

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

How to Answer Arguments for Abortion with Frank Turek

(July 8, 2022)

Ladies and gentlemen, last week we discussed the overturning of Roe v Wade. We pointed out that there is no right to a dead baby, that if your solution to a problem is a dead baby, you've got the wrong solution. Nevertheless, people are going to have objections to you or anyone else saying that an unborn child should be protected. They're going to say that abortion is a right. They're going to come up with objections. What are some of the objections they're going to come up with? We're going to talk about them today and how to answer them.

For example, they're going to say the separation of church and state, you can't set up a theocracy. We covered that briefly last time, we'll go into it a little bit more today. They're gonna say don't impose your morals on me. They're gonna say the law can't change hearts, so why are you trying to do that through the law? They're gonna say an unborn child is not developed, it's not viable. Or they're gonna say the baby will be poor and unwanted so why are you bringing this child into the world? Why are you forcing me to do that? You're going to hear it's my body my choice. You're going to hear don't like an abortion don't have one.

Then they're also going to say what about rape and incest? It would be cruel to have a person who had been raped or had been sexually assaulted by a relative to actually bring a baby to term. You're gonna make the mother think of the rape every time they see that child. How can you say there shouldn't be an exception for rape and incest? And what about all the back alley abortions now? If we start outlawing abortion, there's going to be women dying in back alleys from getting abortions. And not only that, you Christians, you know that God kills babies in the Old Testament. Look at Numbers 5. People get into Numbers 5 and try and say that God is aborting kids, so why can't we if God can do it? We're gonna get into all that today

You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is CrossExamined.org. And this is also a podcast called I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. So, if you're listening on American Family Radio, and you want to hear this again, go back over something that maybe I went through too

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

quickly, and you want to hear it again, just look for the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast.

Now, we need to make our case. The case now matters, ladies and gentlemen, because finally, as we pointed out last week, Roe v Wade has been rightly overturned. It was a terrible decision, not just from a moral perspective, but from a constitutional perspective. And you can go back and listen to last week's program on that. But now we need to answer the arguments for abortion, and we need to make the case for life.

Now, you might ask yourself, well, just who do we have to make the case to? Who do we need to convince? Actually, I think you know, who we need to convince the most, the church. If we could get the church to be the church, if we could get the church to stand for life, most of the issues, politically and morally, would go away. Because if we could get the church to just follow the natural law, and follow the Bible, on protecting life and realizing that everybody's made in the image of God, many of the problems would go away. Not all of them, obviously. There would still be people out there getting abortions. But if we could convince the church to be the church, we could build a culture of life and we could also in some states anyway, restrict or outlaw abortion, outlaw the murder of innocent human beings.

Now you might say, Oh, Frank, this is this is too hard to do. Look, abortion is not intellectually complex, abortion is emotionally complex. Once you know an unborn child as a human being, it's not intellectually hard to say you ought to protect it. But there are emotional complexities to this that we need to address now. I think the easiest way to show somebody that abortion is wrong, and I literally mean show - you don't have to go through a syllogism, you don't need to go through arguments - you just need to show them a one minute and seven second video. I talked about it last week. It's on CaseForLife.com, the Scott Klusendorf website. He has it right there on the front page. Last week, we sent you this video.

If you're an email subscriber to us, we send one email a week, maybe once every two weeks, with a nice video in there. Sometimes it's not so nice like the one we sent you last week, which actually had in it this CaseForLife.com video, actually, it didn't really have it in the video that we sent you, because YouTube actually censored the video. So, if you watch the video that I sent you, I'm doing a presentation on abortion and I get to the point where I'm about to show this

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

video at CaseForLife.com and what we have on the screen is, YouTube censored this - if you want to see it, go into the description of this video and click on the Vimeo link and you can see it. For some reason, I kept getting emails last week from people who got our email saying, Hey, the video has been censored. Read what's on the screen. It tells you where to see the video. It's in the description on the YouTube video right there.

But you don't need to do that. Just go to CaseForLife.com video/ and challenge everybody you know who thinks abortion is okay to watch that video. It's one minute and seven seconds. You need to be informed and once you see a real abortion in all three trimesters, the results of a real abortion, if you don't say this ought to be outlawed, I don't know if you have a conscience. Either that or your conscience has been seared.

Now, if you can't show somebody the video, or they don't want to see it, then you can start talking about arguments verbally. And whenever you're talking about this issue, you need to keep the focus on the humanity of the baby. Here's a very simple argument that you can point out to people that shows that abortion is wrong. Premise number one: It's wrong to kill an innocent human being. It's wrong to murder somebody, in other words. Premise number two: An unborn child is an innocent human being. Conclusion, therefore, it is wrong to kill an unborn child. Now, that is a logical argument. It is a sound argument. It's a valid argument. And the only premise you really need to prove is premise two, an unborn child is actually an innocent human being. You need to prove that. So, how do you do it? Well, we're gonna get into it as we go.

One of the ways is to show people the video. They're gonna see the results of an abortion in every trimester, but you can also make the verbal case for it. Now, this is the most important right we have, ladies and gentlemen, the right to life. The right to life is the right to all of the rights. If you don't have life, you don't have anything. So, you have to have life in order to have any other right; freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, whatever right you have is predicated on the fact that you're alive. So, this is the first of all rights, the right to life.

Now, what I'm about to do is go through these counter arguments that some of the pro-abortion people will throw at you. And we're gonna go through them as quickly as we can. Much of what I'm going to say is actually from a book I wrote with Dr. Geisler many years ago

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

called Legislating Morality. You can find that at Amazon, you can find it cheaper on our website, CrossExamined.org. Just click on store, you'll see it there. So, let's start with the first one, theocracy. People will say, You're setting up a theocracy. What about the separation of church and state?

First of all, when somebody says you're setting up a theocracy by outlawing abortion, you might want to ask them: Are you saying that we shouldn't have laws against murder and theft because those laws are in the Bible? Are you saying anything in the Bible can't be legislated? Because if that's the case, we can't have any law, because most of our laws are derived from one of the 10 commandments. No. It would be ludicrous to say that because a religion agrees with a particular moral premise, you can't legislate that in legislation, you can't put that into law. So, that would make absolutely no sense. You want to ask him that question. Are you saying anything in the Bible can't be put into civil law? Well, we wouldn't have laws against murder, wouldn't have laws against theft, wouldn't have laws against rape. We wouldn't have virtually any law on the big issues if you had to say if it was agreed upon by some religion it couldn't be put in civil law.

But this actually is a red herring in logic. We're not setting up a theocracy by legislating morality. We wouldn't be setting up, perhaps, a theocracy if we were legislating religion, but we're not. And I'll explain the difference right after the break, and then we'll get into the question about imposing your morals. Are you supposed to impose your morals on me? We'll get into it right after the break. You're listening to I'm Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. We're back in just two minutes so don't go anywhere.

Welcome back to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. How do we answer these pro-abortion arguments? That's what we're going through right now, these objections that people bring up when we say abortion ought not be legal, it ought to be banned, it ought to be restricted. How do we answer those objections? That's what we're doing today here.

I want to point out, by the way, we are going back to Israel in September. We only have a few seats left on this trip: I'm really looking forward to getting back to Israel. I haven't been there in

CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

about four years. The pandemic held us up. There are no vaccine mandates anymore, there are no requirements for testing, it's free and open. If you want to be a part of the trip with me and Eli Shukron, the Israeli archaeologist who discovered the Pool of Siloam and excavated most of the City of David, we're going to run where Jesus walked friends. We're going to see just about every major site we can in Israel. And we're staying at the best hotels, because I will tell you that when you go to Israel, it's not walk where Jesus walked, it's run where Jesus walked, and it is tiring. So, we have some nice hotels, nice downtime, and it's really going to be a great trip. So, I'm looking forward to it. If you want to be a part of it, go to CrossExamined.org, click on events, and you'll see it there. Hope to see you in Israel in September.

Okay, we're talking about people who say, Well, you're setting up a theocracy when you outlaw abortion. No, we're not legislating religion. We're not telling people where, when, how, or if to worship. We're not telling them that they have to be a part of a certain church or certain denomination, or where they have to pledge allegiance to God, or any of those things. But we are telling people how they ought to treat one another. And that's what all laws do. All laws legislate morality, they don't necessarily legislate religion. Just because thou shalt not murderer is in the Bible doesn't mean we're establishing a theocracy when we put that into law. We are legislating morality. All laws legislate morality, as we point out in the book, *Legislating Morality*. And even those who say a woman has a moral right to choose an abortion, they're arguing from a moral position. They want to put what they perceive as a moral right into law. They're legislating morality as well. Everyone's legislating morality. The only question is: Whose morality will be legislated?

Now, at this point, people are gonna say, Well, don't impose your morality on me, to which point you can respond: Why not? Would that be immoral? Because you know what you're doing, you're imposing your morality on me right now. You're saying I ought not impose ought not, but you're imposing that ought not on me. Why do you get to impose your ought not, but I don't get to impose mine? Actually, what you can say is this. This is the better answer. That just points out it's self-defeating to say you ought not impose ought not. But when people say, Don't impose your morals on me, I think you can say, These aren't my morals. I didn't make this stuff up. I didn't make up the fact that murder is wrong, that abortion is wrong, that rape is wrong, that theft is wrong, that men were made for women and women were made for men and the best way to perpetuate and stabilize society, which is the reason the government's

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

involved in marriage to begin with, is to legally recognize that man woman relationship over every other relationship. I didn't make any of this stuff up. This isn't my morality, this isn't your morality, this just happens to be the morality. The one Thomas Jefferson said was self-evident. The one the apostle Paul said in Romans chapter 2, the Gentiles who do not have the law written on their hearts.

Look, if you have a problem with the morality, you really don't have a problem with me. I didn't make it up. It's not my morality, you have a problem with the Creator upon whom whose nature this morality is derived. So, I'm not trying to legislate my morality, I don't want to legislate your morality, I just want to legislate the morality. And you know in your heart, and I know in my heart, that murdering innocent human beings is wrong. So, we ought to put that into law. The only question is: Is an unborn child an innocent human being? And the answer is, yes. Scientifically it is. Biologically it is. From the natural law perspective. it is. From the Bible's perspective it is. We can go into Bible verses if you want. We're not going to go there right now.

I'll just say, one of the best places to go in the Bible, just very briefly, is Luke chapter one. Because when Mary comes to visit Elizabeth, who is pregnant with John the Baptist - of course, Mary is pregnant with Jesus - it says right in the text that John the Baptist, in the womb, leapt for joy when Mary was in His presence. That the babe leapt in the womb, meaning the unborn child in Elizabeth's womb was just that, an unborn child. So, this is a human being in the womb. And again, the best way to show this is to show the video at CaseForLife.com.

Okay, how about when people say you can't make people be good? Ladies and gentlemen, most laws are not intended to make people be good, but laws are intended to prevent people from doing evil. They're not trying to make people do good, they're trying to prevent people from doing evil. That's what the law is all about. Most laws are trying to prevent you from doing evil. They're not trying to encourage you to do good, although there are some examples of that, like maybe wearing seatbelts or the law that you have to educate your child. I mean, that's compelling you to do something. But most laws are trying to prevent you from doing evil. So, you're not trying to make people do good through the law, you're trying to prevent evil and murdering innocent children is evil.

CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

How about the claim that they will bring up when they say laws don't change hearts? Well, laws might not change hearts from a salvific perspective, but laws certainly change hearts when it comes to whether or not somebody thinks a particular activity is moral or not. Why? Because the law is a great teacher. Many people think whatever is legal is moral and whatever is illegal is immoral. In fact, let's take slavery, for example. 160 or so years ago, our country was about evenly split on slavery and 160 or so years ago, we probably were a more religious country than we are now. But now, 160 years later, there's hardly any debate over whether or not slavery is right or wrong. Everyone agrees it's wrong.

Now, what changed? Have we gotten more religious or less religious? We've probably gotten less religious, so it's not a religion thing, although Christians were the ones that were the impetus behind overturning slavery or outlawing slavery, so Christians largely get the credit for getting rid of slavery. But now 160 or so years later, although more people are secular, they think slavery is immoral. Why? Because the law has helped teach them that slavery is an evil. In fact, the law is what changed. And the law helped teach people right from wrong.

And the inverse happened with abortion. In 1973, all 50 states had laws against abortion. Some had more restrictive laws than others. But when Roe v Wade overturned all those laws, it enabled people to think, well, maybe abortion isn't really wrong anymore. I mean, it's legal now. So, if it's legal, it must be okay. And so, then abortion skyrocketed. The law is a great teacher. We can't give up on the law.

Now, look, a government can do one of only three things for any activity. A government can prohibit an activity, it can permit an activity, or it can promote an activity. Now, in my view, and I think the natural law biblical view, is to say we need to prohibit abortion except for the life of the mother. For many years, it's been permitted, obviously, in our country. But unfortunately, there are some people now who are promoting abortion. For example, the White House last week created a new website to help even underage kids get an abortion without their parents' consent. So, here we have the government now promoting abortion. Not only that, they want to pay for abortion. Gavin Newsom out in California, he wants to make California a sanctuary state for abortion, where government money is going to be used to pay for it. That's promoting abortion. Look, if you think abortion should be legal, first of all, I think you're wrong, but can we

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

at least agree it ought not be promoted? But that's what people are doing now, they're promoting abortion.

By the way, no extra charge for this, this is one of the problems with same-sex marriage. I've written an entire book on this, so I can't go into depth here. But what same-sex marriage does is it promotes genderless marriage, because now you don't have same-sex marriage or natural marriage, marriage just becomes genderless. And we're promoting genderless marriage, which means that marriage no longer has any connection to children. It's all about the romantic affinities of adults. Well, if the institution of marriage isn't there to protect children, what institution do we have to protect children? If we're going to permit homosexual behavior, that's one thing, but if we're going to promote it by saying, now the government is going to put their stamp of approval on such relationships, and we're going to equate it to man woman relationships when they come together and procreate, then we're essentially saying the two relationships are exactly the same and there's no real additional value to a man and a woman coming together procreating and - what's the word I'm looking for here - perpetuating and stabilizing society. That's why the government's involved in marriage is to perpetuate and stabilize society to bring forth the next generation.

Yes, we know some marriages don't have children. But a man woman relationship generally illustrates a couple that can bring forth children and only a man and a woman can create a child. That's why marriage for millennia has been about men and women, a man and a woman. But I digress, we're back to abortion now. By the way, if you want to see how the White House is doing this, there was a story - you could just go to ReproductiveRights.gov - and you will see what the White House is trying to do to encourage abortion. Not only that, but Amazon, Disney, Citibank, and others are now going to pay for travel to get an abortion. Now, why? Could it be that these companies don't want their employees to have children? Because number one, children will cost these companies more money in health care benefits. And number two, the company wants you to be devoted to them, not your family. Hmm, yeah, maybe you ought to think about that.

Why would you promote abortion, whether you're a company, a person, a government, why would you do that? Well, I think I know why companies are doing it. Follow the money ladies and gentlemen. What about my body my choice? Oh, gee, where was that during the vaccine

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

mandate? That goes out the window. Seems like we had a little bit of a hypocritical position here. My body my choice only applies to killing another body inside myself, but it doesn't apply to the government forcing me to take a vaccine. What's going on? We'll pick that up right after the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is CrossExamined.org. We're back in two minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you're anywhere near the DC area, I'll be at Cornerstone Chapel in Leesburg, Virginia, Monday night, July 18 and Wednesday night, July 20. We're doing I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist then taking a lot of questions. It starts at 7:00pm. Details are on our website. Then the following weekend I'll be in Port St. Lucie, FL at Calvary Chapel Port St. Lucie. We're going to be talking during the services about If God, Why Evil? And then I'll be back to speak on Sunday afternoon. All the details are on our website. Check them out there. Hope to see you either in DC or Florida next week.

Alright, we were talking about the, my body my choice, slogan that people bring out and we just pointed out that of course it goes against what the same people were saying during the vaccine mandate. But when it comes to abortion, it's not just your body. You're begging the question. There's another body inside of you. The baby has his or her own body. I mean, the baby has its own DNA, own blood type, own sex, it's not just a part of your body. And we know, ladies and gentlemen, that dogs conceive dogs, cats conceive cats, human beings conceive other human beings. I mean, what do you think is inside? It's not a squirrel, it's not a dog, it's not a cat, it's not a giraffe, it's a human being. So, the "my body my choice mantra" is just a vacuous slogan that begs the question. Of course, you have a right to control your own body, but not if you kill somebody else in the process, and that's what abortion does.

Isn't it interesting, ladies and gentlemen, that if a man fails to care for his baby, he's a deadbeat dad, but if a woman kills her baby, she's simply pro-choice? Why is that? It's not a good way to argue, is it? It's just a double standard right there. How about, Oh, the baby is not wanted, the baby may be abused, the baby may be pure...poor. Pure. Yeah, the baby is pure, but also the baby is born into poor circumstances. Question, should we murder all children for the same reasons if they're not wanted, if they're about to be abused, or are being abused, or if they're in a poor situation? No, that doesn't make any sense. If those arguments work for abortion, they

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

should work for children already born. Any child that isn't wanted, or is being abused, or is in a poor situation, we ought to kill them all if that argument for abortion goes through.

By the way, this is reducing the argument to the absurd. If you're going to say X, if we push that a little bit further, or if we compare it to other similar situations, you're going to see that the way you're arguing for X there doesn't work. It's absurd. Judge Robert Bork, who should have been on the Supreme Court but wasn't said, Convenience is becoming the theme of our culture. And he said that 30 years ago. Yeah, if it's going to inconvenience me at all, then I have a right to an abortion. Let me give you a couple of scenarios.

A preacher and his wife are living in tremendous poverty. They already have 14 kids. Now the mother finds out she's pregnant with her 15th child. Should they abort the child? If you say yes, you just aborted John Wesley. Another scenario, the father is chronically ill, the mother has tuberculosis, they have four children. The first is blind, the second is dead, the third is deaf, and the fourth also has tuberculosis. The mother finds out she's pregnant again. Should she abort the child? If you said yes, you just aborted Beethoven. Third scenario, a teenage girl is pregnant. She's not married. Her fiancé is not the father of the baby and he's very upset. Should she abort the child? If you say yes, she should abort the child, you just aborted Jesus your Lord. Now these are just scenarios to point out that, regardless of the scenario you're in, the answer is not to murder the child.

Look, if you think the solution to your problem is a dead baby, you've got the wrong solution. Find another solution. How about, don't like abortion, don't have one. This is easy ladies and gentlemen. Just reductio ad absurdum. Let's put another crime in there, another evil in there. Don't like slavery, don't own a slave. Don't like murder, don't murder someone. Don't like rape, don't rape someone. Don't like child abuse, don't abuse your child. I mean, you can nullify every law we have by simply saying that. That doesn't make any sense.

So, how do we make the case that life actually is in the womb and just about every one of these objections falls flat? We've gone through some of them. But Scott Klusendorf in his book, The Case for Life, has an acronym you gotta remember. It's called S.L.E.D. And the S stands for size. So, people will say, Well, this thing is very small in the womb, it's just a blob of tissue. Well, sure, Scott says, embryos are smaller than newborns and adults. But why is that relevant? Do

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

we really want to say that large people are more human than small ones? I mean, men are generally larger than women, but that doesn't mean they deserve more rights. Size doesn't equal value. So that's what you can say when someone brings up the size issue.

Let me mention something from Serrin Foster, who is the president of Feminists for Life. Here's what she says when people bring up this argument about size. "Women are not stupid. We know it's a baby that's growing just like we did in our mother's womb. That is why most women who feel they have the emotional and financial support don't have abortions." She says, "I don't believe in discrimination based on size, age, or location. Do you believe that a child has less of a right to exist because he or she is small? Are large or tall people more valuable than small or short people? By that logic, most women would have fewer rights than men." She goes on to say, "For years, abortion advocates have been pitting women against their unborn children, dehumanizing the growing child with misleading phrases like blobs of cells and products of conception." She says, "Fetus is a Latin word meaning young child or young one, but in practice, fetus has become a clinical dehumanized term for an unborn child."

And as we pointed out last week, ladies and gentlemen, you hear all these phrases that are designed to cover evil because Satan comes as an angel of light. He's always going to try and make evil look better. That's why people will use terms for abortion like this, reproductive freedom, abortion care, or health care, or abortion rights, or reproductive justice, or pro-choice, or product of conception, or even health care. In fact, one of President Biden's cabinet members, Becerra, the head of HHS [Health and Human Services] said this, about abortion right after the Roe v Wade decision was overturned. "Healthcare is a matter to be decided by patients and their providers, not politicians." Yet he's a politician notice. Healthcare. Why don't we just put, murder is a matter to be decided by patients and their providers, not politicians. If the unborn child is a human being it's not healthcare, it's murder. Murder is not healthcare. Politicians and the police need to be involved in murder.

How about, it's not fully developed yet. It's only a potential person, a potential human being. This is where the L in S.L.E.D. comes in, the level of development. Scott Klusendorf says this, "True embryos and fetuses are less developed than you and I, but again, why is this relevant? Four year old girls are less developed than 14 year old ones. Should older children have more rights than their younger siblings? Some people say that self-awareness makes one human. But

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

if that's true, newborns do not qualify as valuable human beings. Remember, six-week-old infants lack the immediate capacity for performing human mental functions, as do reversibly comatose people, or those sleeping, or people with Alzheimer's disease. So, if you're gonna say level of development makes someone less human, then there are people walking around right now, or people in a coma, or people who are asleep, or people who don't have the capacity right now to do certain things, you're gonna say they're not human either and they don't have a right to exist?

Oh, by the way, one other thing about all this. Going back to the blobs of tissue assertion, which of course it's an assertion, not an argument. Do you know when they do an abortion, they have to count the body parts they pull out of a woman, because if they leave any body parts in there, there's going to be an infection? Well, if there are body parts in there, that means there's a human being in there. In fact, Planned Parenthood has been selling body parts. If it's just a blob of tissue, why are we pulling arms and legs out of women when these so-called doctors do abortions? And by the way, dead things don't grow. What's inside a human being, inside a mother, is growing. It's not dead, it's alive. That's, by the way, why you have to kill it if you want an abortion.

How about the environment? People say, Well, it's not born yet. Here's what Scott says in the E in the acronym S.L.E.D. And this is from his book, Case for Life. Scott Klusendorf, who also by the way, heads our online course on abortion, which you can take if you go to CrossExamined.org and click on Online Courses. Here's what he says. "Where you are has no bearing on who you are. Does your value change when you cross the street or roll over in bed? If not, how can a journey of eight inches down the birth canal suddenly changed the essential nature of the unborn from non-human to human? If the unborn are not already human merely changing their location doesn't make them valuable."

I'm thinking viability when I just read that. Yeah, because viability doesn't make somebody valuable either. You know when they say, Oh, it's got to be viable. The baby has to be able to live outside the womb in order to be considered a person. First of all, person is not the issue here. We're talking about: Is it genetically a human being? Genetically, it is from the moment of conception. It has own its own genetic code. It's got its own sex. Got its own blood type.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

But this leads us to the D in S.L.E.D., the degree of dependency. This is when people say it's not viable, can't live outside the womb. Well, as I said last week, I know some teenagers who aren't viable. You leave them alone and don't feed them, they're going to die. By the way, that's true of newborns too. It's true of infants. It's true of toddlers. They can't survive without help from their parents. Here's what Scott says about the degree of dependency. "If viability makes us valuable human beings, then all those who depend on insulin or kidney medication are not valuable and we may kill them. Conjoined twins who share blood type and bodily systems also have no right to life. In short, pro-life advocates contend that although humans differ immensely with respect to talents, accomplishments, and degrees of development, they are nonetheless equal, because they share a common human nature."

Yes, it's about human nature ladies and gentlemen. Not viability. Not these other arbitrary claims that people make who are trying to support abortion. Now, what about rape and incest? We're gonna get to that right after the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. Don't go anywhere. We're back in just a couple of minutes.

Let's get to the really hard cases ladies and gentlemen. What about rape and incest? Shouldn't abortion be legal with those cases? We must admit, ladies and gentlemen, this is the hardest question to answer from an emotional perspective. In particular, it's not intellectually difficult, it's emotionally difficult. Whenever someone is raped, or sexually assaulted in any way, we want to minimize their suffering. And isn't it just adding to someone's suffering to say now you got to carry a baby to term? Is this baby going to remind you of that awful incident? Those are valid concerns that we need to consider.

And, in fact, when you look at it from a theological perspective, evil is a question we all need to answer, whether we're Christians or not. Now, if we are Christians, we certainly need to answer the question: Why does God allow evil? Why would God allow somebody to be raped like this and then impregnated? Clay Jones, who has written on this extensively, and has done research into some of the most depraved things human beings have ever done, including genocide, is going to take on the hardest questions in the course, Why Does God Allow Evil? It starts July 20, on our website, and if you take the premium version, you will actually have an opportunity to ask Clay the hardest questions you can ask on this topic, If God, Why Evil? Why does God allow

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

evil? You need to sign up soon before it fills up. If you want to take the premium version, go to CrossExamined.org, click on online courses, you will see it there. It's only the second time we're running the course. It got rave reviews the first time. So, if you're really interested in this topic, particularly Why Does God Allow Evil, I highly recommend you take the course.

Alright, let's go back to rape and incest. As I say it's not intellectually difficult, it's emotionally difficult. First of all, let me ask this ladies and gentlemen. If you had two sonograms that you're looking at, one of a child conceived consensually and one conceived by rape, what would be the difference? The answer is, you wouldn't see a difference. They're both human beings. So, the question is: Why would we punish the baby for the sin of the father? You say, Well, the child will remind the mother of the rape. Yes, I know. That's emotionally very difficult. But let me ask you a question. If somebody reminds you of something painful, do you have the right to kill them? Do you? No.

I'd also like to ask: How does a murderer correct a rape? How does being violent to a baby correct the violence done to a woman? Let me read what Serrin Foster, again the president of Feminists for Life, says about this on her website, FeministsForLife.org. She says, "At my lecture at Vanderbilt University, a medical student told other students that abortion is a second act of violence against a woman who is raped, and said her abortion was worse than the rape." And then Serrin Foster also said this, "Should a person be deemed an exception?" In other words, well, we're going to protect life except in your case.

Here's what she says. She says, "Could you look at someone conceived in violence and tell her that she never should have been born? What if it turned out to be your best friend or a relative? Would that change the way you felt about it? Would you think less of her mother?" Then she says, Rebecca Kiessling, a young attorney and mother who was conceived through sexual assault asks, 'Did I deserve the death penalty?' Can you imagine if we rank the value of people based on the circumstances of their conception? We don't discriminate based on parentage. That's not equality. You are valuable no matter who your parents are, no matter the circumstances of your conception."

Serrin Foster went on to say this. "After a lecture at a Midwestern University, where I shared the story of Lee and Julie, a student pulled me aside. She told me that she was raped by her

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

third cousin as a mere 13 year old and had become pregnant. Her parents had helped her to have the privacy she wanted during her pregnancy and then she placed her son with two loving parents. I asked her, "Why did she make the decision to have a child when she was just a girl who had lived through what was arguably the worst circumstances?" And here's what this 13 year old said back to Serrin Foster. She said, "she would never pass on the violence that was perpetrated against her to her own unborn child. And Serrin Foster went on to say, "Now that is the strength of a woman." Wow!

One other thing you can ask to somebody who says, "What about rape and incest, should those be exceptions?" Well, if they're human beings in the womb, and they are, why would you think they ought to be killed? But you could ask this. Just from a political perspective, would you agree to ban all abortions except for the life of the mother and rape and incest? If the person says, "No," you might ask them: "Why do you even bring rape and incest up then, because they have nothing to do with your case? You want abortion for convenience purposes, because less than 1% of the abortions are rape and incest. The vast, vast majority of them, more than 93%, maybe even as high as 99% of the abortions have to do with just convenience. Nothing to do with the life of the mother, nothing to do with rape, nothing to do with incest."

And so, from a political perspective, if the only way to pass a law to save babies was to say "okay, we will have an exception for rape and incest - even though I would like to take that out - if I needed to do that to get enough people to vote for the law to pass the law, I would say okay, that's a political compromise. But saving some babies, the vast majority of babies, is better than saving none. But I still think, in fact I know, medical science knows, biology knows, God knows, that an unborn child, regardless of how they've been conceived, is just that, an unborn child deserving of protection."

Now, what about back alley abortions? You hear that all the time. Here's what we said in the book *Legislating Morality*, which you can get on our website. We say, "The problem with the back alley justification, in fact, the problem with all abortion justifications, except the life of the mother, is that the unborn child is a 100% human being. Why should we keep crime safe and legal? Should we allow stores in which we can murder in every town so the murdering process will be safer? How about bomb making facilities so terrorists don't actually blow themselves up

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

making their bombs? What's safe about a legal procedure that kills more than half its patients? After all, some women, and all babies, die from legal abortions."

Now get this. We say, "Moreover, the back alley scare has been grossly exaggerated, if not completely fabricated. First, women getting abortions were not rescued from death by *Roe v Wade*, but by the availability of antibiotics which began in the 1940s. Second, according to one of Planned Parenthood's own medical conferences, more than 90% of illegal abortions before 1973 were done with medical equipment by doctors in their offices, not in back alleys. In fact, Bernard Nathanson, one of the original pro-abortion leaders and founder of NARAL, that's the National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws, now known as National Abortion Rights Action League, who...

By the way, I think Bernard Nathanson later became a Christian. He had aborted so many babies that his conscience just wore on him. He eventually became a Christian. He renounced all of what he was going for politically and what he had done in terms of aborting babies. So, he repented of this. But he actually admitted that he made up exaggerated statistics of women dying from illegal abortions in order to get abortion legalized. Here's the quote. And this, again is in our book *Legislating Morality*.

"I confess that I knew that the figures of 5,000-10,000 women dying from abortion in back alleys were totally false. And I suppose the others did, too, if they stopped to think of it. But in the 'morality' of the revolution, it was a useful figure, widely accepted. So, why go out of our way to correct it with honest statistics? The overriding concern was to get the laws [that prohibited abortion] eliminated and anything within reason that had to be done was permissible."

Ladies and gentlemen, according to the United States Bureau of Vital Statistics, the actual number of women who died from illegal abortions in 1972, before *Roe* was 39. 39. Even if it were 10 times more than that number, it's a long way from 5,000-10,000. You know, the Pew Research Firm now actually says the number wasn't 39, it was actually 35. Now, any woman dying from an abortion is obviously a tragedy. But it's not 5,000-10,000 dying in back alley abortions before *Roe v Wade*. It was a handful. In fact, right now, since 1990, according to Pew, the annual number of deaths among women due to induced abortion has ranged from 2-12

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

every year, according to the CDC. It's probably higher than that but those are legal abortions. Women are dying in legal abortions. So, the whole thing had been fabricated. So, when you see people out there, say we're not going back to the back alley. It was never done in the back alley, at least not very frequently. It was most often done in doctors' offices even when it was illegal.

Now last thing ladies, gentlemen. I'm totally running out of time here. This whole idea about God inducing abortion, and Numbers five as a passage people go to - I don't have time to execute it right now - but let's put the worst possible spin, or the worst possible interpretation on that. If God causes someone to die, does that mean we can cause somebody to die? No. God can play God, but we can't. In fact, we'll unpack that further in a future program. I'm Frank Turek. We need to go out and make the case for life. I hope this program was helpful to you. Get our book, *Legislating Morality*, and also Scott Klusendorf's book, *A Case for Life*. See you here next week. God bless.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**

