

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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

## How to Answer the Toughest Arguments for Abortion | with Scott Klusendorf

(April 16, 2024)

### **FRANK:**

Ladies and gentlemen, does the Bible condone abortion? Because there are some pro-abortion people out there that are trying to say it does, particularly from passages in the Old Testament like Exodus 21 and Numbers 5. What do we say to that? And when we say that we are pro-life, is that just a purely religious position? And what about the separation of church and state? We can't impose that on other people.

So, we're continuing our conversation right now with the great Scott Klusendorf, author of 'The Case for Life: Equipping Christians to Engage the Culture.' He is also the lead instructor of our 'How to Convince People to Be Pro-Life' course. He's the author of that course. And you can take that at [CrossExamined.org](https://www.CrossExamined.org). Click on online courses. You will see it there. And we had Scott on the weekly podcast on the American Family Radio network because abortion has really come up lately with president, former President Trump making comments about it.

So, you need to listen to the first podcast if you haven't listened to it yet. But, Scott, let's jump right in where we left off last week. And that is, let's start with the religion argument again, because we ended there. We were talking about the people who are pro-abortion saying, you can't impose your view. That's a religious view. Unpack your best response to that, if you would.

### **SCOTT:**

Well, the quick response is to say, look, arguments are either sound or unsound, valid or invalid. Dismissing my argument with a label, "religious" is not a refutation. It's a dodge. It's actually a category error, like asking how tall is the number five? You haven't done the hard work of refuting the argument, but the next thing to point out is that everybody in this debate is doing religion. Frank, the question of what makes humans valuable in the first place is inherently a religious question. It involves overarching metaphysical worldviews, first principles that everybody brings to the table when they debate this issue. And there's no avoiding that.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

Look, the claim that an embryo has value and a right to life is no more religious than saying it doesn't. It's also no more religious than saying a ten year old has value and a right to life. Can you tell me why anything has value and a right to life without bringing the metaphysics of religion into the equation? The answer is no.

So, if the pro-life view is disqualified because it's grounded in the metaphysics of religion, so is the abortion choice worldview, because it too is asking the question and giving an answer to the question, what makes humans valuable in the first place? We argue that what makes us valuable is all of us share a common human nature. We're intrinsically valuable in virtue of the kind of thing we are.

Our opponents argue that our intrinsic humanity means nothing. What matters is only the functions we perform. Self-awareness, ability to feel pain, language, interaction with our environment, whatever they pick out as being necessary. It's always arbitrary. But whatever trait they pick out, two things are true. Number one, none of us share those traits equally. And number two, they are inherently risky religious answers to the question of what makes us valuable in the first place.

So, everybody's doing metaphysics here, and you can't just say to the pro-life side, oh, you can't bring your values to the public square. And, you know, when people say to me, Frank, we've got to separate church and state, I always ask, what do you mean by that? Do you mean it in the strong sense that believers, however well-informed their arguments are, do not have a right to bring their values to the public square and argue for them like everybody else does?

You mean only secularists get to bring their metaphysical views to the public square and argue for them? Or do you mean it in the more modest sense that the state and federal government in particular, should not establish a state, denomination or religion that you must adhere to? If you mean it in the modest sense, I agree. I don't want a theocracy. I want a government that's going to respect the rights of the weak and the vulnerable.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

I think, too, the first thing you said there, Scott, you could probably say without getting into the metaphysical side of things, at least not explicitly. You're doing it implicitly. But as you said, the syllogism is just a syllogism. Explain the syllogism to people. It's just logic here. Go ahead.

**SCOTT:**

Yeah, pro-life syllogism goes like this. Premise one, it's wrong to intentionally kill innocent human beings. Premise two, abortion intentionally kills innocent human beings. Conclusion, therefore, abortion is wrong. It's wrong to intentionally kill innocent human beings. Abortion does that, therefore it's wrong. Wait now, Frank, that argument is either sound or unsound, valid or invalid. You can't dismiss it by saying, well, that's just your religious view. It won't work.

**FRANK:**

I didn't hear any Bible verses. Say it again, because there were no Bible verses. How can you come up with an argument without Bible verses, Scott? Come on.

**SCOTT:**

Yeah, exactly. They want to dismiss the argument. They don't want to refute it.

**FRANK:**

No, they don't. They don't want to deal with it at all. That's the problem right now. However, there are people out there, particularly on the so-called progressive Christian side, which means they're not progressive and they're not really Christians. If they're disagreeing with the Bible and disagreeing with Jesus, they're not progressing. They're regressing. But they do bring up some points that we need to deal with, and one is from Exodus 21. What do they say about Exodus? First of all, what goes on in Exodus 21 that causes them to say, oh, look, an unborn child is not the same value as a born child?

**SCOTT:**

In Exodus 21, we have a situation where two guys are duking it out. They're fighting. We don't know why, but they've come to blows, and there's a pregnant woman standing nearby. And in the course of their battle with each other, they inadvertently collide with her and trigger a

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

miscarriage. Or as the text says, the child comes forth. And from that you see the text seem to say in a couple of translations.

Again, it depends on which translation you read. But there are a couple of translations, like the Jerusalem Bible and the reviled, slandered version, I'm sorry, the Revised Standard Version that say, if you harm the mother, the lex talionis applies the life for life, tooth for tooth, eye for eye. But if you harm the child, you only pay a fine. And from that, pro abortionists argue that because God puts lesser value on the unborn in terms of you only pay a fine if you harm the unborn but puts ultimate value on the woman by requiring life for life if she is harmed, that therefore God sees the unborn differently than he sees the mother.

That is a very bad argument. And I'll give you two quick responses. There's a whole lot we could say. Here's the first quick response. How does it follow that because there's a lesser penalty for accidentally unintentionally harming an unborn human, that we may intentionally do so? This is a gargantuan non sequitur. You cannot get from, there's a lesser penalty for inadvertently harming an unborn human to, we have now a permission slip to intentionally harm them through abortion. Doesn't work.

The second big problem with the argument is this. Most translations, Frank, do not translate that passage the way the Jerusalem Bible and Revised Standard Version do. Rather, they translate it, and it's consistent with the original Hebrew that if either mother or child is harmed, the penalty is life for life, tooth for tooth. In other words, the lex talianos applies equally to both mother and child, so that text doesn't help their case at all.

**FRANK:**

Yeah, probably the best text from the Old Testament is thou shall not murder. There's a human being in there.

**SCOTT:**

This gets to the heart of the best biblical argument to make, Frank. Let's grant you and I, for the sake of argument, that nowhere in the Bible is there a command that says, thou shalt not have an abortion. Let's further grant there's no specific text that says the unborn are human from conception. Now, I think these things might be debatable, but let's grant them for the sake of

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

argument. The Bible is still pro-life, and here's how we know it. Premise one, Scripture is clear that all humans have value because they bear the image of God.

Genesis 1 teaches that in the old covenant. James 3 teaches it in the new. Premise two, because humans bear the image of God, the shedding of innocent blood, meaning the intentional killing of an innocent human being is strictly forbidden. Exodus 23:7 teaches this. Proverbs 6:16-19 teaches this. Matthew 5:21 teaches this, among a few. We could add a lot more. From this, we only need to ask one question. Are the unborn human? And we know from the science of embryology they are.

So, premise three is the unborn are human from conception. Therefore, the same commands against the shedding of innocent blood apply to the unborn as they do everybody else. I mean, look, is there a command in Scripture, Frank, that says, thou shalt not use neighbor for shark bait? No, there's not. Does that mean you can do it? No.

We draw the clear inference from Scripture. You're not allowed to intentionally kill your neighbor. He's an image bearer. You don't get to do that. Therefore, you know that using him for shark bait is wrong. You don't need an explicit text saying that that neighbor of yours is human and that having him for shark bait is wrong.

**FRANK:**

It reminds me of a Babylon Bee headline that said, Jesus never said anything about felony home invasion. And you have this criminal going, hey, see, it must be okay. He talked about the category, theft. And so, under that category would be felony home invasion. But he never mentioned felony home invasion. It wasn't a category back then. [Laughter]

**SCOTT:**

In fact, a good argument for your listeners, or a good question for your listeners to put to people when they say, well, the Bible never mentions abortion, right? Simply ask this question. Are you saying whatever the Bible does not expressly condemn, it allows? If not, what's your point? I mean, there's lots of things not mentioned in Scripture. Neighbor for shark bait, lynching homosexuals for fun. I mean, we could draw a whole big list of this stuff.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

Yeah, exactly. How about, oh, one other thing before we go any further. Friends, you need to go to the CaseForLife.com, Scott's website. By the way, the name of his book is 'The Case for Life', you want to get. But you need to watch a 1 minute video on that homepage. I mean, we can talk all day about embryology. We can talk all day about the different arguments that show that an unborn child is a human being. But when you see body parts being taken out of a mother, you know that that is a human being. And it's only 1 minute long.

It shows you the results of an abortion in all three trimesters. It's undeniable. The problem is, it's too true. When I tried to show that on YouTube, they censored the entire video because it's too true. And I've learned that normally when people are censoring something, they are in the wrong. Normally.

Now, we censor things from kids for certain reasons because kids aren't good enough, or old enough, or wise enough to deal with certain images. But when we're talking about adults here and they're censoring what is real footage, it's too true. It cuts too close to home. Let me ask you the second objection that comes from the Old Testament, Scott. That's Numbers, chapter five. This is kind of a relatively new one I've heard talked about. What goes on there?

**SCOTT:**

In Numbers 5, we have a situation where a husband suspects that his wife is guilty of adultery, but he can't prove it. So, the way he's going to prove it is, he forcibly takes his wife to a priest. And the priest makes her drink this potion that is part tabernacle floor dust and part bitter water. And she drinks this. And if nothing happens, she's innocent. But if she's guilty, the text says in some translations, her thigh will waste away and her womb will miscarry.

And some have said, see, there's proof that God approves of abortion. But there's a number of problems with their read on this. First of all, again, the majority of texts don't translate the verse that way. They don't speak to miscarriage directly. Rather, what they say is if she is guilty, her inwards will rot away. It's going to be bodily disfigurement that follows more than miscarriage. That seems to be what the original language and the majority of texts translate the passage as. But more importantly, Frank, look who is causing the miscarriage in this particular passage.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

It's a supernatural, God directed event, not something we get to do intentionally. How can you jump from God triggering a miscarriage, again, to we get to intentionally do it ourselves? That's a non sequitur. It doesn't work. But I think there's even more we can point out here. The other side loves to say this proves the unborn aren't human. Well, if being executed by God means you're not human, the people of Sodom and Gomorrah weren't human, and neither were those who perished in the flood, or the sons of Korah.

If we want to just keep going through this, being executed by God does not make you non-human. So again, I think this passage does not help them. I would point out one other thing. Look at the nature of this text. How can you claim this is a pro woman, pro-abortion text when a husband has the right to forcibly drag a woman to a priest who's going to make her drink something that's going to affect her body? How is that respecting the mother's bodily autonomy? I mean, it's a crazy verse for them to trot out.

**FRANK:**

It is kind of an odd verse in general, regardless of its supposed implications for abortion. I guess we don't really know why this is in there. I mean, there's some things we know what they mean, but we don't know why they're in there. Like, don't boil a kid in its mother's milk. It's in the Bible, but we don't know. I wonder if this had something to do with pagan practices around them, Scott. Is there any insight into that?

**SCOTT:**

I don't know. I haven't read up on that. I do think again, though, Frank, what we can always come back to is the clear teaching of Scripture. I think we should always reason from what we know to what we don't know. What we do know in Scripture is all humans have value because they bear the image of God. And because they bear the image of God, intentionally shedding their blood is forbidden. From that, we can reason that if the unborn are human, they too are image bearers, and they too should not be intentionally killed. The same commands against shedding innocent blood apply to them as they do everybody else.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

Ladies and gentlemen, do not allow what you don't know to cause you to doubt what you do know. There are many clear passages and just natural law that lets us know that an unborn child is a human being. Embryology pictures, video. We know what's inside a human being or inside a mother's womb. It's not a squirrel. It's not a raccoon. It's a human being. We know that. Don't allow obscure questions you might have to cause you to doubt what you already know.

**SCOTT:**

There is one other verse they love to throw at us.

**FRANK:**

What is that?

**SCOTT:**

That's Genesis 2:7. Adam did not become a living soul until God breathed life into him. So therefore, until an infant breathes, it's not a human life. It's not living. And so, I had a guy come at me last week with this verse. See, unless God, unless you are breathing, you're not a human being. I said, okay, I'm willing to concede that any human being God directly creates out of dirt is not living until God breathes into them directly. Did you begin that way? Of course he didn't.

And they're taking a descriptive passage and trying to make it normative. And you can't do that. That's a bad hermeneutic to begin with. But also, if that's true, that means babies that are born are not alive yet. Because until you sever the umbilical cord and they start, you know, the doctor swats them on the butt and they start breathing, that would mean it'd be okay to kill a child immediately after birth as long as he hadn't been swatted on the butt and taken a breath yet.

**FRANK:**

Also, Scott, wouldn't it make sense that if there is any doubt as to when life begins, that you should side on the side of life?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**SCOTT:**

Oh, yeah. It's what former president Ronald Reagan once said. If you're out hunting with your buddy and you see the bushes rustling in front of you and you don't know if it's your best buddy or that deer you've been after, do you open fire? Not unless you're Dick Cheney. [Laughter] But everybody else is going to hold back, right? Nobody that's under the age of 30 got that joke. But for those of you that didn't, when Vice President Dick Cheney was out hunting, he accidentally shot his best friend, and it became a rather humorous internet story.

**FRANK:**

So, yeah, you're going to give the benefit of the doubt to life. You know, if there's somebody knocking at the door late at night and you think they're trying to force their way in, would you shoot first or would you make sure it's not your teenage daughter coming in after curfew? Right? You would make sure. And so, what about the passage? This is a passage in the favor of life, the interaction between Elizabeth and Mary. Explain that one.

**SCOTT:**

I think that's an outstanding place to go, because clearly you have one baby in the womb reacting to another one.

**FRANK:**

This is Luke, chapter one. Explain that. Go ahead.

**SCOTT:**

Well, the whole idea that when Elizabeth and Mary meet for the first time, the babe leaps within her womb, and the idea that there is correlation, there's some kind of connection between these two. Now, it's true, one could say, well, that was supernaturally directed. But the text assumes that the entities involved were human beings.

**FRANK:**

By the way, Scott, I would suspect, and maybe I'm wrong here, I'm just thinking off the top of my head on this one. The reason the Bible doesn't address abortion directly is because wouldn't that be unthinkable to the Hebrews?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**SCOTT:**

It was. This is a key point. Think about the Hebrew culture of that day. Let me just run through a couple of quick facts.

**FRANK:**

Go ahead.

**SCOTT:**

Was barrenness a blessing or a curse?

**FRANK:**

A curse.

**SCOTT:**

A curse. So, there's that. Secondly, Israel is surrounded by hostile nations. They have to have a large population to maintain their national identity and to fulfill the mandate God gave them to subdue the land and to be a blessing to all nations. You need a lot of people to do that. In addition to this, children are taught to be a blessing, not a curse.

You know, Psalm 127, happy is the man that has a quiver full of them. Uh, so let's just put those together. In a nation where barrenness is a curse and children are a blessing, in a nation where you are surrounded by hostile entities, in a nation where you have a divine mandate to fulfill, being a blessing to the whole world, is abortion likely to get a foothold in that culture?

**FRANK:**

No.

**SCOTT:**

Never in a billion years. So, the Bible's silence actually points to, I believe, the fact that Hebrew women were not killing their unborn offspring the way surrounding pagan nations were. Now, later, they regrettably started offering their own born children to be sacrificed. But they understood that there was a problem with intentionally killing their children, their offspring, even before birth.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

All right, let me throw some tough objections at you, Scott. We're talking to Scott Klusendorf, and his book is 'The Case for Life.' By the way, that's an online course, ladies and gentlemen, 'How to Convince People to Be Pro-Life.' Also want to mention, 'Jesus vs. the Culture.' Who do you trust? Well, it's already started, but the first Zoom is April 23. So, if you want to be a part of that and I'll be your instructor for at least seven live Q&A Zoom sessions, go to [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Click on online courses. You'll see it there.

You'll also see Stephen C. Meyer's brand new course that he's going to teach live, called 'Reasons for Faith' that you might want to be a part of as well. Check all that out at [CrossExamined.org](http://CrossExamined.org). Scott, you're going to get the objection if you try and restrict abortion in anyway. It's called the coat hanger objection. This is from your book. Women will die from illegal abortions. How do you respond?

**SCOTT:**

Well, first of all, I can readily agree that any woman that dies from an abortion is tragic and sad. Nobody wants that. But notice this objection assumes the unborn aren't human. In other words, it's question begging. Because otherwise, what you're arguing is, is that because some people will die attempting to intentionally kill other innocent human beings, we ought to make it safe and legal for them to do the killing.

But Frank, why should the law be faulted for making it more risky for one human to intentionally kill another completely innocent one? Again, this objection doesn't work unless you assume the unborn aren't human. But I'm going to go a step further here and take it on factually. It is simply not true that five to 10,000 women a year died from illegal abortion prior to *Roe v. Wade*. And I'm going to very quickly here cite four pro-abortion sources that say that. Not pro-life sources, pro-abortion ones.

Source number one, Dr. Mary Calderon, the former medical director of Planned Parenthood during the 1960's, wrote in an American Journal of Public Health article that the death rate from illegal abortion was so low it wasn't even worth commenting on. Why was it so low? Because the widespread introduction of penicillin had made all surgical procedures safer, so

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

women weren't dying from post op infections like they once did. Second reason why it wasn't a problem, because doctors were doing these illegal abortions in the safety of their office, at least safe for the mother, not the child.

And therefore, this idea that you got some guy named Rodrigo in the back alley with a rusty coat hanger doing them was pure myth. Second source, Dr. Christopher Tietze, Planned Parenthood statistician during the 1960's, called the claim of five to 10,000 deaths a year from illegal abortion "unmitigated nonsense." Third source, Dr. Bernard Nathanson, co-founder of NARAL, National Abortion Rights Action League, said that when he was performing abortions before he eventually became pro-life, he said while he was still doing abortions, he told the New York Times that the claim of five to 10,000 deaths a year was pure myth.

He made it up, along with Dr. Lawrence later. And they made it up and sold it to the press who ran with it. Final source, Dr. Daniel Callahan, author of 'Abortion Law, Morality and Choice,' again, a pro-abortion apologist, argues that the claim of five to 10,000 deaths a year is mathematically impossible, not improbable, impossible, because he says 30,000 women a year of childbearing age die from all causes. To say as high a number of 10,000 come from one source, illegal abortion, is stretching credulity to the breaking point.

**FRANK:**

But, Scott, do you have any evidence for anything of what you just said there? [Laughter]

**SCOTT:**

Oh, none at all. None at all.

**FRANK:**

You're just making this up as you go. By the way, how many women die from legal abortion?

**SCOTT:**

I don't know. I think the number is pretty low. Honestly, I think most surgical abortions are safe for the mother. And I think as pro-lifers, we need to be careful that we don't talk out of both sides of our mouth.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

Although, many abortions now are being done through a pill which apparently has some pretty nasty side effects. Do they not?

**SCOTT:**

That is true. And a lot of this is unregulated. That's exactly right. You can send away in the mail for an at home abortion kit. And that's going to involve two drugs. One drug that is going to begin the process of getting ready for an early miscarriage, the other which will actually trigger the expulsion of the child. But this procedure is no walk in the park, Frank. It involves cramping, heavy bleeding, seeing your child that's been miscarried. It's not an easy thing. And there are medical risks that go with that, that need to be acknowledged. Absolutely.

**FRANK:**

How about the, we kind of covered this already. But maybe briefly we can touch on it again. Don't force your views on others.

**SCOTT:**

Well, then why are you correcting me? Didn't you just give me a moral rule? If you shouldn't force your view on me, why are you telling me I'm wrong? And you know what I love to do when people say that? I'll say, what do you want me to do? Well, I want you to quit saying abortions wrong. So, you want me to become a pro-choicer? So, the only way you'll tolerate me is if I agree with you. How is that not forcing your view on me?

I mean, this is a classic example of a self-refuting argument. But there's another problem, Frank. It assumes the unborn aren't human. Does anybody think that laws against abusing six year olds involve forcing morality? Do they think that laws that say you must allow a woman to have an abortion forces morality? No, they only pick and choose the laws they like and the moral principles they like to then say on these things we can force our view, but not on your views.

**FRANK:**

You know, I think it also assumes relativism. It assumes there's not a real true view. So, I like to say, hey, this isn't my view. It's not my morals. I didn't make this stuff up, right? I didn't make up the fact that murder is wrong or abortion's wrong. This is not my morality or your morality.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

It happens to be the morality, you know? The one Thomas Jefferson said was self-evident. And the Apostle Paul himself said, the gentiles who do not have the law, have the law written on their hearts. So, look, if you have a problem with the morality, you don't have a problem with me. You have a problem with the Creator upon whose nature this morality is derived. That's really what it is. It's a rebellion, Scott, as you well know. It's a rebellion against the created order, against the Creator.

**SCOTT:**

And isn't it interesting, Frank, that your critics and mine get super angry and intolerant of us simply because we have a view different than their own? I can go give a talk on abortion and not even mention the legality of it. Just talk about the moral question of it. And people get absolutely livid when I haven't even brought the law into it. And what they're angry at is that I disagree with them. I thought tolerance presupposes that everybody gets to express their view even if we don't agree.

**FRANK:**

Well, we actually had James Lindsay on the last couple of weeks talking about how tolerance means only if you agree with leftist views.

**SCOTT:**

That's correct.

**FRANK:**

That's what tolerance means. And inclusion means we're only going to include leftist views. And diversity means we're only going to include leftist views. There's no tolerance for anything else. [Laughter] All right, last objection we always have to deal with, and that is the rape and incest objection. And we've talked earlier about incrementalism. I think that was on the last podcast where we would personally both be for a law that allowed rape and incest in order to save some babies, even though at some point we'd want to protect the babies conceived by rape and incest as well. But how do you deal with that? First, morally, and then second, politically, Scott?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

**SCOTT:**

Well, I'm going to reverse the order on you. Let me take it politically first. I will agree to a bill that has rape exceptions in it if I don't have the votes to protect all children. But I'm never going to stop there. I'm not going to settle there. And this is why I have a problem with what former President Trump said when he said we ought to settle on a 15 week ban. No pro-lifer can go for that in principle.

We will say, hey, listen, if we don't have the votes to protect all children, but we can protect them from 15 weeks on, we'll do that. But as a matter of principle, how a child is conceived does not change what it is by nature. So, children conceived through rape are every bit as human and valuable as those of us that were conceived in a marital union. So, here's how I deal with rape. Two types of people are going to bring up rape, Frank, inquirers and crusaders. And you treat them different. And if you don't make that distinction right out of the gate, you're going to end up messing up.

So, the inquirer has heard your pro-life argument. She's heard you argue that it's wrong to intentionally kill innocent human beings. Abortion does that. Therefore, it's wrong. She's seen the video we're telling people to go look at, and she agrees abortion is awful. But she's thinking about her 14 year old niece and thinking, boy, if she got pregnant, how could I tell her she can't have an abortion when that child will remind her of all the pain, she went through being assaulted?

And the psychological complexity of it starts to settle in with the inquirer. Here's the question I'll put to the inquirer. Very gently I will say, you and I agree that that woman who's been sexually assaulted has suffered a terrible injustice. I also agree that the child may provoke memories of what she went through. Given we agree on those two points, how do you think a civil society ought to treat innocent human beings that remind us of a painful event?

Is it okay to intentionally kill them so we can feel better? And I'm pressing the point that hardship doesn't justify homicide. I mean, I think, again, to use a military example. Imagine you're leading a special unit op event in Afghanistan, and you get captured by the Taliban, you and your unit. And the Taliban says to you, hey, Frank, you're the leader of these guys.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

If you help us torture and interrogate your fellow US Marines, we won't torture and interrogate you. You will not take that deal. You will choose to suffer evil rather than inflict it. And sometimes the right thing to do isn't the easy thing to do. I wish there were a third way out of the rape issue.

There's only one of two options open to the rape victim who's pregnant. She either suffers evil or she inflicts evil. I mean, if Joseph Stalin puts a pistol in your hand, Frank, and says, shoot your mother through the head, your choice at that point is do it and commit evil or not do it and suffer evil yourself. That's the only option open to you.

Now, that's enough to get the inquirer at least tracking with your moral logic. The crusader is very different. He's bringing up rape to try to distract you, and he's bringing it up to try to paint you as an extremist. So, here's how I deal with that. I call his bluff. I say, okay, let's grant, for the sake of argument, that we allow abortion in cases of rape. Not my position, but let's grant it. Will you join me now in opposing all other abortions that have nothing to do with rape? 100% of the time, what's the answer?

**FRANK:**

No.

**SCOTT:**

No. Women have a fundamental right to an abortion. Okay, stop right there. If it's a fundamental right, that means no restrictions at all, all nine months for any reason or no reason. If that's your position, argue for that. Don't hide behind rape victims to disguise what you truly believe.

**FRANK:**

Yeah, well done. And there's so much more in the book, 'The Case for Life.' Let me ask you one more question, Scott, and that is, what do you say to pastors or people that have gone to a church that never talk about this issue, never even mention that Roe v. Wade was overturned, and hide their views about life?

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**





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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**SCOTT:**

Well, two things. Number one, get visible on the issue. Make sure they can't ignore it. That means going to your pastoral team and saying, look, I need you to look at this video that we've got right here on the case for life or CaseForLife.com website. One minute of your time. I want you to watch this. And then I'd like you to explain to me why you're silent in the face of this.

Now, a lot of times, pastors will say something like well, we want to be about evangelism, and we don't want to offend people who might be seeking Christian answers to things. Since when did child sacrifice become an acceptable instrument of evangelism? Clerical silence in the face of child sacrifice is not biblical theology. It's cowardice. And by the way, it assumes that it's on us to draw people to Christ when the Bible is very clear that God is in the business of drawing them to Himself. So, I think we need to proclaim truth. And if your church won't do it, find one that will.

**FRANK:**

Well said. Yes. And isn't it interesting that, well, tragic, actually, that people think the solution to their problems is to kill another human being?

**SCOTT:**

Yep. That's right.

**FRANK:**

When you think about it, that's really what this is about. The solution to my problem is somebody else has to die for me to succeed. And it seems that that's what people are clamoring for in our culture now. They want to have the right to fix a problem by killing an innocent human being. Let that sink in, ladies and gentlemen. And if you don't think it's an innocent human being, you just need to go to the CaseForLife.com. Watch the 1 minute video. Share that video with other people.

And Scott, you need to point out, because you do this when you speak before pro-life groups. And friends, if you ever want to have a great speaker for a pro-life event, you want to have Scott Klusendorf. Go to the CaseforLife.com to learn more about Scott and how you can get a

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

hold of him. But you explain that some things need to be seen rather than said. Just explain that, and then we'll sign off.

**SCOTT:**

Well, for example, no professor at a public university would lecture on the Vietnam War without showing pictures of naked children running from a village that's just been napalmed. No professor is going to speak on World War Two without showing bodies stacked like cordwood in the death camps of Europe. These are things we readily accept.

And we all also go and pay money to watch movies like Saving Private Ryan, Schindler's List, Hacksaw Ridge, movies, which I took my sons to see because I recognized these movies convey truth in a way no words ever could. They appeal directly to our intuitions of right and wrong. And if we are committed, Frank, to the Socratic quest for truth, we should look at all of the evidence, even that which we find morally repugnant. We need to look at all the truth in our quest for truth.

**FRANK:**

Scott, you're a champion when too many people are silent. So, keep doing what you're doing. Thank you for being on this program and the one we just did last week. Thanks so much, my friend.

**SCOTT:**

Thanks, brother. And again, I encourage all your listeners to go to [CaseforLife.com](http://CaseforLife.com) and pick up a copy of the new edition of 'The Case for Life.' By the way, if your listeners have not or they already have the original copy, this one is twice as big. They're not just getting a cover redesign. They're getting a lot of new material.

**FRANK:**

Is it case for life or the case for life?

**SCOTT:**

[CaseforLife.com](http://CaseforLife.com).

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek    **PODCAST**

**FRANK:**

CaseforLife.com. That's where that video is too, friends, that you do want to watch. Inform yourself. Don't hide from the truth. Also want to mention, ladies and gentlemen, these online courses are coming up, including 'Jesus vs. the Culture' and 'Reasons for Faith.' You can also take Scott's online course, 'How to Convince People to Be Pro-life.' We will run that also in the fall in a premium version where Scott will be live for Q&A during Zoom sessions.

I also want to mention this weekend I'll be out in Seattle at the Worldview Apologetics conference, and I'll be speaking at Antioch Bible Church on the 21st. So, that's the 19th to the 21st of April. Check all that out. And then the following weekend I'll be in Nashville, Tennessee at the Culture and Christianity conference. All the details are on our website. That's in Murfreesboro, actually. It's not far from Nashville. Great being with you, friends. Stand for life. Do what's right and leave the results to God. God bless.

**CROSS  
EXAMINED  
ORG**

