

Q. Why are pro-lifers trying to interfere with women's reproductive rights and their choice to have control over their own bodies?

A. "Reproductive rights" is one of the most insidious newspeak terms to hit this planet because it turns the murder of millions of helpless babies into a fundamental right to be defended. It distracts attention away from the victims and puts it on the so-called rights of the perpetrators, turning them into pseudo-victims.

Trying to turn the question into one of a woman's choice to control her own body versus government control of her body is an obfuscation of the real issue. The issue is not whether a woman can have control over her own body. The issue is whether a woman can have control over someone else's body, the someone else being the unborn baby growing in her womb. It is contradictory and hypocritical for a woman who claims to believe that a woman should have control of her own body to then claim control over someone else's body to the point of killing it.

Naming rape and incest as if they are the primary causes for ending a pregnancy is also misleading. According to the latest figures at the time I'm writing, the reasons for having abortions are as follows: "in cases of rape, 0.3%; in cases of incest, 0.03%; in cases of risk to maternal life, 0.1%; in cases of risk to maternal health, 0.8%; and in cases of fetal health issues, 0.5%. About 98.3% of abortions in the United States are elective, including socio-economic reasons or for birth control. This includes perhaps 30% for primarily economic reasons and possibly 0.1% each for sex selection and selective reduction of multifetal pregnancies." In other words, the vast majority of "choices" to end a person's life in utero have nothing to do with rape, incest, or even the woman's health. See "Reasons given for having abortions in the United States" (<http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/abortion/abreasons.html>).

The accusation that trying to stop the murder of unborn children is trying to push religious beliefs on others is a perversion of the facts.

Copyright © 2017 wordofhisgrace.org

Permission is granted to reproduce this article only if reproduced in full with no alterations and keeping the copyright statement and this permission statement intact. Unless otherwise noted, Bible references are from the World English Bible (WEB).

Would these people say that trying to prevent the murder of an adult is trying to push religious beliefs on others? After all, the prohibition of murder is found in religious writings (e.g. "You shall not murder" [Exodus 20:13]). Maybe we should repeal the laws against murder and let people have their choice.

A popular propaganda technique is redefinition. Religious cults make good use of this. For example, many redefine grace as meaning favor earned by good works. Similarly, in the abortion industry, pro-abortion is redefined as pro-choice (even though the baby does not get to choose), and pro-life is anti-woman (even though, because of sex discrimination, more female babies are killed). Dehumanizing language is also used effectively. The military, for example, speaks of neutralizing targets rather than killing people. Abortionists, rather than speaking of unborn babies, stick with cold, medical terms, such as zygotes, preimplantation concepti, embryos, fetuses, and products of conception. Abortion, which is itself a dehumanized word, is often further neutralized with terms such as vacuum aspiration, D&C, D&E, and induced fetal demise. It is all baby-killing.

My point is that almost every human society has recognized that murder must be prevented and punished. My position, based upon sound science (see "The Annual Abortion Holocaust") (<http://www.wordofhisgrace.org/abortionholocaust.htm>), is that the unborn child in all stages of development is a living human being and that in the vast majority of pregnancies, taking its life is murder. No one has the right to choose to murder someone else. The idea that those who are working to end abortion have a desire to interfere with a woman's body or with her proper rights (abortion is not one of them) is an absurd suggestion and is a propaganda technique designed to distract attention away from the real issues. The baby is not the woman's body, and, when that is understood, it should be clear why women should not have the free choice to terminate their pregnancies.

Now that I've answered this question using sound and rational but secular reasons that stand on their own, I'll explain to readers two reasons I'm answering it on a Christian, Bible-teaching website. The first reason is that this is essentially a question of rights, specifically the right to life, and where the right to life comes from is a theological question.

Since it will be important in establishing where the right to life comes from, let's first establish this fact: "God created man in his own image. In God's image he created him; male and female he created them"

(Genesis 1:27). After Cain killed his brother, Abel, God said to him, "What have you done? The voice of your brother's blood cries to me from the ground" (Genesis 4:10). It was wrong for Cain to kill Abel. The implication is that Abel had a right to his own life and Cain did not have a right to take Abel's life.

The covenant God made with Noah tells us where man's right to his own life comes from: "Whoever sheds man's blood, his blood will be shed by man, for God made man in his own image" (Genesis 9:6). No one has the right to take another's life on his own authority because God made everyone in His own image. Thus, God gives us the right to our own lives unless we forfeit that right through committing capital crimes.

Do women have a right to choice over their own bodies? Sure, but they are to exercise that right before having sex. They should also consider this before marriage, because married women give up their authority over their bodies to their husbands, just as husbands give up their authority over their bodies to their wives (1 Corinthians 7:4). After the woman is pregnant, it is too late to exercise control. The baby has a right to life, and taking that baby's life is murder. When the government of a nation does not treat the taking of unborn babies' lives as murder, it is failing in the responsibilities God has given it. Nevertheless, that is between God and that nation. God will take care of it (the results may not be pleasant).

The other reason I am addressing this here is to point out the Gospel application. In other words, it is not the responsibility of Christians to have a judging, condemning attitude about others' sins. Jesus said, "I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Luke 5:32). It is the Christian's responsibility to present the world with the Good News of forgiveness in Jesus Christ: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:16).

Peter Ditzel