

# ABORTION IS MURDER AND WRONG

Name: Oneil McQuick Class: SPC1600 Date: July 2005 School: BCC  
Task: Ask to do a persuasive speech, the above topic was suggested.

## What is Abortion and who chooses abortion

“Abortion is a way to end pregnancy. Sometimes, an embryo or fetus stops developing and the body expels it. This is called *spontaneous* abortion or "miscarriage." A woman can also choose to end a pregnancy. This is called *induced* abortion. There are three ways it can be done — with medicine, vacuum aspiration, or surgery.

The chances are high that a woman will have more than one unplanned pregnancy in the course of her lifetime. Nearly half of all U.S. women will have an abortion by the time they are 45 years old. More than six million women in the U.S. become pregnant every year. Half of those pregnancies are unintended. And 1.31 million end in abortion. The most common reasons a woman chooses abortion are:

- She is not ready to become a parent.
- She cannot afford a baby.
- She doesn't want to be a single parent.
- She doesn't want anyone to know she has had sex or is pregnant.
- She is too young or too immature to have a child.
- She has all the children she wants.
- Her husband, partner, or parent wants her to have an abortion.
- She or the fetus has a health problem.
- She was a survivor of rape or incest” (plannedparenthood.org).

“On January 22, 1973, in the famous Roe vs. Wade case, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down all laws in every state that in any way had protected the lives of developing unborn children. It legalized abortion in all 50 states.”

## Life begun and hence murder is obvious, for you can only really kill something that is alive

If you boil it down to the “nitty-gritty” it becomes obvious that this is murder, because murder can only take place on something that is alive: As in termination of life. If you took a cord and tied it around my childhood teddy bear, hung him and said you killed it, you haven't killed it because it was never alive. Now, can the same be said of the abortions done? Was the fetus or baby removed a lifeless teddy bear that no life was terminated for it to take place. If so, then abortion is okay, for you would be removing unwanted filth from the body, much like how you dodo. But it is not so, for life was present, growing and if not terminated would become a full grown adult someday. Hence, if life begun and it was purposely ended, then the act of murder was carried out on another human being. I used some strong terms, like “Alive.” Can the baby in womb be considered alive? One definition states, “Alive means that this being is growing, developing, maturing, and replacing its own dying cells. It means not being dead” (abortionfacts.com). This is certainly true of any fetus and we need not go into any other definitions, as in “Person” or “Human.” For being alive, constitute being a person and a human, for the fetus is not a dog fetus in a human mother, God forbid, it's a human; and if it's not a person, what is it, a tadpole?

Without any scientific or religious data or any form of empiricism, we have unequivocally established that the fetus in the mother's belly is a human person or life – from a few seconds old to 9 months old. Now, if we give the right for someone to kill that human life under the notion of “Choice,” aren't we still discriminating?

For if I can kill a human only when it is in its mother's belly and not any other time, isn't that discrimination. I should be able to kill any human at any time, or, no human at no time. You cannot pull the "Choice" card and yet breed double standard. The Choice card would then be a pretext. You wouldn't be pro-choice, but pro-discrimination. We are allowing discrimination against an entire classes of living humans to be put to death at will. That is wrong! We should instead grant equal protection by law to all living humans in our nation. We can't protect the abused child about to die by the next hit from her father, because she cannot defend herself and not defend the unborn fetus because they too cannot defend themselves. We can't have a double standard, that in itself is unconstitutional and wrong legislatively and morally. We should be upholding the said right for every human life at any stage, in the "pouch" or out of "pouch!"

This erroneous bias is an evil that will ultimately lead to another evil now denounced – selective baby production. You fertilize eggs in the womb, under genetics it is manipulated, you watch it grow in the womb and if it doesn't fit your criteria you terminated it; and continue doing that until you get that green eye, green hair, tan skinned, one sex (male or female) or two sex (male and female), white facial hair baby you and the genetic doctors are trying to make. But wait, didn't the communist irreligious China take a step towards this and thus prove my theory correct? I can see it now, genetic doctors get so popular that they can determine the sexual orientation of your baby and if you don't want a faggot in the family, you can abort the baby; though no genetics can never determine that, because it's not genetic. Don't you see that we are heading down the wrong road, 2) playing GOD 3) Upholding partiality to murder 4) Double standards of the law to suit your need 5) Out right MURDER of the innocent that was destined to be born. This Pro-Choice compost is biased, unconstitutional, unlawful, could be a conspiracy orchestrated for the abominable selective baby production and permitting murder. One person noted,

"Never, in modern times, has the state granted to one citizen the absolute legal right to have another killed in order to solve their own personal, social or economic problem. And yet, if this is human life, the U.S. Supreme Court Decision in America and permissive abortion laws in other nations do all of the above. They represent a complete about-face, a total rejection of one of the core values of Western man, and an acceptance of a new ethic in which life has only a relative value. No longer will every human have a right to live simply because he or she exists. A human will now be allowed to exist only if he measures up to certain standards of independence, physical perfection, or utilitarian usefulness to others. This is a momentous change that strikes at the root of Western civilization. It makes no difference to vaguely assume that human life is more human post-born than pre-born. What is critical is to judge it to be — or not to be — human life. By a measure of "more" or "less" human, one can easily and logically justify infanticide and euthanasia. By the measure of economic and/or social usefulness, the ghastly atrocities of Hitlerian mass murders came to be. One cannot help but be reminded of the anguished comment of a condemned Nazi judge, who said to an American judge after the Nuremberg trials, 'I never knew it would come to this'. The American judge answered simply, 'It came to this the first time you condemned an innocent life'" (abortionfacts.com).

Speaking of "came to this," this is trickery the Pro-Choicers have done why their campaign has come to this "success"; they have played upon the falling morals and godly Christian foundations of our nation. Notice,

They changed the question. Unable to win debating the issue as they saw it on pro-life terms, they cleverly changed the question. They changed it from "Is abortion right or wrong"? to "Who decides, the woman or the government? We believe that the government should stay out of this very private matter. The real question here is about a woman's right to choose." It takes only a moment to realize that this is an entirely different question. Over a period of several years, by paid advertisements, by all pro-abortion leaders using the same party line, and by the enthusiastic cooperation of the liberal media, they largely succeeded in changing the terms of the debate.

You see the folly, they were losing the battle with the Public, because everyone saw that abortion is bad and wrong, so they moved from ethics and good morals (Christianity) to playing the law books and allege civil rights. So how did they get away with murder, legalizing the killing of babies and also subverting the laws of the land? Because if they use the argument, "Who decides, the woman or the government? We believe that

the government should stay out of this very private matter,” on killing a life (abortion) then for justice to prevail, I should be able to use that same twisting with my relatives. It’s my 6-year-old daughter, I have a right, who should decide if I want to rape her or kill her, the parent or the government, the government should stay out of this very private matter? Seeing that the child in the womb is a living human being, he or she should be protected in the same way any other child is protect and shouldn’t allow an irresponsible parent to kill their child or another human being. After giving the speech, my teacher related the story of a woman he knows that had an abortion because she bought a non-refundable world travel ticket for a cruise and wouldn’t be able to fit in her bikini. How blatantly obvious can this pro-choice compost be. So you see what the pro-Choicers and it’s agenda really is, if allowed, probably the same freedom will be given to the man who wants to rape and kill his 6-year-old daughter. The Pro-Choicers failed when it came to the conscience of the people and diverted their efforts under a pre-text of rights; which is really false, and hence abortion sanctioning should be considered unconstitutional. Our founding fathers made this statement when this nation began, which is held throughout most nations, “we hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights — of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” If that is to be true, and we all have these rights, it must be applicable to the life and liberty of the “unborn” being protected from abortion, or else such a statement under the abortion sanctioning has become futile, along with the law books. The unborn has rights too, being humans and foremost among them is their protection from murder, even if it is their own parents. Those who have an ear to hear, with the respective “powers,” shouldn’t let this go unnoticed, but bring back justice, non-partiality and good sense.

To make this argument even more valuable, is an excerpt from The Divine, “Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations” (Jer 1:5). So it’s obvious that a termination of life in the belly of a woman is not a light thing, for that person’s life meant something to God and could very well be planned for great things. Another example is also found in the bible, this time not of a prophet but an irreligious secular King of Babylon, Cyrus. It reads, “That saith of **Cyrus**, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid” (Isa 44:28). This was clear word from God of a man who would set the Israelites free to return to Jerusalem and re-build their temple. But notice how accurate things are planned and how things really are, hundreds of years (701 B.C) before this actually happened (538 B.C) the man’s actual name was given. Nothing, not even science, can get more accurate than that. The actual name of the man, Cyrus, was given before he was born; and also what he would do. According to Easton Bible dictionary, he “was a conqueror of Babylon, and issued the decree of liberation to the Jews (Ezr 1:1-2). Cyrus was a great military leader, bent on universal conquest. Babylon fell before his army on the night of Belshazzar’s feast (Dan 5:30), and then the ancient dominion of Assyria was also added to his empire.” Think what would happen if he was aborted, Israel wouldn’t have gone free and the second temple built. So, both the so-called ‘good’ and ‘bad’ are orchestrated to be born by God and each man’s destiny begins before the womb, but his life begins there and can be terminated there. To terminate his life from the womb under “choice,” is to terminate his purpose, which is simply apart of a greater purpose. These bloody doctors are playing God at the authorization of our legislature. Will God be silent on the matter? Ironically, as you have been doing, you be the judge.

My school history text teaches that Andrew Jackson formed one of the oldest political party in America – the Democrats in the 1800’s. As the 7<sup>th</sup> president of the U.S.A. also, he outlined one of the essence of the U.S.A and democratic countries, “equal protection and equal benefits.” This mirrors what I’ve saying, if the killing of humans in the womb is permitted, then the killing of humans (children, uncles, sisters, etc) outside the womb must also be permitted for “equal protection and equal benefits” and unbiased legislature to foster; the essence of the republic and constitution. We can’t have the latter, so we must prohibit the killing of babies in the womb (abortion) for equality to exist.

## **The case of the terminally ill choice to die (Scivo’s Death Revisited)**

You might say that a responsible adult who wrote it in a will that their life should be terminated on terminal illness/insanity and a baby aborted is the same thing. A baby can’t make decisions on their own. But the

former case is one in a million, and most with no will stating for it to take place. Nevertheless, they being crazy and terminally ill can't make a conscious decision. What to do? End life would be similar to abortion and if allowed, abortion should be allowed with the non-bias argument earlier used.

If they are allowed to live, who pays the medical bill? If the government refuse to sustain life in deliberation of hope, and pay my tax money to sustain a criminal, that is unbiased and should spark outrage. If "push come to shove" the prisoners should be terminated, living off the tax dollars the now terminally ill paid all their life until this condition. So back to it, on the protection of life, such cases may be murder. It is life terminated, and even if a will was left, that might be considered a suicidal note; whereby a person can willfully get sick and suffer the consequences of it knowing the will and not having the heart for direct suicide.

One of the reasons for bringing this up is the prior argument, if protection is given to humans who are out of the womb, then it should be given to humans in the womb for justice, equality and civil rights to hold up, and then abortion was deemed and is murder. But the case of the terminally ill patient to be put to death "threw a bone in it." For if humans in the womb and out of the womb are to be protected, then humans near out of the flesh should be too, to make protection of all humans a viable true statement of our nation. So is termination of life of the terminally ill murder? Or is it free choice under the current abortion trends and hence disqualifying abortion as murder also?

Not trying to overtly defend pro-life, but simply speak the truth, once there is life there is hope and hence willful pre-mature death is murder. For instance, the bible records a man name Job, he was near death with a life threatening leprosy, but unlike the request of the evil one, he sat until his change came. Job noted, "If a man die, shall he live again? all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come" (Job 14:14). Miraculously, he recovered and was fully restored. If that was the only example in the bible and history then there would be a little doubt, but they are countless such examples. The example given was a man who was sane, but there is another example of a "mad man." The bible noted of him, "always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones" (Mark 5:5). But despite his condition, the Jews who were quick to stone a person for adultery never thought to kill him or tried to, though they reached out to him. Fortunately, Jesus healed him and he was fully restored.

So terminal illness with insanity is not an excuse to murder someone. If you can house and feed someone facing 5 life sentences with hope of no parole, you can wait until the breathe is gone out of man by providing. Most often, if they remain alive that long means they are fighting to live, whether sanely aware or not, for in just a few pains it is easy to "give up the ghost." Therefore, protection of life should encompass all humans at any stage - 1) in the womb, 2) out of the womb 3) and near out of the flesh. Allowing Pro-Choice to murder in any of the three warrantee it in all and vice versa. We can't have murder in number 2, so we shouldn't have murder anywhere else. Pro-Choice to murder the unborn and terminally ill is a violation of the said civil liberties it hinges on.

## **Physical and psychological complications for “abortee” and father**

One of the hallmark reasons for sanctioning abortion is health, while I agree that certain health complications may develop that abortion is the solution, it is very rare. The only viable case may be a complication where the doctors tell the couple they have to choose between the baby and mother, as seen on T.V. All other complications are futile and can be trumped up and even to a certain degree with the right enough cash, the former complication can be trumped up too.

What also makes this health point weak is the fact that after abortion, mothers and even the fathers develop physical and psychological health complications. One source noted, even “If what is growing within the mother is not human life, if it is just a piece of tissue — a glob of protoplasm — then it deserves little respect or consideration, and the primary concern should be the mother’s physical and mental health, her social

well-being, and, at times, even her convenience.” In other words, if all arguments fail, the very one that helped legalize abortion can be used to overturn it as well. Notice the following:

"Maternity or additional offspring may force upon the woman a distressful life and future. Psychological harm may be imminent. Mental and physical health may be taxed by child care. There is also the distress for all concerned associated with the unwanted child, and there is the problem of bringing a child into a family already unable, psychologically or otherwise, to care for it. In other cases the additional difficulties and continuing stigma of unwed motherhood may be involved. All these are factors that the woman and the responsible physician will consider in consultation." *Roe vs. Wade*, U.S. Supreme Court, No. 70-18, p. 38, Jan. 1973

The Court said that abortion could be performed: ". . . in the light of all factors — physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman's age — relevant to the well being of the patient. All these factors may relate to health." *Doe vs. Bolton*, U.S. Supreme Court, No. 70-40, IV, p. 11, Jan. 1973

Yet, notice the following fact on abortion:

### **Types Of Physical Complications:**

The number and types of physical complications resulting from abortion are as diverse as the various abortion methods. Depending upon the type of abortion performed, physical complications can be as follows:

- Cervical tearing and laceration from the instruments.
- Perforation of the uterus by instruments. This may require major surgery, including hysterectomy.
- Scarring of the uterine lining by suction tubing, curettes, or other instruments.
- Infection, local and systemic.
- Hemorrhage and shock, especially if the uterine artery is torn.
- Anesthesia toxicity from both general or local anesthesia, resulting in possible convulsions, cardiorespiratory arrest, and in extreme cases, death.
- Retained tissue, indicated by cramping, heavy bleeding, and infection.
- Postabortal syndrome, referring to an enlarged, tender and soft uterus retaining blood clots.
- Failure to recognize an ectopic pregnancy. This could lead to the rupture of a fallopian tube, hemorrhage and resulting infertility or death, if treatment is not provided in time.

Dr. Warren Hern, *Abortion Practice*, c. 1980 & Hern, W. "Long Term Risks of Induced Abortion," *Gynecology and Obstetrics*, 6:63 (1994)

### **Types Of Psychological/Emotional Complications:**

Some women experience immediate psychological problems from abortion. Other women repress feelings of guilt, delaying emotional reactions sometimes for several years and oftentimes triggered by their first planned pregnancy.

These complications include:

- Sad mood.
- Sudden and uncontrollable crying episodes.
- Deterioration of self-concept.
- Sleep, appetite and sexual disturbances.
- Reduced motivation.
- Disruption in interpersonal relationships.
- Extreme guilt and anxiety.

- Psychological "numbing."
- Depression and thoughts of suicide.

Listing provided by David Reardon, Ph.D., the Elliot Institute and Paul C. Reisser, M.D. and Teri Reisser, M.S., "Identifying and Overcoming Post-Abortion Syndrome," (Colorado Springs: Focus on the Family, 1994), pg. 11 (teenbreaks.com).

Both physical and psychological complications apply to the woman but the man bears the psychological only. One might ask, how would men feel if they were the ones pregnant, would this argument come up? It would be the same indifferent legislature proposed and ban on abortion if male pregnancy was possible. Pre-abortion emotions count very little in the strive to protect the unborn, for if it did, the emotion of the dying baby in the womb would be the priority; and once it is life, it has emotions. The best substantiation of these complications comes from an actual story of a girl who had an abortion. Sherry, a would-be-mother, who not only confesses that what she did is murder, but that she herself is dying inside because of this act.

June 22 will forever stay in my mind and in my heart. You see, that is the day I had my abortion. At the time it didn't seem like it would be such a big life-changing thing, but it was and it is. I was 19 and had been living with my fiancé for almost a year. I had turned my back on my Christian beliefs, my family, and my friends all in the name of "love." His reaction to the possibility of my becoming pregnant was, "If that's how you plan to get me to marry you, then you're crazy!" Fortunately, I wasn't pregnant; but a month later, I was.

This time he spoke of his undying love for me and how he wanted us to have children but how unfair it would be to "all of us" at this point. "Don't you want our kids to have everything we can give them? All the things we never had? Lots of toys? A big house?" And then he mentioned an abortion. I was confused, afraid. I couldn't stand the idea of disappointing my parents. Moving in with him was one thing. A child born outside of marriage would be quite something else.

I wanted to keep everyone as happy as I possibly could. According to what I could find on the subject, it was really no big deal. No real medical risk just a routine outpatient operation. I'd be home by mid-afternoon. After all, it wasn't even a baby yet. I was never told anything about the risks, not about the pain, and certainly not about the development of the tiny human inside me.

The day came. The people were very matter-of-fact as they showed me the tube to be used in the suction procedure and "counseled" me. They drew blood, prepped me, and finally stood beside me as a strange, uncaring man took away my child. However, they weren't there a year later to take away the pain when I would hear a baby cry and yet there was no baby. Mine was gone.

Since then I have denied it, accepted it, and hated it. I have wanted to talk about it, yet refused to discuss it. I hated myself for what I did and hated the "Right to Life" people for making me aware of it. It is shattering to find out after having an abortion that the "blob of tissue" actually had fingers and toes. I went up and down trying to deal with what I had done. I couldn't tell anyone. Then I finally found the answer for me.

I took it all to Jesus and asked Him to forgive me and to heal me. He has brought me to this point and made me able to face it in hopes of helping someone who is where I once was (teenbreaks.com).

Sad to say, the same social argument we were sold on has the same turn around and in most case mirror this saying, "we solve one problem (or think we do) and create ten more."

**Rape and Incest is not an excuse, adoption is a viable option**

I didn't want to touch heavily on this section, so I'll give my two-cent and let Heritage House 76 (abortionfacts.com) do the rest under this section. Everyone knows King Solomon, the wisest man that ever lived, he wasn't the direct product of rape but the relations from which he came has a similar disdain to it. His mother (Bathsheba) being forced into by David, while her husband was sent to be killed by David. The child of that incident died, but that same stigma could also be attached to Solomon, the next child David and Bathsheba had. But regardless of the negativity surrounding Solomon, God loved him and he prospered as one of the wisest, richest and mightiest kings ever. David could have terminated his relationship with Bathsheba or Solomon's life after all this and we wouldn't have what we have today from Solomon.

### **Why not allow abortion for rape pregnancies?**

We must approach this with great compassion. The woman has been subjected to an ugly trauma, and she needs love, support and help. But she has been the victim of one violent act. Should we now ask her to be a party to a second violent act -that of abortion? Unquestionably, many would return the violence of killing an innocent baby for the violence of rape. But, before making this decision, remember that most of the trauma has already occurred. She has been raped. That trauma will live with her all her life. Furthermore, this girl did not report for help, but kept this to herself. For several weeks or months, she has thought of little else. Now, she has finally asked for help, has shared her upset, and should be in a supportive situation.

The utilitarian question from the mother's stand-point is whether or not it would now be better to kill the developing baby within her. But will abortion now be best for her, or will it bring her more harm yet? What has happened and its damage has already occurred.

She's old enough to know and have an opinion as to whether she carries a "baby" or a "blob of protoplasm." Will she be able to live comfortably with the memory that she *"killed her developing baby"*? Or would she ultimately be more mature and more at peace with herself if she could remember that, even though she became pregnant unwillingly, she nevertheless solved her problem by being unselfish, by giving of herself and of her love to an innocent baby, who had not asked to be created, to deliver, perhaps to place for adoption, if she decides that is what is best for her baby. Compare this memory with the woman who can only look back and say, "I killed my baby."

### **But carry the rapist's child?**

True, it is half his. But remember, half of the baby is also hers, and there are other outstretched arms that will adopt and love that baby.

### **I don't see how she could!**

"Interestingly, the pregnant rape victim's chief complaint is not that she is unwillingly pregnant, as bad as the experience is. The critical moment is fleeting in this area. It frequently pulls families together like never before. When women are impregnated through rape, their condition is treated in accordance, as are their families.

"We found this experience is forgotten, replaced by remembering the abortion, because it is what *they* did." M. Uchtman, Director, Suiciders Anonymous, Report to Cincinnati City Council, Sept. 1, 1981

"In the majority of these cases, the pregnant victim's problems stem more from the trauma of rape than from the pregnancy itself." Mahkorn & Dolan, "Sexual Assault & Pregnancy." In *New Perspectives on Human Abortion*, University Publishers of Amer., 1981, pp. 182-199 239

As to what factors make it most difficult to continue her pregnancy, the opinions, attitudes, and beliefs of others were most frequently cited; in other words, how her loved ones treated her. Mahkorn,

"Pregnancy & Sexual Assault." *In Psychological Aspects of Abortion*, University Publishers of Amer., 1979, pp. 53-72

### **But many laws would allow for this exception.**

That is because many only think of the mother. But we should also think of the baby. Should we kill an innocent unborn baby for the crime of his father? Or let's look at it this way. Do we punish other criminals by killing their children? Besides, such laws pose major problems in reporting, and also women have been known to report falsely.

### **You accuse women of lying?**

We don't have to. Radical feminist guru Gloria Steinem, in a 1985 interview with *USA Today* said that "to make abortion legal only in cases of rape and incest would force women to lie."

The story of Jane Roe, of the *Roe v. Wade* Decision, is well known. Norma McCorvey (her real name) fabricated a story, that she had been gang raped at a circus, in the mistaken impression that this would permit her to obtain a legal abortion in Texas. Not until 1987 did she reveal that the baby was actually conceived "through what I thought was love." (*Post*, Sept. 9, 1987.) And:

Up until 1988, Pennsylvania's Medicaid program funded abortions, for women who claimed they had been raped, without any requirement for reporting of the purported assault to a law enforcement agency. Under this law, abortion clinic personnel issued thinly veiled public invitations for women to simply state that they'd been raped, and the state ended up funding an average of 36 abortions a month based on such unsubstantiated claims. In 1988 the legislature added a requirement for reporting the rape to a law enforcement agency, and the average dropped to less than three abortions per month.

### **You said reporting was a problem?**

The problem is requiring proof. If the woman goes directly to the hospital, her word is accepted. But, sadly, through fright or ignorance, she may not report it and quietly nurse her fears. She misses her period and hopes against hope that it isn't what she thinks it is. Sometimes months go by before finally, in tears, she reports to her mother, her physician, or some other counselor or confidante. To prove rape then is impossible. The only proof of rape then is to have a reliable witness corroborate the story, and such a witness almost never exists.

### **What proof would be needed early on?**

Reporting the rape to a law enforcement agency is needed. Any hospital emergency room will handle this.

If done within a day or two, she can be examined, given medicine for sexually transmitted diseases and counseled. Her word will rarely be questioned. But if it is many days later, especially after a missed period, her word may not be enough (see above).

### **What percentage of rape pregnancies are aborted?**

Less than half. The balance carry the baby to term. In one study of 37 rape pregnancies, 28 carried to term. S. Makhorn, in *Psychological Aspects of Abortion*, Mall & Watts, Univ. Pub. 1979, Pg. 58

### **What is her chief complaint?**



Perhaps, surprisingly, it is not the fact that she is pregnant. Her chief complaint is "how other people treat her." This should be very sobering to everyone. How is she treated? Do others understand the trauma she has experienced, and love and support her? Or, do they avoid her and act as if it was partly her fault, or worse? Just think, if all such victims were given generous love and support, many more than at present would carry their babies to term. Mahkorn & Dona, "Sexual Assault & Pregnancy." In *New Perspectives on Human Abortion*, University Publishers of Amer., 1981, pp. 182-199 Mahkorn, "Pregnancy & Sexual Assault." In *Psychological Aspects of Abortion*, University Publishers of Amer., 1979, pp. 53-72

### **What if she could not cope with raising the child?**

We must let these women know that it is all right to feel that way. We fully understand. That does not mean, however, that the baby is unwanted. There are innumerable arms outstretched, aching for a child to love. Any number of couples will want the child. She should be supported and encouraged if she chooses to place the child in a loving adoptive home.

### **She had a problem. Abortion permanently removes the problem. Or is there emotional aftermath?**

In recent years it has become clear that these women can and do suffer from Post-Abortion Syndrome. When PAS does develop, a woman, so affected, can carry the same burdens of guilt, denial and depression that a woman who aborted a "love" baby often does. Why is this? At least two dynamics seem obvious. Remember that the rape was done to her. She was not responsible. She was the innocent victim and should bear no guilt. But, by contrast, the abortion will be done by her. She agreed to it. She was a volitional participant in a second act of violence: the killing of her own unborn child. And it is her own unborn child. This is the other inescapable fact of biology that probably is a factor in the development of PAS. The newly-conceived baby is certainly the "rapist's child," but he or she is also her child, for half of the new baby's genetic material came from her. She may try, but, inside of her, she cannot deny this biologic reality, however unwillingly it happened and however upsetting it may be. And so, to kill this little one by abortion is to participate in a violent, lethal act that destroys a baby who is partly her own flesh and blood. In loving charity, we should never remind her of this.

But we don't have to, for she knows it instinctively and all of her maternal feelings may well rebel when faced with being a part of this killing.

### **The "treatment" for rape, isn't it abortive?**

This is best illustrated by giving two theoretical case histories. Woman "A" is raped at midnight on Saturday and is treated in a hospital emergency room with a female hormone medication beginning at 3:00 a.m. Sunday morning. In this case, the woman's body was scheduled to ovulate two days later, on Monday. If that were to have occurred, and if the assailant's sperm were still alive in her body, she might have been fertilized two days after the assault and become pregnant at that time. A very small body of medical opinion believes that the dose of medication given might prevent that ovulation, and she would therefore not get pregnant. This mechanism of action would be one of temporary sterilization, or, in more commonly used (however technically inaccurate) terms, the action would be contraceptive. Woman "B" presents a different case. She had ovulated at 9:00 p.m. on Saturday, was raped at midnight, and also received treatment at 3:00 a.m. To her own observation, this lady also does not "get pregnant." In fact, something entirely different happened inside her body. Let us assume that she was one of those very rare cases where fertilization did occur, and had, in fact, occurred prior to the giving of the medication. The life of a tiny new little boy or girl had begun. The cells of this tiny body begin to divide and divide again, but at one week of life, when implantation within the nutrient lining of the mother's womb should occur, this tiny new human being could not implant and died. The mechanism of action of the drug, in this case, had been to harden the lining of

the womb in order to prevent implantation. This effect was one of a micro-abortion, at one week of life and represents the large majority of medical opinion.

### **Would a law forbidding abortion, prevent such treatment?**

Most legal opinion agrees that since these drugs have a multiplicity of other beneficial and therapeutic effects, they would never be removed from the market. Since they would in some cases have a legally permissible effect (temporary sterilization or/and contraception), even with a strong Human Life Amendment in place, the use of such drugs after rape could not be forbidden. Therefore, the choice now available to a woman after an assault rape, to use or not use such treatment, would still be available after such a law. [Hence, like how some drugs cannot be had without prescription, drugs of this nature shouldn't be obtainable without prescription and pregnancy tests or other tests by a certified doctor – a sort of ban on the drugs as well. With rape victims, seeing that the drug is banned or sensitive to that nature, an alternative drug should be given to such a person and others in a similar situation.]

### **Does anyone win after a rape?**

Once, after answering questions on rape on a radio show, one of your authors was called to the phone after the program. A woman's voice said,

"You were talking about me. You see, I am the product of rape. An intruder forced his way into my parents' house, tied up my father and, with him watching, raped my mother. I was conceived that night. Everyone advised an abortion. The local doctors and hospital were willing. My father, however, said, 'Even though not mine, that is a child and I will not allow it to be killed!' I don't know how many times that, as I lay secure in the loving arms of my husband, I have thanked God for my wonderful Christian father." And so, does anyone win? Yes, the baby does.

### **What of incest?**

Incest is intercourse by a father with his daughter, uncle with niece, etc. It usually involves a sick man, often a sick mother who frequently knows it's happening (even if not consciously admitting it), and an exploited child. Fortunately, pregnancy is not very common. When incest does occur, however, it is seldom reported and, when reported, is hard to prove.

Most pregnancies from incest have a very different dynamic than from rape and must be counseled in a very different manner.

Even strongly pro-abortion people, if they approach an incest case professionally, must be absolutely convinced before advising abortion, for abortion is not only is an assault on the young mother, who may well be pregnant with a "love object," but it may completely fail to solve the original problem. It is also unusual for wisdom to dictate anything but adoptive placement of the baby.

### **Love object?**

When pregnancy does occur, it is often an attempt to end the relationship. In a twisted sort of way, however, the father is a love object. In one study, only 3 of 13 child-mothers had any negative feelings toward him. H. Maisch, *Incest*, New York: Stein & Day Publishers, 1972

### **In incest, is pregnancy common?**

No. "Considering the prevalence of teenage pregnancies in general, incest treatment programs marvel at the low incidence of pregnancy from incest." Several reports agree at 1% or less. G.

### **How does the incest victim feel about being pregnant?**

For her, it is a way to stop the incest; a way to unite mother and daughter, a way to get out of the house. Most incestuous pregnancies, if not pressured, will not get abortions. "As socially inappropriate as incest and incestuous pregnancies are, their harmful effects depend largely upon reaction of others." G. Maloof, "The Consequences of Incest," *The Psychological Aspects of Abortion*, University Publications of Amer., 1979, p. 100

"Pregnancy from rape is extremely rare. A study of one thousand rape victims who were treated after the rape reported no pregnancies. There are no known studies of incest cases. Medically, we know pregnancy in these cases would be rare."

### **Suggestions to stop the murder of babies**

The following are some suggestions to help stop the murder of babies, from heritage house:

**Educate** - First yourself, then others.

**Volunteer** - To help in your local pro-life group or pregnancy help center.

**Lobby** - Your elected officials.

**Write** - Those who support Planned Parenthood and other pro-abortion and anti-family groups. Write your newspapers, your radio and TV stations.

**Vote** - Nothing will change unless you do. Remember that any candidate for public office who permits, supports or wants you to pay for the direct killing of almost every third baby conceived in America — that candidate is simply disqualified from holding public office.

**Support** - Pro-Life groups, like Heritage House 76, ACLJ, Center For Moral Clarity, Reclaiming America and many more.

**Pray** - Pray as if everything depends upon your prayers, for it just might be so. Seeing that we are wrestling a battle that is bigger than us, as explained in the preamble to the Student Manifesto, our best weapon is prayer with faith; that is, pray believing that what you just prayed for is gained instantaneously even though you might not realize it yet.

### **My opinion from a Godly perspective**

The bible gave the remedy, Abstinence! Don't have unplanned sex, don't have unplanned pregnancies. And the only planned sex you can have is between two consenting adults of the opposite sex who are married; the rarity and exception is rape. Even with the latter case, no funding should be provided by the government for murder. Adoption is a viable option and made extra-ordinarily easy by the local agencies and also by the vast number of stable traditional couples, who can't have children, that wants a new born to adopt. You might ask, "How can a girl give up her own baby for adoption and go through life never knowing what is happening to her child?" Which is better to remember, "I gave my baby life. And because I loved him, I gave him into the arms of a loving couple" - or to remember, "I selfishly ended my baby's life?"

I had thought to suggest 3 constitutional amendments that are vital to the survival of the republic, the one I will mention now because I now later withdraw such ideas of suggesting it for constitutional amendment, because it might already be in it. That is, within the constitution, a clear written legislature-outlawing abortion; giving attention to the history of it and detrimental implication it has had on the country, from below and especially from above (Prov 14:34). Citing historic cases as Roe vs. Wade as well. But now doing this essay for a public speaking class, I come to realize that abortion is already unconstitutional, federally and even in the state laws, whether stated or inherent. Because, if it is really analyzed it will be clearly seen that abortion is murder, which I have done, and if so, an unlawful act in America and the world. If the notion, erroneously, is used of Pro-Choice, then I should also have the Pro-Choice to kill my relatives when they annoy me; after all, they are flesh and blood and it's a choice to do so. Of course, that sounds bizarre and unscholarly to convince you of this fact, so I cordially ask that you re-read the section from my essay on why abortion is already outlawed and should be enforced: Because life begun and hence murder is palpable, for you can only really kill something that is ALIVE. If after such plain rhetoric it can't be seen by the adamantly evil Pro-choicers, then I guess the inevitable must occur of making the amendment itself (e.g. NRLC proposal).

"The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government" (Thomas Jefferson "To Republican Citizens of Wash. County Maryland." March 31, 1809). Hence, if this and any government is said to be good, they must protect the human life of the unborn from being terminated.

To further be convinced go to:

<http://www.armyofgod.com/BabySelect.html> or <http://www.threeq.com/pages/abortion.html> or look below: -



"Angels," double click the tack for added convincing on abortion, it's an attachment. Click open when it comes up, they are safe to open.



"Humans," click this attachment for a oversimplified explanation of suckery, not necessary and advised to avoid, here only if you pry in the above.

YOU MUST be using the latest acrobat reader to click the red tag, that is version 7 or a professional version of adobe acrobat. Go here for version 7: <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html> or just [www.adobe.com](http://www.adobe.com)

# YOU DON'T CALL THIS MURDER



**At any stage, from a day to months old, it is still murder.**

[www.armyofgod.com/BabySelect.html](http://www.armyofgod.com/BabySelect.html) or [www.threeq.com/pages/abortion.html](http://www.threeq.com/pages/abortion.html)