



Abortion DISTORTION

THE TRANSCRIPTS

PRESENTED BY
LIFE DYNAMICS

Copyright Information & Permitted Uses:

Any individual or organization commonly known as "pro-life" or "anti-abortion" is granted permission to use the language contained within this book in any way intended to benefit the "pro-life" or "anti-abortion" effort. **In fact, we encourage it.**

Together, we must expose the abortion lobby's dishonest manipulation of language. These people are masters at spinning their positions to make them sound reasonable and attractive. Our job is to make sure that the public hears what they are *really* saying. So we have broken down these flaws into short responses, that are easier to remember - and easier fit into a social media post. **So get to blogging, tweeting, podcasting, etc and help us expose the abortion lobby's lies!**

With that being said, this book may not be copied in its entirety for the purpose of creating another book. Other than the circumstances as described above, all rights to this book are reserved.

Copyright 2023. Published by Life Dynamics Incorporated,
Post Office Box 2226, Denton, Texas, 76202

Contents:

4 The Assault on Adoption	9 The Safe & Legal Trope	14 Chemical Abortion	17 The Reality of "Choice"	25 The Church
39 Common Ground	50 The Issue of Force	55 Graphic Images	60 The Political Game	69 Hard Cases And Exceptions
87 Body Talk	91 Language Manipulations	97 Mad Science	101 Men Not Allowed!	105 See No Evil
109 "Personally Opposed"	113 Pro-Choice Idiocy	128 Public Opinion	132 That's No Excuse!	136 No Regrets
140 Safety First!	143 Science Deniers	146 Sex Education	150 Problem Solving	157 The Abortion Tax
160 The Abortion Industry	162 Viability	165 Personhood	177 Feeling Empowered?	190 About The Author

The Assault on Adoption

**AS IS ALWAYS THE CASE, THE ONLY SOLUTION
THESE PEOPLE HAVE FOR ANY PROBLEM IS BABY KILLING.**



“Overloading the country with unwanted babies.”

The pro-choice crowd says that there are more abortions done every year than there are people on waiting lists to adopt and that outlawing abortion would swamp the country with unwanted babies. They are lying. First off, they are implying that every woman with an unplanned pregnancy places her baby for adoption, even though they know this has never been true. They also know that if the number of adoptable babies increased, the cost of adoption would plummet and make it possible for people to adopt more than one. It would also mean that millions of lower-income families would, for the first time, be able to adopt. So don't be fooled by the abortion lobby's attacks on adoption. All they're trying to do is hide the fact that every single baby they're paid to butcher is wanted by someone. Every single baby.

“Abortion Helps Foster Children?”

The abortion lobby belittles adoption by saying that there are children in foster care who aren't getting adopted right now. But since those children are already born, that has nothing to do with abortion. They also claim that even newborns are hard to place unless they are white and healthy. That too is a lie. There are waiting lists of people trying to adopt minority and mixed-race babies, and even babies with physical challenges. But the pro-choice mob says that, if newborns were not available, people would be more likely to adopt the older children stuck in foster care. In other words, the way to help hard-to-place children get adopted is to kill the children who are easy to place. And so once again; we see that the pro-choice solution to any problem is always the same. Killing babies.

Using Foster Care To Divert Attention From Adoption.

When adoption is suggested as an alternative to abortion, the pro-choice mob likes to divert attention by talking about the children who are already in foster care and not getting adopted. This is a typical example of the deceptions used by these people. In this case, they leave out the fact that problems in the foster care system involve older children who are often hard to place for adoption and, sometimes, not even legally adoptable. The thing to remember is that, when a woman is pregnant, she is not carrying a twelve-year-old, she is carrying a baby. And there are people standing in line to adopt babies. The fact is, the problems in our foster care system have nothing to do with unborn babies, and for the abortion lobby to suggest that letting them live will add to those problems is truly despicable.

EVERY Child Is Wanted By Someone.

The abortion lobby warns that, without abortion, America would be overrun with babies nobody wants. Now if they are not lying, I have a proposal. Let's pass federal legislation that creates a national registry of people who want to adopt a baby. It would be open to any adult who can meet reasonable requirements, and they could adopt one baby or as many as they can care for. Then, any pregnant woman could go to this registry and, if no one was willing to adopt her baby, she would be allowed to have an abortion. But if someone was willing to adopt her baby, she would not be allowed to have an abortion. Of course, the pro-choice mob would never go along with this because it would instantly wipe out their customer base. They are fully aware that every child they are paid to butcher is wanted by someone. Every child.

“Better Aborted Than Abused?”

When adoption is suggested as an alternative to abortion, the pro-choice mob asks how we can guarantee that children who get adopted won't be abused or neglected. The answer is: we can't – anymore that we can guarantee that children who live with their biological mom and dad won't get abused or neglected. But I think we can safely assume that, if unborn children could speak for themselves, they would prefer to take their chances in even the worst adoptive family as opposed to being sliced up alive at some abortion clinic. The point is, once again, we see that the abortion lobby's only solution for any problem related to children, is to kill the children. In this case, their suggestion that we can avoid adoption problems by executing the adoptees is like saying we can prevent rapes by executing women.

The “If I Can't Have It” Argument

The abortion lobby likes to talk about women who say they could never carry a baby for nine months and then give it up for adoption. But if a guy kills his ex-girlfriend and his defense is, “*If I can't have her, no one can*” no one buys that drivel. Instead, we expect him to accept that he doesn't own the other people in his life. But the pro-choice mentality is that pregnant women are too frail and too hysterical to live up to that standard. So behavior that is seen as reprehensible and criminal in every other circumstance, must be treated as just a choice for them. We're also supposed to be stupid enough to believe that women who place their babies for adoption risk being traumatized for life, but those same women would be just fine having their babies ripped to shreds and tossed into dumpsters.

“Are you willing to adopt every unwanted child?”

Abortion apologists say that the pro-life movement has no right to try to outlaw abortion unless we have a plan to adopt all the world’s unwanted children. To appreciate just how moronic this is, imagine that I come across someone beating a helpless dog with a baseball bat and I step in to stop it. Would anyone say that I had no right to get involved unless I was willing to adopt every stray dog in the country? Well as stupid as that would be, that’s exactly what the abortion lobby says to the pro-life movement. Their argument is that we have no right to oppose abortion unless we are willing to adopt every unwanted child in the country. It’s an asinine and morally bankrupt justification for killing unborn children, and it would never be used to justify killing anyone else.

Bringing a child “into the world.”

Some people try to defend abortion by saying that they could not bring a child into the world that they did not want and could not care for. This is pure nonsense. To begin with, unborn children are already in the world. If that’s not true, then where are they? I mean, are we supposed to believe that when we see them on sonogram screens, they are not really there but are, instead, magically coming to us from some sort of parallel universe? As for the excuse that this is a child the mother doesn’t want and could not care for — would it be okay for her to kill her three-year-old for the same reason? Obviously not, so let’s cut to the chase. If a woman doesn’t want her baby, that is no justification for having the baby killed. Be assured, there are plenty of people who would want, and would gladly take care of, that baby.

The Safe & Legal Trope

LET'S BE HONEST ABOUT WHO'S REALLY
HOLDING THE BLOODY COAT HANGERS.



Have Thousands Really Died From Back-Alley Abortions?

The abortion lobby says that women used to die by the thousands every year from back-alley abortions. Yet almost every study ever done on this subject has found that this claim has been wildly exaggerated and that most illegal abortions were actually done by licensed physicians who were simply breaking the law. In fact, in nineteen eighty six, even the radically pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute published data showing that in the fifteen years prior to the legalization of abortion, the average number of American women dying from illegal abortions was one hundred and thirty six per year and dropping. The truth is, the pro-choice mob has been lying about this issue from day one and they continue to tell this lie because they know that their flunkys in the media will never call them on it.

Back-Alley Abortion Propoganda

The abortion lobby still claims that thousands of women used to die every year from illegal abortions. In one case, the president of NARAL Pro-Choice America, actually said during an interview on MSNBC that, back when abortion was illegal, illegal abortion was the number one killer of child-bearing aged women. Of course, she was lying through her teeth, but she also knew that the dimwitted anchor of the show, Thomas Roberts, would never call her on it. Then, in pro-choice author Marian Faux's book, *Roe v. Wade*, she wrote that *"an image of tens of thousands of women being maimed or killed each year by illegal abortion was so persuasive a piece of propoganda that the [pro-choice] movement could be forgiven its failure to double-check the facts."*

Abortion, No Matter What!

The pro-choice mob says that abortion needs to be legal so it will be safe. But at the same time, they are working night and day to pass laws that make it legal for abortions to be done by people who aren't doctors. Now unless you're stupid enough to think that this will make abortions safer, then it's obvious that a hidden agenda is at work here. And here it is. For years, the vast majority of people in mainstream medicine have decided that – even if abortion is legal – they are not going to be one of the moral degenerates who do them. As a result, abortion clinics have been closing in droves because they can't hire enough staff, and that's what this “non-doctors” campaign is about. Simply put, the abortion lobby has decided that keeping their clinics open is more important than the safety of their customers.

Who's really at fault for illegal abortions?

The pro-choice mob claims that our efforts to protect the unborn will cause women to die in illegal abortions. But remember, since the pro-life movement doesn't do abortions, the illegal abortions they're taking about would be done by someone who is pro-choice. And any woman who is killed or maimed would be the victim of someone who is pro-choice. So what these people are really saying is, *“If you stop us from killing babies, we're going to start killing women.”* In other words, if the pro-choice mob doesn't want women to die from illegal abortions, all they have to do is agree not to kill them. But, of course, they're not going to do that because they never cared about this issue to begin with. They're just trying to make it look like we're responsible for the women they are threatening to kill.

Which Side Actually Cares About Women?

One of the abortion lobby's standard chants is that the pro-life movement doesn't care if women die. But just to set the record straight, let me point out that that every woman who is killed during an abortion – be it legal or illegal – is killed by someone who is pro-choice. And just because the pro-life movement is trying to keep these people from butchering every unborn child they can get their hands on, that does not make us responsible for the women they butcher along the way. The bottom line is, every time someone dies in an abortion – whether it's the unborn child, or the mom, or both – every drop of their blood is on the hands of the pro-choice community. After all, they are the ones holding the bloody coat hangers.

No Law, No Danger, No Problem?

The pro-choice mob says that if woman are denied legal abortions, they will get injured or killed in illegal back-alley abortions. But how stupid do you have to be, to say that abortion should not be against the law because that makes it dangerous for those who choose to break the law? It's like saying that armed robbery should be legal because armed robbers sometimes get shot while holding up convenience stores. The fact is, if a woman is harmed while having an illegal abortion, it was not the law that harmed her, it was her decision to violate the law. I will also point out that that every abortion — whether it's legal or illegal — is done by someone who is pro-choice. So if these people are really so concerned about women being harmed by illegal abortions, all they have to do is agree not do them.

Leave The Coat Hangers in The Closet!

The pro-choice mob likes to parade around screaming idiotic things like “no going back” and “never again” while holding up pictures of bloody coat hangers. But remember, anytime a woman dies from a coat hanger abortion, the coat hanger was in the hands of someone who is pro-choice. After all, they are the only people who do abortions — and that’s true whether the abortions are legal or illegal. The fact is, maternal deaths due to illegal abortions are one hundred percent preventable and you don’t have to kill the baby to do it. All you have to do is get the pro-choice mob to leave their coat hangers in their closets. But don’t hold your breath. When abortion is illegal, these people need martyrs – even if they have to kill them themselves.

It’s Not About Saving Lives.

If the reason for legalized abortion is to save the lives of women, why not legalize rape? After all, rape victims are often killed to keep them from identifying their rapist to the police. But if it’s legal, that motivation goes away. We might even create state-regulated centers where rapists could assault their victims in a nice clean environment. Remember, the pro-choice argument is that women are going to have abortions no matter what the law says, and keeping them legal makes sure they happen in a safe environment. Well that also applies to rape. The fact that it’s illegal has not stopped women from being raped, so why not try to reduce deadly back-alley rapes? Of course, this is a preposterous idea, but if the goal is saving women’s lives, it makes as much sense as legalized abortion.

Chemical Abortion

THE ABORTION LOBBY'S NEVER-ENDING SEARCH FOR A WAY TO
MAKE THE SLAUGHTER OF THE UNBORN MORE PALATABLE.



Murder Without Distinction

The abortion lobby never stops looking for some way to make their slaughter of the unborn seem a little less disgusting. An example of this is their marketing of chemical abortions. What they want women to think is that, somehow, it's not really an abortion. It's simply a matter of: you're pregnant ... you take a pill ... you're not pregnant. Of course, by this moronic reasoning, if one man cuts his wife's throat while another man poisons his wife, the second murder is more acceptable. In the case of abortion, the image of babies being poisoned with chemicals is, obviously, more palatable than the image of babies being sliced up with scalpels or having their skulls crushed with forceps. But that distinction only makes the killers feel better. Their victims are just as dead.

Retail Abortionists

One way the abortion lobby is trying to lure doctors, pharmacists, pharmaceutical companies, and drug store chains into getting involved with abortion pills, is by subtly implying that the chemical abortion business is not as sleazy as the regular abortion business. And it's true that killing babies with chemicals is less gruesome for the abortionist than ripping them apart with scalpels and forceps. But in both cases, the intent is to kill a living human being. So these people can sugar coat it all they want to, but when one of these human pesticides is used to poison an unborn child, every person who produced, distributed, or sold that pill, and every person who prescribed it and filled the prescription, became abortionists – no different than those who work at any abortion mill in the country.

The Chilling Link Between the Holocaust And The American Abortion Industry

There is a chilling link between the German holocaust and the American abortion industry. When the Nazis went from shooting their victims to gassing them, they used a chemical called Zyklon B that was developed and manufactured by a company named I.G. Farben. After the war, I.G. Farben executives needed to distance themselves from their role in the Nazi holocaust, so they changed the company's name to Hoechst AG. The company survived and, today, it is a pharmaceutical giant with subsidiaries all over the world. One of those subsidiaries is a French company named Roussel Uclaf, and that is the company that developed the so-called "abortion pill" RU-486. In other words, the same multi-national corporation that created Zyklon B for Germany's death camps, created RU-486 for America's death camps.

The Reality of “Choice”

THE ABORTION LOBBY LIKES TO PORTRAY THE CONCEPT OF
“CHOICE” AS SOMETHING THAT’S INHERENTLY NOBLE. IT’S NOT.



Not All Choices Are Morally Equal

The abortion lobby likes to portray the concept of “choice” as something that is inherently and universally noble. It is not. What rational people understand, is that everything someone does is a choice – but they also understand that all choices are not morally equal and some are so immoral they cannot be allowed. The fact is, the goal of every law ever passed is to prohibit people from inflicting some choice on other people, and whether a particular choice should be legal or not always depends on what’s being chosen. In the case of abortion, the question is whether the government should allow someone the choice to legally kill someone else who is helpless, completely innocent, and posing no threat to anyone. And a civilized society will always say, “*absolutely not.*”

Why The Abortion Lobby Focuses On “Who Decides”

The pro-choice mob knows that they can’t defend the morality of abortion, so they push this absurd idea that the issue is not whether abortion is right or wrong, but who decides — the woman or the state? **The question is: what is it about abortion that makes it different from every other kind of human behavior?** I mean, no one ever says “*right and wrong doesn’t matter*” when it comes to killing born people. And we don’t hear “*right and wrong doesn’t matter*” being said about child molesting, spousal abuse, rape, human trafficking, racial discrimination, or any other issue. The only time we hear it is when someone is trying to justify butchering the unborn. Obviously, the abortion lobby’s strategy is to make the public focus on “*who decides*” so they don’t look at what’s being decided.

Abortion Is NOT A “Personal Decision.”

The abortion lobby argues that abortion is a personal decision that women have a right to make based on their own moral and religious values. The problem is, you can't call something a “*personal decision*” if it affects other people or if it is forced on someone who has not consented. For example, things like rape, carjacking, human trafficking, and child molesting are never considered just personal decisions. Instead, we make them illegal, and we do so while being totally indifferent to the moral and religious values are of those who might want to commit these acts. In the case of abortion, it is a proven biological fact that the unborn are defenseless and innocent human beings, and no civilized society can allow them to be legally killed just because another group of human beings wants them dead.

Does It Matter Whether Abortion Is Right Or Wrong?

The pro-choice mob claims that it doesn't matter whether abortion is right or wrong because, either way, it's up to the woman to decide. In other words, women have a right to do whatever they want to do, even if it causes the death of someone who has no say in the decision. That is nonsense. The laws of a civilized society don't exist to protect one individual's right to harm someone else, and they certainly don't leave the decision about whether one human being can legally kill another human being up to the one who wants to do the killing or be paid to do the killing. The fact is, when these demented pro-abortion hucksters argue that right and wrong don't matter when it comes to abortion, it is irrefutable proof that they know it's wrong. And like Abraham Lincoln said, no one has a “*right to do wrong.*”

What They Really Mean When They Say The Issue Is "Choice" & "Who Decides"

When the abortion lobby says that the issue is not abortion, but "choice" and "who decides," what they are literally saying is that whether an abortion is the intentional killing of a living human being or not has nothing to do with whether it should be legal or not. It's an astounding argument, but from day one these people have known that they could never defend abortion itself. So they came up with this "choice" and "who decides" strategy as a way to keep having to defend it. It's as simple as that. But of course, the most fundamental question will always be whether abortion causes the death of a living human being or not. And no society can honestly call itself civilized while saying that the answer to that question doesn't matter. In reality, it's the only thing that does matter.

Why Pro-Choice People Become Enraged When Referred To As Pro-Abortion

Why is it that the people who sell legalized abortion as such a positive thing, often become unhinged when someone refers to them as pro-abortion? Think about that for a moment. People who support the death penalty don't mind being called pro-death penalty. People who support government-funded healthcare don't start foaming at the mouth if they are called pro-healthcare. People who support the second amendment don't feel insulted if someone calls them pro-gun. The reality is, among all the world's social and political movements, the abortion lobby is the only one that insists on not being publicly identified with the activity they support. And the reason why is obvious. Simply put, these people are trying to defend something that is impossible to defend – and they know it.

“It’s Just A Choice.”

The abortion lobby tries to rationalize abortion by saying it’s just a “*choice*.” But so what? I mean, everything people do is a choice. Robbing banks. Committing murder. Driving drunk. Stealing someone’s identity. Molesting children. Abusing animals. Those are all choices! And if we’re going to say that the “*right to choose*” is inherently more important than what’s being chosen, then by pro-choice logic people should have the legal right to do all those things as well as anything else they “*choose*” to do. But of course, in a civilized society, the law recognizes that not all choices are equal and that some of them should not be permitted. If that were not the case, then one person’s choice to rape somebody would be just as valid as someone else’s choice about what color socks to wear.

What The “Right To Choose” Really Means.

Imagine that a surgeon is halfway through a surgical procedure and decides that he no longer wants to be a doctor. So he walks out and lets the patient die. Or imagine that the workers in a daycare center decide that they are tired of their jobs, so they quit and leave a building full of unattended babies. And later that day, one of those babies dies. In both cases, someone who was directly responsible for the lives of other human beings, chose to abandon them and let them die. Obviously, no one would even try to defend what those people did, but that is exactly what a woman does when she has an abortion. Under the so called “*right to choose*,” she sentences her own baby to death and walks away. And this is defended, and sometimes paid for, by a society that calls itself civilized.

There Is No Difference Between Pro-Choice & Pro-Abortion

When you hear abortion defenders demanding to be called pro-choice rather than pro-abortion, the most important thing to remember is that, for the people most affected by abortion, there is absolutely no difference between pro-choice and pro-abortion. For the unborn, both terms mean they are going to have their legs and arms torn off, their chests crushed, and their skulls split open. Then their corpses will either be ground up in garbage disposals, or tossed into dumpsters, or chopped up and sold for parts. Of course, the abortion lobby knows they can't defend this, so they try to keep the focus on choice. Any way you look at it, "*pro-choice*" is a marketing slogan that was created to keep the public from looking at what's being chosen. That's all it has ever been and that's all it will ever be.

Why "Big Abortion" Opposes Abortion Restrictions.

From the day the abortion battle began, the pro-choice mob has viciously fought against any legislation that allows women to be totally informed about the risks of abortion; or requires parental notification for minors; or makes abortion clinics meet the same standards as legitimate health care providers, or creates a short waiting period before an abortion can be done so women can be sure that they are making the right decision. The list goes on and on, but what's important is that not one of these laws would deny any woman the ability to choose abortion. So don't be naive. The abortion lobby doesn't oppose restrictions on abortion because they limit women's choices. They oppose them because they reduce the abortion rate – and that means they limit abortion industry profits.

Should We Mind Our Own Business When It Comes To Abortion?

The pro-choice mob tells the pro-life movement that a woman's choice to have an abortion doesn't affect us and that we should just mind our own business. But it also true that if some pervert sexually abuses a 5-year-old, it doesn't affect us either. So is that also none of our business? And if a bank in which we have no money is robbed, do we have no right to say that this robbery should be illegal? After all, it didn't cost us anything. And since women can't get prostate cancer, should they have no say in whether research into it is publicly funded? Of course, even the most dimwitted abortion apologist knows that arguments like this make no sense. But they use them because they also know that the most important goal of any pro-choice argument, is to divert attention away from what's being chosen.

Whose Decision Is It?

The pro-choice mob likes to say that the decision to have an abortion should be between the woman, her family, her doctor, and her God. **They are lying.** Remember, these are the same people who have spent decades fighting for laws that make sure no one else has any say in a woman's decision to have an abortion, including the father of her unborn child. And if she's a minor, it even includes her parents. They also know that doctors have absolutely no legal ability to control a woman's decision one way or the other. Their only decision is whether to be the hired killer or not. As for God, His decision is made clear at the moment He puts a child in the mother's womb. And if the time comes that He thinks the child's life should end, He doesn't need any help from a bunch of goons who work at abortion clinics.

The Irony Of The "Right To Choose".

The abortion lobby says that the real issue is not whether abortion is right or wrong, but "*a woman's right to choose*" for herself. The problem is, at the very moment they are saying that, these same people are working around the clock to eliminate the laws that keep people in the medical community from being forced to perform abortions against their will. And they're also working just as hard to require that abortions are paid for with taxpayer dollars. Now obviously, some of these medical professionals, and some of these taxpayers, are women. So what the pro-choice mob is saying is that women have an absolute right to get an abortion, but they have no right not to do abortions or pay for them. And yet, somehow, that still falls under the heading of "*choice.*"

Who Does The Pro-Choice Side Really Fight For?

It's interesting that a junior high school girl can't legally vote, buy a handgun, have her ears pierced, patronize a tanning salon, get a tattoo, drink alcohol, purchase cigarettes, donate blood, sign a loan contract, go to a pornographic movie house, or work in a topless bar. It's also a fact that she can't legally do many of these things even she has her parent's permission. And yet the people who call themselves "*pro-choice*" won't fight all the way to the Supreme Court for her right to choose those things. The only choice they're concerned about is her choice to purchase an abortion – even if it means keeping it a secret from her mom and dad, and even if means letting another adult take her out of state to get it. And you'd have to be pretty gullible to think they do this out of concern for that child.

The Church

THE FACT IS, FAR MORE PEOPLE WHO CLAIM TO BE CHRISTIANS HAVE SHOWN UP AT ABORTION CLINICS AS CUSTOMERS THAN AS PROTESTERS.



The Reason For The Church's Attitude Towards The Pro-Life Movement

The church's attitude toward the pro-life movement often ranges from cold indifference to open hostility, and it's not hard to see where this attitude comes from. The uncomfortable truth is that, from the day that the war against unborn children began, far more people who claim to be Christians have shown up at abortion clinics as customers than as protesters. And every time they hear us refer to abortion as murder, they hear themselves being called murderers. What the pro-life community needs to understand is that these people don't dislike us because they think we're wrong, they dislike us because they know we're right.

You Can't Be Pro-Choice And A Christian.

Some people claim that they can be pro-choice and a Christian at the same time. That is nonsense. Two fundamental tenets of Christian doctrine are that God is the author of life and He doesn't make mistakes. Now if those two things are true, then it is obvious that every time there's a new life in the womb, it is His will that it be there. But the pro-choice position is that life is not a right inherited from God, but is instead a privilege bestowed by human beings who can withhold it if they choose to do so. In other words, the pro-choice position is that God is indifferent about whether the lives He creates are snuffed out in the womb. Of course, people are free to believe whichever of these two philosophies they want to, but to suggest that someone can believe both of them at the same time is absurd.

When Life Begins Isn't Theology, It's Biology.

The abortion lobby says the pro-life movement is a bunch of “*anti-choice*” extremists who are trying to force their religious beliefs on everyone else. And in one way they are right. When “*choice*” means having the legal right to butcher defenseless children, then we are indeed anti-choice. And if that makes us extremists, so be it. But as for the claim that we are trying pass laws to force our theological views on others, that is idiocy. The fact that a new human being is created at the moment of fertilization is not theology, it's biology. And just because people of faith acknowledge that reality, that does not make abortion a religious issue. Look at it this way, if an engineer who designs airplanes is a Christian, that does not make aerodynamics a religious issue.

Is Being Pro-Life A “Religious Belief”?

The pro-choice mob says opposition to abortion is a religious belief and has no place being legislated. But if we reject every law that coincides with some religious belief, then we will have to do away with all of our laws. In this case, to say that abortion should be legal because most of the people opposed to it are Christians, is as moronic as saying armed robbery should be legal because “*Thou shalt not steal!*” is one of the Ten Commandments. Let's also not forget that the civil rights movement has often operated out of Christian churches and been led by Christian pastors. But no one is claiming that the struggle against racial discrimination a religious issue. The fact is, someone doesn't have to be religious to say it's wrong to butcher a helpless unborn child. All they have to be is a decent human being.

Is Life A Gift Or A Privilege?

The pro-life view is that the right-to-life of an unborn child is a gift from God. In fact, it is the very first thing He gives to every human being. The pro-choice position is that the unborn do not have an inherent right-to-life. Instead, that right is something that can be bestowed on them, or withheld from them, by those who have already been born. In that world view, the right-to-life is reserved for the planned, the perfect, and the privileged. In other words, legalized abortion is the philosophy of eugenics put into practice. It is also a textbook example of those with power being allowed to choose life or death for those without power. And for someone to support that while claiming to be a follower of Christ, is indefensible.

Knowing The Difference Between Choice & Christianity

When we say that someone cannot be a Christian and pro-choice, we are often attacked as judgmental and told we don't have the right to decide who gets to be a Christian and who does not. The problem is, none of us ever claimed to have that right. Look, if someone points to a camel and calls it a turtle, and we challenge them on it, we are not saying that we get to decide which creatures are camels and which are turtles. We are simply saying that we can tell the difference between the two. In this case, when "choice" is defined as the right to butcher defenseless children created by God, in His image, there can be no such thing as a pro-choice Christian. And the pro-life movement's ability to point that out does not make us judgmental, it simply means that we can tell the difference between a camel and a turtle.

Abortion: The Sin That Must Not Be Named.

In every corner of American life, there are unavoidable signs that we are now living in a post-Christian nation. The most obvious of these signs is that the church has become a collection of people who claim to be “*born again*” while being totally indifferent to children who don’t get to be born even once. Make no mistake, the abortion holocaust started and continues with the church’s implied approval. At this point, most pastors have decided that this is the one sin they won’t talk about from the pulpit because they know that it is a sin many members of their congregation have been involved with. But a day of reckoning is coming, and those who ignore that reality are simply whistling past the graveyards of the unborn in the hope that God won’t notice. It’s a fool’s bet with enormous consequences.

Ending Abortion Through Prayer

Some Christians say that the only way to end abortion is through prayer. This is nonsense. Prayer must always be a central part of any fight against evil, including the evil of abortion. But prayer must never be used as an excuse for inaction. To understand that, imagine that a five-year-old girl has been hit by a car and is lying unconscious in the street and possibly dying. Now every Christian believes that God has the power to instantly heal this child. But does that mean we should not call an ambulance for her and, instead, just stand around and pray while she bleeds out in the street? That’s lunacy, but it raises the question: **if we honestly believe that the unborn have the same right to life as this five-year-old girl, how would we justify saying that all we will do to save their lives is pray for them?**

What Does “Being A Good Christian” Mean?

A few years ago, a television documentary about pornography included an interview with the number one producer of hardcore porn videos in America. Also present was one of his most well-known porn stars, and both were wearing necklaces with gold crosses on them. When the interviewer asked them how they could reconcile their professions with the crosses they were wearing, both said that their religious beliefs and their jobs were separate issues and that doing hardcore porn does not mean you can't also be a good Christian. Now it's obvious that these people are either delusional or they are heretics and liars. The only question is, how are they different from people who claim to be Christians while supporting legalized abortion? And the answer is, they're not different. They're exactly the same.

It's Absurd To Think God Doesn't Want Christians To Speak Out Against Abortion

Some Christians say that they know abortion is wrong, but that God has not called them to fight against it. To test that argument, imagine that a group of Christians see a young girl being raped and beaten in a field next to their church. But they don't do anything. Later, when they are asked why they didn't help her, they say that they didn't feel like the Lord was calling them to get involved. Obviously, that is nonsense but it's also a perfect reflection of the church's response to abortion. Innocent babies are being butchered by the millions and it is absurd to think that God doesn't want the church involved. But from the day this battle began, the church has chosen to look the other way and become Satan's silent partner in this holocaust – and that's why abortion remains legal today.

God Plans ALL Pregnancies.

Let's be clear about one thing: anyone who says that there is such a thing as a pro-choice Christian is, at best, ignorant about what it means to be a Christian or, at worst, a heretic. The truth is, for God there is no such thing as an unplanned pregnancy or an unwanted child. And it's bad enough when the world doesn't understand this, but it's an obscenity when people who claim to be Christians don't understand it. Remember, a Christian cannot be pro-choice about the intentional destruction of these innocent and defenseless babies any more than they can be pro-choice about rape, slavery, incest, child abuse, or any other form of savagery. The pro-choice mob can dance around it all they want to, but support for legal abortion is totally incompatible with Christianity.

“But Aborted Babies Will Go To Heaven!”

Some people who claim to be Christians try to rationalize abortion with some pathetic nonsense about the babies who are killed going to heaven anyway. In other words, since these babies are innocent it's okay to kill them. But then the question becomes, why do we waste time and money treating children for terminal cancer since they too are going to heaven anyway? In fact, if we're really serious about this, it should also be legal to kill anyone who claims to be a Christian since they are going to heaven anyway. But of course, those who use this idiotic philosophy to justify killing the unborn, would start singing a whole different tune if they thought for one moment that it might be used to justify killing them. After all, that is the nature of cowardice and hypocrisy.

“Jesus Never Spoke Out Against Abortion.”

Some people who claim to be Christians will try to defend abortion by saying that it has been around forever and yet Jesus never spoke out against it. Of course, there is no way of knowing whether Jesus ever spoke about abortion since not every word He uttered is recorded in Scripture. Also, the fact that abortion has been around forever means nothing. Every type of sin and moral depravity has been around forever and there is no Scriptural record of Jesus specifically mentioning most of them. In fact, the vast majority of our laws relate to behaviors that Jesus never spoke about. This includes drunk driving, insider stock trading, employment discrimination, identify theft, child pornography, and thousands of other things. Should we make them legal just because Jesus never mentioned them?

The Sad Reason Why Abortion Remains Legal

Let's make one thing perfectly clear. The main reason why over sixty million American babies have been slaughtered in the abortion holocaust, is because the church does not have the character or the courage to stand up against it. There are hundreds of thousands of churches in this country, and every person sitting in those pews, and every person standing in those pulpits, knows that abortion takes the life of an innocent child that was created by God in His image. They know it, they just don't care. Now if you want to see what they do care about, just imagine the kind of fight those same people would put up if Congress was thinking about taking away the church's tax-exempt status and eliminating tax deductions for donations made to churches. That will tell you where their hearts are.

Two Simple Questions For “Pro-Choice Christians”

I have two simple questions for these so-called “*pro-choice Christians.*” First, if God is the Heavenly Father of a five-year-old girl, when did He become her Heavenly Father? Was she His child while she was still in her mother’s womb; or was she just some disposable clump of cells that somehow morphed into His child as she traveled down the birth canal? Second, when did Mary become the mother of Jesus? Was she His mother while He was still in her womb? And was He the Son of God while He was still in her womb? Or again, was He just a clump of cells that magically turned into the Son of God at birth? The fact is, for Christians, the issue is not when life begins but who created that life. And it is an utter disgrace when someone who claims to be a Christian, actually defends the legality of abortion.

No Soul? No Problem!

The pro-choice mob often argues that abortion is acceptable because no one knows when a soul enters the body. To see just how pathetically stupid this is, imagine that a man is on trial for murdering his wife and his defense is that the prosecution cannot prove that she had a soul. You can bet the family farm that this moron is on his way to prison. The point is, if it’s okay to kill unborn children because we can’t prove that they have souls, then that same argument would justify killing anybody. Of course, in the law, the right-to-life has nothing to do with souls. In fact, there is no legal basis for saying that souls even exist. But if they do exist, it may be possible that some people just don’t have one. And you won’t find those people in their mother’s wombs, you’ll find them working at abortion clinics.

The Fifty Plus Year Shell Game.

From the day the battle over abortion began, America's preachers and politicians have been running a shell game on the pro-life movement. This is how it works. First, we go to the church and ask them to help us protect the unborn. Their response is that that abortion is a political issue and the church shouldn't get involved. So then, we go to our politicians and ask for their help. Their response is that abortion is a religious issue and the government shouldn't get involved. And back and forth it goes – while the killings continue. The fact is, since day one, preachers and politicians have been running this scam because both of them are looking for some way to wash the blood of unborn children off their hands. And so far, this is the best they have been able to come up with.

The Bible Doesn't Make A Distinction Between The Born And Unborn

Some who claim to be Christians will try to defend abortion by claiming that it is not specifically condemned in the Bible. They are lying. The Bible makes it crystal clear that we are not to murder each other and it does not draw a distinction between the born and the unborn. To the contrary, in Luke, the unborn John the Baptist is called a "*brephos*" which means baby in Greek. Then, in the very next chapter, the born Jesus is also referred to as a "*brephos*." We are also told that Elizabeth's baby leapt in her womb upon being in the presence of Mary. In other words, according to Scripture, the first human being in history to acknowledge Jesus was John the Baptist – and both of them were still unborn at the time. If you call yourself a pro-choice Christian, explain that one to us.

God Gave Us Free Will.

The pro-choice mob says that we have no right to judge women who have abortions because God gave us “*free will.*” But the truth is that we’re not judging anybody; we are simply trying to keep unborn children from being butchered. As for the free will argument, let’s not forget that every law is specifically intended to take away someone’s right to free will. So if we’re going to blindly apply the concept of free will, then we should have no laws of any kind and simply live by the law of the jungle. And legalized abortion is a perfect example of that. It’s the born saying to the unborn, “*You’re not as important or as powerful as we are, so we will decide whether or not you get to live in our world.*” It’s the purest form of might makes right, it has nothing to do with free will, and it is intolerable in a civilized society.

Getting A Straight Answer From So Called “Christian Politicians.”

Politicians who claim to be Christians often say that they follow their church’s teaching against abortion, but would not inflict their personal views on others by voting to restrict abortion. Well it’s time we got a couple of answers from these people. First, if they had been in office when slavery was legal, would they have been saying, “*Oh, I’m against slavery, but it’s not my place to tell other people that they can’t own a few.*” And second, besides the unborn, what other group of innocent human beings do they think it should be legal to kill? The fact is, what politicians who take this position are telling us is that, when there is a conflict between their Christian faith and their political ambitions, it is their faith they will abandon. So the question is, if God can’t trust them, why should we?

The Truth That's Pretty Hard For Christians To Deny

All across America, there are people who claim to be Christians while at the same time saying that they support legalized abortion. These people might agree that all children are created by God in His image, and they might even concede that He creates them in their mother's wombs. After all, that's pretty hard to deny since He clearly says so in the book of Jeremiah. But they ignore that and, instead, tell themselves that God's plans for those children are less important than the mother's right to kill them. Now, for those of you who have bought into this nonsense, and actually think that you can be a "*pro-choice Christian*," perhaps you should think about the fact that, one day, you'll be standing alone and face to face with The One who created and loved every single baby that you helped to kill.

Saving Dollars Instead Of Saving Souls

Pastors often say that they don't get involved in the battle against abortion because their job is to save souls not bodies. But the question is, if one of these guys saw that someone he loved was about to be murdered, would he try to stop it or would he just shrug it off since it's not his job to save bodies? And why wouldn't he drown everyone he baptizes just to make sure that they go straight to heaven. Of course, the truth is that when you hear pastors try to rationalize their indifference to the slaughter of the unborn with this "*save souls not bodies*" nonsense, they're not thinking about souls or bodies, they're thinking about the pro-aborts in their congregation and the dollars they drop in the collection plate. And that makes them little different than the abortionists who actually do the killings.

Christians Labling Abortion As Just One of Many Issues

Some people who claim to be Christians try to hide their indifference to abortion, or excuse the cowardice of their abortion-silent church, by labeling abortion as just one of many issues the church has to be concerned about. But if we accept the proven biological fact that every abortion takes a human life, then our country is part of the largest holocaust in world history. And to suggest that this is even in the same universe as any other issue is indefensible. You can also bet that if those good already-born Christians who spout this nonsense were about to be sliced open alive and dismembered, and have their corpses tossed into a dumpster, they would not be calling it “*just one of many issues*” the church needs to be concerned about.

Abortion Is None Of The Church's Business?

Years ago, a young woman named Kitty Genovese was raped and stabbed to death outside her New York City apartment. Later, neighbors told police that they heard her screaming for help, but ignored it because it was none of their business and they didn't want to get involved. And now today, unborn children are being slaughtered by the millions while the vast majority of church leaders look the other way. In other words, modern day preachers have the same attitude about abortion that Kitty Genovese's neighbors had about her rape and murder. In short, while they would certainly agree that it's wrong, they don't have the courage or the character to stand up against it. Of course, unlike Ms. Genovese's neighbors, these preachers don't have to hear the victims scream or see their dead bodies being hauled off.

Every Pastor Knows Abortion Takes The Life Of A Child Created By God.

Some people say that the solution to the church's deafening silence on the abortion issue is to do a better job of educating pastors. In other words, their failure to act is due to a shortcoming of the pro-life movement. That is utter hogwash. Every pastor in America may not know all the horrible details of abortion, but there is not one of them who doesn't know that it takes the life of an innocent child who was created by God in His image. And every one of them is also aware that they have an obligation to act in the defense of those children. But they don't do so, not because they lack education or information, but because they lack character and courage. Any way you cut it, their silence isn't golden, it's yellow.

Common Ground

THE TRAP THAT PRO-LIFERS CONTINUALLY FALL FOR.



Reducing the “Need” For Abortion

The abortion lobby often proposes that we join them to look for ways to end the need for abortion. It's a trap called “*common ground*.” These people know that legal abortion is easier to sell when the public believes that they are done out of need rather than want, and every time we take the “*common ground*” bait we help them sell that lie. After all, rational people don't look for something unless they believe it exists, so when we agree to look for ways to reduce the “need” for abortion, we are agreeing that, sometimes, abortions are needed. The truth, of course, is that almost every abortion done in America is for non-medical reasons to kill a healthy baby being carried by a woman whose pregnancy does not threaten her life or health and was not the result of rape or incest. And that has nothing to do with need.

Understanding The Stakes

Those of us in the pro-life movement tend to see the conflict over abortion as a war between us and the pro-choice mob. But that's not accurate. Our lives are not at risk, we are simply a community of people who choose to fight for those whose lives are at risk. In other words, this is not a war between us and the pro-choice mob, it's a war between the pro-choice mob and the babies. Once we understand this, it becomes clear that whenever we agree to sit down with these killers – not for the purpose of confronting them, or stopping them, but to look for “*common ground*” with them – we betray the unborn children they are killing. So while this “*common ground*” idea might seem reasonable on the surface, in reality it is an act of surrender. It's like sitting down with the Klan to reduce the “need” for lynchings.

The “Common Ground” Trick

It's interesting that every time someone holds one of these “*common ground*” discussions, the ground rules are that both sides agree to set aside any discussion about whether abortion should be legal or not, and simply look for ways to reduce the need for abortions. In other words, these discussions always start with an acceptance of the abortion lobby's basic position. But if the real goal is common ground, it would be equally legitimate to say that everyone has agreed to look for ways to reduce the number of abortions once they are again illegal. Of course, that is never the basis upon which these discussions are held because the abortion lobby would never agree to discuss their position on their opponent's terms. Apparently, pro-lifers are the only ones gullible enough to fall for that trick.

The Time For Talking Is Over.

We often hear it suggested that the pro-choice people and the pro-life people should come together and look for common ground and, on the surface, this sounds very mature. But imagine that during the Nazi holocaust, while the ovens at Auschwitz were burning day and night, the Jewish people were asked to sit down with Hitler's thugs and look for common ground. That would have been outrageous. The truth is, when people are threatening to do evil, talking with them may be reasonable. But once they have begun committing that evil, the time for talking is over. At that point, the only goal is to stop them. In this case, any time we sit down with these baby killers in some starry-eyed quest for common ground, all we do is give the impression that even we believe their position has some moral validity. It doesn't.

It's Time For Pro-Lifers To Stop Being So Easily Manipulated.

When we are told that we should seek common ground with the abortion lobby, and join them in looking for ways to reduce the need for abortion, we would be wise to keep two things in mind.

First, we have nothing in common with people who say that it should be legal to butcher babies. Second, unless you think there some babies out there who need killing, then there is no such thing as a *"need for abortion."* The point is, it's time for pro-lifers to stop being so easily manipulated. Our job is not to sit around the campfire and sing Kumbayah with people who torture and slaughter helpless children for money. **Our job is to stop them.** Besides, for these baby killers to say that we should help them reduce the need for abortion, is like some pimp calling on the vice squad to help him reduce the need for prostitution.

Distractions & Distortions

THE ABORTION LOBBY DOES WHATEVER IT
TAKES TO KEEP THE PUBLIC IN THE DARK.



What A Post Abortion America Really Looks Like

Since *Roe v. Wade* was flushed down history's toilet, the pro-choice mob – along with their stooges in the media – have promised that a whole catalogue of disasters is waiting for us if states pass laws that prohibit abortion. To hear these people tell the story, if women can't hire a bunch of psychopaths to murder their babies, all hope is lost and it won't be long before America looks like a scene out of *Mad Max Beyond Thunderdome*. But the question is, if protecting the lives of unborn children is going to turn America into some sort of dystopian wasteland, why wasn't it like that before abortion was legalized? Remember, we don't have to imagine what our country would be like without legal abortion, we have decades of real-world experience to show us. And it's not what the abortion lobby is describing.

“You Can't Be Pro-Life And Pro-Death Penalty!”

The abortion lobby says that the pro-life movement is hypocritical for supporting the death penalty, even though there is absolutely no evidence that pro-lifers support it any more often than the general public does. In fact, there is actually a lot of opposition to the death penalty within the pro-life community. The real question is, how demented do you have to be to support the death penalty for the only group of human beings on earth who are physically incapable of having committed even the most low-level crimes? Let's also not forget that, before condemned prisoners are put to death, they are given a trial and an appeals process that can last for decades. But when an unborn baby is carried into an abortion clinic, there will be no trial, no judge, no jury, no appeal – and no stay of execution.

“Abortion Is Just A Simple Medical Procedure.”

The pro-choice mob defends abortion as just a simple medical procedure that only takes a few minutes. To see how idiotic this argument is, imagine that an unborn baby girl is about to be aborted. But instead of being killed in her mother’s womb, she’s going to be taken out alive, placed on a table, and butchered on prime-time national television. So with a monitor hooked up to her, we see her heart race as the abortionist starts to pull off her arms and legs. Then he crushes her chest and collapses her skull and finishes up by tossing her mangled corpse into a dumpster. In other words, he does the same things to this little girl that he would have done to her during a regular abortion. The question is, would the people who saw this dismiss it as a simple procedure that only took a few minutes?

The Truth About “Keep Abortion Rare.”

The pro-choice mob knows that the public is getting more and more uneasy about abortion. So to create the illusion that they are not pro-abortion fanatics, many of them are now saying that they want abortion to be rare. This is a scam. First off, to think that these people want abortion to be rare is like saying that General Motors wants car buying to be rare. Second, the abortion lobby can’t have it both ways. Either abortion kills children and there’s no justification for it to be legal, or it doesn’t kill children and there’s no need for it to be rare. Besides, if it’s not murder and it empowers women, why would the pro-choice mob want it to be rare? So don’t be fooled by their rhetoric. It’s nothing more than a marketing gimmick designed to put a happy-face on the abortion industry.

Selling Abortion As Self-Defense Instead Of Murder

One of the abortion lobby's marketing strategies is to portray women as victims of their pregnancies rather than participants in them. For example, they replace phrases like "*she got pregnant*" with nonsense like "*she found herself pregnant*" as if a bunch of random sperm cells just sneaked up on her one day and jumped into her uterus. A second part of this strategy is to make women see children as their enemies. So they talk about how babies cause devastating economic hardships for women, destroy any possibility they have for a happy life, keep young girls from getting an education – and the list goes on and on. Of course, the goal behind all this is obvious. The pro-choice mob is trying to sell the idea that legalized abortion isn't really murder – it's self-defense.

The Dangers Of Child-Birth

We've all heard of the stone age, and the bronze age, and the iron age, well one day people are going to look back and refer to this as the stupid age. Think about it. Before there were sonograms, no one had ever seen an unborn child and yet we had laws to protect their lives. But the moment ultrasound technology made it possible to actually see that they are living human beings, we started killing them by the millions. And the pro-choice mob tries to justify this insanity by talking about the dangers of child-birth, despite the fact that there has never been a time in history when child-birth was as safe as it is today. Of course, it's easy to see why the abortion lobby considers child-births to be dangerous. After all, every baby born alive is a missed sale, and that is certainly a threat to their bank account.

But What About The Right-To-Life Of Animals

The abortion lobby says that the pro-life movement is hypocritical to fight for the right-to-life of humans while saying nothing about the right-to-life of animals. This is mindless stupidity. To buy into it, you would have to believe that accidentally running over a five-year-old child is no different than accidentally running over a squirrel. Or if a mom and dad are told that their 10-year-old child has a fatal disease, that's no worse than if their vet says their pet hamster is dying. The fact is, most pro-lifers probably agree that people who abuse animals are despicable and deserve to spend a long time in a cold and dimly-lit prison cell. But that doesn't mean animal rights are equivalent to human rights, and anyone who says they are is in desperate need of long-term psychiatric care.

One Person's Hypocrisy Is Not A Defense For Another Person's Evil.

The pro-choice mob calls the pro-life movement hypocritical because pro-lifers have been caught having abortions or taking their wives or daughters for abortions. And even though this is extremely rare, it has happened. But that doesn't justify legalized abortion. In fact, it actually reinforces the pro-life position. After all, if even people who know that abortion is murder, will submit to it under some circumstances, that is proof that the lives of unborn children must be protected by law. The truth is, one person's hypocrisy is not a defense for another person's evil. And to suggest that abortion should be legal because, once in a blue moon, some gutless pro-lifer has one, is as idiotic as saying the police have no right to arrest rapists because some police officers have committed rapes.

Downplaying Abortion

The abortion lobby tries to down play what happens in an abortion by describing it as a simple procedure that only takes a few minutes. Of course, this is not true when it comes to late-term abortions. Killing a baby at this point can be anything but simple, and it can take a long time to complete. But if what they're talking about is early abortions, they're right. The question is, so what? Acts of violence are often simple and take no more than a few minutes. For example, robbing convenience stores is not complicated and every person in the place can be killed in just a few seconds. So does that mean it should it be legal? The reality is, these people can sell abortion as "*quick and easy*" all they want to, but that doesn't change the fact that an innocent and helpless human being is killed.

Abortion Advocates Don't Care About Women's Beliefs

The pro-choice mob claims that when pro-lifers are faced with an unplanned pregnancy, some will have abortions. Of course, the pro-life movement is made up of millions of fallible human beings, and it would be foolish to think that this has never happened. But there is also another aspect to this issue. Abortion advocates claim that every woman should be free to choose abortion based on her own moral values and beliefs. Then they turn around and admit that they do abortions on women who consider it to be murder. So obviously, these people don't care about women's beliefs. If they did, they would never help a woman betray her values, they would encourage her to live up to them. But the reality is, they don't look at pro-life women who have abortions as persons, they see them as trophies.

“Abortion Is Just A Small Part Of Planned Parenthood’s Work.”

The pro-choice mob defends Planned Parenthood by claiming that abortion is only a small part of what they do. It’s a lie, but even if it was true, so what? It’s like saying that gassing Jews was only a small part of what the Nazis did, or that lynching black people was only a small part of what the Klan did. Besides, the pro-life movement has never said that killing unborn babies is all Planned Parenthood does. We simply point out that they kill more of them than anybody else in the country – and that is an undeniable fact. As for the claim that some Planned Parenthood facilities don’t do abortions at all, the reality is that there is not one of them that does not either do abortions or refer for abortions. And any individual or organization that refers for abortion, is as guilty as the savages who hold the knives.

The Issue Of Force

**REGARDLESS OF WHO IS AT THE CENTER OF THEIR ARGUMENTS ON FORCE,
IT'S CLEAR THAT ABORTION SUPPORTER'S OUTRAGE OVER FORCE IS A SHAM.**



Abortion Bans Outlaw Abortion, Not Require It

The pro-choice mob likes to say that any government that can tell a woman she can't have an abortion, can also tell her she has to have one. To understand the sheer stupidity of this statement, try to name one thing the federal government, or any state legislature, has ever outlawed and then required people to do. I mean, has anyone ever been forced by the government to snort cocaine, or cheat on their taxes, or have sex with children, or murder their spouses? If not, what would make us think that a state is going to make abortion illegal, and then drag women off the street and force them to have abortions? The fact is, the only women who have ever been forced by their governments to have abortions, live in countries where abortion is legal – not illegal.

“Abortion Bans Are Forced Motherhood.”

It is common for the pro-choice mob to argue that prohibitions against abortion are just *“forced motherhood.”* They also claim that the battle for legalized abortion is a battle for equal rights between men and women. With those two things in mind, let's say that a man and woman are having a sexual relationship and they have agreed that, if she gets pregnant, she will have an abortion and he will pay for it. What happens if she does get pregnant, and he says that he will live up to his part of the bargain, but she refuses to have the abortion? Should he be legally required to support a child that she agreed to abort? And if so, how can *“forced fatherhood”* be a good thing, but *“forced motherhood”* a bad thing, if the goal is to have equal rights between men and women?

Why The Abortion Lobby Would NEVER Support Legislation Making Force or Coerce a Federal Crime

It is well known that women and girls are often forced to have abortions against their will, usually by boyfriends, husbands, parents, or relatives of the guy who got them pregnant. And those who refuse to comply are sometimes murdered. Meanwhile, the pro-choice mob is fully aware of this problem but silently looks the other way. My suggestion is for legislation to be passed that makes it a federal crime to force or coerce a woman to have an abortion, or perform an abortion on a woman who is in that situation. But of course, the abortion lobby would never support this idea. After all, selling abortions to women who are being forced to have them is highly profitable, and no industry ever supports legislation that would cost them business. Remember, abortion is not just murder, it's also big business.

Is The Pro-Life Movement Really Trying To Force Women To Have Babies?

One of the abortion lobby's standard lies is to claim that the pro-life movement is trying to force women to have babies. Of course, the truth is that we totally support the right of every woman not to have a baby. But the right to not get pregnant is not the same as the right to kill the baby if you do get pregnant. And the biological reality is that when a woman is pregnant, she already has a baby. The other biological reality is that, unless she figures out a way to stay pregnant forever, she is going to give birth. Her only option is to give birth to a live baby or a dead one. For those of us who are pro-life, our goal is to see that every baby comes out alive, while the abortion lobby gets paid a lot of money to make sure they come out dead. And in a nutshell, that defines the battle over abortion.

The Birth Control Excuse.

The pro-choice mob contends that if a woman gets pregnant because her birth control failed, she should not be forced to have the baby. But let's make one thing clear. When a woman is pregnant, she can choose to have a live baby, or she can buy an abortion and choose to have a dead one, but one way or the other she is having a baby. As for the failed contraception issue, when a man and a woman are having a sexual relationship, unless they are hopelessly stupid, they are aware that pregnancy is a possibility even if they are both using birth control. And if that happens, mature individuals accept the consequences and responsibilities of their actions, while the self-centered and immature choose abortion and let their child pay the price. That's what's known as the "pro-choice" position.

What Actually Forces Women To Give Birth

A perfect example of the pro-choice mob's deceptive rhetoric is their claim that when someone works against legalized abortion, they are working for legislation that forces women to be pregnant or forces them to give birth. This is pure idiocy. In the first place, to suggest that preventing abortion is the same as forcing women to be pregnant is like saying that when we prevent men from murdering their wives we are forcing them to be married. As for this "forced birth" nonsense, remember, it is biology and nature that forces pregnant women to give birth – not the law. The reality is, every pregnant woman gives birth. They will either give birth to live babies or dead ones. The pro-life movement prefers live ones, the abortion industry makes money by killing them. It's just that simple.

Nobody Is Calling For Women To Be Forced Into Motherhood

Abortion defenders ask why a woman who is acting responsibly should be “*forced into motherhood*” just because her birth control failed. Of course, no one in the pro-life movement has ever called for women to be forced into motherhood. But once a woman is pregnant, her only options are to be the mother of a live baby, or have an abortion and be the mother of a dead baby. Second, just because someone is acting responsibly, they are not immune from the consequences of their actions. For example, someone might be driving their car responsibly, but they can still get into an accident and they are still responsible for the damage they do. In the case of sexual activity, being responsible is more than just taking steps to avoid pregnancy; it is also accepting up front that pregnancy is always a possibility.

What Pro-Choice Equality Really Looks Like

The pro-choice mob argues that women should not be “*forced into motherhood*” just because their birth control fails. But they never apply this concept to men, even though they constantly lecture the country that legalized abortion is about equal rights for men and women. So let’s say a man and a woman are in a sexual relationship; he is using a condom and she is on birth control pills, but she gets pregnant anyway. If she decides to abort their child, he has no legal say in the matter. But if she doesn’t abort, he can be legally required to pay child support for years. In other words, in the perverted world of pro-choice thinking, equality means that a woman’s decision to kill her child is just a personal choice, while a man who refuses to provide for his child can be arrested and thrown in jail.

Graphic Images

**PICTURES OF ABORTION ARE DISGUSTING AND BARBARIC
BECAUSE ABORTION ITSELF IS DISGUSTING AND BARBARIC.**



Genocide Is Easier To Sell When No One Sees It.

It's understandable that the pro-choice mob goes ballistic when pro-lifers show graphic images of abortion to the public. After all, genocide is always easier to sell when no one sees it but the killers. These images also remove any doubt that it's not just a clump of cells that gets killed in an abortion, it's a living human being. So yes, pictures of abortion are disgusting and barbaric, but only because abortion itself is disgusting and barbaric. And what's even more disgusting and barbaric, is that what's shown in those photos is tolerated in a society that considers itself to be civilized. The sad truth is, it shouldn't be necessary to use these images in order to convince the public that it is wrong to butcher helpless children. But that's the world legalized abortion has given us.

“Graphic Abortion Photos Are Fake!”

It's interesting that the same people who defend legalized abortion, go ballistic anytime we show the public photographs of what an abortion actually looks like. In fact, they often claim that these images are fake. Now if that's true, why don't they just show the real images? All they would have to do is provide before and after pictures of what's being aborted, and if they showed that we have been using phony or exaggerated images, the pro-life movement's credibility would go up in flames and the pro-choice mob would win the abortion battle immediately. But of course, they are not about to provide those images and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out why. Better than anyone else on earth, these people know that they cannot afford for the public to see what they are doing.

Becoming America's Conscience

When the public sees the horrific images of babies butchered in abortions, it's interesting how often they get more angry at the people who showed it to them, than they do at the people who actually did it. It's called "*intellectual dishonesty.*" Although they would never admit it, these people understand that the guilt for what is taking place in those pictures does not belong only to those who do it, but also to those who sit back and let it happen. The fact is, when someone wants to do evil, or look the other way and allow evil to be done, their conscience is their enemy. And when we show the public the dismembered corpses of babies killed in legal abortions, we become their conscience. So don't think that they get mad at us because they think we're wrong, they get mad at us because they're afraid we're right.

Abortion Causes Trauma, Not Pictures.

The abortion lobby says that the pro-life movement's graphic images of abortion can traumatize women who've had abortions. But even they don't claim that they traumatize women who have not had abortions. So obviously, it's the abortion that causes the trauma, not pictures of abortion. Now if the abortion industry is truly concerned about these women, there is a solution. All they need to do is just show these pictures to all their customers before they do abortions on them. That way, any woman who might be traumatized by them could make another decision, and no woman would ever have an abortion without knowing exactly what she is doing. Of course, that's the very reason this deal will never happen. The abortion industry knows that their business plan depends on having low-information customers.

Transforming Belief Into Observable Fact

Have you ever wondered why the pro-choice mob becomes so unhinged when we show pictures of the battered and dismembered corpses of the babies they kill? After all, if the unborn are not living human beings, and if legalized abortion is such a positive thing for women, then these people and their political toadies should have no fear of these images. But instead, they melt down over them, and they do so for the same reason they fight against any legislation that would require abortion customers to see ultrasound pictures of their babies before they have them killed. They know that these images transform the argument that the unborn are living human beings from a belief into an observable fact, and if you're trying to defend abortion, you can't let that happen.

“Those Photos Are Of Miscarriages And Stillbirths - Not Abortions.”

The pro-choice mob often claims that our graphic images of abortion are really stillbirths and miscarriages. But if that's true, how do we get all those stillborn babies, and how do those babies get all those puncture wounds and torn-off body parts? Are they saying that hospitals give us the corpses of stillborn babies which we then mutilate and photograph. As for miscarriages, it is standard medical procedure for the biological material from a miscarriage to be sent out for a pathology report. But apparently, these people want the public to believe that the first thing a doctor does after one of his patients loses her baby, is to alert the pro-life movement so we can rush over with our lights and cameras. It's complete nonsense.

A Slimy Attempt To Dodge Responsibility.

The pro-choice mob claims that our graphic images of abortion can cause psychological trauma to women who've had abortions. In other words, what they're saying is that women who've had abortions are so emotionally fragile that it's best for them not to see what they did. Look, this is just a slimy attempt by the people who sell abortions to dodge responsibility for the emotional pain they have inflicted on their customers. And their strategy is to blame it on the pro-life movement that tried to prevent those abortions in the first place. So let's not be naïve about what's going on here. These people aren't trying to hide these images from their past customers, they're trying to hide them from their future customers, because they know that seeing this reality might cause them to change their minds.

A Serious Question.

For those of you who call yourselves pro-choice, I have a serious question for you. If a 12-week-old unborn little boy was removed from his mother's body intact and still alive, would you have the guts to hold him up by the feet and shoot him through the head? Or do you only support legalized abortion as long as someone else does the killing and you don't have to see it? And before you answer, remember, shooting that little boy in the head would be quicker and far less barbaric than what happens in a normal every-day abortion.

The Political Game

**NOWHERE IN OUR LEGAL OR POLITICAL SYSTEM IS ANYONE GIVEN THE LEGAL
RIGHT TO INTENTIONALLY KILL INNOCENT AND HELPLESS HUMAN BEINGS.**



When You Vote Pro-Choice, You ARE Pro-Choice.

When someone who claims to be pro-life, says they could vote for a candidate who supports legal abortion, that person is a fraud. The fact is, when you vote pro-choice you are pro-choice. And even if a political office is not related to abortion, the abortion views of someone seeking that office matter. Remember, almost every decision a politician will make has a moral component to it. Spending money the country doesn't have is more than just a financial decision, it's a moral one. Going to war is more than just a military decision, it's also a moral one. And when it comes time to vote, the thing we must never forget is that politicians who support the wholesale slaughter of unborn children are not qualified to make good moral decisions, and to vote them – while claiming to be pro-life – is a scandal.

“Outlawing Abortion Will Not End It!”

The pro-choice mob argues that outlawing abortion will not end it and that women have always had abortions and always will. Of course, by this simple-minded logic, nothing should be illegal since no law has ever been one hundred percent effective. We have laws against rape, human trafficking, murder, child porn, and a million other ways that people are victimized, yet these things continue to happen. The fact is, anyone with five brain cells still working understands that the passing of laws cannot eradicate all evil any more than the practice of medicine can eradicate all disease. Societies pass laws against certain behaviors when they find them so despicable that they cannot be legally tolerated. And if butchering unborn children doesn't fit that definition, then nothing does.

Is Abortion Your Core Issue?

Some people argue that we should not have litmus tests for politicians and judges. That is pure nonsense. A politician could be attractive, intelligent, experienced and have all the right answers to the important issues of the day, but if he was found to be a member of the Ku Klux Klan that would be a litmus test. If a judge was nominated to the Supreme Court and it was discovered that he had written a law review article saying women should not be allowed to vote, that would be a litmus test. If a politician said that the 9/11 terrorists had legitimate reasons for flying airplanes into the World Trade Center, that would be a litmus test. The fact is, there are many legitimate reasons for litmus tests and people who claim they don't have any are either lying or they have no core principles.

The First Duty Of Government Is To Protect The Lives Of Its People.

Some people will agree that abortion is wrong but that the government's has no right to be involved in it. This is pro-abortion double-talk. Look, the only basis for saying that abortion is wrong is the acknowledgement that it takes the life of a living human being. So what these people are saying is, *"If someone wants to slaughter this one specific group of human beings, it is none of the government's business."* This is pure nonsense. The first duty of government is to protect the lives of its people, so the real question is not whether the government has a right to prevent abortions, but whether it has the right not to. The fact is, any government that allows innocent human beings to be intentionally killed, has no moral authority to even exist.

Can You Be For Limited Government And Pro-Life?

The abortion lobby claims it is hypocritical for conservatives to say they are for limited government, while trying to deny women the right to make their own choices. But being for limited government has never meant “anything goes” and it certainly doesn’t mean that a bunch of abortion industry savages should be allowed to legally butcher innocent and defenseless human beings. Look, the intent of every law ever passed is to deny someone the choice to legally do something. That is the goal of laws against rape, bank robbery, drunk driving, human trafficking, having sex with minor children, and a million other things. What the law establishes is that, in a civilized society, “*the right to choose*” is dependent on the behavior being chosen. And that is not contrary to any conservative principle.

Changing Laws vs Changing Hearts

Some people say that the answer to the abortion issue is not in changing laws but in changing hearts. But what would happen if we applied this concept across the board? Would we be willing to do away with all of our laws and replace them with a campaign to change the hearts of rapists, child molesters, human traffickers, and all the rest? Or does this “*change of heart*” idea only apply to the unborn? Look, the next time you hear this nonsense just remember two things. First, laws are not intended to change hearts; they are intended to restrain the heartless. Second, if abortion doesn’t take a human life, then we don’t need a change of heart. But if it does, then we have no right to let innocent and defenseless children be slaughtered by the millions while we wait for their killers to have a change of heart.

Are Abortion Laws Really Discriminatory?

Abortion advocates claim that state laws against abortion are discriminatory since women with more money can travel to states where abortion is legal. And in one sense they are right. A child would obviously be safer in the womb of a poor woman than a rich one, since the rich woman can afford to take her child out of the state for execution. Let's also remember that it is rarely even possible for laws to be enforced evenly across all economic groups. Laws against armed robbery and street drugs impact the poor more than the rich, while laws against insider trading and stock manipulation impact the rich more than the poor. But just because a particular crime is committed more often by one group of people than by another group of people, that doesn't mean it should be legal.

Does Sentience Bestow The Right To Life?

Abortion apologists say that the unborn don't have any rights because they are not sentient. Stedman's Medical Dictionary defines sentience as being conscious, having a sense perception, and experiencing sensations or feelings. So if the non-sentient have no rights, it would be okay to kill someone who is in a coma, or a vegetative state, or under general anesthesia, or just unconscious. Also, studies have shown that, even in the earliest stages of pregnancy, the unborn react to outside stimuli and that, once born, they can recognize music and voices they heard while still in the womb. So to say that the unborn are not sentient is a lie. But even if it were true, that doesn't mean you can kill them. What they are aware of, or unaware of, does not change the fact that they are living human beings.

“Morality Can’t Be Legislated!”

Abortion apologists like to say that, even if abortion is immoral, that doesn't mean it should be illegal since morality cannot be legislated. This idiotic statement is always the last refuge of people who are trying to defend something that even they know civilized people will find morally indefensible. The reality is, the law is nothing more or less than a society's collective moral values, and it legislates that morality with every law it passes. So while it is true that the law cannot make an immoral person moral, it can make it illegal for them to inflict their immorality on others. In the end, the most important question is: if the decisions about what behaviors a civilized society will and will not allow are not going to be based on morality, what are they going to be based on?

Considering ALL The Issues

Some people say that they do not support abortion, but consider all the issues when deciding who to vote for. But remember, for the unborn, the battle over abortion is not just *“an issue”* and it's not just philosophical. In their little corner of the world, it's a life and death reality. That's why, for people who are truly pro-life, a candidate's position on other issues is irrelevant. There is simply no moral equivalence between the intentional slaughter of defenseless children and any other issue. Be assured, if what's being done to these babies was being done to born people, no one would be saying that there are other issues to consider. Any way you want to look at it, the fact is that politicians who support the killing of the unborn, cannot be right enough on every other issue to make up for it.

“The Government Has No Right To Be Involved In The Practice Of Medicine!”

There are those in the pro-choice mob who argue that the government has no right to be involved in the practice of medicine. What they are conveniently ignoring is that the government is already involved in the practice of medicine and has been for a long time. In fact, except for the abortion industry, the medical community is one of the most highly regulated environments in America. I will also point out that telling people they can't intentionally kill their fellow human beings is not practicing medicine – even if the people you tell it to are doctors. It's also interesting to note that the same people who say the government has no right to be involved in abortion, are the first ones to demand that the government pay for abortions with taxpayer money.

Sizing Up Personhood.

Abortion defenders often ask how tissue only a quarter of an inch in diameter could have legal rights. Well, in the first place most abortions happen long after the unborn child is that small. In addition, only a moron could see a sonogram image of an unborn child and dismiss it as mere tissue. But if you buy into this idea that size is the yardstick for legal rights, I have a few questions. First, how big does a human being have to be before it starts having rights? And is weight or height the determining factor? Also, do these rights come on gradually as the person gets bigger and, if so, what is the official ratio of size to rights? And if someone loses weight do they lose rights? And finally, are men entitled to more rights than women since they are generally larger?

Distinction Without A Difference.

In 1994, a woman named Susan Smith drowned her one-year-old and three-year-old boys in a South Carolina lake. At her trial, it was revealed that she killed them because she was having an affair with a man who did not want children and her sons were coming between them. The public was outraged over this and Susan Smith instantly became the most hated woman in America. But the fact is, if she had been pregnant with twins and had them killed at the local abortion clinic, no one would have batted an eye. So the question is, if we are going to say that women have a legal right to kill their unborn children in order to live the lives they want to live, why should anyone be outraged – or even surprised – at what Susan Smith did? After all, it happens every day at every abortion clinic in the country.

Need Abortion? Will Travel.

The abortion lobby says that if abortion is banned or restricted in their state, women will just travel to other states to have them, and that may be true in some cases. But so what? It's like saying that a state should not raise its legal drinking age because some teenagers might travel to other states to purchase alcohol. Or saying that a state should not prohibit the carrying of a concealed handgun if it's legal to do so in other states. The fact is, state legislatures are not obligated to pass laws based on what other state legislatures do. And besides, you'd have to be pretty gullible to think that the abortion lobby is really concerned about women having to take their babies out of state to be killed. What they're concerned about are the abortionists in their state who will be put out of business.

A Painful Argument.

The abortion lobby claims that the unborn don't feel pain while being ripped apart during an abortion. That seems odd since it is standard medical practice for the unborn to be given anesthesia during fetal surgery. Maybe we're supposed to believe that unborn babies only feel pain when someone is trying to save their lives, but not when someone is trying to kill them. But let's assume that the unborn don't feel pain. Does that make it okay to kill them? If so, what about congenital analgesia? That's a rare genetic disorder that causes those who have it not to feel pain. Is it okay to kill them too? And what about people in a coma or under general anesthesia? They don't feel pain. Look, the problem here is not that the pro-choice mob doesn't think the babies they kill feel pain. The problem is, they don't care.

Portraying Abortion As Justifiable Homicide

Sometimes, members of the abortion lobby will grudgingly concede that the unborn are living human beings. But then they defend legalized abortion on the grounds that it is legal to kill people in certain situations. The most common examples they give are that we go to war knowing that people will be killed, and that our judicial system executes people for certain crimes, and that people are allowed to use deadly force to protect their lives or property. There are other examples, but none of them has anything to do with killing the unborn. **The fact is, nowhere in our legal or political system is anyone given the legal right to intentionally kill other innocent and helpless human beings.** And that makes this portrayal of abortion as some sort of justifiable homicide, a bald-faced lie.

Hard Cases & Exceptions

USING TRAGEDIES TO JUSTIFY ABORTION ON DEMAND
AND PROTECT ABORTION INDUSTRY PROFITS.



Pro-Life With Exceptions Is A Lie!

Some people claim to be pro-life while saying that abortion should be legal in some circumstances. So on one hand, they agree that unborn children are living human beings – after all, there is no other basis for being pro-life – but on the other hand they say it should be legal to kill some of them. For example, it’s okay to kill babies with Down syndrome or babies conceived in rape. But the truth is, the “*pro-life with exceptions*” position is a fraud. It’s as irrational as someone in 1850 saying, “*Slaves have a right to be free, but in some situations it should be legal to own a few.*” Remember, the only legitimate pro-life position is that if a given circumstance does not justify killing a five-year-old or a 50-year-old, it does not justify killing an unborn child.

Why Many Rape Victims Say Abortion Was The Worst Decision They Ever Made

Abortion apologists say that when a woman is pregnant from rape she should not be forced to have the baby. They are hoping we will ignore two things. First, when a woman is pregnant, she is going to “*have the baby.*” Her only option is to have a live baby or a dead baby, and that does not change regardless of how she got pregnant. The second thing they want us to ignore is that this baby is not only the child of the rapist, it is also the woman’s child. And for her to take the life of that child will never undo or lessen the damage that was done to her. This is why many rape victims who had abortions say it was the worst decision they ever made, but those who didn’t have abortions almost never say they now wish they had. In fact, many of these women say that her baby is the only good thing that came out of this situation.

The Abortion Industry's Trojan Horse

It's interesting to watch how the pro-choice mob politically exploits the relationship between rape, incest, and legalized abortion. Anytime a legislature is considering limits on abortion, the abortion lobby trots out stories of rape and incest victims. But if a compromise is offered that allows abortion for these cases, suddenly the issue is no longer abortion for rape and incest victims, it's unfettered abortion-on-demand in every circumstance. In other words, they never cared about rape or incest victims in the first place, they were just trying to use their tragedies to protect abortion industry profits. Now if you don't believe that's true, ask them why they constantly talk about rape and incest, but then oppose legislation that would prohibit abortion except in those cases.

Aborting The Disabled Is NOT Compassionate.

When pregnant women are told that their unborn babies are handicapped, the pro-choice mob often portrays abortion as some noble act of compassion, and they actually push the idea that killing the disabled is a service to the disabled. **This is a disgrace.** First off, doctors are not always right about this sort of diagnosis, but the most important thing is that people with disabilities have the same right to life as people without disabilities, and no one has the right to decide that their lives are not worth living – not even their mothers. Of course, the abortion lobby tries to sugarcoat it, but their basic sales pitch to the public is that it's easier and cheaper to kill the disabled than it is to accommodate them. And you can call that a lot of things, but you certainly can't call it compassion.

Using Abortion To Save Lives?

The American abortion lobby would have us believe that every year, millions of pregnant women are saved from certain death by having abortions. Of course, to paint this picture they have to ignore the fact that there is no pregnancy-related medical disorder that is cured by killing the baby. In reality, modern medicine has all but eliminated almost every circumstance in which continuing a pregnancy will cause the mother's death. However, if that situation were to exist, the medical staff should be required to do everything possible to save both mother and child. And if either or both fail to survive, it must be as an unintended consequence of that effort. But there is no medical or moral justification for either a mother or her child to be intentionally killed in order to save the other.

The Inconvenient Truth

The pro-choice mob says that abortion is not used as birth control and that women have them responsibly - and only in the rarest and most difficult of circumstances. Of course, they are lying. According to the abortion industry's own studies, the overwhelming majority of their customers concede that they weren't pregnant from rape or incest, the pregnancy wasn't a threat to their lives or their health, and the baby wasn't unhealthy. The number one reason these women give is that they were concerned about how a baby would impact their lives. That's it! In other words, the babies were inconvenient and in the wrong place at the wrong time. So they had to be killed. Now that isn't pretty and you'll never see it printed on the front of a pro-choice t-shirt, but that's the reality of legalized abortion.

Pro-Choice With Exceptions

When people claim to be pro-life, while at the same time saying that abortion should be allowed in some situations, what they are actually saying is that they support the “choice” to kill certain babies but oppose the “choice” to kill others. In other words, they are “*pro-choice with exceptions.*” Remember, the only basis for the pro-life position is that a new human life is created at the moment of fertilization. So when someone says that they are pro-life but that some abortions should be allowed, their position is that the unborn are living human beings, but it’s okay to kill some of them. **By definition, that means they are not pro-life.** For the person who is legitimately pro-life, there is never an excuse that justifies intentionally taking the life of any unborn child.

Bearing “The Rapist’s Child”

The pro-choice mob says that a woman who is pregnant from rape should not have to bear the child of the monster who attacked her. But that cannot be avoided. Her only options are to either give birth and bear a live child, or have an abortion and bear a dead one. Second, to refer to the baby as “*the rapist’s child*” treats the woman as an object and dismisses the fact that it’s her baby too. It also ignores the incredible courage and integrity it takes for a woman to do what is right, even when a terrible wrong has been done to her. The truth is, if she protects her baby in this situation, whether that child brings joy to her or to an adoptive family, she will always know that, in the end, she was stronger than her attacker and a far better person than those who say that a baby conceived in rape is disposable.

Who Are We Really Protecting?

We often hear incest used as a justification for abortion. But in reality, abortions done on girls who are pregnant by a family member, protect the perpetrators not the victims. And if you don't think that's true, honestly answer this one question. In the vast majority of cases in which an abortion is done on an incest victim, who do you think scheduled the appointment, made sure that the victim knew to keep her mouth shut, drove her to the clinic, and paid for the abortion? The fact is, an incest victim's abortion not only takes the life of an innocent unborn baby, but it keeps the perpetrator out of jail and makes it easier for him to continue doing what he's doing. Meanwhile, America's abortion profiteers want us to believe that this is in the best interest of the victims. You'd have to be pretty gullible.

The Definition Of Eugenics

From the day the concept of eugenics was introduced, it was marketed as a combination of intelligence and compassion. But over time, eugenics became exposed as the purest form of racism and elitism, and today, most people are revolted by the mere thought of it. The problem is, many of those same people will turn right around and say that abortion should be legal if the unborn child is handicapped or disabled. What they don't seem to understand – or don't want to understand – is that killing babies in the womb because they have physical or mental challenges, is the very definition of eugenics. It is also a perfect example of the mindless thought process that destroyed America's moral compass, and keeps the abortion holocaust going.

What About The Children Who Are Going To Die Anyway?

The pro-choice mob tries to portray abortion as some act of compassion for women whose unborn babies are not going to survive, since those children are going to die anyway. Of course, doctors can be wrong about this diagnosis, but even if they were always right, to market abortion as compassion is absurd. Just imagine that the mother of a five-year-old boy is told that he has an incurable and fatal disease. Would we tell her that the most compassionate thing she could do is have him “put down” like he was the family dog? Or let’s say that a man is charged with murdering his wife, should the charges be dropped if we find out that she had a fatal disease? After all, she was going to die anyway. Of course, that would be outrageous, but no more so than selling abortion as compassion to a woman who is losing her child.

“A Fetus Has More Rights Than Its Mother!”

The abortion lobby accuses the pro-life community of believing that a fetus has more rights than its mother – even when the pregnancy threatens her life. As usual, they are lying. We have never said that the baby’s rights are superior to the mom’s; what we’ve said is that they are equal because they are both living human beings. And we have never called for laws that would either force a pregnant woman to die in order to save her unborn child’s life, or prevent a doctor from doing whatever is necessary to save both her life and the life of her child. But let’s also remember that, with modern medicine, the possibility that continuing a pregnancy will kill the mother is virtually non-existent. In fact, there is no medical disorder that threatens a pregnant woman’s life that is cured by killing her unborn baby.

Abortion IS Backup Contraception.

The abortion lobby has always denied that abortion is used as birth control. But that is clearly a lie given that, today, a large percentage of abortion clinic customers are there for their second, third, and fourth abortions – and sometimes even more. In addition, one of the common defenses for legalized abortion is that birth control sometimes fails. That is a clear admission that abortion is just backup contraception. The fact is, the pro-choice mob has always known that legal abortion is used as birth control, and they're fine with it. But they also know that most people are not fine with it, so they lie and tell the public what they want them to hear. Of course, the real issue is, if abortion doesn't take the life of an innocent and helpless human being, why does it matter how people use it?

Poverty Is NEVER An Excuse For Killing.

Although the pro-choice mob markets abortion as something that helps women in dire circumstances, their own data shows that these hard cases are almost never the reason given for abortion. That has forced them to defend abortion even when the woman's reason for wanting one is that she can't afford the child or just isn't ready to be a mom. Of course, when a woman is pregnant it doesn't matter whether she is ready to be a mom or not. ***She is a mom.*** Her only option is to be the mother of a live baby or have an abortion and be the mother of a dead baby. As for the "can't afford" excuse, civilized people do not see poverty as a justification for killing your children. That's why they would never excuse a man for killing his five-year-old daughter just because he lost his job and decided that he could no longer afford her.

The Cycles of Violence

To say that abortion is justified in the cases of rape or incest may be motivated by compassion, and some people might think that it returns some level of control to the victim, but this reasoning is severely flawed. The most important thing to remember is that sexual assault does not make the victim guilty of anything – but an abortion changes that. For the rest of that woman’s life, the blood of her child will be on her heart and she will always know that no matter how horribly she was treated, taking her own child’s life was the greater crime. In the final analysis, it is outrageous to suggest that allowing a rape victim to inflict violence upon her child, can diminish the violence that was done to her. Like our parents told us, two wrongs never make a right.

Legalized Abortion And The Soul Of A Nation

To see what legalized abortion does to the soul of a nation, consider this. Today, when a pregnant woman is carrying a less-than-perfect baby, abortion is no longer just an option, it has become the default position. In fact, some people are now saying that, given modern pre-natal testing and the availability of abortion, any woman who gives birth to a handicapped baby is irresponsible. My question is, why limit this “*better-dead-than-disabled*” philosophy to the unborn? If we are going to kill a disabled child who is not yet born, so he or she won’t live an unpleasant life in the future, wouldn’t it be even more compassionate to euthanize a disabled two-year-old who is already living an unpleasant life? And by the way, this is already being advocated by some members of the pro-choice community.

Capitalizing On Difficult Situations.

In order to justify all abortions, the pro-choice mob routinely tries to capitalize on the difficult situations some pregnant women find themselves in. The most common of these “hard cases” are rape, incest, fetal deformity, or to save the mother’s life. The problem is, the abortion industry’s own data shows that only a tiny fraction of the abortions they sell are for these reasons. In almost every case, abortions are done to kill a healthy baby who was not conceived in either rape or incest, carried by a healthy woman whose pregnancy does not threaten her life. So here’s the question, if hard case pregnancies are really what the pro-choice mob is so concerned about, do you think they would support legislation that prohibits all other abortions? *I’ll give you one guess.*

Reproductive Injustice

I keep hearing people say that abortion is justified when the woman got pregnant from rape. But the baby did nothing wrong, so why should he or she be killed? And who came up with this idea of punishing people for crimes committed by their relatives? Apparently, these people believe that it’s okay to execute a child because his father is a rapist, so we must assume that they also think it’s okay to snuff out the rapists’ parents, brothers, sisters, and maybe even a few members of the extended family. Of course, this sounds more like a Mafia vendetta than it does American justice, and only a fool would buy into it. In fact, the only time we hear this sort of lunacy even suggested is when someone is trying to rationalize the slaughter of the unborn.

The Cure Hoax.

One of the abortion lobby's standard defenses for late-term abortions is that complications sometimes arise late in pregnancy that threaten the mother's life. But what they never seem to explain is how killing the baby eliminates this threat. So the question is, if killing the woman's baby won't cure whatever late term pregnancy complications she has, what is the justification for taking the baby's life? It seems that the only real threat posed by allowing this baby to live, is to the bank account of the people who get paid to kill them. And even if there is a legitimate medical diagnosis that the baby is an immediate threat to the mother's life, since it is late in the pregnancy, why not induce labor or perform a Caesarean section and give the baby a fighting chance to survive?

The Abortion Lobby's P.R. Nightmare

Today, about half of all abortions are on women who've had at least one prior abortion, and it is not uncommon for women to have several abortions. Of course, defending this would be a public relations nightmare for the abortion lobby, so they pretend that even they don't support repeat abortions. In other words, while they market abortion as a right that protects women, they abandon women who freely exercise that right. Look, abortion is either right or wrong, and the reasons women have them, and how many they have, has no bearing on that issue. The fact is, if the unborn are not living human beings, then no justification for abortion is necessary. But if they are living human beings, then no justification is possible. And by the way, the science says that they are living human beings.

Killing Compassion.

When women are carrying babies they are told will not survive the pregnancy, or will die shortly thereafter, the abortion lobby defends abortion as a compassionate alternative. What they are hoping these women will ignore, is the fact that there is an enormous moral distinction between the natural death of a child and the intentional killing of one. It is the same as the moral distinction between one man dying from cancer and another man being shot to death during a holdup. In this case, it's a horrific tragedy for someone to lose a child through no fault of their own. But that tragedy is made even worse, for those who will spend the rest of their life knowing that they made a decision to have their own child put to death. And that doesn't change, just because the child may have been going to die anyway.

Violence Against The Powerless.

When a man commits rape, he uses power to inflict violence against an innocent and powerless victim, and he doesn't care what damage he does to her. And if she becomes pregnant and has an abortion, now there are two victims. Remember, she is the mother of that child and the circumstances of the conception don't change that. But instead of protecting her baby, she pays some abortionist to inflict violence on that child. Of course, her baby's death doesn't un-rape her and it won't solve any of the emotional and psychological problems she faces because of the rape. The only thing that really changed is that she went from being the mother of a live baby to being the mother of a dead baby, and it's hard to see how she profited from that.

The One Percent Provision.

The abortion industry's own data shows that only a tiny fraction of their customers are pregnant as a result of rape. Generally speaking, the figure is less than one percent. But their political rhetoric would have you believe that rape accounts for most of the abortions they sell. So what's behind this gap? The answer is that the pro-choice mob is made up of moral hyenas who know that there is enormous empathy for rape victims, and that this emotion can be capitalized on. For proof of this, notice that when a ban on abortion is proposed with no exception for rape, the abortion lobby goes berserk. But if such an exception is added, their attacks are just as vicious as they were before. So obviously, their concern for rape victims is a fraud; they just use them for political cover.

When Did Pregnancy & Childbirth Become So Dangerous?

In nineteen-sixty-seven, Alan Guttmacher – the former head of Planned Parenthood – said, *“Today it is possible for almost any patient to be brought through pregnancy alive, unless she suffers from a fatal illness such as cancer or leukemia, and if so, abortion would be unlikely to prolong, much less save her life.”* But now, all these years later and despite enormous advances in modern medicine, the pro-choice mob talks about pregnancy as if the Grim Reaper lurks in every labor and delivery ward ready to claim even the healthiest women. So the question is: when did pregnancy and childbirth become so dangerous? Was it when legal abortion became so profitable?

Don't Fall For The Distraction.

The pro-choice mob constantly implies that most abortions are done on women who are pregnant through rape or incest, and women whose pregnancies threaten their lives, and women whose unborn children are either handicapped or fatally ill. But their own statistics show that these reasons are given by only a tiny percentage of women who have abortions, and that the overwhelming majority of them are just backup birth control. Of course, the abortion lobby doesn't want this widely known so they harp about the "hard case" reasons for abortion, knowing all along they are almost never the reasons women actually have abortions. It's a classic "tail-wagging-the-dog" strategy in which people are made to overlook the extraordinarily common by diverting their attention to the extraordinarily rare.

Compounding Trauma

Abortion apologists dismiss adoption for women who get pregnant from rape because they say those women might not be emotionally prepared to carry a child for nine months and then give it to someone else. In other words, the same woman who would be traumatized by placing her baby for adoption, would be just fine having her baby brutally ripped to shreds and tossed in a dumpster. That is nonsense. The truth is, when a rape victim kills her baby, she is no longer just a victim of violence, she is now a perpetrator of violence. That may explain why you can find rape victims who say that their abortions will haunt them for the rest of their lives, but you never hear of a rape victim who allowed her child to live, to later say she wishes she had had an abortion.

Honoring The Hippocratic Oath

It is now possible for doctors to surgically separate conjoined, or Siamese, twins even though it is accepted that one or both may not survive. However, no ethical surgeon would ever agree to perform this operation with the intent of killing one of the twins in order to save the other one. The intent would always be to save both, and this should be the model for dealing with pregnancies that threaten a woman's life. With modern medicine, that situation almost never exists, but when it does the medical staff should be required to do everything possible to save both mother and child, and if either or both fail to survive, it must be as an unintended consequence of that effort. But it is as wrong to intentionally kill the baby to save the mother as it would be to intentionally kill the mother to save the baby.

The “Going-To-Die-Anyway” Rationale

Abortion defenders say that when a doctor tells a pregnant woman that her unborn baby is going to die, it would be more compassionate for her to have an abortion. Of course, they're overlooking the fact that this diagnosis is not always accurate, and that women who are told this sometimes give birth to normal healthy babies. But my question is this: If we're going to adopt this *“going-to-die-anyway”* mentality, why limit our compassion to the unborn? Let's say a doctor tells the parents of a five-year-old that their child has an incurable and fatal disease, wouldn't a quick lethal injection be the compassionate thing to do? Using the pro-choice mob's reasoning, why force everyone involved to endure what could be a prolonged, painful and expensive ordeal if, in the end, the child is going to die anyway?

All Life Is Equally Valuable.

If you defend killing babies conceived in rape, what you are saying is that the circumstances of their conception makes some children less human and less valuable than others. Now if you buy into that argument, remember this: studies show that between three and five percent of all the children born in America are conceived in rape. That means, on average, a school photo of one hundred children will include at least three who were conceived in rape. So what characteristics could you point to that would distinguish those three children? And should it be legal to kill them? After all, that is exactly what happens when rape is used to justify abortion. And let me ask you this: would you be able to look someone in the face who was conceived in rape and say to them, *“You have no right to be here. You should be dead.”*

Pro-Choice Storytelling.

The abortion lobby likes to portray the typical abortion scenario as a dirt-poor twelve-year-old who was raped by an uncle and whose pregnancy threatens her life. Then for good measure, they will toss in that her unborn child is severely handicapped and is going to die anyway. They do this despite the fact that their own statistics, as well as those put out by the U.S. government, show that “hard case” abortions are extremely rare and that the overwhelming majority of them are done only because these women just don’t want to be pregnant. In other words, the pro-choice mob’s strategy is simple: use women in difficult circumstances to rationalize killing the children of women who are not in those circumstances. It’s cynical and it’s disgraceful, but it’s exactly what we expect from these people.

A Get-Out-Of-Jail-Free Card

The pro-choice mob's use of incest to justify abortion shows just how morally bankrupt these people are. Look, if some pervert is having sex with his daughter, the thing that is most likely to get him caught is for her to get pregnant. And he knows it. So if that happens, he is going to get her to an abortion clinic as fast as possible. And if she doesn't want to go, that's tough. The fact that he is having sex with this child means that he has an unnatural amount of power over her. So she's going to the abortion clinic, and he's going to be right there beside her, and he is going to have her well-coached on what to say and what not to say. The fact is, sexual predators who prey on children – including those who prey on their own children – know that the local abortion clinic is where get-out-of-jail-free cards are sold.

Out Of Time.

When legislation restricting abortion is proposed, any exception for rape victims often requires that they reported the attack to the authorities within a short length of time. Of course, the pro-choice mob launches a vicious attack against this calling it *“too restrictive.”* But law enforcement experts say that the best way to reduce rapes is for them to be immediately reported, and that a rapist's chances of being caught drop every day that an assault he committed goes unreported. So in other words, legislation containing a feature that experts say is the best way to combat rape, is aggressively fought by people who claim to be looking out for the welfare of women. Apparently, in the war to protect the abortion industry, sexually assaulted women are written off as just the cost of doing business.

Back To The Pregnancy

The pro-choice mob says that for a women to keep a baby conceived in rape would be a constant reminder of the rape and, if she is not okay with adoption, abortion is her only option. So let's apply that thought process to the case of Jaycee Dugard. At age 11 she was kidnapped by a man named Phillip Garrido and his wife Nancy. She was routinely raped and, when she was rescued years later, she had two daughters fathered by Garrido. Now, if Ms. Dugard said that her children were a daily reminder of her rapes, but she did not want to place them for adoption, should she be allowed to have them euthanized? After all, that would give her back the "choice" she was denied when she was pregnant. Of course, that is preposterous, but it is the same excuse used for killing unborn children conceived in rape.

The Pro-Life Movement's Ultimate Goal

The pro-choice mob often paints the pro-life community as hypocritical for saying that every unborn baby deserves legal protection, and then supporting legislation that allows abortion in some circumstances. They say it proves that we don't believe our own rhetoric. But the political reality is, it is not always possible to completely stop the bloodshed, so we try to stop as much of it as we can, until we can do better. Be assured, when the day comes that we can protect every baby, we won't settle for anything less. In the meantime, sincere members of the pro-life community have every right to criticize legislation that doesn't save every baby. But for that criticism to come from those who are doing the killing is utterly indefensible, and it illustrates just how morally bankrupt these people are.

Body Talk...

THE PRO-CHOICE MOB CHANTS THAT "IT'S THE WOMAN'S BODY"
AS IF THERE IS ONLY ONE BODY INVOLVED.



The Worst Science Deniers On The Planet!

Abortion is often defended with the argument that women have a right to control their own bodies. Of course, this assumes that the unborn child is part of the mother's body and ignores the biological reality that they are separate individuals. If that is not the case, then it means that when a woman is pregnant she has 4 arms, 4 legs, 2 heads, 2 hearts, 2 brains, and so on. And if her baby is male, she also has a penis and testicles for nine months of her life. The biological fact is that a mother and her unborn baby are two separate human beings with their own unique DNA, and only the worst science deniers on the planet would try to defend abortion with this ridiculous "*woman's body*" argument as if there is only one body involved.

The Body of Law

The abortion lobby says that the law has no right to control what a woman does with her own body. But let's follow the science. First, every part of a human body has the same DNA as every other part of that body. But an unborn child always has a different DNA than the mother. So how is that possible, if the unborn baby is part of her body? And if they are the same body, how is it possible for an unborn child to survive if the mother dies? I mean, no other part of her body keeps on living after she dies. The point is, regardless of what the pro-choice mob says, it is a biological fact that outlawing abortion does not determine what a woman can or cannot do with her body, but what she can or cannot do with the body of another human being. And in a civilized society, the law certainly has a right to be involved with that decision.

Happy Amputation Day!

For those of you in the pro-choice mob who claim that the fight against abortion is an effort to control woman's bodies, I have some questions. First, if the unborn child is part of a woman's body, where in the biological literature is it stated that a woman can give birth to a part of her own body? Second, when a woman has an abortion, is it reasonable to say that she is paying to have part of her own body killed? Third, if a baby five minutes after being born is not part of a woman's body, how is it biologically possible that it was part of her body fifteen minutes earlier? And fourth, if the unborn child is part of a woman's body, are you saying that babies are not born, they are amputated?

How Many People Do You See?

The pro-choice mob chants that *"it's the woman's body"* as if there is only one body involved. To see how idiotic this is, imagine a photo of conjoined – or Siamese – twins and ask yourself how many people are in the picture. Of course, the answer is two. And yet, they are far closer to being one person than a mother and her unborn child are. Conjoined twins are always the same sex, always have the same DNA and blood type, always share at least one external body structure, often share internal organs, and as long as they are joined, if one dies they both die. But none of that is true about a mother and her unborn baby. So obviously, if conjoined twins are individual human beings, then it is biological nonsense to argue that the mother's body is the only body involved in an abortion.

It's Not Your Body.

The next time you are tempted to buy the pro-choice mob's argument that abortion should be legal because women have the right to control their own bodies, remember this: it's not the woman's body that's going to have a needle shoved into its chest; it's not the woman's body that's going to have its arms and legs ripped off; it's not the woman's body that's going to have its skull crushed; it's not the woman's body that's going to be sucked through a vacuum hose; it's not the woman's body that's going to be chopped up and sold for parts; and it's not the woman's body that's going to be ground up in a garbage disposal or tossed into a dumpster. And by the way, none of that is someone's opinion or part of some theoretical philosophy. It's the biological reality of abortion.

Language Manipulations

ALL THE LANGUAGE MANIPULATIONS IN THE WORLD
CAN'T CHANGE THE REALITY OF ABORTION.



When A Woman Says She Has Not DECIDED Whether To “Have The Baby” Or Not.

When a pregnant woman says that she is has not decided whether to “*have the baby*” or not, she is actually saying two things. First, she is saying that she knows that what’s growing inside her is a baby. Not a bunch of tissue, or a clump of cells, or some sort of parasite — a baby. She is also saying that she is thinking about paying some psychopath at the nearby abortion clinic to kill her baby. Of course, her conscience won’t allow her to say it in those words, so she tries to sugarcoat it with this “*have the baby*” nonsense. The truth is, it is physically impossible for a pregnant woman to not have her baby. She can give birth and have a live baby or she can buy an abortion and have a dead one, but one way or the other she’s having the baby. And all the language manipulations in the world can’t change that.

Redefining Healthcare.

The abortion lobby is desperately trying to convince the public that abortion is healthcare. But even studies from the U.S. government and the abortion industry itself prove that almost every abortion in America is done for non-medical reasons on healthy babies being carried by healthy women whose pregnancies pose no risk to either their lives or their health. So the question is: just how stupid do you have to be to say that killing a healthy baby being carried by a healthy mom is healthcare? And besides, if abortion is healthcare, then a woman would be healthier after she has one than she was before. And that’s obviously not the case. The fact is, elective abortions are not healthcare anymore than boob jobs are healthcare.

The “Miracle Of Child Birth”

You often hear people talk about “*the miracle of child birth*” and it sounds all warm and fuzzy. But while birth may be a joyous and emotional event for the parents, grandparents, and other family members, there is nothing miraculous about it; the baby simply changes location. Just look at a sonogram image of an unborn child, and you will see that the miracle has already taken place. The problem is, every time someone who is pro-life talks about the miracle of birth, they unwittingly reinforce the pro-choice mob’s lie that the most important event in a human being’s life is not creation, but birth. And whenever we surrender that piece of ground to the enemy, the unborn lose.

“You Have No Right To Tell A Woman She Can’t Terminate Her Pregnancy!”

The abortion lobby says that we have no right to tell a woman she can’t terminate her pregnancy. Of course, we’ve never tried to prevent pregnancy terminations. All pregnancies terminate! They either terminate with live babies or dead babies. We prefer live babies and the abortion industry is paid to deliver dead babies. Now if they’re saying that we have no right to tell a woman she can’t have an abortion, they’re right. As individuals, we have no more authority to tell a woman she can’t have an abortion than we have to tell her she can’t rob a bank. But just as our government has a responsibility to prevent bank robberies, it has a responsibility to prevent the killing of innocent human beings, including those who are waiting to be born. And any government that fails to do that, has no right to even exist.

“We have babies having babies!”

It is common for the pro-choice mob to describe very young girls who get pregnant as “*babies having babies.*” Of course, they never bring up the fact that organizations like Planned Parenthood created this situation, and are now raking in millions off of it. But the other issue is that these people have no problem referring to a thirteen-year-old who gives birth as a “*baby having a baby,*” but if that same girl buys an abortion, they never refer to her as a “*baby having an abortion.*” Obviously, the abortion lobby is sending a subtle message to young girls that abortion is some kind of right of passage. If you’re thirteen and give birth, you’re still a baby; but have an abortion and, all of a sudden, you’re a powerful young woman exercising her legal rights.

Avoiding The B Word

When abortion clinic workers locate the baby they plan to kill on an ultrasound screen, they never say to the mother “*there is the baby.*” Instead, they’ll say something like “*there is the pregnancy.*” This is gibberish. Pregnancy is not an object that can be seen, it is a condition. Looking at an ultrasound screen and saying, “*there is the pregnancy*” is like looking at an x-ray and saying “*there is the flu.*” It’s pure idiocy, but the abortion industry has to use this sort of twisted rhetoric because their financial and political survival depends on having low-information customers who never hear the word baby. The fact is, it’s babies that show up on a sonogram screen, not pregnancies. But the abortion industry realizes that “*pregnancy terminations*” are a lot easier to sell than “*baby terminations.*”

Calling Contract Killings “Healthcare”.

The abortion lobby tries to justify abortion by calling it “*healthcare.*” They are lying. To begin with, healthcare is the treatment of illness, injury or disease and pregnancy is none of those. Second, no procedure can be rightly called healthcare when its sole intent is to transform a living human being into a corpse. It is like saying that when a doctor administers the lethal drugs used in the execution of a condemned prisoner, he is providing healthcare. Also, for abortion to be healthcare, a woman would have to be healthier after having one than she was before, but the reality is, there is no medical disorder affecting pregnant women that is cured by killing their babies. So the bottom line is, by definition, abortions are not healthcare. They are contract killings.

Being Selective

If a woman is pregnant with twins or triplets, but she only wants one baby, it is possible for an abortionist to kill those that she doesn't want. This can also be used in sex-selection abortions. So if a woman is pregnant with a boy and a girl, but she only wants the boy, the girl can be eliminated. In both cases, the procedure is to insert a needle through the mother's abdomen and into the chest of the targeted baby. Then, potassium chloride is injected to stop the baby's heart. Of course, the people who do this don't refer to it as a killing; their term for it is “*selective reduction.*” But whatever they choose to call it, they will never escape the biological reality that the babies they allow to be born, and the babies they “*selectively reduce,*” are both living human beings.

Location, Location, Location!

Today, the abortion lobby is desperately trying to market elective abortion as healthcare. Their message seems to be that, because they are done in medical facilities, that automatically makes them healthcare. This is nonsense. All kinds of cosmetic procedures are done in medical facilities, but it would be laughable to call them healthcare. And the same thing is true about abortion. According to the abortion industry's own data, they are almost always done for non-medical reasons on healthy babies being carried by healthy women whose pregnancies pose no risk to either their lives or their health. So by definition, that means they cannot be healthcare. The fact is, abortions are contract killings, and that is why they are considered a failure if no one dies.

What Was It That Grabbed The Doctor's Finger?

The abortion lobby says that what gets killed in an abortion is a fetus, not a baby. But think about this. Today, doctors are able to take the unborn — whatever you call them — out of the womb, place them on the woman's abdomen, perform surgery on them, and then return them to the womb. In one famous case, a surgeon in Tennessee had just completed such an operation, when a tiny hand pushed out of the incision he had made in the mom and grabbed his finger. A photo of this ended up on magazine covers and television sets around the world and astonished the people who saw it. But of course, it has never stopped the pro-choice mob from becoming unhinged whenever someone refers to their victims as children or babies. And so the question still remains, what was it that grabbed the doctor's finger?

Mad Science

SCIENCE WITHOUT MORALITY IS THE MOST
DANGEROUS AND MOST EVIL FORCE ON EARTH.



Do Pro-Lifers Oppose Fetal Tissue Research & Embryonic Stem Cell Research?

The pro-life movement is often attacked for opposing fetal tissue research and embryonic stem cell research when it might save so many lives. But the truth is, we have never opposed any kind of responsible medical research. If the material needed for this research comes from umbilical cords, or placenta, or from babies who are miscarried, or stillborn, or die as a result of an accident, few people would have a moral objection. But researchers crossed the line when they began using parts taken from babies who were intentionally killed by abortion. And when they began creating human life in order to destroy it and use it in medical experiments, they stopped being scientists and became savages. Just remember, science without morality is the most dangerous and most evil force on earth.

Abortion: A Tool Of Eugenics

Some foreign countries are now bragging that they have virtually eliminated Down Syndrome from their population and the obvious assumption is that they have discovered a cure. But that's not the case. What they're saying is that they've eliminated Down Syndrome by killing every child in the womb who might have it. Unfortunately, America is going down this same path. And don't be stupid enough to think we are doing this out of compassion for those being killed. We are doing it because we have decided that these children are inconvenient, unsightly, more expensive to care for than they are worth, and missing many of the "normal" human qualities we so admire in ourselves. It's called eugenics, and it is the inevitable sickness of a culture that says the value of human life is utilitarian and negotiable.

“It’s A Parasite!”

The left is always telling us to “*follow the science*” on things like climate change and environmental policy. But when it comes to abortion, science is suddenly off the table. Just one example of this is that the pro-choice mob will often describe the unborn as parasites and say that the government has no right to tell women that they can’t have them removed. The problem is that the unborn do not fit any accepted definition of a parasite, and nowhere in science are they classified as parasites. Of course, that could be just some sort of gap in the scientific community’s knowledge. So maybe the abortion lobby would be willing to educate the rest of us about this mysterious biological process that turns parasites into living human beings. After all, they seem to be the only people on earth who are aware of it.

The Major Distinction Between Abortion & Amputation

You will sometimes hear the pro-choice mob equate elective abortion to amputation. It’s a perfect example of how low these people will sink in order to justify killing the unborn. To begin with, amputations are done as a medical necessity and no ethical surgeon chops off a healthy part of someone’s body just because the patient asked them to. But the abortion industry’s own data shows that almost every abortion they do is for non-medical reasons to kill a healthy baby being carried by a healthy woman whose pregnancy does not threaten her life or health. That alone destroys any claim of a similarity between elective abortion and amputation. But beyond that, anyone who can look at a picture of an aborted baby, alongside a picture of an amputated leg, and see the two procedures as morally equal, is sick.

Should We Discard Aborted Babies Instead Of Using Them In Medical Experiments?

Some people question how the pro-life movement can object to parts harvested from aborted babies being used in fetal tissue research and embryonic stem cell research when so much good could come from it. Besides, they say, these babies are already dead. Of course, that's the same justification the Nazis used when they stole the gold fillings from the teeth of the Jews they killed in their concentration camps. Look, it is morally indefensible that we slaughter these babies in the first place, but when we rob their graves to make our lives better, we disgrace ourselves even further. So if the question is: should we discard these dead babies instead of using them in medical experiments designed to benefit us, the answer is an unqualified yes. We have absolutely no right to profit from our own evil.

The Fetal Harvest.

Think about this. There are those in the pro-choice mob who say that abortion is okay because the unborn are not really human beings. But at the same time, there is a lucrative market for human body parts harvested from babies killed by abortion. So how does that work? I mean, if the unborn are not really human beings, how can they be made up of parts that are human? And here's another question. Let's say that a woman needs embryonic stem cells or bone marrow to save her life. It's well-known that the closer she is, biologically, to the donor, the better the results will be. So would it be acceptable for her to get pregnant on purpose to have a baby she can abort to get this material? If not, why not? After all, if abortion is acceptable when it is done to save the life of the mother, wouldn't that be the case here?

Men Not Allowed!

REAL MEN DON'T JUST STAND AROUND WITH THEIR HANDS IN THEIR POCKETS WHILE HELPLESS BABIES ARE BUTCHERED.



“Equal Rights For Me, Not For Thee”

Those of you in the abortion lobby like to say that, because men don't have a uterus, they have no right to express an opinion about abortion. But what happened to the idea that our society was supposed to be against gender-based discrimination? And let's not forget, you're the ones who brought men into this issue when you started demanding that abortions be paid for with tax dollars. After all, a lot of that money comes from the paychecks of men. But the bigger issue is that real men don't just stand around with their hands in their pockets while helpless babies are butchered. That means that being involved in this issue is not only their right, it's their duty. So whether you like it or not, as long as you're killing babies, some of the people fighting you will be men. **Deal with it.**

Silencing Those Who Think Women Deserve Better Than Abortion

The pro-choice mob often screams things like, “*no uterus – no opinion.*” It seems that they believe someone's ability to make rational and unbiased decisions, and their right to express those decisions, is somehow connected to their reproductive system. But setting that idiocy aside, don't be fooled into thinking that their contempt for the opinions of men means that they have respect for the opinions of women. They don't, and it's proven any time there is a confrontation between a pro-choice man and a pro-life woman. In every case, the abortion lobby will throw her under the bus, even though he doesn't have a uterus. The fact is, these people are trying to silence anyone who thinks women deserve better than abortion, and they're counting on this “*no uterus*” nonsense to pick off the men.

The Double Standard Of The “Uterus Rule”

Those of you in the pro-choice mob like to whine that men have no right to be involved in the abortion issue. But you never seem to play this “*Vagina Card*” on male politicians and judges who are pro-abortion. Or on the men who go to your marches and rallies. Or on the male escorts hanging around outside the abortion clinics. And you never say that men should not be allowed on the boards of pro-abortion organizations, or that men should be prohibited from giving political or financial support to these groups. And you certainly have no problem with those men who show up at your clinics with cash in their pockets and pregnant women in tow. So the question is, are you allowing these guys to be involved in the abortion issue under some sort of “*honorary vagina*” status?

Which Gender Supports Abortion More?

When those of you in the pro-choice mob say men have no right to express an opinion on abortion, it may be that you’re running off your most loyal support group. Remember, polls consistently show that men are at least as pro-abortion as women, and usually more so. And there are good reasons for this. First, every woman who gets pregnant knows what she is pregnant with. That makes it harder to sell her the lie that it’s some sort of parasite or clump of cells. It’s a baby. Second, sexually irresponsible men know that the legalization of abortion, and the willingness of women to submit to it, have been the two greatest gifts they’ve ever received. And third, for men who prey on underage girls for sex, secret abortions are often the only thing that keeps them from being found out and sent to prison.

Who Is Biologically Qualified To Have An Opinion?

Today, we hear the chant that people without vaginas have no right to speak out on the abortion issue. Well if that's so, then there must be other subjects that people should be barred from discussing because they don't have the appropriate genitalia. For example, what issues should people be prevented from expressing an opinion about if they don't have testicles? And what about the trans community? Do people who were born biological females, give up their right to have an opinion on abortion when they transition into males? And do people who were born male, suddenly gain the right to have an opinion about abortion when they transition into females? And finally, who are the nitwits that came up with these rules and where are they written down?

Men: No Choice, But All The Responsibility

The pro-choice mob says that a man has no right to interfere if his partner chooses to abort their child – even if she admits that he is the child's father. But yet, if she chooses to let the child live, he becomes legally responsible for supporting that child for the next eighteen years, and he can be thrown in prison if he fails to do so. The obvious question is, if he has no say in whether or not this child is killed, how can he be held responsible for the welfare of that child? In other words, how does someone become legally responsible for something that the law says is none of their business? Also, are there other area of the law where this standard is applied, and is it only enforced against men, or are there areas where it is also applied to women?

See No Evil...

TURNING A BLIND EYE TO THE ONGOING GENOCIDE.



A Disturbing Question Regarding The Abortion Issue...

Here's a disturbing question regarding the abortion issue. Why is it that so many people will concede that the unborn are living human beings, but then turn right around and say it should be legal to intentionally kill them? I mean, no one ever says that about any other group of innocent human beings. Of course, the explanation for this is both obvious and ugly. Simply put, the people who take this position know that – since they're already born – legalized abortion is not a threat to them. It's the same reason why so many white Americans looked the other way while Africans were being bought and sold, and why so many Germans looked the other way while Nazi thugs were gassing Jews. So maybe it shouldn't come as such a surprise when the born look the other way, while the unborn get slaughtered.

What If You're Wrong?

There is a fine line between self-confidence and arrogance and, in any conflict, intelligent people always accept the possibility that they may be wrong. They also think about what the consequences are for being wrong. In the battle over legalized abortion, if the unborn are not living human beings, then the pro-life movement is wrong and is guilty of trying to deny women a right that we have absolutely no right to deny them. But if the pro-choice side is wrong, then they are carrying out mass genocide on a scale that has killed more innocent and helpless people than have been killed in all the other holocausts in world history, combined. So the question becomes: which side of the abortion conflict would you rather be on if it turns out that you're wrong?

Easy Targets.

No matter what you think about legalized abortion, you have to admit that the unborn make perfect victims. They can't vote. They have no political power. They have no money. They can't fight back. They can't get away. They can't even object to being killed. On top of that, they're executed in private so no one sees it happening except the psychopaths who do the killing and the women who hire them. Once it's over, of course, the corpses can just be tossed into a dumpster, or flushed down the sewer system, or chopped up and sold for parts, or hauled off to an incinerator. And all we have to do, is to keep telling ourselves that allowing defenseless and innocent unborn children to be legally slaughtered makes us a better people and a more civilized society.

How Will Future Generations Look Upon Legalized Abortion?

Today, we look back on slavery and the Nazi holocaust and ask ourselves how any nation claiming to be civilized could have allowed these things to happen. And yet, we allow mass genocide to be carried out against the unborn, despite the fact that modern technology has scientifically proven that they are living human beings, and even some people who work in the abortion industry are now openly admitting that abortion takes a human life. But we have decided that it is a capital crime for unborn children to be inconvenient, so we execute them by the millions and toss their tiny corpses into the garbage. The reality is, we are letting genocide masquerade as liberty, and if we think future generations will see us as morally superior to slave traders or concentration camp guards, we are complete fools.

What's Really Being Protected.

Regarding the abortion debate, let's get one thing straight. Historically, even civilizations with almost no formal government never allowed one individual to decide whether another individual did or did not have a right to live. In fact, the most universal view is that the first duty of a legitimate government is to protect innocent human life. In America today, you'd have to be pretty simple minded to think that these fanatical abortion advocates are a bunch of noble crusaders trying to protect the rights of women. The truth is, they are nothing more than special interest lobbyists protecting a multi-billion-dollar abortion industry. And you can be assured that, if there were not boxcars full of money to be made in the baby-killing business, no one would be spending five minutes defending it.

“Personally Opposed”

A POSITION TAKEN BY COWARDS.



This Is An Not Open Minded Position On Abortion.

There are a lot of women who will agree that the unborn are living human beings and say that they would never have an abortion. And there are also a lot of men who will acknowledge the humanity of the unborn and say that they would never encourage a woman to have an abortion or pay for one. But in the next breath, these same people are capable of saying that abortion should be legal. They want us to think that being both pro-life and pro-choice at the same time makes them thoughtful and open minded. But in reality, it just exposes them as amoral cowards who don't have the courage to defend either position. It also raises the question of whether there are any other groups of innocent human beings that they think it should be legal to kill, or are unborn children the only ones?

Playing Both Sides.

When politicians say they are "*personally*" pro-life but that they won't impose their beliefs on others, they think it makes them enlightened and tolerant. In reality, it makes them gutless hypocrites who are desperately hoping that they can play both ends against the middle. So they say what one side wants to hear them say, while agreeing to do what the other side wants them to do. In the final analysis, there are two things to take away from this situation. First, when some political hack tells you up front that their words won't match their actions on an issue that decides life or death for innocent human beings, they are telling you that they can't be trusted on *any* issue. The other thing they are telling you is that, if you vote for them, you are as big a fool as they are.

REAL Pro-Lifers Can't Ignore How Innocent Children Are Being Slaughtered

There are a lot of people who claim to be pro-life, which means that they acknowledge that the unborn are living human beings. After all, there is no other reason to be pro-life. But many of those people also say that they would not force their views on others and that abortion should be legal. So what they are saying, is that they would do nothing to prevent the mass executions of what they agree are living human beings. Now, these people may be able to look the other way while defenseless and innocent children are being slaughtered, but those of us in the pro-life movement are not. The truth is, we don't have a right to act on behalf of these children, we have a moral obligation to do so. And that is exactly what we are doing, because that is what any decent human being would do.

Hitting The Easy Button.

When politicians say that they are personally opposed to abortion, they are obviously agreeing that it takes the life of a living human being, since that is the only reason to oppose abortion. But then some of these same people will claim to be "*politically*" pro-choice because it is an area in which the government has no right to interfere. The question is, if the intentional killing of innocent human beings is off limits to the government, what right does it have to interfere in any issue? What we need to remember is that it's easy for born politicians to say that the government shouldn't interfere in the slaughter of the unborn. But you can be assured that if these cowards were in the baby's shoes, and some psychopath was about to slice them up with a knife, they wouldn't mind if the government interfered.

Are The "Personally Opposed" On Abortion Equally Tolerant On Other Issues?

Some people say they are personally opposed to abortion, but that they have no right, and the government has no right, to impose that belief on others. But what's interesting is that these people never seem to be this tolerant on other issues. We can assume that they are also personally opposed to rape, armed robbery, drunk driving, human trafficking, wife-beating, and a million other acts of violence. But in those cases, they are never reluctant to impose their personal beliefs on others, or have the government do so. The difference is, these people know that it's safe to be "*open-minded*" about abortion since they're already born. In other words, this is a position taken by cowards. They know that abortion is murder, but they don't have the courage or character to stand up against it.

Politicians Are Elected To Impose Beliefs

Some politicians claim to be pro-life, but say they would not impose their personal beliefs on others. But imposing their beliefs is what politicians are elected to do, and it's what every law they pass does. Besides, if they're not going to impose their own views, whose views are they going to impose? Let's also remember that unborn babies are slaughtered by the millions because the personal beliefs of pro-choice politicians are imposed on them. Look, the only reason for someone to be opposed to abortion is because they agree that the unborn are living human beings. So the question is: are there any other innocent human beings that these people think it should be legal to kill? Or is that a standard they reserve only for those human beings who can't fight back, have no money, and can't vote?

Pro-Choice Idiocy

THE BIZARRE AND DISHONEST RATIONALIZATIONS
THE PRO-CHOICE SIDE USES TO DEFEND ABORTION.



“Keep Your Rosaries Off My Ovaries!”

Those of us in the pro-life movement often hear the pro-choice mob telling us to keep our rosaries off their ovaries. Now if you happen to be one of those bewildered individuals who thinks the pro-life movement is trying to stake a claim to your ovaries, let me see if I can clear up a little of your confusion. First off, a lot of us are not Catholic and don't even have rosaries. But even if we did, we would not be using them to go after your ovaries. The fact is, we are as indifferent to your ovaries as we are to your spleens, your gall bladders and your tonsils. All we are trying to do is keep you from butchering helpless unborn children by the millions. That's it. So unless you are holding the abortion instruments with your ovaries, this is something you really don't need to be all that worried about.

“Consent To Sex Isn't Consent To Be Pregnant!”

In their attempt to justify abortion, you'll often hear the pro-choice mob argue that *“consent to sex is not consent to be pregnant.”* It's about as stupid a statement as saying that living on potato chips, Twinkies, and Dr. Pepper is not consent to be fat. The fact is, the possibility of pregnancy is a natural and predictable consequence of sexual activity, and unless a woman is a complete idiot, she knows this when she jumps into bed with someone. So the pro-choice mob can sugarcoat it all they want to, but having an abortion is just another way of saying, *“I will pay the psychopaths who work at the abortion clinic to butcher my child so I don't have to accept responsibility for my actions.”* And that makes it the ultimate combination of immaturity, selfishness and immorality.

“Since God Allows Millions Of Fetuses To Die In Miscarriages, God MUST Be OK With Abortions.”

Occasionally, someone in the pro-choice mob will say that, because pregnancies often end in miscarriage, this means that God is okay with children dying in the womb. I've even heard some of these people say that this makes God the world's number one abortionist. They're actually trying to sell the idea that there is no distinction between one baby dying in a natural miscarriage and another baby being intentionally killed in an elective abortion. Obviously, only a complete idiot would buy that. It's like saying that there is no distinction between one man dying from a heart attack, and another man being shot and killed by someone who's stealing his car. It's also a textbook example of the mind games the abortion lobby has to play in order to justify their wholesale slaughter of unborn children.

“Abortion is None Of The Government's Business!”

Some people argue that the government should stay out of the abortion issue altogether. Their chant is: don't subsidize it and don't prohibit it. Apparently, they think that this makes them seem reasonable. But imagine that back when slavery was legal, some pro-slavery advocates were saying that the government should just stay out of the slavery issue altogether by agreeing not to either subsidize it or prohibit it. Today, would anyone say that was a reasonable and thoughtful solution? Of course, not. The only time we hear this kind of mindless stupidity being said, is when someone is using it to justify killing the unborn. The fact is, when the government allows abortion, and sometimes even pays for abortions, only a moron would claim that the government is staying out of the abortion issue.

“A Heartbeat Doesn’t Make It Human!”

Some of the more simple-minded members of the pro-choice mob like to say that, just because a fetus has a heartbeat, that doesn’t mean they are human beings. They will point out that cows and dogs also have heartbeats, but that doesn’t make them human beings. So my question is this: when a doctor is examining a pregnant woman and listening to the fetal heartbeat, are they saying it’s possible that those heartbeats are coming from a cow or a dog? Or when the doctor does a sonogram on this woman, do they think that the image of an unborn cow or dog could pop up on the screen? I would also ask one of these nitwits to provide just one example in the entire history of the world where a woman gave birth to a cow or a dog — or anything else that was not a human being.

“Abortion Is ONLY 3% Of Planned Parenthood’s Overall Services.”

Planned Parenthood says that abortion is only three percent of the services they offer. It’s an example of that old saying, figures don’t lie, but liars do figure. Ask yourself this: if General Motors sells three cars for every ninety-seven spark plugs it sells through its parts departments, would you say that car sales are only three percent of what they do? Well, that’s exactly how Planned Parenthood comes up with their “*three percent*” figure. But even if they weren’t lying, so what? If the Ku Klux Klan proved that lynching was less than three percent of what they did, would that make lynching okay? Clearly not, and the same thing is true about Planned Parenthood. They are a bunch of psychopaths who are paid to butcher defenseless babies by the millions, and nothing else they do can make that right.

“You Have No Right To Tell Others What To Believe!”

One of the pro-choice mob’s favorite chants is that the pro-life movement has no right to tell others what to believe. It’s a diversionary tactic they use to take the focus off of abortion itself. The fact is, it is utterly absurd to claim that the pro-life movement is trying to control what people believe. We’re simply trying to bring legal protection to a class of innocent and helpless human beings who are being slaughtered by the millions. **Remember, laws are not passed to control beliefs, they are passed to control behavior.** That is what Martin Luther King meant when he said that the law could not make people love him, but it *could* keep people from lynching him. In this case, the pro-life movement has no interest in what people believe or don’t believe about the unborn – as long as they don’t kill them.

The Difference Between Pro-Choice & Pro-Abortion

Those who defend legal abortion angrily object to being called pro-abortion and insist on being referred to as pro-choice. The question is, why? Why do the same people who fight so viciously to keep abortion legal, also fight just as hard not to be associated with abortion? And is there any other issue in which people do this? If there is, I’ve never heard of it. But here’s the real question. For the children facing abortion, how is the term “*pro-choice*” different from the term “*pro-abortion*?” Both terms mean that some amoral psychopath has been paid to pull off their arms and legs, rip their body to shreds, crush their skulls, and toss their corpses into a dumpster. So again, for the ones most affected by abortion, what is the practical distinction between pro-choice and pro-abortion?

“It’s Nobody Else’s Business!”

The abortion lobby says that a woman’s decision to have an abortion is no one else’s business and that the law has no right to interfere in the personal and private choices that people make. And that would be true if no one else would be impacted by her decision. But it is absurd to call abortion a private and personal matter, when the biological and scientific evidence is overwhelming and undeniable that at least one other human being is intentionally killed every time an abortion takes place. In reality, abortion is no more a personal and private matter than is some pervert’s decision to have sex with a 5-year-old girl who lives in his neighborhood, and the moment we choose to look the other way at either one of these barbaric acts, we give up any right we ever had to call ourselves a civilized people.

Giving Thanks.

People who work in the abortion industry often claim that they get letters from women expressing gratitude for the service their clinics provide. But so what? I mean, if a man is having an affair, he is going to be grateful to his friends who help to keep his wife in the dark. If a hit-and-run driver runs over and kills a pedestrian, is he grateful to those who were in the car with him and didn’t call the police? If an alcoholic is always late for work, is he grateful to his co-workers who punch-in for him. The point is, there are many times when gratitude only means that someone did what someone else wanted them to do. But that doesn’t mean it was right. And the perfect example of that, is the woman who hires a group of serial killers to butcher her child, and is then grateful to them for having carried it out.

“Don’t Like Abortion? Don’t Have One.”

When you hear the pro-choice mob chant, “*If you don’t like abortion, don’t have one*” what you are seeing is their arrogance on full display. After all, you can be pretty sure that they wouldn’t be quite so pro-choice if they were the ones who might be chosen. But if they are serious about this concept, I think it’s one the pro-life movement could really get behind — as long as this same choice is offered to the baby. Remember, every time a mom has an abortion her baby also has one, so it seems only fair that the child be allowed to have a say in the matter. Of course, we can’t ask unborn children whether they would like to be butchered alive and then tossed in a dumpster or chopped up and sold for parts, but it’s safe to assume that their attitude would be that they don’t like abortion and don’t want to have one.

Where’s The Choice?

If abortion is indeed the toughest decision a woman will ever make, that makes it even more appalling that abortion is the only thing offered to them by the so-called “*pro-choice*” community. Where is the choice in that? The reality is, pregnant women are not all alike and their situations are not always the same. It is also true that, for every abortion clinic in America, there are several crisis pregnancy centers staffed and funded entirely by pro-life volunteers. These centers treat each woman as an individual with unique needs and they offer her solutions that match those needs. And they do so at no charge. Meanwhile, the abortion lobby sells a one-size-fits-all solution regardless of circumstances, and of course, it always comes with a price tag attached.

“Not All Planned Parenthoods Offer Abortions”

One way that Planned Parenthood tries to put a happy-face on their organization is by saying that most of their facilities don't actually do abortions. But my question is this: if abortion does not kill a living human being, and if abortion being legal truly benefits women and society, why would these people try to distance themselves from it? The obvious answer, of course, is that Planned Parenthood wants the money that comes with operating the nation's largest chain of abortion mills, they just don't want the image. Let's also not overlook the fact that there is not one Planned Parenthood facility in the entire United States that doesn't either perform abortions or refer for them. And those that only refer are every bit as guilty as the remorseless psychopaths who hold the knives.

“God Can Bring It Back At A Better Time.”

It is common for someone in the pro-choice mob to tell a woman who says she just isn't ready to have a baby, that she can get an abortion and ask God to bring the child back at a better time. This is, of course, nonsense. In the first place, if she's pregnant she is having a baby whether she is ready or not. Her only option is to have a live baby or a dead baby. As for this *“bring-it-back-at-a-better-time”* idea, do these people honestly think that women are stupid enough to really believe that they can talk God into joining them in some bizarre conspiracy in which He puts their unborn babies back on the shelf and then brings them back at a more convenient time? That is the very definition of stupidity. The fact is, a woman who submits to abortion might have another baby one day, but the baby she kills is dead forever.

“Abortion Is Just A Simple Medical Procedure.”

In a desperate attempt to remove the stigma of abortion, some members of the pro-choice mob are now arguing that abortion is just a simple medical procedure that only takes a few minutes and that having one is no big deal. But at the same time, they continue to argue that, because abortion is the toughest decision a woman will ever have to make, no one else has the right to interfere. Now obviously, abortion can't be *“no big deal”* while also being the toughest decision a woman will ever have to make, but the pro-choice mob needs both arguments so they flip back and forth depending on who their audience is.

The Question Of Consent.

One truly moronic thing you hear from the pro-choice mob is that just because a woman consented to sex, that doesn't mean she consented to be pregnant. Of course, mature and intelligent people accept that actions have consequences, and one consequence of sex is the risk of pregnancy. But this discussion raises an interesting question. The abortion lobby says that they are fighting for equal rights for women. So let's say that when a woman consents to sex, she is not consenting to have a baby, does that also apply to the man? In other words, if she gets pregnant and he says he never consented to having a baby, does he have any responsibility to support that child? If he does, then what we are saying is that when a man and a woman have sex, only the man is consenting to have a baby. Where is the equality in that?

Don't Like The Truth?

You often hear the pro-choice mob defend abortion by saying, *"If you don't like abortion, don't have one."* But to see how truly idiotic this statement is, imagine that when slavery was legal, someone said to those who were opposed to it, *"If you don't like slavery, don't own one."* And let's also remember that the people who spout this *"don't like abortion, don't have one"* nonsense, are the same ones who scream that making abortion illegal will cause women to die in dangerous back-alley abortions. So the question is, when abortion is made illegal, are these people going to be telling women, *"If you don't want to die in an illegal abortion, don't have one."*

Who Is "Helping" Who?

The pro-choice mob often says that no one has the right to interfere in the decisions a woman makes regarding her unplanned pregnancy. So let's examine that issue. When a woman is in this situation, some people offer her food, shelter, clothing, car seats, diapers, formula, legal advice, pre-natal care, and a bunch of other products and services that she might need to care for herself and her baby. These people are called *"pro-lifers"* and they fund the crisis pregnancy centers across America that provide this help at no charge. They are said to be *"interfering."* A second group of people are called *"pro-choice"* and, for a fee, they will kill the woman's baby. It's a choice that even the pro-choice side admits no woman wants to make, but it's all they'll do for her. They are said to be *"helping."*

“These Children Are Forced To Lead Terrible Lives”

The pro-choice mob points out that some children are forced to lead terrible lives and their suggestion is that abortion is better than that. In other words, we're going to kill these children for their own good. But even if we buy into this perverted logic, how do we identify which unborn children will lead these terrible lives so we don't accidentally butcher some who might have lived good lives? Should only women who promise to give their children terrible lives be allowed to have abortions? We also know that a lot of children who are already born live terrible lives. So should we kill them as well? After all, if it is compassionate to kill children who might live a terrible life someday in the future, surely it is even more compassionate to kill children who are living terrible lives right now.

The Government Has No Right To Come Into Our Bedrooms!”

One of the most idiotic arguments made by the pro-choice mob is that the government has no right to come into our bedrooms. Of course, the obvious flaw in this argument is that abortions are not usually done in bedrooms. But let's say for a moment that they were. So what? The bedroom is not a sanctuary from the law. In fact, there are a lot of illegal activities that take place in bedrooms. Spouses shoot each other in bedrooms; children get sexually assaulted in bedrooms; people do heroin in bedrooms – the list goes on and on. The point is, the abortion issue has nothing to do with keeping the government out of our bedrooms. It has to do with the wholesale slaughter of innocent human beings, and that is a crime against humanity whether it takes place in a bedroom, in a hospital, or in a cow pasture.

WHY Abortion Is The Toughest Decision

The pro-choice mob says that, because abortion is the toughest decision a woman will ever make, that means it's no one else's business. That is pure idiocy. It's like saying that if a man kills his wife in order to collect on her life insurance policy, it's nobody else's business because it was the toughest decision he ever had to make. Of course, the real question abortion defenders try so desperately to avoid is why having an abortion is such a tough decision. And the answer is that, within every rational woman, is the knowledge that when she has an abortion, she is murdering her own baby. And you know what, that should be a tough decision. I mean, just how cold blooded or mentally wacked out would a woman have to be to say that killing her own baby was not a tough decision?

“I’m Against Abortion But...”

Some people say they are against abortion and would never have one, but they don't think it should be illegal. What these people are trying to do is have the moral high ground of the pro-life position without having to actually be pro-life. Look, the only reason to be against abortion is the recognition that it takes the life of a living human being. So what these people are saying is, *“I know abortion is murder and I would never kill my own baby, but if other people want to kill their babies that's their business.”* That is the definition of cowardice. Being pro-life means defending the life of every unborn child, not just your own. Claiming to be against abortion while saying that it should be legal, is like saying, *“I'm against incest but if other people want to have sex with their children that's up to them.”*

What Makes Someone An Abortionist?

People who do abortions often object to being labeled an “*abortionist*” because they say abortions are only a tiny part of their overall practice and that they never do more than a few of them during any given month. Of course, you have to be pretty simple-minded to buy into that nonsense. It’s like some guy claiming that he’s not really a child molester since he never molests more one or two children a month. The fact is, there is no minimum number of children you have to molest before you can rightly be called a child molester. And the same thing is true about elective abortion. When you intentionally kill even one unborn baby, by definition that makes you an abortionist. Now for those members of the medical community who find that label offensive, here’s a perfect way to avoid it: **don’t do abortions.**

“Abortion Is Just An Induced Miscarriage.”

Abortion defenders often cite miscarriage as evidence that God is okay with abortion. Some of them even say that abortions are really just induced miscarriages. What they conveniently ignore is the gigantic difference between a death that occurs naturally or through an act of God, and one that is intentionally caused by another person. To see the stupidity of their argument, imagine that some guy is accused of murder and his defense is that it’s no big deal since thousands of people die from cancer every year. Well that is no different, and no more idiotic, than the pro-choice mob saying that because babies die in miscarriages, it’s okay to kill them in abortions. But in their demented minds, the right to choose which babies get to live and which babies have to die is shared equally between man and God.

Is EVERY Unplanned Pregnancy A Tragedy?

The abortion industry tries to paint this picture that every unplanned pregnancy is a tragedy. But the truth is that, every year, millions of very loved children are born from unplanned – and sometimes even unwanted – pregnancies. Now, for those women who do see their unplanned pregnancies as a tragedy, let me point out a couple of things. First, killing the baby is simply stacking one tragedy on top of another. And if the abortionist injures or kills the mom, yet another tragedy is tossed onto the pile. The second thing to remember is that tragedies usually attract vultures. Hurricanes attract looters, car wrecks attract ambulance-chasing lawyers, and unplanned pregnancies attract abortionists. And of course, all of these vultures show up for the same reason. It's called money.

“No Woman Wants To Have An Abortion.”

The pro-choice mob says that abortion is a decision no woman ever wants to make, and that women only have abortions when they need to. But if these people honestly believe that is true, then why do they spend billions of dollars and every waking hour fighting for women to end up with something that even they admit no woman wants? Remember this: for every abortion clinic in America there are several crisis pregnancy centers, staffed and funded entirely by the pro-life movement and offering their services for free to women with unplanned pregnancies. But meanwhile, the only thing the pro-choice mob will do for these women is sell them abortions they don't want.

“No One Really Knows When Life Begins.”

In our legal system, the defendant in a capital murder trial doesn't have to prove anything because he or she is assumed to be innocent. The burden of proof belongs to the prosecution. But the pro-choice argument is that we should take the opposite approach when it comes to the unborn. They say that it's okay to kill them because no one really knows when life begins. It would be like a judge saying to a defendant, *“We're really not sure whether you're guilty or not, but we're going to execute you anyway.”* Obviously, a civilized society would never tolerate that, but it is exactly what the pro-choice mob says to the unborn. Of course, the bigger issue is that there is no longer any question about whether the unborn are living human beings or not. Science and technology settled that question years ago.

Public Opinion

**AMERICA'S "PRO-CHOICE MAJORITY" IS
NOTHING MORE THAN SMOKE AND MIRRORS.**



The “Pro-Choice Majority” Scam

When *Roe v. Wade* was trashed, the abortion lobby ratcheted up their claim that the vast majority of Americans are pro-choice. But remember, their definition of choice is that abortion should be legal through all nine months of pregnancy, for any reason whatsoever, for no reason whatsoever, paid for with tax dollars, and done on minor girls without their parents' knowledge. And there has never been one poll of the American people that found anything close to majority support for that position. The fact is, if the pro-choice mob believed that the “*pro-choice majority*” actually existed, they would not have spent the last fifty years fighting to keep the abortion issue out of the legislative process where public opinion rules, and in the courts where public opinion is virtually irrelevant.

What A Post-Abortion America Looks Like

Before a state decides what its abortion policies will be in the future, maybe it would be wise to ask what legalized abortion has brought us in the past. Has it made us a better people? Has it made America a more civilized nation? Has killing the unborn increased our respect for human life? Has legal abortion actually solved any of the social problems we were told would be addressed by legal abortion? In other words, what have been the practical benefits of sacrificing children by the tens-of-millions? If we can't provide positive answers to those simple questions, then we are left with the two biggest questions of all ... what did these children die for, and why should the killings continue?

Troubling Times

In order to seem reasonable, some members of the pro-choice mob will claim that they are personally troubled by late term abortions. They tell this lie because they are stuck between a rock and a hard place. On one hand, they don't care one way or the other about late term abortions, but on the other hand they realize that they are indefensible and a public relations nightmare for the abortion lobby. But I have a couple of questions for these people. First, if early in pregnancy the unborn are just worthless clumps of cells that can be disposed of at will, when do they turn into something that causes you to be so troubled about killing them? And second, what is the biological process that causes this incredible transformation to take place and in what scientific journal is it described?

United In Insanity

The pro-choice mob says there is no consensus in America for outlawing abortion. Of course, it is well known that polling on abortion is notoriously unreliable, so that may or may not be true. But so what if it is? History is overrun with examples where consensus simply meant that most of the fools and idiots were on one side of an issue. And it wasn't always the right side. Remember, at one time the consensus was that the earth is flat, and for much of American history there was no consensus for outlawing slavery or for allowing women to vote. What we need to understand is that consensus does not create truth; truth is supposed to create consensus. And in this case, the truth is that abortion takes the life of an innocent and helpless human being.

One Versus One Hundred

Today, about half of all the abortions done in America are on women who've had at least one prior abortion, and it is not uncommon for woman to have several abortions. Of course, the pro-choice crowd knows that this doesn't line up with their claim that women use abortion responsibly and only in the most difficult of circumstances. So to cover their tracks, some of them will say that even they don't favor women having multiple abortions. But if abortion's not murder, then why would it be wrong for a woman to have 10 or 20 or even a hundred of them? The fact is, abortion is murder regardless of how often it happens. And by the way, only a complete idiot would think that the abortion industry is really concerned about some women buying too many abortions. After all, those are their best customers.

Survey Says....

The abortion lobby claims that there is a pro-choice majority in America. But when people are asked specific questions about when, and under what circumstances, abortion should be legal, almost none of them say it should be legal on-demand up to the moment of birth without restrictions. Even most of those who identify as pro-choice say it should be limited to the so-called "hard cases" like rape, incest, to save the mother's life, and fetal deformity. And since even statistics put out by the abortion industry show that only a tiny fraction of abortions are done for those reasons, that means most people do not support most of the abortions that are actually done. The simple fact is, abortion is being used as back-up birth control, and no poll has ever shown anything close to majority support for that.

That's No Excuse!

That's No Excuse!

THE PRO-CHOICE SIDE'S MOST UNDERHANDED DEFENSES FOR ABORTION.



All That Glitters Is Not Gold.

The pro-choice mob says that abortions often allow women to have successful careers that they could not have had if they were saddled with a baby. And if their point is that it's possible to profit from killing other people, they're right. In fact, it happens all the time. So let's say a man takes out a large life insurance policy on his wife and then drowns her a few months later. But the authorities can't find enough evidence to convict him, so he gets away with it. Then he uses the insurance money to become a successful businessman who employs hundreds of people. He also donates a lot of money to support homeless shelters and other charities. Since none of this would have happened if he had not murdered his wife, do we say that what he did is okay?

Every Child A Wanted Child

One of the pro-choice mob's standard rationalizations for abortion is that every child should be a wanted child. In other words, as long as we label a child "*unwanted*," it should be legal to kill them. Of course, the truth is that the right to life of a human being is not is not determined by whether someone else wants them or not. In fact, there are large groups of people that the world might classify as unwanted, but that does not mean it's okay to kill them. In the case of abortion, the pro-choice mob wants us to assume that all unwanted pregnancies produce unwanted children. It's a lie, but even if it was true, it doesn't change the fact that the unborn are living human beings who have a right not to be killed.

Do Reasons Matter?

The pro-choice mob angrily opposes the term “*abortions of convenience*” and claims that women never use abortion frivolously, but only in situations of legitimate necessity. At the same time, they also claim that legal abortion is a human right to which every woman is entitled. But if that’s true, what difference does it make why women have them? If abortion is a right, then a conceptual artist who gets pregnant on purpose to have a dead fetus that she can use in a sculpture, is as entitled to have an abortion as the woman who is pregnant from a vicious rape and carrying a severely handicapped child. The irony is, the fact that abortion advocates go to such great lengths to pretend that women always have legitimate reasons to kill their unborn babies, is proof that even they know it is not a right.

Should We Be Bringing More Children Into The World?

You often hear the pro-choice mob trying to rationalize abortion by saying that, the way things are going today, we shouldn’t be bringing more children into the world. But if the unborn are not already “*in the world,*” where are they? I mean, is the abortion lobby asking us to believe that the womb some sort of alternative universe? Also, this argument implies that abortions are done for the benefit of those who are being aborted. That is preposterous, but if we’re actually going to buy into this “*kill ‘em for their own good*” mentality, shouldn’t we be putting all the born children in the world into gas chambers? After all, if it’s compassionate to execute the unborn to keep them from living in a bad environment, shouldn’t born children be entitled to the same consideration?

Adopting ALL The Unwanted Children.

The pro-choice mob often asks the pro-life movement whether we are willing to adopt all the unwanted children who will be born if abortion is outlawed. But when we say that we will gladly accept that responsibility if they will agree to stop killing them, they suddenly look the other way. Of course, the real issue here is that the basis of their argument is preposterous to begin with. Imagine this: let's say that I prevent a terrorist from shooting down an airliner and killing the three hundred people onboard. Would anyone be demanding to know how I plan to take care of all those people? Well, as stupid as that sounds, it is exactly what the pro-life movement is often told about our efforts to stop the unborn from being killed. It is a sorry excuse for murder, and it would never even be tried anywhere else.

No Regrets

No Regrets

THE PRO-CHOICE MOB'S LIES THEY TELL TO MAKE ABORTION
– AND ABORTIONISTS – SEEM LESS DISGUSTING.



Survey Says...

The abortion lobby says that women almost never regret their abortions. To test this claim, I propose an independent national survey of women who had unplanned pregnancies in their past. Those who aborted will be asked if they now wish that they had given birth, and those who gave birth will be asked if they now wish they had aborted. Of course, the pro-choice mob would never go along with this because they know that for every woman who would say that she regrets letting her child live, thousands would say that they regret killing theirs. The fact is, regrets over abortion decisions are only experienced by women who have them – not by those who don't. In fact, what we should be most concerned about is the mental health of any woman who pays some goon to murder her child, and then says she has no remorse about it.

Standing On Shaky Ground

When the pro-choice mob is forced to concede that some women do have emotional problems after their abortions, their usual explanation is that these women either had these problems before their abortions, or they developed them afterwards for reasons that had nothing to do with the abortion. In other words, the abortion lobby's position is that the only women who might be emotionally traumatized by their abortions, are those whose mental health is a little sketchy to begin with. But if a woman has issues that might cause her to regret her abortion, shouldn't that be discovered during the "counselling" she supposedly gets at the abortion clinic? And shouldn't she be advised that abortion may not be in her best interests? After all, no sane woman ever regretted not killing her baby.

A Lack Of Regret Means Nothing.

The abortion lobby claims that women almost never regret their abortions. But if that's true, why are there are support groups all over America to help women overcome the emotional train wreck of abortion, but no support groups for women traumatized by their decision not to have an abortion. The fact is, those groups don't exist because the only women traumatized by an abortion decision are those who choose to kill their babies, not those who chose to let their babies live. Remember, a lack of regret relates to the morals and the conscience of the person acting, but it does not justify what they did. I mean, if some pervert rapes and murders a little five-year-old girl, whether he regrets it or not is irrelevant. And that applies to every decision people make — including abortion.

What About The Road Not Taken?

When someone robs a convenience store and kills the clerk, do they ever think about the person they killed while they are spending that money? Or does the man who murdered his wife to collect on a life insurance policy, ever think about the woman he killed so that he could live the kind of life he wanted to live? Well, that same question could be asked of women who have abortions. The pro-choice mob says that legalized abortion allows women to have successful careers that they would not have been able to have if they were saddled with babies. But when these women see a little boy taking his first steps, or a pretty ten-year-old girl laughing with her friends, do they ever think about their own children who were killed and tossed into dumpsters, so that they could live the kind of life they wanted to live?

Conscience Of A Nation.

The pro-choice mob says that women almost never regret their abortions. It's a lie they tell to make abortion — and abortionists — seem less disgusting. But let's say for a moment that it's true. So what? The reality is, every pregnant woman knows what she is pregnant with, and if her maternal instincts have decayed to the point that she can hire some abortion industry psychopath to kill that baby — and then have no remorse about it — it could mean that she has no conscience. Ironically, it may be that women who are emotionally or psychologically damaged by their abortions, are mentally healthier than those who are not. We also need to ask ourselves what the long-term future is for a nation that produces large numbers of people who are capable of killing their own children with no regrets.

Safety First!

Safety First!

THE ABORTION INDUSTRY'S LINE THAT ABORTION IS SAFER THAN CHILDBIRTH.



Is Abortion Safer Than Childbirth?

When a woman dies from a legal abortion, the pro-choice mob and their media stooges immediately go into damage control mode and start talking about how much safer abortion is than childbirth. It's a lie, of course, and they never mention the possibility that, when a woman dies during childbirth, she may have had Asherman's Syndrome, placenta accreta, placenta previa, or an ectopic pregnancy – all of which could have been the result of a prior abortion. The fact is, given the advances in modern medicine, if someone is talking about how dangerous childbirth is, you can bet that they're trying to rationalize abortion. Just remember, in the abortion lobby, the company line is that abortion is about as risky as a manicure, but pregnancy and childbirth is a mine field from which women rarely come out alive.

Does Abortion Prevent Deaths Due To Childbirth?

The pro-choice mob often claims that legalized abortion prevents deaths due to childbirth. To see just how phony this argument is, ask a thousand physicians if they warn all their female patients not to get pregnant because childbirth is so dangerous. And ask those same physicians if they advise all of their patients who are already pregnant to have abortions. After all, if pregnancy is as dangerous as the abortion lobby wants us to believe, and if abortion is safer than childbirth, that would be sound medical advice. Obviously, these are preposterous ideas, but you'd have to be pretty gullible to think that this "*deadly childbirth*" argument has anything to do with protecting women. In reality, the only thing it's intended to protect is the abortion industry.

Safety Risk!

The pro-choice mob claims that abortion is justified because it saves the lives of women who might die in childbirth. But if we carry that line of reasoning to its logical conclusion, then we should also allow parents to kill their born children. After all, they sometimes cause the death of a parent through an accident. And crime statistics also show that a certain number of born children will grow up to one day abuse — or even murder — one or both of their parents. So we could save every mom and dad who might one day be killed by one of their own children, by allowing them to kill those children first. Of course, this is a totally outrageous suggestion. But it is no more outrageous than saying it's okay to kill unborn children by the millions, because a tiny percentage of them pose a risk to one of their parents.

Science Deniers

**THE BIGGEST SCIENCE DENIERS ON THIS PLANET
ARE THE PEOPLE WHO DEFEND LEGAL ABORTION.**



Following The Science... On Abortion

The godless left always is always lecturing the rest of us to “*follow the science.*” But somehow, when the abortion issue comes up, all of a sudden science is off the table. In just one example, these people are constantly bringing up the issue of climate change, but their position on abortion is that each individual woman should be allowed to decide what is true about her unborn child. And yet, there is far more scientific proof that unborn children are living human beings than there is scientific proof that climate change is caused by human activity. Of course, the claim that abortion takes a human life is no longer just an opinion. Modern science and technology have proven it. And what that means is, the biggest science deniers on this planet are the people who defend legal abortion.

Denying The Holocaust

As incredible as it is, there are people who say that the Nazi holocaust never happened. They’re called “*holocaust deniers*” and they have decided to ignore all the films, all the books, all the photos, all the military accounts, all the government records, and all the personal testimonies because these things don’t support their sketchy political agenda. To any rational person this seems incomprehensible, but the truth is that we now live in a nation full of holocaust deniers. Only the holocaust they are denying did not take place 80 years ago in Germany, it’s happening right now in America. It’s called legalized abortion and, one day, the world is going to look back and wonder how this could have happened in a nation that considers itself sophisticated and civilized.

Scientific Nonsense

Isn't it odd that so many of the people who claim to be "*pro-science*" immediately throw science out the window when it comes to abortion and the unborn child. All of a sudden, "*choice*" is all that matters and science is irrelevant. In this alternative universe, two people can see the image of an unborn child on a sonogram screen, and one can argue that it is, indeed, an unborn human being while the other one can dismiss it as just a clump of cells. And somehow, both of them can be right! Look, the undeniable fact is, to justify abortion you have to either believe that the unborn are not living human beings, or you have to believe that – even if they are living human beings – it's okay to butcher them by the millions. Of course, the first position is scientific nonsense and the second one cannot be morally defended.

Welcome To The Stupid Age!

There are some incredible ironies in the battle over abortion, but one of them really stands out. In the early nineteen seventies, ultrasound technology made it possible to see the unborn child for the first time. Their humanity was no longer just philosophical or theological, it was an observable and undeniable fact. But about that same time, governments around the world – including the United States – started making elective abortion legal. In other words, long before anyone had ever seen an unborn child, laws were enacted to protect their lives. But when the time came that we could actually see that they are living human beings, we started butchering them by the millions. You know, there was an Ice Age, an Iron Age, and a Stone Age, and my guess is that this will one day be known as the Stupid Age.

Sex Education

INVITING AMORAL HUSTLERS INTO THE
CLASSROOM TO TEACH OUR CHILDREN ABOUT SEX



“Sex Education Reduces The Abortion Rate.”

Abortion defenders say that the pro-life movement is hypocritical for opposing sex education since it would reduce the abortion rate. They are lying. What the pro-life movement opposes are the sex education programs that have produced an epidemic of promiscuity, teen pregnancy, abortion, and sexually transmitted diseases. The real question is, why do organizations like Planned Parenthood continue to push these programs despite these well-known failures? And the answer is that, for them, these programs have not failed. To the contrary, they continue to provide a reliable stream of customers for their birth control pills, abortions, and STD treatments. The fact is, allowing these amoral hustlers to teach our children about sex is like hiring crack dealers to teach them about drugs.

The Truth About Value-Neutral Sex Education

In the 1960s, groups like Planned Parenthood started introducing what they called “*value-neutral contraception-based*” sex education into the nation’s school systems. Their sales pitch was that the way to deal with the relatively small teen pregnancy problem that existed at that time, was to isolate sex from morality and teach kids the mechanics of having sex without getting pregnant. Of course, this concept was not value-neutral at all, it simply replaced traditional values with Planned Parenthood values. The result was an epidemic of promiscuity, teen pregnancy, abortion, sexually transmitted diseases, and children having sex at younger ages. And with that, “*value-neutral contraception-based*” sex education became a cash cow for the organizations that were pushing it.

Is Abstinence Realistic?

Planned Parenthood and the rest of the abortion lobby argues that sex-ed programs based on abstinence are not realistic. But let's say that a teenage girl tells her parents that her boyfriend is pressuring her to have sex but she doesn't want to. Should her parents tell her that she is being unrealistic to expect him to be abstinent? Obviously not. But if a teenage boy can abstain because his girlfriend doesn't want to have sex, then he can also abstain because he has been taught that it is the right thing to do. The fact is, the most unrealistic thing of all is to expect kids to have higher standards than what their parents and society expects from them. So don't be fooled, the abortion lobby doesn't reject abstinence because it is unrealistic, they reject it because they can't make money off of abstinent kids.

Is Birth Control The Way To Prevent Abortions?

Is birth control the way to prevent abortions? Well the evidence is that pushing contraception increases sexual activity at a higher rate than it increases the use of the contraception, and that gap produces an increase in pregnancies. It's also true that many common forms of contraception can act as abortions. Although the manufacturers of birth control chemicals and devices say their products are intended to prevent fertilization, they will concede that if their product fails to do that, it can also keep the fertilized egg from implanting. Of course, when that happens, the pregnancy was not prevented it was aborted. In the case of IUDs, they are marketed as contraception despite the fact they are specifically designed to prevent implantation, not fertilization. **Again, that is abortion.**

The Million Dollar Business Plan

When Planned Parenthood began getting into the schools, sexually active boys were seen as just *“sowing their wild oats”* but girls were expected to *“remain pure”* until marriage. It was called the double standard and it needed to go. But these social engineers knew that if they started pushing for higher standards from boys, the demand for birth control pills, abortions, and sexually transmitted disease treatments would go away. But if they could lower the standards for girls, the demand would go up. And that’s what their contraception-based sex education was designed to do. In effect, it was not a social policy, it was a business plan – and it worked. Every year these people rake in hundreds of millions of dollars to patch up problems that their sex education system created in the first place.

Problem Solving

**AS A SOLUTION TO SOCIAL PROBLEMS, ABORTION
IS INEFFECTIVE AND MORALLY INDEFENSIBLE.**



What Kind Of Country Do We Want To Be?

The pro-choice mob has always pushed abortion as a solution to social problems. It's the standard eugenics argument that says any social problem can be solved if we will just eliminate enough of the right people. The problem is, abortion on demand has been legal for decades, and yet every social problem America faced when the first baby was executed has gotten worse. As it turns out, this idea that abortion could be used to solve social problems is just a self-serving lie told by people who support the abortion industry. But let's just say for a moment that our social problems had been helped by killing babies, would that justify those killing? I mean, do we really want America to be the kind of country that uses child sacrifice as a tool of social engineering? Are we not better people than that?

Helping People "Who Are Already Here"

The abortion lobby says that the pro-life movement should spend its resources helping people who are already here. But of course, the unborn are already here. If that's not true, then where are they? Let's also not forget that there are over three thousand crisis pregnancy centers in America that are funded and staffed by pro-lifers and providing their services for free. There are also thousands of other organizations and ministries that take care of those in need, and a lot of their support comes from pro-lifers. But for now, let's just say that not one pro-lifer anywhere in the world is doing anything to help anyone. And let's say that we really don't care about children after they're born. The question is, how would that give the pro-choice mob the right to kill them before they are born?

"How Many Children Have YOU Adopted?"

In order to justify abortion, the pro-choice mob will often bring up the tragic circumstances some born children live in. Then they try to paint pro-lifers as hypocritical by asking how many of those children we've adopted. Of course, a lot of children have been adopted by pro-life people, but that's irrelevant. To see just how idiotic this question is, imagine that you step in to protect a 5-year-old child that some guy is beating with a bat. But you're told it's none of your business because you haven't adopted any children. As stupid as that sounds, it is exactly what the pro-choice mob is saying. Their sales pitch is that, unless the pro-life movement is working to solve all the social problems faced by born children, then we have no right to keep them from butchering unborn children.

Does Abortion Help Deal With Overpopulation?

Although it is highly debatable whether overpopulation is really a problem, the pro-choice mob continues to use it to justify their baby-killing business. But it's well known that our country's population growth is not caused by too many babies being born, it's caused by people living longer. Given that fact, why aren't we enforcing a legal limit on how long people are allowed to live? And why aren't we passing legislation to prohibit any new research, drugs or medical treatments that might cause people to live longer? Of course, these ideas are outrageous, but if we're truly concerned about overpopulation, and if we know that it's caused by people living too long, and if we see killing people as an acceptable solution, then bumping off the elderly makes a lot more sense than going after the unborn.

Where's The Payoff?

When the pro-choice mob pushes abortion as a solution to social problems, what they're talking about is called eugenics. It's the concept that society's problems can be solved by eliminating certain groups of people. The interesting thing is that people who advocate eugenics, never seem willing to give up their own lives to solve social problems. They only insist that other people give their lives. In this case, it's the unborn. Of course, not only is the concept of abortion-based eugenics morally indefensible, it obviously doesn't work. After all, we've killed our nation's children by the tens-of-millions, and we're still executing them every day. And yet, the social problems America faced when we began this holocaust, haven't gotten better – they've gotten worse. So where's the payoff?

"Pro-Lifers Only Care About Children In The Womb."

One of the pro-choice mob's favorite tactics is to claim that pro-lifers only care about children in the womb and that, once they are born, we don't care what happens to them. To back it up, they say we're not doing anything about homelessness, hunger, child abuse, poverty, problems in the foster care system, or any other social problem affecting born children. Of course, that is a bald-faced lie but, even if it was true, it is still a completely idiotic argument. It's like saying that people who support breast cancer research are hypocrites, if aren't doing anything about diabetes, kidney disease, and Alzheimer's. But the real issue is, let's say it's true that the pro-life movement really doesn't care about born children, how does that justify butchering unborn children?

Does Abortion Prevent Starving Children?

Abortion defenders try to rationalize abortion by saying there are already millions of starving children in the world. But among the babies they slaughter, the number who might have one day lived in hunger is tiny and the number who might have starved to death is, essentially, zero. The fact is, the problem of starving children is almost exclusively limited to third-world nations with poor farming techniques or poor food distribution systems, or corrupt political leaders who don't care if their people starve. And we could kill every unborn child in America for the next hundred years, and it would not solve even one of those problems. But despite that, the abortion lobby is still pushing this idea that killing children is the solution to starving children.

Banning Abortion Increases The Number Of Children Being Abused!"

The abortion lobby warns us that outlawing abortion will increase the number of children being abused. Of course, they offer no evidence that unplanned – or even unwanted – children are any more likely to be abused than planned or wanted ones. But what we do know is that, after abortion became legal in 1973, we started seeing an increase in child abuse. Given that fact, it's time for the pro-choice mob to answer a couple of questions. First, if abortion reduces child abuse, and given that you've killed unborn children by the tens of millions, where did all the children who are being abused today come from? And second, how many more children do you have to kill before your plan starts to work? Or is the idea of preventing child abuse by executing the potential victims about as stupid as it sounds.

"Every Child A Wanted Child"

One of the abortion cartel's standard chants is *"every child a wanted child."* But it's time someone set the record straight about this nonsense. First off, civilized societies don't kill innocent and helpless people just because someone else doesn't want them. Second, if a baby is not wanted, that is a statement about the attitudes, the character, and the morals of the parents. It has nothing to do with the value or status of the baby. Third, the abortion lobby wants us to believe that every child they butcher is unwanted. But that is a lie. When someone applies to adopt a baby, it will take them years and thousands of dollars to get to the top of the list. So in other words, legalized abortion is not about killing babies that no one wants, it's about killing babies that people are standing in line for.

When Do We Start Seeing Results?

One of the abortion lobby's sales pitches is that abortion solves social problems. Today, they've had decades to prove their point and no one can say that they've been stingy in carrying out the death sentences. They've already slaughtered the unborn by the tens-of-millions and the pile of corpses continues to grow every day. Meanwhile, we've had increases in homelessness, hunger, welfare, poverty, child abuse, spousal abuse, divorce, gang violence, drug addiction, suicide, sexually transmitted diseases, high school drop outs, and the list goes on and on. But the pro-choice mob continues to say that the social problems that got worse after abortion was made legal, will get worse if it is made illegal. So how does that work, and how many babies have to be killed before we start seeing results?

Solving Hunger

One way the pro-choice mob tries to justify abortion is by talking about hunger. But if we're going to address that problem by killing people, wouldn't it be more efficient to kill adults? After all, they eat more. So all we have to do is come up with an age at which we think people consume more food than the benefits they provide to society, and when someone reaches that age we simply "*put them down.*" And since abortion clinics are already set up for this sort of thing, adding the elderly to their customer base would be easy. We could also expect the government to fund this program since killing these folks would be cheaper than keeping them on Medicare and Social Security. Any way you look at it, if killing people is the way to address social issues, it's stupid to limit ourselves to the unborn.

The Disease Of Unwantedness

The abortion lobby continues to ask who's going to pay for all the unwanted children who will be born if abortion is made illegal. But before abortion was legalized, no one was complaining about hoards of "unwanted" children draining the American economy. In fact, this argument didn't crop up until the pro-choice mob discovered how much money could be made killing babies. The truth is, the "*disease of unwantedness*" was invented by the abortion industry to create a market for their product. But so far, they've executed unborn babies by the tens-of-millions, and yet every category of people who might be classified as unwanted has gone up. So the question becomes: if abortion is the cure for unwantedness, where did all these unwanted people come from?

The Abortion Tax

THEY'RE "PRO-CHOICE" WHEN IT COMES TO WOMEN HAVING ABORTIONS,
BUT "NO-CHOICE" WHEN IT COMES TO US BEING FORCED TO PAY FOR THEM.



"The Government Should Fund Abortions For The Poor!"

The pro-choice mob argues that the government should fund abortions for the poor so taxpayers don't have to pay to raise their children. And few issues show the abysmal immorality of these people better than this one. Just imagine that the two-year-old daughter of a poor family has fallen into an abandoned well. Authorities calculate that a funeral is a cheaper than a rescue, and even if she survives she will probably be on welfare for the rest of her life. So they decide to just flood the well with water, wait for the little girl's corpse to float to the top, and then bury her. It's a monstrous idea, but if we are willing to reduce taxes by aborting the unborn children of the poor, why would we suddenly lose our nerve when it comes to killing their born children?

Redefining "Private."

The pro-choice mob says that abortion is a private matter and the government has no right to be involved. But at the same time, they demand that the government use taxpayer money to buy abortions for other people. Apparently, they are "*pro-choice*" when it comes to women having abortions, but "*no-choice*" when it comes to you and me being forced to pay for them. Look, just because someone has the right to do something, that doesn't mean the taxpayers are obligated to pay for it. We have the right to buy new cars, but the government doesn't buy them for us. We have the right to own guns, but the government doesn't hand out free pistols to those who can't afford them. And we have freedom of religion, but imagine what would happen if poor churches started demanding free Bibles from the government.

"Governments Often Pay For Things Taxpayers Disagree With."

When the abortion lobby demands government funding for abortion, they often argue that it is common for governments to pay for things that some taxpayers disagree with. One example they give is that people opposed to war have to pay taxes that fund the military. What they conveniently leave out is that military contractors never argue that national defense is none of the government's business. But in this case, the same people who say that the government has no right to be involved in the abortion issue, demand that the government give them money to pay for abortions. Apparently, in the bizarre world of pro-choice "*reasoning*," it's possible to pay for something without being involved in it. So just because some guy hires a hit man to kill his wife, that doesn't mean he's involved in her murder.

The Abortion Industry

INCOMPETENT DOCTORS LIKE ABORTION BECAUSE THEY KNOW IT'S THEIR LAST CHANCE TO HAVE A JOB IN THE MEDICAL COMMUNITY.



"Doctors Don't Do Abortions For The Money!"

The abortion lobby says that their doctors don't do abortions for the money since there is more money in delivering babies than doing abortions. But that's irrelevant. The fact is, when someone's medical career has deteriorated to the point that they are working at an abortion clinic, the choice they have is not between doing abortions or delivering babies; it's between doing abortions or being out of work. For proof of that, just look at the kind of people who go into the abortion industry and what you quickly find is that they are not exactly the cream of the crop. To the contrary, they are not only moral degenerates, they are also the washouts and losers of the medical community. In fact, if it weren't for the abortion business, these people would not be driving Cadillacs, they'd be washing them.

Strange Allies Of The Pro-Abortion Movement

An often overlooked aspect of the abortion lobby is that it is a living example of the old saying, "*Politics makes strange bedfellows.*" In this case, the bed fellows are overpopulation doomsayers who like abortion because it wipes out a lot of people; and radical feminists who like abortion because they think it gives them power over men; and sexually predatory males who like abortion because it lets them duck their responsibilities; and eugenicists who like abortion because it keeps minority populations in check; and incompetent doctors who like abortion because they know it's their last chance to have a job in the medical community. And the one thing all these bedfellows have in common, is that their personal agendas are joined at the hip with legalized abortion.

Viability

**VIABILITY HAS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE QUESTION OF
WHETHER THE UNBORN ARE LIVING HUMAN BEINGS OR NOT.**



"A Fetus Doesn't Have Any Right To Life Until It's Viable!"

Some abortion defenders say that a fetus doesn't have a right to life until it is viable and can live on its own outside the womb. Of course, this ignores the fact that abortion clinics across America routinely perform, and even advertise, elective abortions well past the point where it is known that babies can survive on their own. But the real issue is that viability has absolutely nothing to do with the question of whether the unborn are living human beings or not. Viability is a moving target and a function of medical technology. This is proven by the fact that premature babies are now routinely surviving at gestational ages that would have been impossible a hundred years ago. And yet, unborn children are not "more human" today than they were then. The fact is, tying abortion to viability is a fraud.

"Since the fetus depends on the woman for survival, it's her body and her choice."

The pro-choice mob often defends abortions before viability on the basis that the unborn are dependent on someone else to survive. But by that standard, a six-month old baby is no more viable than an unborn baby since neither can survive without the support of others. This could also be said about some severely handicapped people, or those who are senile, comatose, unconscious, or under general anesthesia. If an unborn baby has no right to life simply because he or she is unable to survive without help, then these people have no right to life either. Of course, another reason viability cannot be used to justify abortion is that the abortionist is the one who gets to determine whether his victim is viable or not. And if there is a better example of the fox guarding the henhouse, I don't know what it would be.

Viability Doesn't Define Humanity

Sometimes, the pro-choice mob argues that abortions before viability are okay since the child cannot survive if he or she is removed from the mother's womb. This argument is so illogical it's laughable. It's like a doctor saying: "*This patient will live if we leave his feeding tube in a little longer, but he'll die if we remove it. So it's okay to remove his feeding tube.*" Look, what these people are trying to make us believe is that viability defines humanity – and that's a lie. An unborn baby is just as human five minutes before viability as he is five minutes after viability. But the real point is that, just because a particular group of people are dependent on others to survive, that doesn't mean it's okay to kill them. In fact, decent people see it as the reason to protect them.

Personhood

THE ABORTION LOBBY KNOWS THAT THE UNBORN ARE NOT JUST CLUMPS OF CELLS, THEY JUST DON'T WANT THEIR CUSTOMERS TO KNOW IT.



"No One Can Prove When Life Begins!"

The pro-choice mob claims that it's okay to kill the unborn because no one can prove when life begins. It's like the jury in a capital murder trial saying, *"We don't really know if the defendant is guilty or not, so it's okay to just go ahead and execute him."* The interesting thing is, abortion defenders seem to be the only people left on earth who are still confused about when life begins. Medical science proved decades ago that when a male's twenty-three chromosomes combine with a female's twenty-three chromosomes, the life of a new and unique human being has begun. And anyone capable of rational thought would agree that, before they can be executed, the abortion lobby has a duty to prove that the science is wrong and that the unborn are just the worthless clumps of cells they are accused of being.

The Right-To-Life Isn't Determined By Development

Some abortion defenders say that abortion is not murder because the fetus is not fully developed. This, of course, conveniently ignores the fact that human beings develop throughout their entire lives. In fact, research has shown that the human brain is not fully developed until the person is in their mid-twenties, and some people have issues that will keep them from fully developing no matter how long they live. But that doesn't make it okay to kill them. The point is that, yes, a fetus is less developed than a newborn just as a 12-year-old is less developed than an adult. But that doesn't mean that a 12-year-old is less human, and it certainly doesn't mean that a human being's right-to-life is determined by their level of development.

From Embryos To "Clumps Of Cells?"

It is interesting to notice that when scientists involved in things like fertility experiments, or embryonic stem cell research, talk about fertilized eggs in petri dishes, they refer to them as human embryos. But when the abortion lobby talks about fertilized eggs in the womb, all of a sudden, they're just disposable clumps of cells. So how does that work? How can something that's human and has its own DNA when it's in one environment, not be human simply because it's in a different environment? It's like saying that water is only water when we're thirsty, but otherwise it's just a bunch of molecules.

"Can I Kill It?"

If you show someone a large cardboard box and ask them whether it is okay to kill what's inside, their first question will always be, "*What's in the box?*" And it won't matter where the box is located or who owns it. The fact is, there is no morally defensible answer to the question, "*Can I kill it?*" until it is known what "*it*" is. The only people who claim an exception to this principle are those who defend legal abortion. They say that no one really knows when life begins and that no one can prove that the unborn are persons or human beings, or that they are even alive. Of course this is complete nonsense, but that's what they claim. So in other words, even though they readily admit that they don't know for sure what an unborn child is, they're absolutely certain that it's okay to kill them.

Human Being But Not A Person?

Modern medical technology, such as ultrasound, has forced many of those in the pro-choice mob to concede that the unborn are indeed living human beings. But they say it's okay to kill them because they are not "persons." But the problem is, they can't point to any scientific basis for determining which human beings are persons and which ones are not. The fact is, the English language doesn't even have a word for a human being that is not a person, and in Black's Law Dictionary, the first definition for "*person*" is "*a human being.*" So the question is: if we're going to say it's legal to kill a particular group of human beings because they are not persons, how do we justify allowing the people who want them dead, and the people being paid to kill them, to arbitrarily decide whether they are persons or not?

Can Women Decide When Her Child's Life Begins?

The pro-choice argument is that it is up to the woman to decide when the life of her child has begun. To appreciate the sheer stupidity of this, imagine that two women get pregnant on the same day. Three months later, one woman believes she is carrying a baby and is getting pre-natal care. The other woman decides that her child's life hasn't begun yet and has an abortion. Now according to pro-choice logic, both of these women are right – despite the fact it is physically impossible for that to be the case. The reality is, regardless of what someone "*believes*" about these two babies, whatever is biologically and scientifically true about one, is biologically and scientifically true about the other. Obviously, one of them cannot be a living human being while the other one is just an inert clump of tissue.

Why Humanity Isn't Irrelevant.

The pro-choice crowd has always claimed that no one knows when life begins. But modern technology – like ultrasound – has made that statement ridiculous. Besides, when you say that no one knows when life begins, you are conceding that it might begin at fertilization. So wouldn't the rational and moral approach be to have a moratorium on abortions until we can scientifically establish that the unborn are not living human beings? Of course, a lot of the pro-choice mob is now saying that abortion should be legal even if *it is* biologically proven that the unborn are living human beings. That raises the question: if the humanity of the unborn is irrelevant when deciding whether they can be killed, why is it relevant when deciding whether a five-year-old or a fifty-year-old can be killed?

"It's Only A Potential Human Life!"

The pro-choice mob often claims that the unborn child is only a potential human life, as if no one really knows for sure what they are. Of course, only through mind-numbing stupidity could someone buy into that. First off, if by "*potential*" they mean that the unborn are only potentially alive, then how is it that they get bigger every week? I mean if something is growing, it's alive! Or maybe they are saying that, even if a fetus is alive, it is only potentially human. But for that to be true, it would have to be possible for a woman to be pregnant with something that is not human. Perhaps a parrot or a chipmunk. But since that never happens, the obvious conclusion is that unborn children are living human beings because **that's the only thing they can be.**

"It's Just A Clump Of Cells!"

Defenders of legalized abortion often claim that the unborn are just clumps of cells. But when legislation is proposed that would require abortion clinics to show their customers a sonogram image of their baby before the abortion is done, the pro-choice mob starts squealing that this would guilt-trip these women and leave them psychologically damaged for life. But wait a minute. If the unborn child is just a clump of cells, why would a woman be traumatized by seeing it? Are we supposed to believe that women are so emotionally fragile that seeing some inert clump of cells on a sonogram screen is going to send them screaming into the night? That's ridiculous. The simple fact is, the abortion lobby knows that the unborn are not just clumps of cells, they just don't want their customers to know it.

Ignoring Pain.

The pro-choice mob always fights any legislation that would require anesthesia for babies who are about to be aborted. They claim that unborn babies do not feel any pain even when their arms and legs are being ripped off and their heads are being crushed. Of course, they know they are lying but they can't afford to humanize the unborn so they push this narrative that, somehow, pain receptors don't exist until birth. To see how idiotic this is, think about this. It is now possible for surgeons to operate on unborn children and then return them to their mother's wombs. Now if you ask those surgeons if they would operate on a 20-week-old unborn child without anesthesia, what you'll find is that the only people who are cold-blooded enough and immoral enough to do such a thing, are abortionists.

Inventing Their Own Reality.

If pregnant women have this mystical ability to determine when life begins, the question is: do they lose this ability once they are no longer pregnant? What I mean is, if a woman kills her three-month-old baby and claims to sincerely believe that life doesn't begin until speech is possible, what gives society the right to charge her with murder? After all, why is her belief that life doesn't begin until a baby can talk less valid than another woman's belief that life begins after the first trimester of pregnancy, or at viability, or at birth, or at any other point she chooses? Or is it true that, even though people are free to ignore science and biology if they want to, civilized societies do not allow them to invent their own realities just so they can do whatever it is they want to do.

"But Theologians Can't Agree When Life Begins."

Abortion apologists often claim that even theologians cannot agree about when life begins. Of course, that's totally irrelevant since America is not a theocracy but a Constitutional Republic with a secular political process. And in that environment, the battle over abortion is not just some ivory-tower philosophical discussion; it is a serious real-world conflict between life and death. And within that conflict, is the proven biological reality that a new human life is created at the moment a woman's egg is fertilized. That means abortion kills the smallest, most vulnerable and most defenseless human beings in our community, and that is not something civilized societies permit – regardless of what a bunch of pastors, priests, shamans, and gurus may or may not agree upon.

Ignoring The Science.

One way the abortion lobby tries to justify slaughtering the unborn is by claiming that no one knows when life begins. But think about it for a minute. The DNA of a new human being is created at the moment of fertilization, and it is completely different from every other human being that's ever lived or will ever live. Nothing is added or subtracted at birth, or at any other point, and a human being's DNA never changes whether he or she is killed in the womb or lives to be a hundred. And none of this is just a theory or a philosophical argument, it is a scientifically proven fact. So if someone is a living human being at five years old or fifty years old, then he or she was a living human being in the womb. And just because some people choose to ignore that fact, it's still a fact.

"They're Not Babies! They're Fetuses!"

When we say the pro-choice mob is killing babies, they often become unhinged and start screaming that they're not babies – they're fetuses. Obviously, these people need a course in biology. The fact is, the words zygote, embryo, and fetus do not conflict with the word baby. They simply refer to a particular age and stage of development – just like the words newborn and toddler will do later on. And think about this: if a fetus is not a baby, that means there is no such thing as an unborn baby. And as idiotic as that sounds, that's what the abortion lobby is selling. To protect their political and financial interests, they need the public to blindly accept that fetuses transform into babies through some mystical process that doesn't take place until they exit the mother's body. It's biological nonsense.

One Of The Most Common Lies.

Whenever some abortionist has been caught killing babies outside the womb if they survive one of his abortions, people often become outraged and accuse him of killing “*live babies.*” This is an example of how a statement that is only partially true can be as deceptive and as dangerous as an outright lie. In this case, to say that this guy is killing live babies is true, but it implies that the children he kills inside the womb are not alive. And that simply reinforces one of the pro-choice mob’s most common lies. The biological reality is that an unborn baby one minute after fertilization is just as alive and just as human as a newborn child or a fifty-year-old man. And the only real distinction between taking the life of an unborn child or any other human being is the location where the killing takes place.

We’re All A Clump Of Cells.

The pro-choice mob often tries to rationalize abortion by saying that the unborn are just clumps of cells. And in one sense, they are right. An unborn child is indeed a clump of cells, just like a fifty-year-old man is a clump of cells. The only difference is that when a fifty-year-old man is murdered, no one tries to justify it by blowing off the victim as just a clump of cells. It's also interesting that, if scientists were to find a single living cell on Mars, it would be hailed as evidence of life on Mars. But meanwhile, the abortion lobby continues to push this harebrained idea that the millions of cells that make up a child in the womb, are not really evidence of anything we should be all that concerned about.

The Potential To Be What?

It is common for abortion apologists to argue that the unborn are only potential human beings. Apparently, they believe that a human female can be pregnant with something that may or may not be human. It's obviously an idiotic argument, but if you are one of those who buy into it, then you should be able to tell us what else a human fetus has the potential of being. Now I realize that, in your hands, they have the potential of becoming bloody and dismembered corpses. But they still have to be the bloody and dismembered corpses of something. **So the question is, what are they?** And if they're not living human beings at the moment of fertilization, but they are living human beings after they exit the birth canal, what are the scientific and biological forces that cause this transformation to take place?

When Do We Become Persons?

The abortion lobby says that the unborn cannot be persons because they are still in their mother's wombs. But here's what I want to know. In the case of fetal surgery, let's say that a fourteen-week-old unborn child is taken out of the mother's womb, placed on the mother's abdomen, operated on, and then returned to the womb. The question is: was this child a non-person while in the womb, who became a person when on the mother's abdomen, and then reverted to being a non-person again when placed back in the womb? If so, what is the recognized scientific explanation for how someone can switch back and forth between being a person and a non-person? And does this bizarre transformation ever take place in any other situation, or is it only used to justify killing the unborn?

"We May Have Aborted The Next Beethoven..."

You often hear pro-lifers say that we may have aborted the next Beethoven, or Mother Teresa, or the doctor who would have discovered a cure for cancer. And even though this is a true statement said with good intentions, it is not a pro-life argument since it implies that some babies are more important and more valuable than others because of the contributions they might make to society. **Remember, the only legitimate pro-life position is that a human being's right to life is not earned, it is inherent.** That means the unborn child who might end up spending his or her life on welfare and living under bridges has the same right-to-life as the unborn child who might grow up to cure cancer or be President of the United States. And anything that suggests otherwise is contrary to the pro-life position.

It's Alive!

It is not uncommon for the pro-choice mob's more dimwitted members to claim that nothing dies in an abortion since unborn children are not actually alive. This is idiocy. If you take a sonogram image of a woman's unborn baby when she is three months pregnant, and you come back and take another one when she is eight months pregnant, if it is a normal healthy pregnancy, the baby will be significantly larger and more developed in the second sonogram. And so the question becomes, what could have caused it to get bigger and more developed – if it was not alive? And of course, the answer is nothing. The biological reality is that, if something is growing and developing, it's alive.

Selling Barbarism.

Whenever a group of people wants to exploit, enslave, declare war on, or exterminate another group of people, they refer to their victims in ways that are intended to take away their humanity. Throughout history, this is what savages have always done to justify their particular brand of barbarism, and the pro-choice mob is no different. But the problem they have, is that science, fetal medicine, and ultra-sound technology have made it impossible to deny that the unborn are living human beings. So their fallback position is to argue that, even if they are human, it's okay to kill them because they are not "*persons.*" Of course, we all agree that a newborn baby is a person, so I guess we're supposed to believe that a non-person enters the birth canal, and a few seconds later, a person comes out.

Feeling Empowered?

**THE TRUTH IS THAT THE ONLY PEOPLE EMPOWERED
BY ABORTION ARE THE PEOPLE WHO SELL THEM.**



"Women Know Best!"

The pro-choice mob defends legalized abortion by saying that every woman has the right to decide what is best for her and that no one is more qualified, or more entitled, to make decisions about her life than she is. So the question is, if another woman decides that, in her situation, it would be best for her to drown her two-year-old child, should that also be legal? After all, isn't she the one most qualified and most entitled to make decisions about her life? Or are we supposed to believe that women are only good decision makers while they're pregnant? If so, what is the mysterious force that gives them this talent when they become pregnant, and then takes it away during the birthing process? Or maybe this is just one more rationalization for killing the unborn that would never be applied anywhere else.

"Women Aren't Free Unless They Can Control Their Reproductive Lives!"

Abortion apologists say that women are not free unless they can control their reproductive lives. This is utter nonsense. The biological reality is, when a woman is pregnant, reproduction has already occurred. The only thing abortion does is kill the child that she has produced, and only a perverted mind would see that as some kind of symbol of freedom. That's what pro-life feminist, Melissa Simmons-Tulin, meant when she warned women that they would never achieve equality with men by crawling over the dead bodies of their children. Like all early feminists, she understood that legalized abortion doesn't free women, it's just a safety net for sexually predatory and sexually irresponsible men. And for those guys, it's a win-win deal since the women they use for sex take all the risks of abortion.

Does The Fetus Have More Rights Than A Women?

Those who push legal abortion claim that the pro-life movement wants the unborn to have more rights than their mothers. They are lying. The pro-life movement has never argued that the baby's rights are superior to the mom's but that they are equal. Now with that in mind, remember that the American abortion industry's own data proves that virtually every abortion they sell is for non-medical reasons on a healthy baby who was not conceived in rape or incest, and a healthy woman whose pregnancy poses no threat to either her life or health. That means the abortion decision is not a conflict between the baby's right to life and the mother's right to life, but whether the woman's convenience, or her desire to not be pregnant, outweighs her baby's right to life. And no civilized people would say that it does.

"It's Not About Abortion, It's About Trusting Women."

Abortion defenders say that the real issue is not abortion, but whether we trust women. This is, of course, pure idiocy. It's like saying laws against rape mean that we don't trust men. The fact is, every man and woman is fully capable of making immoral decisions, and society passes laws to keep them from inflicting those decisions on other people. But if the pro-choice mob is serious about this "*trust women*" idea, why aren't they demanding that women be exempted from all laws? After all, any law that can be enforced against women, is society's way of saying that women can't be trusted to make that particular decision. Or is the abortion lobby asking us to believe that the only women who can be blindly trusted to make good decisions, are those who are pregnant and thinking about buying an abortion?

The Only People Empowered By Abortion Are The People Who Sell Them.

There are real-world similarities between abortion and suicide. Both are acts of surrender driven by desperation, cowardice or selfishness, and no one was ever seen as courageous or powerful for giving in to either one. But there are also some big differences between them. The most obvious is that when someone commits suicide they take their own life, but when a woman has an abortion, she takes the life of her child. Another difference is that, unlike abortion, no one has ever figured out a way to make money off of suicide. And finally, while no one claims that people are empowered by committing suicide, there are actually people who argue that women are empowered by having the right to kill their children. Of course, the truth is that the only people empowered by abortion are the people who sell them.

The Unborn Child Is NOT The Enemy.

At its core, the abortion lobby's sales pitch is that unborn children are the enemies of their mothers and that protecting their lives would keep women from reaching their full potential. At the same time, they push the idea that men are also their enemies because the only thing they want is control over women. The consistent drumbeat is that the pro-choice movement is the only thing standing between women and total enslavement. Of course, not only is this argument hopelessly stupid, it's also a textbook example of how women get trapped in abusive relationships. The process is simple. First, the victim is isolated, and then she is made to feel dependent on the person who isolated her. And this is the scam that the pro-choice mob, along with their lackeys in media, have been running for decades.

Irresponsibility Dressed Up As Liberty

The abortion lobby says that legal abortion is about equal rights for women, but that can't be true since men have no rights in this issue – even when it's their own children that are being killed. And the pro-choice mob defends this by arguing that pregnant women have the right to do what they think is best for themselves. But if that means women can kill their unborn children, and if this battle is about equal rights, then shouldn't men have the right to abandon their children if they think that's what's best for themselves? And why should they be known as “deadbeat dads” if the women who have abortions are not known as a “deadbeat moms?” After all, they both rejected their own children, and it's nonsense to call that irresponsibility by one parent, while dressing it up as liberty for the other one.

"If You Can't Trust Me With A Choice, How Can You Trust Me With A Child?"

One of the most idiotic arguments you hear coming from the pro-choice mob is, *“If you can't trust me with a choice, how can you trust me with a child?”* Of course, the problem is that no one is saying woman can't be trusted with a choice. Every day, they are trusted to choose their careers and their friends. They are trusted to choose what kind of car to buy, where to live, what to eat, whether to get a tattoo or not, and millions of other choices. But when someone demands the right to make a choice that is intended to take the life of a defenseless and innocent human being, that's when things change. The fact is, in a civilized society, no one is trusted to make that choice, and the reality that some women will choose to kill their own children is absolute proof that those children must be protected by law.

Is All That Matters What Women Believe?

Abortion apologists say that what others believe about abortion is irrelevant and all that matters is what the woman believes. So one woman can be 10-weeks pregnant and believe that she is carrying a child, and another woman can be 10-weeks pregnant and believe that she is carrying a blob of tissue, and somehow both of them can be right. Of course, that is pure stupidity. Look, just because a woman is pregnant and doesn't want to be, that does not make her immune to the laws of science and biology. The issue is whether abortion takes the life of a living human being, and modern ultrasound technology has answered that question. Today, the humanity of the unborn child is not a theory or a philosophy, it is an observable fact. And that is true no matter what the mother of that child believes or doesn't believe.

Why The Pro-Choice Side Focuses On The "Right" To Have An Abortion - And Not Abortion Itself.

It's interesting that the abortion lobby never defends the actual act of abortion; they only defend the right of someone to have an abortion. The question is, why don't they defend it on its own merits? The answer, of course, is that abortion has no merits and there is nothing remotely appealing about it. A woman climbs onto a table and puts her feet in metal stirrups. Then some goon invades her body with sharp instruments and rips her child apart limb by limb. The woman is in this place because she has been convinced that this is a solution to her problems, but when it's over, she'll be just as poor, or uneducated, or alone, or abused as she was before. The biggest difference is that she is now the mother of a dead baby instead of a live one, and it's hard to imagine that she is any better off for that experience.

Abortion: The Corruption Of Women's Equality

The abortion lobby continues to push this perverted idea that having the legal right to murder their babies is the cornerstone of women's freedom and equality. But as pro-life feminist Frederica Mathewes-Green once said, a woman aborting her child is like an animal gnawing off its leg to get out of a trap. Abortion, she said, is not a sign that women are free but that they are desperate. What we need to remember is that the pioneers of the women's movement were almost universally opposed to the legalization of abortion because they understood that it doesn't liberate women, it devalues them. The reality is, anyone who thinks women must have the right to kill their children in order to be equal to men, has a perverted view of equality and a low opinion of women.

In Whom Do You Trust?

If the abortion lobby is serious about their "*we trust women*" rhetoric, why do they only apply it to abortion? I mean, either they trust women or they don't. And if they do, why aren't they saying that women should be trusted to decide whether they're going to stop at red lights, rob banks, beat their children, or poison their husbands? And why aren't they insisting that female business owners be trusted to decide for themselves whether they are going to hire minorities? In fact, the "*trust women*" crowd should be demanding that women be exempted from all laws and just blindly trusted to always do the right thing. But that's not what they are doing. Instead, the only women they seem to think should always be trusted, are those who might be in the market for an abortion. I wonder why that is?

"Abortion Laws Prevent Women From Being Their Own Moral Agents!"

The pro-choice mob says that laws against abortion prevent women from being their own moral agents. This is gibberish. The law has no ability to keep people from acting as their own moral agents. If a man shoots and kills a teller while robbing a bank, he is obviously acting as his own moral agent. He is simply choosing to do something immoral that also happens to be illegal. The same is true about any other illegal act. In the case of abortion, regardless of its legal status, there is nothing virtuous about it. But by using the term "*moral agent*," the abortion lobby hopes to create the illusion that a woman who has one is acting on strong moral convictions. In reality, abortion is at best an act of despair, and at worst a cold-blooded execution carried out for selfish reasons. It is never an act of moral virtue.

What Legalized Abortion Is REALLY About.

The pro-choice mob continues to tell the lie that legal abortion is about "*choice*" and "*women's rights*" and "*reproductive freedom*" when, in reality, it has nothing to do with any of those things. Instead, it's about allowing people to have their own children legally executed by the millions so they don't have to take responsibility for their actions. It's also about letting an industry made up of savages and psychopaths financially profit from carrying out those executions. Now I realize that this doesn't sound very noble and those of us in the pro-life movement would like to think that America can be a better place than that. But until that time comes, we should at least stop lying to ourselves about why this holocaust is allowed to continue.

Do Pro-Lifers Trust Women?

You often hear politicians – especially our more *"enlightened"* male politicians – say that they are personally troubled about abortion but they trust women to make their own decisions. Their sales pitch is that they trust women but pro-lifers don't. This seems strange given that women dominate the membership and the leadership of the pro-life movement. Apparently, we're supposed to believe that all these women came together for the sole purpose of squashing other women. It would be silly if it wasn't so insulting. The other thing is, since the *"troubled by abortion"* crowd almost always votes against any limits on abortion, and for taxpayer funding of abortion, how troubled could they really be? Or maybe they've figured out how to be troubled by abortion and promote it at the same time.

All That Matters Is The Truth.

The pro-choice mob says that what others believe about abortion is irrelevant, and if a woman doesn't believe it is wrong the law has no right to tell her she can't have one. In other words, it doesn't matter whether abortion is murder or not as long as the person who wants one says it isn't murder. By that logic, it would be legal for a member of the Ku Klux Klan to kill a Black person as long as he claims to believe Black people are not really human beings. Of course, we do not base our laws on this guy's perverted views or on what he believes or doesn't believe. All that matters is the truth. As for abortion, the truth is that modern technology and medical science have made it undeniable that the unborn are living human beings, and we cannot let people create their own artificial realities just so they can kill them.

The Power of Maternal Instinct

Every hiker knows that it can be extremely dangerous to walk between a female mountain lion and her cubs. If she sees you as a threat to her babies, it is almost certain that she will attack you, and the same thing is true about almost every other species of animal on earth. It doesn't matter whether they are injured, or starving, or terrified, or completely alone, females are hardwired to protect their babies and that is what they will do. It is called "*maternal instinct*" and it defines what real feminine power looks like. But it is also the abortion industry's worst enemy. After all, their political and financial success depends on women believing that their power comes from having the right to lie on their back in an abortion clinic with their feet in metal stirrups while some goon rips their baby to shreds.

The Easy Way Out?

Let's make one thing perfectly clear. No woman was ever admired for killing herself and no woman was ever admired for having an abortion. That's because, regardless of someone's political position on abortion, anyone with five brain neurons firing sees abortion in the same way they see suicide. Simply put, they are both the easy way out. In fact, the only real difference between suicide and abortion is that, when one woman is not strong enough to face her problems, she kills herself, and when another woman is not strong enough to face her problems, she kills her baby. But the thought process that goes into both decisions is virtually identical. In the final analysis, legal abortion empowers pregnant women in exactly the same way that handguns and poisons empower women who are suicidal.

"Women Can't Be Free Without Legalized Abortion."

The pro-choice mob says that women cannot be free without legalized abortion. But what kind of twisted mind defines freedom as having the right to kill your own child? The reality is, other than habitual criminals and the mentally ill, every mature adult understands and accepts that freedoms always come with responsibilities. In this case, the freedom to enter into a sexual relationship comes with the responsibility to refrain from killing the child that might result. But the pro-choice mob thinks this is unreasonable and that we should live in some sort of alternate universe where everyone can be as irresponsible and self-centered as they want to be – with no consequences – even if it means intentionally taking the life of another completely innocent human being. These people need to grow up.

A Matter Of Trust

Those of you in the abortion lobby say that you trust women, but I have a question for you. Should women also be trusted when it comes to deciding whether they will kill their five-year-olds or their teenagers? In other words, if you trust women to make the right decision when it comes to their unborn children, do you also think they are worthy of your trust when it comes to their born children? If not, it certainly seems odd that you would think only pregnant women are capable of being trustworthy. Maybe it has something to do with the fact that, once they are no longer pregnant, it's too late for you to sell them an abortion?

Empowered Women Don't Kill Their Babies For Anyone Or Any Reason.

The pro-choice mob claims that having the right to legal abortion empowers women. This is pure nonsense. If you want to see the weakest and most submissive people in our society, just stand in front of an abortion clinic and look at the faces of women going in and coming out. Or go sit in the waiting room of an abortion clinic. What you will see is desperation, fear, and resignation. What you will not see is women who feel empowered or in control. Their faces will make it clear that the abortion decision is one made by women who have been convinced – either by themselves or by others – that this is the only choice they have. The reality is, contrary to the abortion lobby's sales pitch, women who are truly powerful don't kill their babies for anyone or any reason.

“There are NO unimportant discussions about abortion. With the public's growing unease over abortion, people who we could have never reached in the past are at least willing to listen to the pro-life message. And ALWAYS assume that the words you are using will one day be repeated to a pregnant woman who is considering abortion. It may not happen for years, and you may never know about it, but there is a reasonable probability of this happening. When it does, the message you gave may be the only hope that baby has for survival.”

- Mark Crutcher

About The Author



Mark Crutcher worked full-time in the pro-life movement for more than 30 years, becoming known for his fiery, unapologetic and uncompromising pro-life position.

He trained more than 15,000 pro-life activists across the United States and Canada, and pioneered investigation into the abortion industry - exposing their dirty secrets. As founder and president of Life Dynamics, he struck blows to the abortion movement - with Time magazine writing, "*LDI's emergence has many abortion-rights supporters worried.*" He was bestowed numerous awards and recognition for his work.

Throughout his time in the pro-life movement, Mark appeared on many local and national television news outlets including ABC World News Tonight, NBC Nightly News, the CBS Evening News, Fox News, Nightline, 20/20, the O'Rilley Factor, and the 700 Club.

He brought his unique perspective to paper and was the author of several books, including *Lime 5* and *Siege*. He was also the writer and director of *Maafa 21* - a ground-breaking two-hour documentary that removes all doubt that the real reason for the legalization of abortion was eugenics and racial genocide. "*Abortion Distortion*" was the last project he worked on before his unexpected death in 2023. This ebook is dedicated to him.

Subject Index



Abortion Industry [11](#), [15](#), [22](#), [118](#), [120](#), [122](#), [125](#) - [126](#), [161](#), [186](#)
Abstinence [148](#)
Adoption [5](#) - [8](#), [86](#), [135](#), [152](#)
America [44](#), [129](#) - [130](#), [151](#), [153](#), [171](#)
Amputation [89](#), [99](#)



Back Alley Abortions [10](#) - [13](#), [122](#)
Bedroom [123](#)
Belief [19](#), [110](#), [112](#), [117](#), [166](#), [168](#), [171](#), [182](#), [185](#)
Bible [34](#)
Biology [27](#), [64](#), [68](#), [88](#) - [90](#), [99](#), [114](#), [127](#), [144](#), [166](#) - [167](#), [169](#), [172](#) - [173](#)
Birth [54](#), [74](#), [76](#), [93](#), [141](#) - [142](#), [174](#)
Birth Control [53](#), [54](#), [72](#), [76](#), [82](#), [131](#), [147](#) - [149](#)



Chemical Abortion [15](#) - [16](#)
Child Abuse [7](#), [154](#)
"Clump of Cells" [56](#), [92](#), [103](#), [130](#), [145](#), [167](#), [170](#), [173](#)
"Choice" [18](#), [20](#), [21](#), [24](#), [27](#), [28](#), [119](#), [145](#), [181](#), [184](#)
Christians [26](#) - [37](#)
Climate Change [144](#)
Coat Hangers [13](#)
Common Ground [40](#) - [42](#)
Compassion [71](#), [74](#), [76](#), [77](#), [80](#), [83](#), [123](#), [134](#)
Consent [114](#), [121](#)
Conservatives [63](#)
Contraception [53](#), [54](#), [72](#), [76](#), [82](#), [131](#), [147](#) - [149](#)



Death Penalty [44](#)
Development [67](#), [166](#), [172](#), [175](#)
Disability [71](#) - [72](#), [77](#) - [78](#), [82](#), [84](#), [163](#)
Discrimination [64](#), [102](#), [104](#)
DNA [88](#), [89](#), [167](#), [172](#)



Embryonic Stem Cell [98](#), [100](#)
Empowerment [178](#), [180](#), [183](#), [186](#) - [188](#)
Equality [51](#), [54](#), [74](#), [84](#), [102](#), [121](#), [179](#), [181](#)
Eugenics [74](#), [77](#), [98](#), [151](#), [153](#)
Exceptions [70](#), [73](#)



Fertilization [148](#), [166](#), [169](#), [172](#), [173](#)
Fetal Tissue [98](#), [100](#)
Fetus [75](#), [96](#), [163](#), [172](#)
"Follow The Science" [144](#)
Force [51](#) - [54](#), [111](#)
Forced Birth [53](#)
Forced Motherhood [51](#), [54](#)
Foster Care [5](#) - [6](#)
Free Will [35](#)



Gender [88](#) - [89](#), [95](#), [102](#) - [104](#), [149](#), [179](#), [181](#), [185](#), [186](#)
Genocide [56](#), [106](#), [107](#)
God [23](#), [28](#) - [33](#), [35](#), [38](#), [115](#), [120](#), [125](#)
Government [18](#), [51](#), [62](#), [63](#), [66](#), [93](#), [108](#), [111](#), [115](#), [145](#), [158](#) - [159](#)
Graphic Images [56](#) - [59](#)
Guttmacher [10](#)



Healthcare [45](#), [66](#), [92](#), [95](#) - [96](#)
Heartbeat [116](#)
Heaven [31](#)
Holocaust [16](#), [41](#), [100](#), [106](#), [107](#), [144](#)
Hunger [154](#), [156](#)



Illegal Abortions [10](#) - [13](#), [122](#)
Incest [71](#) - [72](#), [74](#), [77](#) - [78](#), [82](#), [84](#) - [85](#), [131](#)



Jesus [32](#) - [33](#)



Late Term Abortion [130](#)
Legislation / Laws [12](#), [13](#), [22](#), [52](#), [53](#), [58](#), [61](#), [63](#) - [65](#), [85](#), [117](#), [129](#), [145](#), [170](#), [179](#)
Limited Government [63](#)
Litmus Test [62](#)



Maternal Instinct [186](#)
Medical Community [24](#), [98](#), [125](#), [141](#), [161](#), [167](#)
Medicine [45](#), [66](#), [68](#), [75](#), [83](#), [95](#) - [96](#), [99](#), [121](#), [163](#)
Miscarriage [58](#), [115](#), [125](#)
Morals [18](#), [19](#), [48](#), [65](#), [147](#), [155](#), [184](#)
"Moral Agent" [184](#)



Non-Doctors [11](#)



Overpopulation [152](#)



Pain [68](#), [170](#)

Parasite [99](#)

Pastors [34](#) - [38](#), [171](#)

"Personally Opposed" [110](#) - [112](#), [124](#)

"Persons" [168](#), [174](#), [176](#)

Planned Parenthood [49](#), [81](#), [94](#), [116](#), [120](#), [147](#) - [149](#)

Politicians [34](#) - [35](#), [61](#) - [62](#), [65](#), [110](#), [111](#), [112](#), [185](#)

Politics [34](#) - [35](#), [61](#) - [68](#),

Potential [169](#), [174](#)

Poverty [64](#), [76](#), [84](#), [158](#)

Prayer [29](#)

Privacy [118](#), [123](#), [158](#)

Pro-Abortion [20](#), [22](#), [117](#)

Pro-Choice Majority [129](#), [131](#)

Pro-Life Movement [12](#), [44](#), [47](#), [48](#), [52](#), [56](#) - [59](#), [86](#), [117](#), [119](#), [122](#), [147](#), [151](#) - [153](#), [185](#)



Racism [74](#),

Rape [70](#) - [74](#), [76](#), [78](#), [80](#) - [82](#), [84](#) - [86](#), [131](#)

"Rare" [45](#)

Regret [137](#) - [139](#)

Repeat Abortions [76](#), [79](#), [131](#)

Reproduction [8](#), [52](#), [54](#), [76](#), [92](#), [114](#), [134](#), [151](#), [173](#), [178](#)

Rights [21](#), [24](#), [64](#), [75](#), [79](#), [158](#), [179](#), [182](#)

Right to Life [47](#)

Roe vs Wade [44](#)

Rosaries [114](#)

RU-486 [16](#)



Safety [10](#) - [13](#), [46](#), [72](#), [79](#), [81](#), [141](#) - [142](#)
"Selective Reduction" [95](#)
Sentience [64](#)
Sex Education [147](#) - [149](#)
Sex-Selection Abortions [95](#)
Social Problems [151](#) - [156](#)
Sonogram [46](#), [145](#), [169](#), [170](#), [176](#)
Soul [33](#)
States [18](#), [64](#), [67](#)
Stillbirth [58](#)
Studies [72](#), [76](#), [78](#) - [79](#), [81](#) - [82](#), [84](#), [103](#), [130](#), [131](#), [179](#)
Success [133](#), [138](#), [180](#)
Suicide [180](#), [186](#)



Tax Dollars [24](#), [66](#), [102](#), [115](#), [129](#), [158](#), [159](#), [185](#)
Teen Pregnancy [94](#), [147](#)
Trauma [7](#), [57](#), [59](#), [82](#), [137](#), [138](#), [170](#)
Travel [64](#), [67](#)
Trust [178](#), [179](#), [181](#), [183](#), [185](#), [187](#)



Ultrasound [46](#), [145](#), [169](#), [170](#), [176](#)
Unplanned Pregnancy [48](#), [122](#), [126](#), [137](#), [154](#)
Unwanted Babies [5](#) - [8](#), [133](#), [135](#), [154](#), [155](#), [156](#)



Viability [163](#) - [164](#), [171](#)
Violence [77](#), [80](#), [82](#)
Voting [61](#), [62](#), [65](#)



Published By Life Dynamics Incorporated

Post Office Box 2226 | Denton, Texas 76202
☎ (940)380-8800 | ✉ info@lifedynamics.com
🌐 LifeDynamics.com