

# All Abortions Must Be Illegal

*Are Abortion Rights Threatened?*, 2013  
From Opposing Viewpoints in Context

Judie Brown is president of the American [Life](#) League, the largest grass-roots, pro-life nonprofit advocacy organization in the [United States](#). Robert P. Evangelisto is a former director of public relations for American Life League.

No one other than God should decide who lives or dies, and that applies to the "preborn" as well as the born. All choices should not be legal or protected, and [abortion](#) is one that should not be legal. Allowing abortion in cases of [rape](#) or [incest](#) punishes the innocent child more than the guilty rapist. The circumstances of a preborn child's [conception](#) should not negate its [right to life](#). There are no medical conditions that threaten a woman's life in which abortion is a recognized treatment. Permitting abortion for fetal deformities translates to the theory that some lives are not worth living, and no one has the right to say which individual is not worthy of life. What some people see as "restrictions on women," others see as "protections for preborn children."

The true question is: Should abortion be a legal choice at all? If the issue were [slavery](#), [murder](#), robbery or rape, such questions would not even be considered. As an example, slave masters were "pro-choice" in regard to slavery. They thought the choice of whether or not to own a slave belonged to them, not the government.

## Defining the "Choice"

---

The "choice" has to be defined. Thus, for the question, "Who should make the choice to kill preborn babies?", the answer is "Nobody."

In regard to innocent human life, *who should decide* in matters of life and death? Certainly not man. The answer is God, Providence, Nature, etc. In other words, the death of the innocent should always be the result of "natural causes," not direct human intervention of destructive intent. Intervention should only have the intent of healing or saving innocent human life.

Allowing preborn capital punishment for cases of rape/incest punishes the innocent child more severely than the guilty rapist.

Choice is important to us all, but we should not endorse choices that drastically and unjustly limit the choices of other human beings. The most drastic way to deny choice to a person is to take his or her very life....

## Rape and Incest

---

"I see no reason why incest often is coupled with rape in discussions of abortion, except for the fact that

both arouse in most people an emotion of revulsion that proponents of abortion seek to divert from parties who are guilty to individuals who are innocent—the nameless unborn" [Germain Grisez, *Abortion: The Myths, the Realities, and the Arguments*, 1970].

Allowing preborn capital punishment for cases of rape/incest punishes the innocent child more severely than the guilty rapist. An "innocent bystander" (at the time of assault not yet created!) is given a greater sentence than the perpetrator of the crime.

Allowing abortion for cases of rape or incest effectively blames the preborn for another's (i.e., the father's) crime. Killing a preborn because his or her father is a rapist is no more justifiable than killing the rapist's mother or father (perhaps even less so, in that, plausibly, a parent could have in some way influenced, caused or contributed to the son's actions). The preborn child has not yet been created; no causal influence and, therefore, culpability, is possible. The perpetrator alone should be punished. Punishing the preborn makes him or her a scapegoat and the second victim.

The circumstances of a preborn child's creation should not modify, let alone negate, his or her right to life. In other words, the preborn baby has a right to life regardless of the circumstances under which he or she was created. And regardless of the father's identity, the woman is still the mother—the baby still her child.

Murder is not a solution, even if the mother at such a distraught time believes it is.

If we were to consider two infants, one created through marital intercourse, the other through forcible rape, would we say that one person was "more human" than the other?

## The "Easy Cases"

---

The "hard cases" represent perhaps only one percent of all abortions, yet we hear about them all the time. To be equitable, there are no doubt "easy cases" that can be brought up against the abortion advocate. What about abortion performed for sex selection, under duress, without full disclosure of fact, or without [parental consent](#) or notification? Or abortion for birth control? Or abortion in the last month of pregnancy? Or how about abortions performed on the basis of coin flips, tea leaves, horoscopes, etc.? As upsetting or outlandish as some of these scenarios sound, all are possible. All are legally permissible. And such "easy cases" are no doubt much more prevalent than the oft-cited "hard cases."

If a rape/incest exception were allowed, how would we differentiate between the rape victim and an abortion-minded liar? Making a woman "prove" she was raped, not to convict her attacker, but to get an abortion, would be disastrous. Surely some women desiring an abortion would feign rape (the plaintiff in *Roe v. Wade*, Norma McCorvey, admittedly lied about being raped). This would cause great damage to the true victims of rape who already risk character assassination by the judicial system.

Rape or incest engenders sympathy, and rightly so, for the victim. However, sympathy and concern should be confined to helping and healing the victim—caring for her and the innocent life within her. Caring for the victim cannot justify killing innocent life whether or not the woman, now a mother, desires an abortion.

Murder is not a solution, even if the mother at such a distraught time believes it is.

While abortion may seem to some like the best course of action for a mother after being assaulted, there is growing evidence that abortion harms the victim physically, psychologically and spiritually in the long term.

In rape or incest, promotion of "therapeutic abortion" is derived from an assumption one could refer to as "murder-as-therapy." However, even if an abortion could provide the assault victim temporary relief, there is no evidence to support the tenet that abortion provides long-term benefits. The unfortunate woman and her sexuality are instead victimized twice. Any negative effects—physical, psychological or spiritual—arising from the abortion can only compound pre-existing problems. Also destroyed are the potentially positive benefits for the mother that may arise from unselfishly preserving the life of her child. And, of course, one cannot forget the tragedy and injustice of abortion in regard to the preborn child.

Our abhorrence toward incest (or rape) engenders sympathy for the victim, and rightly so. However, our sympathy and concern for the victim should not cloud our judgment on what is right or wrong. The preborn baby deserves both our sympathy and concern, especially under such unfortunate circumstances.

There are no conditions that threaten the mother's life in which abortion is a medically recognized treatment.

We must deal with a tragedy in an appropriate manner. A negative event should be handled with a positive response. Killing a preborn baby is not, and never can be, a positive response to any situation. Also, we must be clear as to what is negative in the case of an incest victim becoming pregnant; obviously, the act (or acts) of incest is (are) what is to be deplored. In contrast, conception, regardless of the precursory circumstances, is not negative; it is the creation of a new, unique and precious human being.

## Life of the Mother

---

In the event that the mother's life is threatened, we must remember that there are two patients involved. Every possible effort must be made to save both.

There are no conditions that threaten the mother's life in which abortion is a medically recognized treatment. In some conditions (e.g., an ectopic pregnancy or a cancerous uterus), a treatment may be required that indirectly kills the preborn. But, in such cases, the treatment does not legally or morally qualify as an abortion. When removing a cancerous uterus, the intent is to save the mother; every effort to save the child should still be made. Thus, even if the child dies, the treatment is still fully justified. The death of the child was never INTENDED. In contrast, for an abortion, the intent is always the same—to kill the preborn child.

Allowing abortion for "defects" turns genetic screening into a "search-and-destroy mission."

According to Dr. Alan Guttmacher, abortion proponent and former head of Planned Parenthood, in 1967, "Today it is possible for almost any patient to be brought through pregnancy alive, unless she suffers from a fatal illness such as cancer or leukemia, and if so, abortion would be unlikely to prolong, much less save life."

## Fetal Deformity

---

Allowing a fetal deformity exception for abortion is an extension of the utilitarian, quality-of-life ethic. In other words, some lives are not worth living. Even if this were true, who should have the right to say which individuals are not worthy of life or to justify the intervention of direct killing? Certainly not those doing—and profiting from—such killing!

Allowing abortion for "defects" turns genetic screening into a "search-and-destroy mission." This is a purely eugenic application of human technology. Genetic screening is not 100 percent accurate. Furthermore, genetic screening sets up a "test" for all prospective newborns—you must meet our criteria and pass our "test" to escape the threat of termination. If you fail the test, whether or not you are spared is dependent upon our (mother's, father's and doctor's) discretion. Whose interests does abortion for fetal defects serve? To say it serves the interests of the preborn is absurd. Many individuals in our nation were "defective" before birth. Yet they live and prosper in society despite their impairments. Clearly, it was in their interest to be born and experience life. Author, Germain Grisez, who has written about abortion myths and fetal deformity, states, "If life is a human good, even a defective life is better than no life at all—some value is better than no value."

In a 1969 legislative debate on a proposed bill permitting abortion for fetal abnormalities, Martin Ginsberg, New York state assemblyman and polio victim, stated, "What this bill says is that those who are malformed or abnormal have no reason to be a part of our society. If we are prepared to say that a life should not come into this world malformed or abnormal, then tomorrow we should be prepared to say that a life already in this world that becomes malformed or abnormal should not be permitted to live."

A society may benefit financially by removing some future "burdens" and their associated expenses via abortion, yet this puts a monetary value on a human being's life. Additionally, the benefits—financial and otherwise—that the impaired child may return to society are not known and, thus, not even considered.

In regard to abortion, our efforts to protect babies are a restriction only to those who would kill or harm babies.

Finally, society's true interests would not be served, even if a policy of aborting the handicapped were proven to be monetarily "cost effective" and adopted along with the necessary utilitarian ethic. The costs in terms of human suffering, moral decay and devaluing human life are inestimable and would clearly proscribe its application.

Abortion-for-eugenics may serve the interests of others, but motives here may well be selfish and cannot justify taking innocent human life....

## Protection vs. Restriction

---

Anti-abortion laws are seen very differently by pro-lifers and abortion advocates. What abortion advocates consider "restrictions on women," pro-lifers see as protections for preborn children. This brings up an

interesting question: When is a protection a "restriction," or, more pointedly, to whom? Obviously, a protection is only a restriction to an aggressor, one who would do another (or oneself) harm.

Thus, in regard to abortion, our efforts to protect babies are a restriction only to those who would kill or harm babies. A protection for a preborn child is a restriction only to someone who would harm that child....

## "Babies Having Babies"

---

Real babies cannot get pregnant, much less have babies; they are far below the reproductive age. But, even if we call these young women "babies," we must step back to gain some perspective.

The concern about "babies having babies" is inconsistent with the way of life that organizations like Planned Parenthood advocate. If the concern is about the innocence of a child and children being pushed into an "adult" situation at too early of an age, these organizations should also be concerned about these same "babies" beginning contraceptives at an early age, having pre-marital sex, and leading a promiscuous lifestyle in general.

When referring to young women (girls) who are pregnant, the terminology of the abortion advocate changes dramatically. When discussing childbirth, it's "babies" having babies, yet when discussing contraception/abortion, "young women" are exercising their reproductive choice.

How can abortion proponents reconcile this? Is the decision to kill one's child a rite of passage to "womanhood"? And is the responsible, generous, life-respecting decision to not kill one's child "babyish"?

---

### Source Citation

Brown, Judie, and Robert P. Evangelisto. "All Abortions Must Be Illegal." *Are Abortion Rights Threatened?* Ed. Tamara L. Roleff. Detroit: Greenhaven Press, 2013. At Issue.Rpt. from "The Moral and Logical Arguments against Abortion." Vol. 5. 2011. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*. Web. 22 June 2016.

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
-