

**The Power to Choose Life:
How to Gain Success in the Politics of Human Abortion**

John C. Rankin

May 18, 2001

The legal protection of women and their unborn can be achieved in the United States, with simple attention to biblical ethics, and a willingness to embrace **hard questions** head on. Here I plan to set the table with some crucial background, from which I will then propose a two-prong initial strategy for the U.S. Congress. It is a strategy that will put pro-life advocates in the driver's seat for defining terms, for the moral high ground, and will effectively change the course of American politics.

The biblical ethics center on a definition of the central terms of the debate: **God, life, choice and sex**. The hard questions to be addressed are three: 1) how to defang the "anti-choice" accusation; 2) how to address the question of rape and incest; and 3) how to expose the pagan feminist abortion-rights position as nothing more than a handmaiden to male chauvinism.

God, Life, Choice and Sex

The book of Genesis starts with the definition of four subjects, and these subjects are all-defining, for the balance of the Bible, and indeed, for all human history. They are **God > life > choice > sex** – in that order. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth..." The biblical assumption is that **God** the Creator is greater than space, time and number in his very nature, and that his trajectory in making the earth is for us, man and woman, to inhabit as his image-bearers. Human **life** is then distinguished from other life in that we are given moral, intellectual and aesthetic freedom, or **choice**, to enjoy his creation as he ordered it. Then the gift of **sex** is predicated on the assumption of one man, one woman, one lifetime in covenantal marriage. We thus have the ability, through procreation, to pass along **God's image** to our children, as we pass along life, choice and sex as given by God.

The theological logic of this order is inescapable. God is the Creator, and we receive the gift of life from him. Without God, there is no life. With the gift of life, we then have the power to make satisfying choices as we rule over God's creation as stewards of his goodness. Without the gift of life, we are truly moot, and thus, we have no power to make choices. And in the gift of sex in marriage, we have the power to choose a spouse, and with our spouse, to have children. Without the gift of choice, a covenant of marriage cannot be entered – we would be reduced to mere animal instincts.

The biological logic of this order is also inescapable. Who chose ahead of time, as biologically discrete entities, to be conceived and born? And who can make moral or aesthetic choices unless they are first alive? And who can make sexual choices, unless they are first alive and able to choose?

And the legal logic of this order is also inescapable. Thomas Jefferson, and those with him, composed the foundational language of **unalienable rights** for our nation in the Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of

happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

This also equals: **God > life > choice > sex**: **God** = “Creator;” **life** = “Life;” **choice** = “Liberty;” and **sex** = “the pursuit of happiness” (certainly in the mind of most contemporary college students, but I have in mind John Locke’s definition, not theirs).

The Declaration begins with **God** as our Creator who endows us with **unalienable rights**. The first right is that of **life**, followed by liberty, which equals the language of **choice** or freedom. Then the language of the pursuit of happiness, along with that of “property” as set forth in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, equals the domain of **sex**, where citizens are protected from the deprivation of “life, liberty or property” without due process of law.

Human sexuality, in the biblical order of creation, is based on the joining of man and woman in marriage, where the man leaves his parent’s household in order to establish a new one. It equals the completion of Genesis 1-2, summing up these two chapters in how they establish the social order – man and woman in marriage. The Greek word for “household” is *oikonomos*, our root for the English word “economics.” The household, based on man and woman in covenantal marriage, is the basis for property rights and economic productivity, which in total yields society’s power for the pursuit of happiness. The “pursuit of happiness” language of John Locke and Thomas Jefferson explicitly understood this reality, that the happiness of which they spoke was a socially wholistic happiness rooted in covenantal marriage, and not a modern hedonistic and deconstructed definition.

The simple outcome of this reality is that, in theology, biology and law, life precedes and defines choice. And hence the conflict between the self-chosen terms in the abortion debate today – of “pro-choice” versus “pro-life.” This conflict only exists because a false definition of choice is used to destroy life: **God > Life > ### < Choice < Sex**.

In other words, it is fidelity to **God** which defines **life**, and should properly motivate the political language of “pro-life.” And it is **sex** as sexual promiscuity which in truth defines the idolatry of **choice**, and thus motivates the political language of “pro-choice.” “Pro-life” reflects the biblical worldview which is the basis for the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. “Pro-choice” reflects a pagan worldview that at the core seeks to justify sex outside of marriage: Sex > Choice > Life > /God. A false dichotomy is set up: sex/choice versus God/life, made possible because of how abortion-rights partisans advocate sex outside of marriage. Atomistic choice is used to destroy the life of the unborn in the act of human abortion, and in an affront against God – the Creator of life, choice and sex. All pagan religious origin texts assume sexual promiscuity as permissible, indeed, to be ritually celebrated, and thus we see their priorities highlighted in the abortion-rights movement.

Theologically, and also in terms of the abortion debate today, we have two choices:

God > Life > Choice > Sex; or
Sex > Choice > Life > /God.

Once this reality is identified, we who are biblically pro-life must know how to redeem the language of choice to protect the unborn, to protect marriage, and thus to defang the slander of “anti-choice” which abortion-rights partisans hurl against those with whom they disagree. We need to define and advocate **the ethics and power of informed choice**. Abortion-rights is in truth based on the ethics of misinformed choice, indeed of various forms of coercion as well.

You Have the Power to Choose Life

In 1986, when I first met head-on the idolatry of choice as represented in the advocacy of the Religious Coalition of Abortion Rights (RCAR), I was confronted by a syncretistic and pagan assault on the integrity of the Bible. I had been asked to give a biblical basis for a pro-life position, at a regional conference of leaders in the American Baptist Churches (ABC). Because of the ABC's alphabetical positioning, they were always listed first in RCAR's promotional materials, and many in the denomination did not like this. So the ABC was reconsidering its affiliation with RCAR, with a series of similar conferences across the nation.

I gave a theological sketch rooted in Genesis, part of which involved defining the relationship between life and choice – namely, both are given to us by God, but choice is designed to be in service to life, and not employed to destroy it. And I defined how the unborn fully qualify as human life, made in God's image. The RCAR representatives in turn called me “anti-choice.” I asked them to define how choice relates to life, and they were unable or unwilling. I stated how I was truly “pro-informed choice” in my position, they did not refute my definitions, and then again fell back into the stereotypical accusatory language of calling me “anti-choice.” When their view of the Bible was scrutinized, they rejected its authority in favor of a syncretistic faith that allowed an idolatry of choice. I later learned that the ABC rescinded its membership in RCAR.

From 1989-1991, I headed up a witness at the largest abortion center in New England, Preterm, in Brookline, Massachusetts, adjacent to Boston. Our strategy was rooted in a loving and persuasive presence of empowering women choose life for themselves and their unborn children equally. And many did. We eschewed blockade and any other coercive means, out of biblical conviction.

One central element to our presence was a large banner that read: **YOU HAVE THE POWER TO CHOOSE LIFE.**

From my post-graduate Th.M. studies at Harvard, where I encountered a feminism expressed by abused women, I came to articulate **the power to give**. The first six words of our banner thus appear to equal the centerpiece of feminist sympathies: “You have the power to choose...” And pagan feminist thinking believes the concept of the power to choose is their formulation of an identity in stark opposition to a biblical worldview. Unfortunately, too much of the church has forfeited this territory to the pagan feminists – the language of “power” in the face of the gender wars at large, and the language of “choice” in face of the abortion debate in specific. Biblically, most of us pro-life Christians had instincts that were otherwise, but we did not possess the theological perspective or language to express ourselves better. This is still the rule today, as elitists in politics, academia and the media easily intimidate the pro-life instincts of many people.

Such a banner, in its simplicity, reverses the fiction that biblically rooted pro-life advocates want to impose their will on others. The words “You have” underscore the language of acknowledgment and gift, of **the power to give**. We are stating what both the abortion-rights activists and the abortion-minded women “have” to begin with – they possess something which we acknowledge a priori, the power of choice. It is something neither God, nor we, desire to, nor will take away.

The words “You have the power” strengthens this language of acknowledgment and gift, and in adding “power,” feminist yearnings find resonance. This is further symphonized with the addition of choice – “You have the power to choose...” These six words are as central to all feminist theories as any summation can make. The abortion choice is largely the result of male chauvinism, men who got them pregnant and took off, and many feminists and abortion-rights activists are in painful reaction to having been so violated. Thus, these six words minister to the broken remains of **the image of God** within them. It gives a moment of breathing space for such women to stop and reconsider – “Am I exercising the power of my own choice, or am I being bullied into it by a man, into something I really don't want to go

through with?”

When the final four-letter word is added to the phrase, “**You have the power to choose life,**” the de facto feminist ethic of misinformed choice is revealed. **The power of informed choice** requires accurate definition of terms, it requires an acknowledgment of reality. When “life” is put in, the object of “pro-choice” is no longer amorphous. It takes on flesh, it becomes real in its consequences. The power to choose? The power to choose what? Are all choices equal (in classic dualistic fashion), or are some good and some evil? Does “pro-choice” as a political slogan refer to all unrestricted choices, such as a male’s “choice” to force or dominate, or should the choices of the chauvinist be opposed, since they are evil choices? Or does the pro-choice slogan represent a deception where the only choice considered “sacred” is that of human abortion when wanted or “needed?” “Choice” must be defined accurately so as to be redeemed.

For the first nine months of our presence at Preterm, the Boston Chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW) recruited many volunteers, mostly college students, to counter-protest our presence. After that NOW stopped sending their recruits down, for, according to reports that reached us, we were persuading too many of them. On our second time there, one of our volunteers heard one of the NOW recruits ask one of her leaders how to respond to our slogan, “**You have the power to choose life.**” The NOW leader responded, “Well, that’s their language, and we tell our people not to use it anymore.”

They forfeited the language of choice. They tacitly acknowledged that their “pro-choice” rhetoric is dishonest, and that **the power to give** and **the power of informed choice**, as rolled into our slogan, redeemed the language of choice to protect the unborn.

On September 30, 1989, I was not present at Preterm, but I received a detailed report from several witnesses to one of the most signal examples of the power of these words. At the rear entrance, two volunteers were holding up the banner, with other pro-life volunteers also present. One was Sue O’Connell, a volunteer who with her husband Jamie, would travel about 100 miles from Amherst, Massachusetts, and they were as regular as any of our volunteers. That morning, Sue’s eight-year old daughter, Kelly, was also with her.

Sue and the others were positioned on the sidewalk next to the entrance to the parking lot, and from the lot people coming to Preterm would then enter the rear door. There were about eight “escorts” positioned by the door, many dozens of feet away from Sue and Kelly, each wearing aprons designating their escort status. These were women and men, serving as volunteers (I was told) to Preterm, to “guard” incoming “clients” from being harassed by “anti-choice zealots.” Since the parking lot was private property, our volunteers never went onto it from their public sidewalk positions.

This particular morning, a college-age woman walked down the street and was preparing to cross the lot to the rear door. As she did, she stopped, looked at the banner and pondered its words. Sue offered her some printed literature, and the young woman was preparing to receive it. But during those moments, the eight escorts saw what was happening and quickly came up and surrounded her, creating a human blockade around her with arms linked. This was a common practice such escorts developed to shield women when trying to break through an Operation Rescue blockade wall. Blockade against blockade, force against force, human angst against human angst. So it was tragicomical to witness their intensity of forming such a blockade where there was no physical interference to such women as they entered the abortion center. But they had a deeper fear – that abortion-minded women might intelligently reconsider their choice, and seek some informed input from a different perspective. Thus, these escorts started shouting and chanting so as to prevent her from hearing anything Sue might say, and especially to prevent any printed literature from coming her way. Thus they forced her into the doors of Preterm by such a

surrounding tactic, being careful not to physically touch her and run afoul of the law.

One witness to the event told me that as much as he opposed the tactic of blockade, the sight of the woman being hustled inside made him so frustrated that he wanted to physically intervene. As he wrestled with these thoughts, eight-year old Kelly O'Connell started praying out loud and with the strength of child-like faith, that the woman would come out of Preterm. And within minutes the woman did, shaken in countenance, making her way back to Sue and the others, where she received some material and went her way. A triumph for the biblical **power of informed choice**.

Thus the banner, in its summation of biblical theology, "**You have the power to choose life**," has a power that abortion-rights activists are unable to answer. When God said to Cain that he must overcome his sin, and when Moses and Joshua told the Jews to choose between life and death, between the true God and the false gods, they were saying that they "have the power" to do so. Not the intrinsic ability within sinful humanity to overcome evil, but the broken remains of **God's image** within them are sufficient by God's grace to discern truth from falsehood, and to say "help me Lord," at which point he sends his help. By acknowledging this "power" within hurting people, we redeem the language of choice to serve human life, not to destroy it.

A Vice Presidential Debate

In 1992, Vice President Dan Quayle and Senator Al Gore engaged in their singular debate. Mr. Gore took the offensive on the abortion issue, seeking to appease the "feminist" vote. In a condescending tone, as I discerned it, Al Gore said something like, "Mr. Quayle, will you repeat after me, 'I believe in a woman's right to choose?'" The strategy was to get Mr. Quayle to be profiled in opposition to the moral agency of women at large, and in opposition to the language of choice (read: in opposition to the language of democracy). Mr. Gore was operating entirely within the terms of pagan feminist theory, and in so doing, he mimicked the language of amorphous or undefined "choice." Mr. Quayle was energetic in his response, defending the integrity of the unborn as best he could, and he sought to turn the tables on Mr. Gore. But in so doing, he never did answer the specific question.

At that moment, I would have been glad to have pinch-hit for the Vice President. I would have said, "Very good question, Senator Gore. I am delighted to repeat the exact words you have proposed. In so doing, I will add one four-letter word to it, and then I will ask you if you are honest and courageous enough to repeat these words after me: 'I believe in a woman's right to choose life.'" "

It would have been instructive to see how Mr. Gore would have responded. Note that I did not say "unborn" life. The power of understatement is at play. His first option would have been to repeat these words, and thus he would have necessarily forfeited, in that moment, the pagan feminist theory of amorphous, or undefined, choice. He would have thus acknowledged that choices have consequences, and that some choices lead to life, and some lead to death. At that point the language of the debate would have shifted to a true definition of terms, with **the ethics and power of informed choice** now at center stage.

But too, Mr. Gore could have then applied the word "life" to "women's lives" in the political rhetoric of honoring only one of the two parties involved. I would have eagerly engaged Mr. Gore at this point, affirmed his concern for the lives of women, and honed in on his non-concern for the lives of unborn girls and boys. In fact, an appropriate question would have been: "Mr. Gore, are you a friend or foe of the unborn?" Indeed, this is a compelling question for whom all abortion-rights advocates should be accountable. For him to waffle on the question would signal his opposition to any concern for the unborn.

From there the issues of biological, legal and theological humanity could come to the fore, as well as the reality of abortion being the ultimate male chauvinism. It would have been fun.

His second option would have been to refuse to repeat these words, and then he would have thus acknowledged by such negation that he was not in favor of choosing life, which means that he is in favor of choosing death, which means: abortion equals death. Again, accurate definition of terms would have proved inescapable due to the proper phrasing of the question.

At Preterm, **the ethics and power of informed choice**, as underscored in the banner's language, proved as powerful as I could have hoped for. I believe its power would have been just as effective with Al Gore. When **the ethics and power of informed choice** are defined, the "anti-choice" rhetoric is defanged, and as we shall see, it is turned on its head to reveal that the abortion-rights position is really one of misinformed choice due to the fear of informed choice, due to deliberately chosen ignorance.

The Hard Question of Rape and Incest

Why is it that many pro-life politicians make an exception for rape and incest? Simply, I believe they know the evil of rape, and they have compassion for the woman so victimized. How therefore do we show compassion simultaneously for the unborn child?

In March of 1989, in a debate at Brown University, I was questioned about the issue of rape and incest. A young woman believed that the right to have an abortion should be available to those who became pregnant by such a violent act. I began to frame my response by looking directly at her and saying: "In your life, are you like me, seeking the qualities of **peace, order, stability and hope**?" As I spoke these words, I had her eyeball to eyeball attention, and the hundreds of students in the 1881 Sayles auditorium came to a hush, producing a moment of intense focus. She said, "Yes."

I then said, "Is it also fair for me to assume, that like me, you also seek **to live, to love, to laugh and to learn**?" Again, the same focus of intensity defined the audience, and again she said, "Yes."

So I continued, "Then there is far more that unites us than divides us – we are seeking the same qualities. The question is, in the face of the hell of rape and incest, does abortion unrape the woman and restore to her the lost qualities of **peace, order, stability and hope**? Or does the abortion only add further brokenness?" The room was quiet, and I could have actually left the issue there. I knew that the resonance with **the image of God**, as represented by these qualities, was so complete in that moment, that most students could answer the question themselves and deduce from there the reality I was addressing.

This question is the most frequent one I have encountered on the university campuses, and it is viscerally the most potent. The hell of rape and incest is so universally repulsive to all people of good will, that even deeply committed pro-life politicians have been willing to carve out a legal exception for abortion when a woman becomes pregnant in such circumstance. They do so, not because they believe abortion remedies anything, but because they think they will be perceived as lacking compassion for the woman victimized by rape or incest if they do not concede an exception at this point. And when they do so, abortion-rights partisans are emboldened to accuse them of being inconsistent. They say that if such pro-life politicians believe human life begins at conception, then why allow abortion in this case? So on the one hand, they accuse them of a lack of compassion, and when the pro-abortion partisans win a concession here, they then accuse them of inconsistency on the other hand, and succeed in muting the pro-life witness. We need to know how to have the pro-abortion partisans silence themselves in their own chosen duplicities. In every case where I have been posed this question, often by college-age people who are not adversarial in their concern, sometimes by those who are adversarial, I have seen either gratitude or silence in response to my answer.

If the language of the abortion debate is examined, it can be noted that it is abortion-rights advocates who posit a war between mother and child. It is pro-life advocates who seek reconciliation between the two, and admit no war. And the war posited by abortion-rights activists is often due to their own experiences in having been warred against, as the power to take has been exercised upon them as children, instead of having received the blessings of **the power to give**. In having been violated by the absence of true fatherhood or by some other form of male chauvinism.

Once I addressed a debate at Harvard Medical School, with a colleague who is a medical doctor, Andy White. The abortion-rights side was represented by a physician and a Unitarian sociologist. About 80 medical students were in attendance. During the evening, Andy and I consistently spoke of the woman and her unborn equally. But the abortion-rights advocates kept positing a war between mother and (unwanted) child.

During the Q & A, a medical student stood up and announced that politically he held a “pro-choice” position. Then he addressed Andy and me, saying he noted how we expressed “care for both the woman and her unborn child.” Then he addressed our debate opponents and noted how they only spoke about care for the woman. Then he asked them, “Do you also have any care for the unborn?”

The physician and sociologist looked at each other, were at a loss for words for some embarrassing moments, then the sociologist gestured to us, and she said, “Well, that is their concern, not ours.” The audience, overwhelmingly “pro-choice” in sympathies, then rippled with some laughter and amazed sighs. The contrast could not be clearer: abortion-rights activists defined an inequality of the strong over the weak, and accept a war; pro-life advocates define and accept the hope of true equality and reconciliation.

The raped woman is the one who needs to be **empowered to choose life**, for she is the one under duress. If ever we allow pro-abortion partisans to frame a conflict between the woman and the unborn, in the public imagination, then brokenness not reconciliation will triumph. There is no conflict, even when a woman’s life is in jeopardy with a continued pregnancy. In those cases, whether with the need for an abortion of an early pregnancy (i.e., when either both die or the woman is saved), or a C-section later on, the humanity of the unborn is never disaffirmed. A godly woman in such a trauma would not view her child as an aggressor against her, but the cancer or other septic condition is the aggressor against both mother and child. The woman and her unborn child are equal, and if we have equal concern for the humanity of the unborn, it cannot be honestly and effectively advanced apart from ministering first to the woman.

Once, in a debate at the University of New Hampshire (UNH), I asked the abortion-rights panel if there was anything intrinsically good in the act of human abortion. They hesitated even more embarrassingly than did the physician and sociologist at Harvard Medical School, for perhaps ten seconds. Then one woman said, “Well, we are not used to the format yet...” and proceeded to avoid the question, because they knew that human abortion is intrinsically an act of destruction. And we were already 45 minutes into the format.

At the debate at Brown, with respect for the woman’s well-being already having been established by an appeal to the **image of God**, I was then able to appeal to the biological and theological humanity of the unborn, and diagnose the reality of what abortion does. The audience had resonated with my starting point of compassion for the woman, and hatred for rape and incest, so when I asked if the abortion would heal the broken remains of **the image of God**, or unrape the woman, they agreed with my implicit answer that it would not.

Then, and in many other similar instances, I took pause to look more closely at the evil of rape. Whereas I cannot fully grasp a woman's perspective on such violation, I can grasp the perspectives as a son, brother, husband and father, with due respect for all women. When I consider the vulnerability and intimacy of sexual union between husband and wife, and the emotional realities as well as the physical realities, I shudder deeply when I consider the hell of rape or incest. And I use the term "hell" in a full theological sense.

Thus, the humanity of the woman is embraced, true compassion underscored, and the deepest hatred for the evil of rape and incest is profiled. But since human abortion does not heal the evil and does not unrape the woman, the next question is where healing and justice are to be found. In order to move in this direction, **the power to give** and **the power to forgive** must be embraced. Courage is needed to overcome the adversity, but rarely is courage able to be grasped when someone is alone – especially if facing single motherhood with the painful memories of the pregnancy having occurred in such a violent fashion. **The power to give** trumps the power to destroy, and the raped woman needs love given to her so as to help her overcome such devastation. We love because God first loved us. Thus the church must be an agent of that love to such a woman, giving her the time, love, counsel, spiritual, psychological and material resources necessary for her to become an overcomer.

When a woman becomes pregnant by rape or incest, she is terribly aware of her weakness and vulnerability. Cowardly acts lead to a true loss of humanity, but courageous acts lead to a greater humanity, and it is the courageous whom history fetes. In the face of the destruction and dehumanization of rape and incest, **the power to choose life** for the unborn is an act of courage, and the church needs to be there to help the woman make this choice. Courage is never easy on the face of it, but it is the right thing to do, and in the long run it produces peace in the soul.

The unborn child is innocent, and if aborted, the child becomes the second victim. It is a question of power – if the child is aborted, the rapist prevails twice. He has succeeded in having one act of destruction lead to another act of destruction. He has succeeded in prostituting motherhood by causing a mother to forsake her child. This prostitution is his prostitution, not hers, but she is the one in whom the agony is deposited alongside his seed. He is the coward to begin with, and he poisons her with that same cowardice if she yields to an abortion. He has succeeded in having the power to take trump **the power to give**.

What about the woman's emotions? Oftentimes, in pregnancy due to rape, the very thought of giving birth to a rapist's child is repulsive. She cannot but view the child as the offspring of such a "father," and cannot imagine loving such a child. This is why the love of God the Father is indispensable – he who has loved us, when through our sins we have become as unlovely as can the appearance of a rapist's child to the mother.

Who has more power – the rapist or the woman? In 1 Corinthians 7, Paul says that the believer has more power than the unbeliever, especially in terms of influencing the children. Do we encourage victims of rape to believe this? Are they empowered in the face of the hell they are going through, to overcome looking at the child as a "rape child," and instead to see him or her as an image-bearer of God in whose life the love of God can triumph? Does a rape victim view the child as her child, the one whom she will influence, or does she buy the lie that the rapist, and the memory of him *in absentia*, will be the primary influence?

The percentage of abortions due to rape is very small (about 1/10 of one percent), and women who abort due to rape, abort at about the same rate as all women who abort their pregnancies. So the emotions and the trauma associated with rape do not produce a higher choice for abortion than women who get pregnant out of a chosen relationship. But because of the huge hormone changes in a woman's body during the first weeks of pregnancy, a woman is emotionally vulnerable to being pressured into an

abortion in the 8-12 week range – while her emotions can be reacting to that state of pregnancy, before her hormone shift is complete and she begins to identify with the growing child within her.

Whereas pro-abortion ideologues say that an abortion is necessary to rid the evil of rape and incest, in truth, they take the pain of women so victimized, and employ it to their own ends. This is why the pro-abortion activists, in their ideological zeal, can actually hate women, despite their protestations to such a diagnosis. The nature of forcible rape actually lessens the statistical norm for possible pregnancy, but whether the number of instances is small or great, it is nonetheless a real hell for those so victimized. My point here is that upon the backs of these women, the pro-abortion ideologues market an ideology of sexual promiscuity and abortion-on-demand. Whereas some of them do genuinely care for women thus victimized, in large part it is the pain of the raped woman that is used to market the justification for abortion in all instances. The pain of raped women is employed as public rhetoric in service to Planned Parenthood and other abortion marketeers. Whenever they have need for political persuasion to keep abortion legal, they prostitute the emotional identification we all have for compassion upon a rape victim, so as to say that pro-life people hate women, and thus the pro-life argument must be rejected in total.

But the pro-abortion ideologues rape these very women all over again, using their pain as chattel. When we grasp this reality, we can see clearly how the abortion-rights language is in service to misinformed choice. We need to help empower rape victims to choose life equally for themselves and their unborn children, to embrace overcoming courage and to reject the male chauvinistic cowardice that only knows destruction. We do this by saying “no” to the physical rapists of the women, and “no” to the spiritual and political rapists of these same women all over again by pro-abortion ideologues.

Another way we can look at this issue is pointing out that we are all children of rape, whether physically or metaphorically. In other words, if we were able to trace every act of sexual union that produced us, from our parents back to the Garden of Eden – how many of these acts were in true marital love with the planned embrace of children so conceived? How many of these sexual unions were in various states of turmoil, and how many were adulterous unions, acts of fornication, acts of rape or acts of incest? For all I know, and I do not know, a drunk fifty-year old man in the highlands of Scotland ca. 850 A.D., raped his thirteen-year old niece, apart from which I would not be here today. And for all we know, a similar act of sexual evil produced the lineage that eventually led to William I of Normandy (and he was an illegitimate child), apart from which he would not have shaped history with the crossing of the English Channel in 1066, apart from which not only would I not be here today, but many tens of millions of others as well, including British royalty and most if not all of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Of course too, we know that such sexual sins have also produced evil people. The point is this – none of us come from a lineage that is sexually pure. Thus, if we judge the child of the raped woman to be less than human, then we judge ourselves and our loved ones also to be less than human. I would not be surprised to learn that the majority of or all of the human race has literal rape or tabooed incest in their lineages at some point.

In 1986, I sponsored a public forum on abortion at a local school in Gloucester, Massachusetts. We distributed flyers citywide and in Rockport as well. I had invited Planned Parenthood to send a representative, but they refused. When I arrived at the school that evening, I was greeted by three women protesters with placards. They were not protesting me per se, but were protesting a pro-life initiative for the 1986 state ballot, which though I supported (it opposed taxpayer funded abortions), I was only marginally involved with the political campaign that was advancing it, and this initiative was not the advertised or actual substance of the forum that evening.

I approached the women, and invited them into the forum, and offered them equal time from the podium to address their concerns. One woman left, and the other two accepted my invitation but demurred to take

the podium. So I gave them first shot at asking questions from the audience, and priority in the amount of time they wished for. One woman asked many questions, and we went back and forth for a good period. It made the evening, as most of the audience of 120 people were pro-life in sentiment. In her final statement, she said how she now agreed with me 90 percent on the subject, but still could not accept my opposition to abortion in the cases of rape and incest. (As well, my articulation concerning rape and incest was much less seasoned than it is now). My response was straightforward – if we have 90 percent agreement, let’s build on it and go from there. I stated my belief that if she agreed that much, then a patient examination of the basis for such an agreement would lead her to understand the consistency and compassion involved in saying no to human abortion in such instances. But I was not going to push the issue – I prayed that the seeds of truth she had accepted would bear fruit in due season.

If we can answer the question of rape and incest, the toughest of questions in the abortion debate, we can then win the largest portion of public sentiment possible. The tragedy of pro-life politicians who carve out an exception for the rare reality of pregnancy due to rape and incest, is that by side-stepping the question, they reduce their ability to tackle the real question of human abortion head on – the willful destruction of unborn children, which simultaneously assaults the humanity and psychological health of their mothers. We can only succeed in the overall concerns if first we embrace **the power to love hard questions** in this regard.

In the mid-1980s, I conducted a series of open forums on abortion with sponsorship from various campus ministry groups. I would go onto a university campus, in conjunction with flyers being passed out, at the lunch hour at a central location, set up a microphone and start speaking on the issues surrounding the debate. People would gather, in modest or substantial numbers, and after a summary presentation, I would invite questions. The forums would last up to two hours, with people stopping by for a short time or a long time. At the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (UMass), we had perhaps our most successful forum, where up to 250 people stopped for enough time to make it worth noting. At the end of this event, with about 100 people present, a young woman was questioning me passionately. She came to the question of rape and incest, and I sought to give answer.

As I did, she interjected and stated, in the presence of everyone there, that she herself was conceived though an act of rape. I had never before encountered a person with such a testimony, and I was astonished at her forthrightness. I then asked why she of all people would argue for abortion in the case of rape. “Would you rather have been aborted?” She was astonished, for as her reaction then made clear, she had never thought of it from that perspective. She had only thought of it in terms of the woman who had been raped, e.g., her very mother, and now paused as she tried to sort out her thoughts. We brought the forum to a close shortly thereafter, and I walked right over to her. We then went to the Student Union and sat down at a cafeteria table, and she shared with me her story.

She was a freshman or sophomore as best I recall, thus about nineteen-years old. Her mother was raised in a West Virginian coal mining town, although I was not told the specific town. But for any of us who know anything about many of these towns, they are historically “company” towns, where most all the jobs are directly or indirectly linked to the coal mining company. The education levels are generally low, and at least until World War II, most of the children stayed in the given town to work as did their parents. Everyone knows everyone else, and Protestant churches with “fundamental” doctrinal and social concerns are predominant. This is a generalization of the milieu from which this college girl came, and the flavor of her story conveyed this sense as well.

She was thus born in the 1965-68 time frame, and her mother was eleven years old when raped. So there I sat, in my early thirties, looking at a nineteen-year old woman whose mother was younger than me. As well, I gleaned the sense from our conversation that the father was known to everyone in the town, and though she did not say so explicitly, I wondered if he were perhaps a member of the extended family, thus

involving the question of incest. When her mother was known to be pregnant, her family exerted severe pressure on her to get an abortion. The sense I also gleaned was that abortion was generally opposed in the family, church and town, where there was a strong commitment to the institution and social glue of marriage. But too, abortion was favored in the case of rape. In a small town like that, and especially if family members and the gossip chain knew who the father was, the carrying to term of the child would serve as a constant reminder to them of the evil of the rape.

Remarkably, the eleven-year old girl in West Virginia resisted the pressure, and chose to give birth to her child. When we speak in terms of courage, and the need for the church to help those facing the evil of rape and incest when it results in pregnancy, we can contrast it with this grade school girl who had no such support. If she could muster the courage in such a hostile environment, anyone can do the same in other rape and incest scenarios by placing their trust in God. She gave birth at age twelve, and about nineteen years later I was talking with her daughter.

The twelve-year old mother was treated as “dirt” by the town for having chosen to have the baby, and her daughter with whom I was speaking nearly two decades later, was treated as “double dirt.” Because she saw her mother’s pain and wanted to stand up for her, she uncritically accepted the abortion rationale in college – until she happened upon the forum. As I spoke with her, and perceived her own struggle, I looked straight at her and said something like, “It doesn’t matter that you were conceived in rape – you are just as loved by God as anyone else, including those conceived in a loving marriage, or where there is great wealth like British royalty.” As I spoke these words, I witnessed them touch her soul in a fashion that she had never experienced. I do not believe she had ever been affirmed as an equal image-bearer of God, and as I said these words, they were received like water through the parched lips of a severely dehydrated person. So dehydrated that I concluded the conversation at that point, realizing that such a proclamation of the Good News was so radical that she needed time to process it.

In the fall of 1989, I was interviewed on WGAN radio in Portland, Maine, a 50,000 watt super-station. During the course of the show, the issue of rape and incest was brought up by the talk show host, as he did not appear to share my perspective. I gave answer, and then a woman called the show on the air. She began by saying how she had once been raped. She continued and said that I was the first man she had ever heard who understood her pain, and in listening to me, the hatred she had held for so many years against all men drained out of her heart. I was blown away, and had a very difficult time in responding to her. She then continued with passion, and without stating that she had actually had an abortion, said how incredible it was for a woman who has been raped and made pregnant by a man, to then allow another man to scrape out her uterus. It was like being raped again, she said.

In a 1996 forum with the Katherine Hancock Ragsdale, president of the Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights (RCAR), I did something I had never done before, as later I also did with Ann Stone, chairman of Republicans for Choice, in a forum at Dartmouth. I addressed the issue of rape and incest in my opening comments, not waiting to respond to someone’s question. In both cases, neither Ragsdale, Stone nor any of the audience raised the issue in their responses to me. In other words, by taking the intellectual, moral and spiritual offensive on this question, we can see the opposition arguments silenced, and our position is greatly strengthened from which to lobby for the legal protection of the unborn.

In summary, human abortion is not an answer to the hell of rape or incest:

1. Human abortion does not unrape the woman – it redeems nothing and thus it is in service only to destruction.
2. Human abortion does not restore the fractured qualities of the **image of God**.
3. Human abortion only adds further brokenness, since it equals the intrinsic power to destroy.
4. Human abortion is not compassionate to the woman or to her child.

5. Human abortion mocks the power of the woman to overcome the evil she has suffered, it excludes the power and redemptive effect of courage.
6. Human abortion mocks the humanity of the unborn by killing the child – the other innocent party.
7. Human abortion allows the rapist to triumph twice – to assault both woman and child – to get away with “double murder.”
8. Human abortion allows the power to take and destroy of the rapist to vitiate **the power to give** of the woman.
9. Human abortion allows the pro-abortion ideologues to market “abortion-rights” on the backs of rape victims – it rapes the woman all over again.
10. Human abortion is theologically a tool of the evil one, who would abort us all, since all of us are actually or metaphorically “children of rape.”

Human Abortion as the Ultimate Male Chauvinism

According to the Alan Guttmacher Institute of the pro-abortion Planned Parenthood, 82 percent of all abortions occur outside of marriage (i.e., sexual promiscuity). Of the remaining 18 percent, some interesting factors appear clear. I have been long involved with Crisis Pregnancy Centers (CPCs). In two representative cases, one in California and one in Connecticut, I know CPC directors who each have personally counseled over 1500 women facing crisis pregnancies. They tell me that at least 75 percent of the married women they see are pregnant by someone other than their husbands (i.e. adultery), and of the remaining 25 percent of this number, their marriages are in serious trouble – usually in terms of the man being ready to leave the marriage. Very rarely do a man and woman in a stable marriage consider abortion – and in those rare cases there are extenuating trials, and where confusion is thus introduced. I have not seen anyone ever do a formal study on this question, but I am convinced that the statistical testimony of these 3,000+ women – given all possible variables – is close to reality.

In other words, abortion justifies sexual infidelity, and as such it is the ramrod of male chauvinism where the man who gets the woman pregnant outside of marriage is able to take off and leave her to face the pregnancy alone. When the above statistical factors are taken into account, this means that some 95 percent of abortions occur in a relationship where the woman is not married to the father, and some 4 percent where the husband is prone to divorcing her – thus equaling 99 percent male chauvinism. Is this a woman’s right, dignity or freedom?

In the many times that I have defined the **God > life > choice > sex** paradigm in largely “pro-choice” university settings, I have found agreement in every instance to its reality, and its application to the abortion debate. Even among abortion-rights leaders, among whom I have often asked the question: “Should sexual intimacy be restricted to heterosexual faithful monogamous marriage?” They consistently say no. They thus tacitly endorse **the reversal** order of sex > choice > life >/God. The only exceptions (two or three) are people whose human instincts are better than their politics on this issue.

The abortion-rights argument has been based on a concept of “women’s rights” (where abortion is its linchpin), and the language of “pro-choice.” In order to accomplish a **reversal of this reversal** in the political order, we need a) to redeem the language of choice to protect the unborn, and b) to demonstrate the male chauvinism of human abortion, so as c) to secure, by moral consensus nationwide, the status of the unborn as persons who deserve equal protection under the law. The first two must be achieved before the third is possible. Abortion is successfully marketed by various feminists, not because it holds intrinsic satisfaction for them, but in reaction to male chauvinisms in their lives. They see it as a way to fight back, and to gain independence from men who treat them thus. But in reality, it only deepens the chauvinistic hold. If a man impregnates a woman and takes off, she faces either a) the courage of single motherhood with its economic and social trials (some 90 percent living at or below the “official” poverty line), b) the courage of adopting the child out with the accompanying emotional trials, or c) being pressured into

aborting her child, where she treats her boy or girl as a piece of disposable property, much as the man treated her. Her abortion becomes a tacit admission of the inability or unwillingness to parent a child, a destructive self-diagnosis, usually of sexual promiscuity rooted in the **reversal** reality of sex > choice > life >/God, augmented by male chauvinists.

I have argued the male chauvinism of human abortion since my public involvement in the abortion debate, and consistently this reality has been affirmed by pro-life advocates and abortion-rights advocates alike. Whether at Cornell University, Wellesley College, the College of William and Mary, Smith College or Georgetown University, and on dozens of other campuses, college women have always affirmed this. The most passionate challenges I have encountered are with men – both abortion-minded men who seek to absolve themselves of any responsibility for their promiscuity, or with some extreme “pro-life” men who are willing to blame the woman solely for the situation that led to the abortion.

In the mid-1980s I was addressing an audience at the University of New Hampshire. I was supposed to have a debate with a professor of philosophy, but she backed out at the last moment. So with 140 students showing up, I sought to explain the best argument an abortion-rights advocate might make, and what my response would be. Then I opened it up for questions. There were two men at the back. One spoke up and said that he did not understand my argument about male chauvinism. He said something like, “If I get a girl pregnant, she is free to go to the abortion clinic and get it taken care of. What’s the big deal?” As he said this, virtually all the women in the audience turned and glared at him intensely. Seventy sets of eyeballs riveted on his body and psyche. Reality check. I reaffirmed my position, then took the next question. As I did, he and his friend slipped quietly out of the auditorium. The man put his foot in his mouth and revealed his male chauvinism.

In another instance, in the mid-1990s, I addressed 1,000 high school students at Ridgefield High School (Connecticut). My subject was religious liberty, but the two questions from the floor at the end of my address both dealt with abortion. In response to one of them, I diagnosed the Playboy mentality of human abortion; namely, that if a woman gets pregnant by a chauvinist, he sends her off to the abortion center to get “fixed,” that is, aborted, to be returned to him like a broken toy that has been repaired, and thus, a toy which can be played with again. When I said this, so many of the boys in the crowd groaned that the whole auditorium reverberated with a “gnashing of teeth,” and as some of their girlfriends similarly stared them down and questioned them as well.

Because of the pervasiveness of sexual promiscuity and the male chauvinism that undergirds it, many political leaders are men who know they have “fooled around.” Thus they have no moral mettle to resist the demands of political feminists. The abolition of male chauvinism, repentance of it where any of us have been guilty, and the honoring of marriage is key to **reversing the reversal**. When U.S. Senator Bob Packwood was driven from office because of sexual harassment charges against him, it was a pathetic sight. This man had written down his sexual conquests as a Senator in a journal, that somehow became known, proud of all the women he had bedded. It was a game of conquest to him, and a reification of women. Because he had always been a strong supporter of legalized abortion, he had the political support of feminist groups. When these same groups began to call for his resignation, he was in shock. As the quintessential male chauvinist he did not get it. He publicly complained that the feminists should not be opposing him, since he was their “champion” on abortion-rights. He thought abortion-rights equaled a “pro-woman” stance, and was blind-sided when reality proved otherwise. The only way we are going to win the legal protection of the unborn is by winning the argument in the public diet:

abortion = anti-woman;
pro-life = pro-woman.

We need to reverse the common mythology advanced by the pro-abortion movement that pro-life equals anti-woman. Interestingly, in polls over the past quarter century, women have always been more pro-life than men, regardless of their position on legalized abortion.

With regard to the charges of promiscuity leveled against former President Bill Clinton, and if we distill all the politics out of it and go to the moral core – what do we find? An accusation was made that as Arkansas Governor, he was guilty of sexual harassment, and it led to his lies, ultimately before a Grand Jury, as he sought to cover over his sexual sins. He was thus charged with contempt of court. Then, as well, the accusation has been made that he was guilty of sadistic rape when serving as Arkansas Attorney General, a charge he has not refuted. Indeed, when members of the U.S. Congress reviewed the sealed material that substantiated these charges, some emerged in tears. Adultery and rape are lies and lead to other lies, and in these cases, also to a mockery of the rule of law. It is the debate over **God > life > choice > sex** versus its **reversal**, and how “sexual politics” affects the whole culture.

Some defenders of the President were cacophonous and even shrill in pointing out his abortion-rights advocacy as a central reason why he should not be impeached. The history of his sexual promiscuities, the details of his relationship with the White House intern, and the evil of rape, indicate the quintessence of male chauvinism. The core of the abortion ethos is male chauvinism, and here it was paraded on the national stage. Yet subsequent to the impeachment trial, the allegations of his raping a woman have not been challenged with any facts or passion. De facto admission of guilt? Male chauvinism. And the mainstream media has been complicitous with its own silence in this regard. And moreover, it leads the charge in supporting the male chauvinistic terrain of human abortion. Its opposition to President George W. Bush’s election, or to Senator John Ashcroft’s nomination as U.S. Attorney General, are both rooted in a devotion to human abortion, to the deeper ethos of the sexual promiscuity rooted in **the reversal**.

In November, 1994, I addressed one of my **Mars Hill Forum** series, with Patricia Ireland, president of NOW, at Smith College, and where most of the audience was sympathetic to a pagan feminist worldview. Probably more so than in any other venue. The topic for the evening was *Feminism and the Bible: Do They Share Any Common Ground?* Abortion was not a specific subject per se. But in Patricia’s questions of me, she asked specifically about violence at abortion centers, and thus the abortion subject came up as a side issue. In the process, I alluded to human abortion in its male chauvinistic realities, from my diagnosis that abortion is the opposite of **the power to give**.

With the television lights so bright in my face, I could not see the audience very well past the first few rows. And given my natural concentration on the subject at hand, and my focus on Patricia’s person as the one with whom I was communicating, I was not focusing on how the audience was responding. Christian students in the audience later told me how amazed they were to watch fellow students nodding their heads to the biblical ethics of **the power to give** and **the power of informed choice** – women whom they knew to be lesbian, pagan, feminist and/or supportive of abortion-rights.

At the end of the audience participation time a woman challenged me on how I could respect women’s dignity while opposing abortion. We were running out of time, and I only had a few seconds to give answer. So I said, “I think that if I had the time to address the abortion issue straight ahead, you would find that I would argue that abortion rips off women as much as it rips off the unborn, and allows male chauvinists to run free.” Before I completed the final clause, the auditorium of some 500+ people broke into enthusiastic and sustained applause (with one discernible loud “boo” in its midst). I was astonished, and there I sat, there Patricia Ireland sat, and there the dean of Students, as moderator, sat.

This was not supposed to happen. There I was – a white heterosexual male, an evangelical and pro-life minister. Six strikes against me on a “politically correct” campus, Smith College no less. The applause did not come because I was necessarily smart or cute, but because **the image of God** had been touched in

these women. They knew the male chauvinistic reality of human abortion, from direct personal experience, or through the testimony of women friends. And perhaps for the first time, they heard a man diagnose it. I was not there passing judgment on women, but as a man I was submitting my gender to judgment first.

If the reality of human abortion as the ultimate male chauvinism can win an audience at Smith College that came to hear one of their heroines, it can win the whole culture. And with the successful presentation of this argument in politics and culture, we can demonstrate that it is Christian pro-lifers who truly respect all women equally, and the “pro-choice” consensus in this nation will fall apart. The few extreme pro-abortion partisans will be marginalized by their own choice, and we will be able to build the moral consensus necessary for a Human Life Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, based on **the power of informed choice**.

A Two-Pronged Initial Agenda for the U.S. Congress

Thus far, I have looked at the all-defining subjects of **God, Life, Choice and Sex**, how to defang the “anti-choice” accusation with the true language of **the ethics and power of informed choice**, answering the emotionally **hard question** of rape and incest, and the reality that human abortion is in truth an evil freedom for male chauvinists, not a true freedom for women. This material is in part excerpts from the first two volumes of my trilogy, **First the Gospel, Then Politics...** And I have chosen this material out of a much larger corpus, in order to give us a theological foundation that allows us to grasp a vision on how to minister to the depths of human pain that surround the abortion debate. We cannot change the laws of the nation until first we see change in the human heart. And the biggest issue deals with the need to teach and exemplify godliness among men, who will accordingly be chaste outside of marriage and faithful within it. In order to change the culture so radically, how do we go about it? There are many aspects, but in terms of politics, what can be done? I propose two non-binding resolutions for the U.S. Congress to pass, and which if they do, which even if they debate it, will change the language of the abortion debate nationwide, providing for the first time since 1973 a level playing field to debate it, and thus to persuade the culture.

The First Resolution

Proposed Resolution for the U.S. Congress and the Legislatures of the Several States:

Human Abortion and a Process of Informed Choice

We recognize that the U.S. Constitution defines three principal arenas of unalienable human rights, and with a specific order – life, liberty and property. For these rights to be protected, they must be defined.

The 1973 U.S. Supreme Court *Roe v. Wade* decision left the beginning of individual biological human life as undefined. We believe this matter must be addressed by the nation’s electorate. If there is truly no consensus as to the beginning of an individual human life, let it be shown, and the status quo will hold and be strengthened. If, however, a clear consensus emerges, let it be instructive.

The U.S. Congress should poll its members to answer the following question, and the Several States should place this simple non-binding multiple-choice question on their ballots:

In **biological terms**, when does an individual human life begin?

Mark a cross X in the square next to the answer you prefer. Only vote for one.

- A. Conception.
 - B. Viability.
 - C. Birth.
 - D. Write-in: specify a different biological term _____.
-

The 1973 *Roe v. Wade* U.S. Supreme Court ruling is the first legal interpretation in U.S. history based on the assumption of a “non-consensus” as to the central fact of the case. It was based on a pretension of ignorance.

Texas urges that, apart from the Fourteenth Amendment, life begins at conception and is present throughout pregnancy, and that, therefore, the State has a compelling interest in protecting that life from and after conception. We need not resolve this difficult question of when life begins. When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary, at this point in the development of man’s knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer (410 U.S. 113 at 159).

This is in fact the weakest form of moral argument there is – the “I don’t know” position. When Cain murdered Abel, God came to him and asked him where his brother was. Cain said, “I don’t know. Am I my brother’s keeper?” Cain could not a) admit the truth that he murdered Abel, because he was not going to repent, and he could not b) market a lie that Abel was somewhere else. Thus c) he pretended not to know.

This same pretension of ignorance was adopted by the Pharisees when they opposed Jesus. They asked him where he got the authority to do the things he was doing, so Jesus replied, and said he would answer them if they would first answer a prior question. Namely, where did John the Baptist get his authority from – heaven or men? The Pharisees could not a) say heaven, because they would then have to admit that Jesus was the Messiah – since John bore witness to him – and they did not want to repent of their sins. Nor could they b) say from men, since they were in the midst of a large crowd of people who held John to be a prophet, and who would stone the Pharisees to death at a moment’s notice if they challenged John the Baptist’s credentials. So they c) answered Jesus, “We don’t know.”

When the truth will not be admitted, and a lie cannot be marketed successfully, the pretension of ignorance is the last refuge for the cowardly. Cain, the Pharisees and the *Roe* Court qualify:

- a) when dishonest elitists do not have the courage to admit true definition of terms and then make their case; and
- b) when they cannot market a false definition of terms, because they know they cannot fool the common people with it; then
- c) they pretend to be ignorant of reality.

This is the weakest form of moral argument there is, yet it has stood undisturbed from 1973 to the present. A full treatment of the *Roe* decision will reveal that this “I don’t know” argument is its philosophical linchpin.

In 1988 I led a petition drive to place this non-binding question on the Massachusetts ballot. It was the most successful petition of its kind in state history, as in 13 weeks of work (against a legally defined deadline), and as political novices, we qualified in 105 of the state’s 160 representative districts. Another three weeks, and we would have qualified in nearly every district. Our research showed that in excess of 80 percent of the voters in the state would have answered “conception”, even without any educational

material. The reason was simple – we did not put an “I don’t know” option among the choices. We wanted positive answers, and “conception” is it. Besides, when can we elect an “I don’t know” to office, or vote an “I don’t know” into law? Planned Parenthood was so scared that they filed a legal brief against us, arguing against informed choice. And the Attorney General, a former board member of Planned Parenthood, blocked us by sheer political muscle, arguing also against informed choice – saying that we were not allowed to use a multiple choice format, even though the Legislature did so in 1970. But before he told us we could not use multiple-choice, he offered us other choices to place on the question, including “I don’t know.” The weakest moral argument there is. We were told later that we had the best case in Massachusetts history to challenge the Attorney General in Court and win, but sadly, we did not know enough to go through two simple steps first in order to gain a hearing before the Supreme Judicial Court. Thus, they refused to rule on the merits.

To place this non-binding question before the U.S. Congress will require, for the first time since *Roe*, an accurate measurement as to what consensus there is or is not. It will effectively redress *Roe*’s pretension of ignorance, and demonstrate that abortion supporters have no interest in informed choice. It is we who are pro-life who are pro-informed choice. Then the question can go to state ballots and we can demonstrate the consensus that there is – individual biological human life begins at conception, that human life and human personhood are co-extensive, and thus *Roe* is based on a lie. Abortion-rights politicians will censor themselves on this matter, because they hide behind *Roe*’s skirt of ignorance.

To win factually is but step one. Step two is to reverse the myth that abortion rights is pro-woman. Thus, I offer a second non-binding resolution that is self-explanatory.

The Second Resolution

Proposed Resolution for the U.S. Congress and the Legislatures of the Several States:

Human Abortion and Male Chauvinism

With regard to the social causes of human abortion, we understand the following:

1. Women rarely if ever plan to get pregnant in order to have an abortion, and rarely do women ever regard human abortion as an intrinsic good. Rather, women most often view abortion as tragic and undesirable.
2. Most abortions occur in situations where the woman is not married to the man who made her pregnant; or in some instances, where a marriage suffers stress to the point where the husband does not want the child to be born.
3. In most abortion choices, some man is pressuring the woman to have the abortion, whether overtly or subtly.
4. In cases where the woman is made pregnant by a boyfriend, if he would support her, especially by means of faithful marriage, she would likely keep the child.
5. Apart from the evil of rape or incest, women who get pregnant out of wedlock are complicitous to one degree or another; however, the man possesses the power to forsake her in her pregnancy.
6. In such instances, the male chauvinism pressures the woman to a) embrace the courage and sacrifice of single motherhood, usually with financial duress; b) to embrace the courage and

sacrifice of adopting the child out; or c) to reify and abandon the child to abortion, much as the man who impregnated her has reified and abandoned her to begin with.

7. Abortion is thus the ultimate male chauvinism, consistent with pornographic views of women; where such men regard women as sexual objects, who if made pregnant, are discarded as broken toys, sent off to be aborted, so they can be played with once again.
8. Accordingly, “abortion-rights” do not serve women – rather it is most often a ruse for male chauvinists to trample women and children.

Thus, we affirm the following:

The equal protection for women and their unborn children will not occur until men start being responsible in their sexuality, and regard women as their moral equals and full partners where sexual expression is reserved for marriage – one man, one woman, one lifetime – and where the responsibility of fatherhood is fully embraced.

To place this resolution before the U.S. Congress, the state legislatures, and before the public by means of non-binding referenda, would be instructive and productive to observe. The chauvinists of all stripes would groan, intelligent women would take notice, and the human abortion ethos would suffer a serious and hopefully fatal wound. Just like the two men at the University of New Hampshire who departed in haste after being stared down by the women who discerned their chauvinism; just like the hundreds of women at Smith College cheered at the diagnosis of abortion as the ultimate male chauvinism; just like so many of the 500 boys groaned at Ridgefield High School at the diagnosis, as the 500 girls gave them discerning and questioning glances. Then, with such a moral consensus in place, legal action can be prescribed for chauvinistic men who abandon pregnant women. And then we will in position to work for a Human Life Amendment that wins the consensus of the nation.

Conclusion

President George W. Bush will, sooner or later, have a vacancy to fill on the U.S. Supreme Court. And when he does, all political hell will break loose. Fanatical abortion supporters will go apopleptic in trying to keep any judicially and constitutionally honest Justice from being appointed. They will seek to hide their commitment to misinformed choice and male chauvinism. To have presented these two resolutions to the U.S. Congress ahead of time will put us in the driver’s seat of defining the terms, for the first time since 1973.

###