show that the entire population of the world could fit in an area the size of Texas very comfortably (leaving over 1,000 ft² per person). So instead of focusing on eliminating innocent lives to combat current problems of poverty and hunger, we should be focusing on breaking down political and economic barriers.

*www.foodfirst.org/fr/node/239

Freedom

When compiling statistics, an estimated **98%** of abortions are simply due to the mother's choice.

*www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/abortion/abreasons.html

Freedom is the primary argument for abortion. We live in a time where personal freedom is held above almost everything. A woman's choice to do what she wants with a pre-born baby is placed above the life of the child herself all in the name of freedom. It is argued that a woman's body is hers after all, so why should she not get to choose what she does with it? This argument assumes that the baby is not a person yet because of all the previous reasons we looked at but a simple question should be asked;

If it is your body, why are there two heads, two beating hearts, and/or two sets of DNA?

In a time where freedom is elevated to such a level, focus on self is far too prevalent and respect for others is being lost more and more causing a moral decay that has not been seen before, at least not in our generation's lifetime. Babies are a blessing, not an inconvenience. Raising children is not always easy but women and men need to step up to the plate and take responsibility for their actions. They would be better people for it and we would be a far better society as well.

Our Role in the War on Babies

Just forty years after the legalization of abortion in America in 1973 an estimated **55,000,000** babies have been killed, the vast majority because they simply were not wanted. That is well over **3,000** babies a day in America alone. Even after the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act enacted in November 2003 which was supposed to prevent babies from being terminated if they could survive outside the womb, many women are still getting abortions up into the third trimester because of loopholes. So as Christians, what part should we play in this war? When the innocent are being killed, are we not called to protect them? If this is truly a war on a specific group of people, wouldn't God condone the protection of these innocent lives, even up to using force to save them? After all, wasn't Dietrich Bonhoeffer praised for his attempt to assassinate Hitler, what makes this war any different? Well the simple answer is found in a single verse:

"For we are not fighting against people made of flesh and blood, but against the evil rulers and authorities of the unseen world, against those mighty powers of darkness who rule this world, and against wicked spirits in the heavenly realms."

Ephesians 6:12 (NLT)

While abortionists do kill millions similar to the Nazis, the fact remains that women still get abortions, they are not forced into it. That is the true difference, we are called as Christians to win the hearts and minds of women who would otherwise not be changed by force. So physical force and even laws may save lives but hearts still need to be softened and shown Christ's love, that is the true battle.