

The Case for Life

Introduction

Perhaps one of the most controversial social issues today is the matter of abortion. This practice involves the killing or destruction of life in the womb of a mother, whether it is a child almost ready to be born or just two cells that have only begun to divide. This practice, despite having existed for thousands of years, has never lost its connection with darker acts throughout history. It is an act that not only ends a human life, but also can emotionally and mentally scar the parents who chose to have an abortion performed. The purpose of this paper is to not only explain why I believe in life at conception and that ending it is wrong, but to persuade others to think likewise through this explanation.

Early Stages and History

The first records of abortion occurred in a papyrus book that became known as the Ebers Papyrus, which was an ancient Egyptian herbal remedy guide. There were mentions of not only herbal contraceptives but also of ways to induce an abortion using natural resources. This artifact was dated to 1550 BC, approximately 30 or more years before Moses' birth. Interestingly enough, taking into account the above portion of the Ebers papyrus, at the time of Moses' birth the Pharaoh had issued a decree that all Hebrew boys were to be killed at birth. I view this as a genocide, provoked by the Pharaoh's growing fear of the Hebrew nation, and one of the world's first examples of a government attempting to control their populations through murdering innocent life. Another later example came from ancient Greece, from none other than Plato and Aristotle. These philosophers advocated abortion for population control, with Plato going further and advocating it be used as a means of maintaining superiorly healthy offspring and to maintain social order by eliminating the "physically and mentally inferior". Even though these ideas were not enacted by the Greek government, abortion remained legal and a matter of individual choice. Even European and American culture maintained abortion as legal in the 18th and early 19th centuries, commonly out of fear of financial stability or inability to properly care for the new child.

Anti-Abortion Laws Begin

Even though Sweden may have passed anti-abortion laws first, the U.S. was the first nation to have state-level laws against it. Ranging from Connecticut's 1821 restrictions on contraceptives to outright illegalization in some states, abortions were becoming more restricted and, in some

cases, banned altogether. Another noteworthy fact about these laws is that in many cases, they were being endorsed and pioneered by physicians. They realized that the chemicals involved with abortion and contraception had a higher chance of harming the woman than the actual pregnancy. This may have influenced Illinois to pass a law that classified abortifacient chemicals as poisons in 1827. Even the Roman Catholic Church passed their own abortion laws, banning all abortions at all ages in its territories. They have clearly stated that the sentence for an abortion is excommunication, the highest clerical sentence they are able to pass. Other nations soon followed; the United Kingdom and its colonies, Chile, South Korea, Spain, Portugal, France, and Italy all had and some continue to have laws to protect unborn life.

The 70's, Roe v. Wade and Modern Thinking

1970 ushered in a host of challenges for the rights of the unborn. The Counterculture of the 1960's, also known as the Hippie movement, was just beginning to decline in popularity. This movement had inspired radical and occasionally rebellious thinking in the younger generation. The sexual revolution was also impacting the next generation, and many were starting to leave the moral standards surrounding sexuality and reproductive rights. Hedonism was also becoming a popular form of thinking for many people now, resulting in innumerable new personal morals, and many of these new morals and ideas found homes in the incoming generation. These events provided perfect conditions for groups of people to advance their ideologies and push standards. In terms of abortion laws, the challenge for them came in the form of Roe v. Wade, a now famous court case that opened the doorway to again legalizing abortion nationwide. This time however, the culture had changed, and many saw laws protecting the unborn to be "outdated" and "oppressive". They wanted freedom to exercise their free will, and abortion restrictions and bans stood in their way. The Roe v. Wade case occurred as a woman who took the legal name Jane Roe sued Dallas district attorney Henry Wade challenging the Texas law that banned abortions as unconstitutional. It infringed her because she stated she was a victim of rape, and was now pregnant with a third child. A special court for the Northern District of Texas found in her favor, but she chose to challenge it in the U.S. Supreme court as well to have enforcement of the law stopped. This was the first ruling in favor of abortion on a national scale. This seemed to be a piece that clicked into place to move this self-centered ideology into prominence in cultural and political matters. More and more people have been leaning into it, and because of this, there is a significant amount of resistance to the pro-life cause in modern day society. This case continued to be a pinnacle for those of pro-choice mentality until it was overturned in 2022.

Doe v. Bolton: The Darker Side

Another court case that was ruled in favor of abortion “rights” was Doe v. Bolton. While perhaps not as well-known as Roe v. Wade, it was identical in both nature and target, and decided the same day with the same ruling. What this case does do that Roe does not expose as well is expose evidence of several rather malicious tactics that were executed to get the case to the court and influence the outcome of the suit. With the plaintiff being Sandra Cano, who adopted the pseudonym Mary Doe for the legal proceedings, the lawsuit was entered in Georgia challenging a law much like the Texas law neutralized by Roe v. Wade that allowed abortion only in cases of danger to the mother, rape, incest or severe fetal deformities. These were restrictions that allowed abortion exclusively to Georgia citizens. The Northern District Court of Georgia ruled in favor of Doe, and the case was referred to the Supreme Court to neutralize this law as well. The exact same 7-2 ruling that decided Roe v. Wade passed judgment striking down another pro-life law in the same day. However, when examined in more detail, there were several things that seemed rather sinister. The first hint of suspicious tactics was that Sandra Cano had self-described her stance on abortion as pro-life. Perhaps she came to believe in life at conception after the court ordeal. However, upon further investigation, it was revealed that her involvement may have been blind. She had sought legal help through Atlanta Legal Aid Office for a divorce and to regain her children from Social Services, there becoming acquainted with Margie Pitts Hames, an abortion rights advocate who was present during the Supreme Court hearing for Roe v. Wade. Hames was working with Cano on her divorce and custody case when the local branch of the American Civil Liberties Union hired her to represent them in a court case challenging Georgia’s abortion ban. She accepted, but still needed a plaintiff to file the case in defense of. According to Cano, she was given several documents to sign but she did not read them, most likely believing they were documents to aid in gaining custody of her children. Several months later, Hames applied her for an abortion in preparation for the Supreme Court hearing on December 13th, 1971. Cano strongly objected; she was six months pregnant and feared she would now be forced to have the abortion. This fear motivated her to flee to Oklahoma until Hames assured her she would not need to have it. A further confounding fact is that Cano stated that she was never made aware of the facts of the Doe case, having been instructed by Hames to only spectate the legal proceedings. She never testified in court or even on paper. These facts were later emphasized by Bolton, along with the fact that she was never asked if she was pregnant or if she wanted an abortion. It is very possible that Cano had been able to testify, her pro-life stance would have come out and the whole case would have fallen apart. However, the ways that Sandra Cano was harassed in 1988, after she had reopened records of the Doe v. Bolton case, were truly appalling. She had opened these court files to answer questions she had had about the proceedings. A question to be considered is why would she have questions about a court case she was knowingly involved in? After opening these records, the truth of the case came to light

and she quickly began to search for ways to reverse the impact of the case. She attempted several times to reopen the case, first in 1989, then 2000, 2003, and 2006, all of which failed. After abortion rights advocates got wind of her actions, things turned violent. Her car was shot at and vandalized, and she was shot at on the front porch of her home while holding her newborn grandchild. It is disturbing that these advocates would threaten the life of a witness merely to keep their cause going. Yet in spite of this opposition, Cano continued working with anti-abortion and pro-life organizations until her death in 2014.

Margaret Sanger, PPFA, and Eugenics

Planned Parenthood was the first birth control clinic founded in the U.S. Established in 1916 as an illegal clinic by Margaret Sanger, this organization has become one of the largest opponents to the pro-life ideology. Though many claim it originated as a means of providing contraceptive treatment to the poorer class who could not afford a child, the clinic readily started undertaking abortion procedures soon after Sanger's death. Even though its advocates state otherwise, it seems very probable that the organization was a result of the ideology of Margaret Sanger. She was raised an Agnostic Socialist, and later became a feminist. This set of beliefs was the beginning of her pro-birth control mentality. She began advocating unrestricted access to contraceptives, stating that abortion would cease once women could control their "unwanted" pregnancies. She also spread literature regarding the advocacy of contraceptive products as well as sexual liberty. The latter topic was not only meant for older women, but there were specific works meant for young girls to read. She was arrested multiple times for this sort of activity, and eventually weaponized it to provoke legal cases that she could attempt to turn into a podium for her ideas. These consistent arrests and imprisonment made her seem like a martyr, rallying a great deal of support to her cause. Sanger became involved in actively smuggling contraceptive devices into the country and distributing them to her clients. This resulted in a court case that ended with the court legalizing contraceptives nationwide. In this time, Sanger had come to follow Malthusian philosophy, leading her to become an advocate of eugenics. Eugenics is the idea that the most unfit offspring of the human race should be eliminated to enhance the whole. On top of this, Malthusianism advocates population control to accommodate resources for current and future generations. In a sense, these two philosophies are a twisted and forced natural selection that makes the weaker humans seem insignificant, if not an inconvenience to society. And in Sanger's head, abortion is the best way to prevent the "unfit" from ever existing, thus enhancing the whole human race. She took a step further into feminism by blaming "male-dominated institutions" such as the church and the state for mental and physical distress in women by banning birth control methods. However, she goes on to say that women have fought back against this "oppression" by carrying out illegal abortions and infanticide. Considering the context, Margaret Sanger justified infant murder! Yet another statement from Sanger that

perhaps thinly veils racism is sourced from a discussion with Clarence Gamble, her collaborator in "The Negro Project", an attempt to spread birth control clinics to predominantly African-American neighborhoods so they could obtain "healthcare". Realizing the role of church in their culture, Gamble is suggested by Sanger to affiliate with and persuade ministers to fall in line with their ideals and goal. She wished to "train the ministers in favor of the BCFA (Birth Control Federation of America) and sway them to our ideals and our goal, seeing how important their work is [to the community]. We do not want word to get out that we want to exterminate the Negro population, and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more 'rebellious' members." Something I personally question about this statement is A), why would there be an expectation of such opposition that an advocate who was a community member be needed, particularly if this was a health service that this specific people group could only dream of obtaining, and B), why did this 3-year project end due to low participation rates despite being "free and much needed" to these impoverished communities? There seems to be a possibility that the birth control endeavor may have been founded in racism, considering Margaret Sanger's support of the Buck v. Bell ruling, which legalized forced sterilization, as well as her acquaintances with white supremacist eugenicists such as Charles Davenport and Lothrop Stoddard, who was also a member of the KKK and a Nazi influencer whose work impacted Hitler's equally racist ideology. Yet another question to posed is this: Sanger's mission was constantly bringing birth control into Black neighborhoods, and was usually met with participation rates so low the clinics were forced to close. Why was she so insistent on reaching these people when very few of them used her services? And as a Malthusian eugenicist whose ideology states that the inferior and deficient of the human race, who she personally defined as "morons, feeble-minded, mentally and morally deficient, and paupers", should be exterminated, be so focused on serving impoverished communities that were fairly uneducated? Moreover, the organization she began that today is known as Planned Parenthood disavows her ideals and actions as hateful and racist, her Malthusian doctrine in particular. The final question? Was Planned Parenthood and its affiliates a revolutionary, empowering healthcare crusade, or a weapon of racist eugenics bent on the elimination of ethnic minorities?

Turning Point: The Overturning of Roe v. Wade

Up until 2022, the devastating effect from Roe v. Wade continued to inhibit pro-life efforts. But in June of 2022, the case was overturned. This event was due to the ruling of another case, Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization. This case occurred due to Mississippi implementing the Gestational Age Act, banning abortion after 15 weeks. The bill was based on a model law that was created by Alliance Defending Freedom, a Christian conservative legal organization. The legislation was intended to implement the act in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas by introducing it to the 5th Circuit Court, which held legal authority over these states. It was

signed into legislation by Mississippi governor Phil Bryant on March 19th, 2018. Mere hours later, Jackson Women's Health Organization (JWHO), the only abortion clinic in the entire state. The clinic performed abortions up to 16 weeks, and they wanted to challenge the Gestational Age Act. They were represented by the Center for Reproductive Rights, and were successful in convincing both district and circuit court of its unconstitutionality. This also influenced the 5th Circuit Court to block a newly passed heartbeat bill, which would have banned abortion as soon as a heartbeat was detectable. However, the matter was referred on to the Supreme Court. Both sides filed briefs to the court, with Mississippi stating that the fetal viability standard (which centers on whether the fetus can survive outside the womb) does not accommodate for newer understanding of life before birth, as well as the fact that the human fetus can feel pain at 10 to 12 weeks, thus making abortion an inhumane procedure. The response brief from the JWHO and their representatives included a request to deny Mississippi's petition on the grounds that the lower courts' rulings were correct, therefore not requiring the intervention of the court, as well as that they felt the state of Mississippi's interest in the rights of the unborn did not supersede the right of the individual. The case was argued December 1st, 2021 and the ruling was given June 24th, 2022. The verdict was in favor of the State of Mississippi, maintaining the legality of the Gestational Age Act. The outcome also overturned the rulings of cases such as Roe v. Wade, Doe v. Bolton, and other cases with similar rulings. Upon the closing of this suit, many states with pre-Roe bans and restrictions were able to enforce them again, and they saw significant decrease in abortions statewide. 3 years after, government Medicaid funding to Planned Parenthood was cut, and there are propositions being made to the FDA to restrict over-the-counter abortion pills. There have been many protests that resulted from this decision from abortion rights advocates, with one being ended with tear gas after the participants trespassed into the Arizona State Capitol building. Similar events occurred in Los Angeles and New York City. In spite of this opposition, which occasionally reached violence, the rights of the unborn have had a significant comeback.

The Modern View of Abortion

Much of the public today views abortion much differently than it was seen even 100 years ago. It is seen today as an empowering right every woman should have, because it gives her reproductive freedom. Many refer to it as an essential individual right, and to ban it is an infringement of privacy or government overreach. Many times, in the case of complications, many view abortion as a lifesaving medical procedure that spares the mother's health or life. In cases of fetal defects, some even view it as "merciful" to the unborn embryo! Many people think like this because in their eyes by ending the unborn life, they are saving it from pain and struggle in life. But as I said before, much of the modern perspective of abortion has been shaped into the hedonist mold set by the 60's Counterculture movement, and society now seeks for their own

good and gain. This is not limited to the issue of abortion; it affects all social and cultural aspects of life. But topics of contention when the area impacted by outcome is the individual and their life, there tends to be much more hostility. Society has begun to see abortion as a political debate theme and not as a matter of saving unborn life. This is made obvious many times when people are questioned by interviewers during rallies and protests. They will begin a conversation on abortion, but more often than not, when they begin to see logical points being made against their case, we often hear the response "Well, I'd rather not get political". Politics has become more and more of a smokescreen to avoid exposure of illogical claims in one's case. Another common argument is that the embryo is not alive until it has a heartbeat or its body begins tasks that are the most essential to life. Perhaps one of the more well-known examples of this is a debate between Charlie Kirk and a college student during a Turning Point USA meet. The transcript of part of the argument is included below:

Kirk: "You want to have as much sex as possible, but then I say 'if I get pregnant, then I can kill the baby'? That's really dark."

Student: "It's not killing the baby..."

Kirk: "Killing what?"

Student: "It's a clump of cells."

Kirk: "YOU'RE a clump of cells. I'M a clump of cells. We are ALL clumps of cells."

There are 2 reasons I included the above transcript; the first one is because it reveals how modern society thinks less of life in the womb due to how many cells it has and its ability to survive in the outside world. Secondly, Charlie Kirk's last statement in the argument is a very logical one. What he shows is that physically, all humans are clumps of cells, whether 2 cells at conception or 17.3 trillion at death. The number of cells in a human being does not make them lesser or inferior. Without the first 2 cells that divide, there would never be 17.3 trillion later in life. Every cell of a human holds value because its very existence is in God's hand, and has been His creation from the beginning.

What the Bible Says About Abortion

The very first chapter of the Bible proclaims that man is made in the image of God. Genesis 1:26-28 says, "Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." So, God created man in His *own* image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. Then God blessed them, and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it;

have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth." These are the words from God Himself as He created man and woman. Thus, if God created male and female in His image, it stands to reason that every cell both makes up and comes from their bodies was created by God. This includes their offspring, whether only at the stage of conception or ready to be born into the outside world. Having been established as a human being under this piece of Scripture, the unborn child would be included under the 6th Commandment: Do not murder. The intentional killing of a human being of any age is murder in the eyes of God. There are several other Bible verses that condemn or oppose the practice of abortion. They include Psalm 139:13-14a (For You formed my inward parts; You covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise You, for I am fearfully *and* wonderfully made.), Jeremiah 1:5 ("Before I formed you in the womb I knew you; Before you were born, I sanctified you; I ordained you a prophet to the nations."), and Exodus 21: 22-25, which prescribes a penalty for simply causing a woman to miscarry ("If men fight, and hurt a woman with child, so that she gives birth prematurely, yet no harm follows, he shall surely be punished accordingly as the woman's husband imposes on him; and he shall pay as the judges *determine*. But if *any* harm follows, then you shall give life for life eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.") Levitical law condemns abortion as well, in the form of child sacrifice. Leviticus 18:21 says, "And you shall not let any of your descendants pass through *the fire* to Molech, nor shall you profane the name of your God: I *am* the Lord." Molech was a pagan god that many would sacrifice their children to in an attempt of gaining his favor. This ritual many times involved burning the child alive, and they almost never survived. This was a rite of sacrifice as opposed to dedication because it was a near sure way of death for the child. The word used to describe this horrific practice in Leviticus is "abomination", used only in reference with some of the worst violations of God's law. This should be a clear indicator as to the morality and legality of abortion in God's eyes. Interestingly enough, the Satanic temple recognizes this as well. In fact, after Roe v. Wade was overturned, they took it on themselves to offer "religious abortions" in states with high restrictions. This is because they could not be challenged as clinical seeing as how they were on "religious" grounds, thus enabling abortions to continue at their temples as demonic sacrifices to gods like Molech. Their sole purpose at the core of this child sacrificing is to violate God's creation by destroying it. Here is a story exposing their motive: in the past several months, there was a surge in vandalism and destruction of Tesla vehicles. This was because the creator, Elon Musk, was disliked by very many people for his political views. He was strongly disliked by many, but they couldn't take it out on him without risking legal repercussions. So instead, they retaliated by destroying his creation out of hatred towards him. It may seem odd to include this, if not irrelevant, but it reveals an important factor in the Satanic temple's new "service", and this is it: If people can't satisfy their hatred on the creator, they will do their best to defile and destroy his creation instead. These satanists hate God, and they take joy in the destruction of the life only He gives.

Refuting 3 Common Pro-choice Arguments

Argument: It's my body, my choice

My response: First off, if you are a Christian and using this argument, you should remember that your body does not belong to you. You were made a masterpiece by God, so what right do you have to destroy something that is currently a part of you, not to mention a being that was created of your own body (and whose life comes from God as well), thus establishing it as a human being? For those who may not believe in the Bible, think of this: science, through obstetrics and gynecology, have found a human baby to be an individual being from the mother. Their DNA is different, which means that the child is not, in fact, a body part of the woman. This would stand directly against a claim of killing the baby as her exercising her right to do as she will with her body, because the child is not a body part. The subsequent argument that many times follow the one above: "The baby is in my body and is living off of my functions and my nutrients. I should have the right to remove it". Again, this does not morally equate to "good" because the child has been established as a human being by both God and medical experts. Also, does the number of cells a human being has in their person make them any less of a person? That would be equal to discrimination against those at a different stage of life, known as Ageism. This practice has mostly been used against older generations, but it can take shape against old and young alike. Most of society, despite their view on this issue, will agree that killing an old person because they rely on other people for their daily necessities would be a horrible crime. Why then, do they sit quietly or even approve as an industry is made of killing the unborn human children? The correct thing to do would be to treat young and old with equal rights, whether the being who was just conceived and made of 2 cells, or a 95-year-old man with 17.3 trillion cells who is on his deathbed. After all, he would not have made it to that age without having started with 2 cells and been left alive to grow into an adult.

Argument: Many mothers can't afford to have a child and care for them properly. Abortion is free, and it allows the woman to live her life without bringing her child into an environment where they would suffer.

My response: In the vast majority of situations where a mother may not be able to "properly care" for their child, the pregnancy can be avoided. A quote from Charlie Kirk which I feel explains this idea very comes from a debate with a college student regarding whether she should have to carry the responsibility (the child) after conceiving them if it will "ruin" her college life and career. She does not think she should have to carry a child while in college, even if she decides to have sex in that time. To this, Charlie Kirk responds by saying "If you play certain games, you may win certain prizes. If you engage in activities that may result in your pregnancy, then you should carry the child." I find this to be reasonable because you should not kill a smaller human being as a matter of convenience to us, because it may affect our lifestyle. There is no

justice in that, and again, the killing of any human being, no matter how small, is murder. And in the cases where the woman did not choose to try having a child (such as in instance of rape), there are alternative options, the first being for her to carry the child and raise him/her. There are many people out there who say that they are grateful their mothers chose to bare and raise them, and many parents whose children were conceived by rape that say they have no regrets about giving birth to and raising children they didn't want to conceive. The reason that they can say this is because they saw the value in a life that was created in a situation that caused them much pain, and realized they should not make that life suffer for the decision of another person. And in the instances where the mother truly cannot afford to have a child, there are centers for adoption, both private and state-run that are able to take the child and raise them, providing them with the necessities for life and attempting to find them a family to take them as their own. Another argument that may spawn off of this one is "If a child has a defect that will significantly affect their life and make life incredibly hard, it may be better to abort them than bring them into a life where they will suffer immensely. To this I say, is it better to end someone's life because they will ultimately feel great pain than to let them live it and give them a chance to turn the pain into strength and excel? Many people who have been in comas and who were declared brain-dead have come out and thanked the doctors for not pulling the plug and letting them live, because they were able to change their lives and improve themselves with their second chance. In similar cases, I have seen several people who were born with very deformed limbs, and sometimes none at all that are using it as a ministry to tell the world that God chose to make them that way, and that they are now at peace with that area of their being. This brings God glory because the world sees how they live and wonder how someone who struggles with many basic actions can be so at peace and joyful. This gives great opportunity to spread the Gospel and some of these people are even pastors!

Pro-life is just a right-wing political tool to restrict the woman's rights.

My response: Before I say anything else, I will pose a question of my own: how is trying to protect the life of the unborn, who cannot do so themselves, a political tool? There is hedonism in all of humanity regardless of political beliefs, there is sin in all of humanity regardless of political beliefs, and there is self-love in all humanity regardless of political beliefs. These are the root issues surrounding abortion, and lifting and lowering people groups and political parties will not eradicate it. This is an issue in the human heart that is affected by the individual's lack of responsibility, self-service, and pride. God's Word declares the sanctity of life, and commands that mankind acknowledges it. The association with politics comes from people seeing that the right tends to take to defending the unborn more than some others, the reason being that the right-wing political views usually tend to align closer to what the Bible says. Not necessarily because they believe in it, but because they want to honor what the Founding Fathers set the country's foundation on. And as established above, the unborn child is not a part of the woman's

body; they are a separate being. It is not restrictive to a woman's body to preserve an unborn human body, because the baby is only in her body for a short time. Also, consider that there are non-political and non-religious voices that speak out on this issue. Consider Scott Klusendorf, who bases his pro-life case on scientific evidence and logical structure. Also think about Stephanie Gray, a Canadian author who disavows abortion on secular grounds. She believes that every human deserves a future, and depriving the unborn of that future makes abortion wrong. Consider this paper, that is written from a mind that has almost nothing to do with any political ideologies. I find abortion wrong because God declared it to be, and because there is more than sufficient evidence to convince me of its overall harm and immorality. These authors have philosophical, not political, views on the life of the unborn. Some may not even have a faith at play in their perspectives. But yet they find it wrong anyhow. This is not an issue confined to right-wing politics, or politics of any kind. To me, this is an issue of faith and morality, and to many others, politics holds little to no effect on their outlook. Abortion and the unborn child's life are not a political issue unless we make it one!

Conclusion

At this point I will share my closing thoughts and questions. I see abortion to be a murderous practice with some of its earliest roots in pagan child sacrifice. It is an appalling attack on the unborn child that is often fueled by a desire for self-service, for reproductive "rights", and an aversion to the responsibility of caring for the child. Abortion has been closely associated with eugenics and population control, social weapons which have been wielded by several Communist dictators to eliminate those of races declared unfit by their agendas, and moreover is condemned by God's Word in several places over hundreds of years. Why should we be standing silently by, let alone approving of, a practice that is little more than clinical infanticide with ties to genocides executed by the likes of Hitler and Stalin? Has society become so "inclusive" as to devalue the human life for someone's convenience? How can healthcare involve the destruction of one life to allegedly enhance another? Since when should the value of a human life depend on the parents' convenience? How is it "merciful" to end a child's life because they have a defect or deformity? Why should the number of cells hold any bearing on what a human life is worth, or whether it is a human life? Without the 2 cells at conception, there would never be 17.3 trillion to become an adult. And most importantly, what is the true motive behind this practice known as abortion? Was it ever meant as "healthcare", or was its core purpose much more sinister and darker? We may never know the answer, but one fact should stand out to us all: no human life should be deemed an inconvenience simply because it alters ours. Every human cell is valuable in God's eyes, and it should be in ours as well. What right do we have to take life when God has given it? The answer is none. Life is not ours to give or take away, and every person, no matter how many cells make up their bodies, deserves to have a chance at it.