

PART I

INTRODUCTION

Chapter

- 1 – The Situation
- 2 – The Three Questions
- 3 – How To Teach The Pro-Life Story
- 4 – Discrimination
- 5 – Something Old, Something New

CHAPTER 1

THE SITUATION

The situation in the United States, almost three decades after abortion became legal throughout the nation, seems to be at an impasse. Canada, presented with abortion (now on demand) throughout that nation four years earlier, is not that much different. One thing that is completely obvious is that the issue will not go away.

The other obvious fact is that the two sides remain completely polarized. There seems to be no middle ground, no chance for compromise. When one strips the issue to its bare bones, the reason for the lack of middle ground is only too obvious. This either is or is not a living human from conception. This living human either continues to live or is killed. It is obvious that this being can't be just a little human, or perhaps not human, at one point and then human at another. He or she either is or is not. Just as simply, there is either life or death. There is no middle ground.

Compromise?

Pro-abortion advocates, who call themselves pro-choice, are unwilling to concede any ground at all. Would they allow passage of laws in either nation forbidding abortion in the third trimester for sex selection,

to pick an extreme position or would they stop killing babies during delivery (partial-birth abortion)? No! They have fought any such attempt.

Would true-blue pro-lifers, if they had their choice, allow abortion for pregnancies resultant from assault rape and incest, or for pregnancies when the developing baby is severely handicapped? No, they might be forced into this as a political compromise, and as a temporary measure. But, ethically speaking, no real pro-lifer would consent to this. It would seem, then, that the chance for compromise simply does not exist. On the other hand, it is obvious that people of goodwill must continue to try for a solution.

Ultimate Pro-Abortion Goals:

Many of the ultimate goals of those who favor abortion already exist. Abortion is legal in both of our nations until birth for social and economic reasons. Many areas use tax money to pay for elective abortions. What pro-abortion forces have not achieved has been to mainstream this procedure into the day-to-day practice of medicine. They also have not achieved a status of respectability, as the word “abortionist” still is one of low esteem, or even condemnation. Also, abortion is still strongly condemned by substantial segments of the cultures of both the U.S. and Canada.

The Ultimate Pro-Life Goals:

The ultimate pro-life goal is quite direct and very simple. Pro-lifers want an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, to the Canadian Charter of Rights that will give equal protection under the law, to all living humans from the time their biologic life begins at fertilization until natural death.

Understanding that such a goal remains yet in the future, pro-life people have an intermediate goal. It is a Constitutional Amendment returning the right to make decisions about abortion to each individual state in the

U.S., and the equivalent in Canada, to each individual province. This would take federal judges out of the mix completely and make legislating on abortion a state's issue. States and provinces could then allow abortion, forbid it, or anything in between.

Since the above intermediate goals also remain yet unattainable, pro-life forces today are seeking more immediate goals, particularly so in the United States. These include parental notification and consent for abortion for minor daughters; specific public health regulations of free-standing abortion facilities; women's right to know, or informed consent laws; forbidding certain types of abortions (such as partial-birth abortion); forbidding of abortions for certain reasons, such as sex selection and after a certain age of fetal development.

Certain allied issues can also be legislated, such as forbidding destructive live fetal experimentation and forbidding human embryonic stem cell research and cloning. Freedom of conscience can be guaranteed, both for individuals and for institutions. Laws to ban the use of tax monies for elective abortions have been the first line of attack for pro-lifers, but much yet can still be done. There are many avenues where federal monies have been given to pro-abortion organizations. A major example is family planning, which includes abortion as a method of family planning, and routinely uses abortifacients. Government support for institutions that have encouraged and referred for abortions could be terminated and such monies redirected to those that support women before, during and after birth.

Adoption:

There are certain constructive areas that can be encouraged that should be non-controversial. An obvious one is adoption. Certainly, the pro-life side has been warmly supportive of this. Tragically, the pro-abortion side, while giving lip service to adoption, nevertheless has, in practice, strongly discouraged adoption to the

point of not so subtly condemning it. The typical Planned Parenthood type of advice to an unmarried teenager contemplating adoption is to hold it up as a fate worse than death for her unfortunate child. Sadly, adoption should be, but has not been, common ground.

Contraception:

A major thrust of pro-abortion rhetoric has been the assumption that if only young people were given adequate education in how to use contraceptives, and then adequate access to them, the problem would be solved.

A portion of the pro-life side has serious moral reservations about contraception per se. Many other pro-lifers do not share this. Almost universally, however, pro-lifers oppose contraceptives for premarital sex, for adultery, and for homosexual liaisons. They oppose so-called contraceptives that cause abortions in the first week of life. They also oppose our federal government exporting huge amounts of contraceptives for “population control.”

Title X, the U.S. federal family planning program which has expended billions of dollars giving contraceptives to teenagers over the last three decades, has proven to be a colossal failure. Wherever its clinics have been established, an intense campaign has been launched to teach contraceptive use to unmarried teens. The result? The pregnancy rate has gone up. Sexually transmitted disease has gone up. The abortion rate has gone up. The age of first sexual encounter is younger. Planned Parenthood has reported that 60% of women getting abortions had used contraceptives the month they became pregnant. This evidence, along with other studies, has convinced many that the siren song of “give them contraceptives and the problem will be solved” is not part of the solution, but rather part of the problem.

But legalizing abortion was sold to us as a cure for many of our social ills.

Let's look at the record.

Social Concern	1970	1990
Illegitimate Births	10.7%	26.2%
Children with Single Mothers	11%	22%
Children on Welfare	8.5%	11.9%
Violent Crime Rate (per 100,000)	36.4	73.2

From the Index of Leading Cultural Indicators,
William J. Bennett.

Love Them Both:

Your authors have been teaching, writing, and lecturing in the field of human sexuality for forty-five years and have been in the thick of the struggle over abortion for thirty years. Is there any common ground? We certainly can take sides, and many do with great passion and dedication. We, however, see one glimmer of light that hopefully would appeal to both sides, and certainly would to those in the middle. It is the recent emphasis on the simple question, "Why can't we love them both?"

Why can't we all stand with the pregnant woman? Why can't we tell her that we share the agony of her decision? That we really know of no "convenience" abortions? Why can't we tell her that we stand with her, not against her? Why can't we begin to discuss constructive alternatives to abortion, adoption being an alternative par excellence?

Why can't we cooperate in giving her all the information there is to be given from both sides of this controversial issue? Why not fully informed consent? Give her all the reasons for abortion? The law allows, even requires this. But also give her all the reasons for waiting and, most emphatically, offer to her all of the constructive alternatives that now exist. If our laws

continue to dictate that she be given that choice of life or death for her unborn, at the very least that choice should be a fully informed one. It should not just be informed in terms of technical information. No, it should also be a choice that is made in view of the fact that there is a warm and loving alternative to the technical quick-fix of abortion.

In the coming years, the hallmark of the pro-life movement, at least, should not be just to save the baby, but to love them both.

Next Chapter

Contents Page