

What does it mean to be pro-life? Does this include physical assisted suicide?

Special topics: Hot Button issues

- ~~1) What is wrong with the world?~~
- ~~2) What does it mean to have a Biblical worldview?~~
- ~~3) What is the Biblical Worldview of In Vitro Fertilization, and why does it matter?~~
- ~~4) What is the Biblical Worldview regarding immigration, and why does it matter?~~
- 5) What does it mean to be pro-life? Does this include physical assisted suicide?
- 6) Should Christians be pacifists?
- 7) Should Christians support gun control?
- 8) What is a Biblical worldview of education: Public School, Christian school, or home-school? At its root, who is responsible to educate a child?
- 9) Is the United States a Christian Nation, should we be a Christian nation?
- 10) Should we support the Separation of Church and State? Is it wrong for a church to endorse candidates?
- 11) What happens when we die? Where do I go? Do I enter a state of soul sleep? Will I have a body right away?

Okay for today-

What does it mean to be pro-life? Does this include physical assisted suicide?

When Mercedes and Abigail were born, it was instant love. However, we had love for them even when they were in the womb. We heard the heartbeat, and it was absolutely amazing. Then, when they were born, we were both amazed. It was instant love; it was instant affection. We would die for the baby, and we still would.

Why is that?

God created us that way.

However, when a baby is in the womb, in love, God is creating the baby. God created us in the womb. God loved us before we were born.

David Jeremiah writes:

When a young couple announces that a baby is on the way, everyone tells them, "It'll change your life!" But the fact is, they are already changed. From the first

moment of anticipation, they see themselves in a different light. They find that it's possible to be deeply in love with a tiny human being they've never met. They brim with dreams of the things they'll do with their child— taking trips to the beach, getting a puppy, learning about God. Until that child is born, father and mother will think of little else; after the child is born, they will devote themselves fully to their precious offspring.

Where did this powerful love come from? The answer: It's an inherited trait. We are made in the image of a heavenly Father who felt the same deep joy before we were born, but His love is even more powerful, more boundless. You know that God loves you now, but do you realize that He always has—even before you were born? Even before the world was created? He has loved you from the very foundation of time. Let's explore what the Bible says about God's relationship with you before you were born.¹

Scott Klusendorf writes on Desiring God:

Abortion discussions can get ugly real fast.

In a June 11 interview with the Des Moines Register, Senator Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY) likened judges who oppose abortion to bigots who promote racism. She was just getting started.

A moment later, she put the entire pro-life movement in her crosshairs. "I think there are some issues that have such moral clarity that we have, as a society, decided that the other side is not acceptable," the presidential hopeful said. Lest anyone miss the point, the ultra liberal Huffington Post summarized the interview in its headline: "Kirsten Gillibrand Compares Anti-Abortion Views to Racism." For Gillibrand, pro-lifers are not only bigots; they are religious bigots who wrongly force their sectarian views on others. "All these efforts by . . . ultra-radical conservative judges and justices to impose their faith on Americans is contrary to our constitution," she told the paper. "Church and state are separated by law," but the conservative right is legislating the religious views of pro-life advocates. Put simply, opposing abortion is an unacceptable form of religious bigotry.

¹ Jeremiah, Dr. David. God Loves You (pp. 27-29). FaithWords. Kindle Edition.

I think Senator Gillibrand is correct. Abortion is a private matter, and laws restricting it are unjust. She's right that pro-lifers should not impose their views on others. She's right that only women should decide the issue. She's right that the government should stay out. Yes, she is right about all of that if . . . If what? If the unborn are not human beings. And yet that is precisely the question she refused to engage. She simply changed the subject to a personal attack on pro-lifers.

Contra the senator, the issue that divides us is not that she is pro-choice and I am anti-choice, or that she is tolerant and I'm a bigot. Truth is, I am vigorously "pro-choice" when it comes to women choosing a number of moral goods. I support a woman's right to choose her own healthcare provider, to choose her own education, to choose her own husband, to choose her own car, and to choose her own career path — to name a few. These are among the many choices I fully support for the women of our country. But some choices are wrong, like intentionally killing innocent human beings simply because they're unwanted. No, we shouldn't be allowed to choose that.

In short, the abortion issue is not about forcing religious views; it's not about privacy; it's not about who hates women and who loves them. It's about one question: What is the unborn?

Men and women have an equal right to weigh in on that question. Religious and non-religious people do as well. A tolerant society will welcome a free exchange of ideas and judge arguments according to their merits, not according to the religion or gender of those advancing them.²

He continues later:

In a society that wants to change the subject on abortion, it's vital that pro-life advocates keep the main thing the main thing. We begin with a clear syllogism to keep discussions on point:

Premise #1: It is wrong to intentionally kill innocent human beings.

Premise #2: Abortion intentionally kills innocent human beings.

Conclusion: Therefore, abortion is morally wrong.

² Scott Klusendorf, President, Life Training Institute; Desiring God on July 22, 2019; accessed on Oct. 21, 2025 <https://www.desiringgod.org/articles/the-question-abortion-advocates-wont-answer>

Pro-life advocates defend that syllogism with science and philosophy. We argue from science that the unborn are distinct, living, and whole human beings. We argue from philosophy there is no relevant difference between you the embryo and you the adult that justifies killing you at that earlier stage of development. Differences of size, level of development, environment, and degree of dependency are not good reasons for saying you could be killed then but not now.

Of course, even with a clear syllogism, your critics may object. But here's the good news: You don't need to memorize responses to every possible objection. Just ask yourself one key question: Does the objection refute my pro-life syllogism? That is, does it prove that the unborn are not human or that intentionally killing them is okay?³

- I. First, what does it mean to be pro-life?
 - a. Being pro-life means we believe in the sanctity of all life.
 - b. From the womb to the tomb. From conception to natural death.
- II. Who gives life?
 - a. Genesis 2:7 (ESV) ⁷ *then the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living creature.*
 - b. Genesis 1:27 (ESV) *So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.*
 - c. Jeremiah 1:5 (ESV) *“Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations.”*
- III. Who takes life:
 - a. Job 1:21 (ESV) ²¹ *And he said, “Naked I came from my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return. The LORD gave, and the LORD has taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD.”*
 - b. Using reason we know that we are owned by God.
 - c. He has the right to give life and take life.
- IV. Psalm 139:
 - a. Psalm 139:1-6: God knows us.
 - b. Psalm 139:7-12: God is always with us.
 - c. Psalm 139:13-24: God’s omnipotence.

³ Scott Klusendorf, President, Life Training Institute; Desiring God on July 22, 2019; accessed on Oct. 21, 2025 <https://www.desiringgod.org/articles/the-question-abortion-advocates-wont-answer>

- d. In the first six verses we see about God knowing us.
- e. As we look at the beginning of Psalm 139 we see that the Lord knows us. *He is the all-knowing God who has an intimate understanding of the psalmist, as of all His creation.*⁴
- f. Then we want to jump to Psalm 139:13-17.
- V. He creates and arranges our bodies within the womb.
 - a. We see this in Psalm 139:13-15.
 - b. Psalm 139:13 (ESV): ¹³*For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother's womb.*
 - c. The “you” is emphatic. No one but God did this.⁵
 - d. When did He do this?
 - e. He did this in our mother's womb.
 - f. Verse 14: *I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made. Wonderful are your works; my soul knows it very well.*
 - g. The Psalmist praises God.
 - h. Why does he praise God?
 - i. He is fearfully and wonderfully made.
 - j. We could say, “awesomely and wonderfully made.”
 - k. He appeals to his soul.
 - l. His soul knows how wonderfully he is made.
 - m. Though that could be translated that the Lord knows it well.
 - n. Verse 15: *My frame was not hidden from you, when I was being made in secret, intricately woven in the depths of the earth.*
 - o. This is really awesome.
 - p. *The phrase **depths of the earth** is normally associated with death (63:9; Ezk 26:20), but here it is figurative for the concealment of the womb.*⁶
 - q. God saw him being created. “Made in secret” would refer back to the womb.
 - r. *Modern technology now allows us to see the astonishing complexity of a developing child with our own eyes. In a 2010 TED presentation titled *Conception to Birth—Visualized*, Alexander Tsiaras, mathematician and chief of Scientific Visualization at Yale University, presented a series of*

⁴ R. C. Sproul, ed., [The Reformation Study Bible: English Standard Version \(2015 Edition\)](#) (Orlando, FL: Reformation Trust, 2015), 994.

⁵ Insight for Living; Swindoll; 11.24.2021

⁶ Kevin R. Warstler, “[Psalms](#),” in *CSB Study Bible: Notes*, ed. Edwin A. Blum and Trevin Wax (Nashville, TN: Holman Bible Publishers, 2017), 936.

incredible images of a child's development in the womb. In his production you can see never-before-viewed videos and photos of the very first cell division, the development of the heart at only twenty-five days, the development of arms and hands at only thirty-two days, and the development of the retinas, nose, and eyes at fifty-two days.

- s. *Clearly astounded by what he witnessed in his own images, Tsiaras concluded his talk with these words: "The complexity of these things, the mathematical model of how these things are indeed done, [is] beyond human comprehension. Even though I am a mathematician I look at this with the marvel of, 'How did these instruction sets build that which is us?' It's a mystery, it's magic, it's divinity."*⁷
- t. *And Bible scholar John Phillips describes the magnificent complexities of our bodies at the cellular level: We know that every living creature is made up of microscopic cells so small that the letter O on this page would contain between thirty to forty thousand of them. Each microscopic cell is a world in itself, containing an estimated two hundred trillion tiny molecules of atoms. Each cell, in other words, is a micro-universe of almost unbelievable complexity. All these cells put together make up a living creature. Each cell has its own specialized function and each works to an intricate timetable which tells it when to grow, when to divide, when to make hormones, when to die. Every minute of every day some three billion cells in the body die and the same number are created to take their place. During any given moment in the life of any one of these cells, thousands of events are taking place, each one being precisely coordinated at the molecular level by countless triggers. The human body has more than a million million of them—a million in each square inch of skin, thirty billion in the brain, billions of red blood cells in the veins. Obviously such a complicated and unerring development of cells cannot possibly be the result of chance.*⁸

VI. He schedules every day before we are born.

- a. We see this in Psalm 139:16: *Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.*
- b. David continues showing that God is in control. God's eyes saw him in the womb.

VII. Other Scripture:

⁷ Jeremiah, Dr. David. God Loves You (p. 32). FaithWords. Kindle Edition.

⁸ Jeremiah, Dr. David. God Loves You (pp. 32-33). FaithWords. Kindle Edition.

- a. Exodus 21:22–25 (ESV) ²² *“When men strive together and hit a pregnant woman, so that her children come out, but there is no harm, the one who hit her shall surely be fined, as the woman’s husband shall impose on him, and he shall pay as the judges determine. ²³ But if there is harm, then you shall pay life for life, ²⁴ eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, ²⁵ burn for burn, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.*
- b. We must protect the innocent:
- c. Exodus 23:7 (ESV) ⁷ *Keep far from a false charge, and do not kill the innocent and righteous, for I will not acquit the wicked.*
- d. Proverbs 6:16–17 (ESV) *There are six things that the LORD hates, seven that are an abomination to him: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood...*
- e. Isaiah 1:17 (ESV) *learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression; bring justice to the fatherless, plead the widow’s cause.*
- f. Jeremiah 22:3 (ESV) ³ *Thus says the LORD: Do justice and righteousness, and deliver from the hand of the oppressor him who has been robbed. And do no wrong or violence to the resident alien, the fatherless, and the widow, nor shed innocent blood in this place.*

VIII. Syllogism

- a. It is wrong to take a life
- b. Abortion takes a life
- c. Therefore, abortion is wrong.

IX. Euthanasia

- a. **euthanasia.**
- b. *The intentional killing, by design or by omission, of a person whose life has been deemed not worth continuing. Although euthanasia was probably used in a variety of circumstances in the ancient Greek and Roman societies, in contemporary Western societies proponents of the practice tend to restrict its potential use to persons who are terminally ill or who are being kept alive by artificial means. In the current debate, ethicists tend to divide the general practice into several varieties. Active euthanasia, or mercy killing, involves the attempt to bring about the death of a person by means of a death-producing agent or procedure, in contrast to passive euthanasia, which entails the intentional avoidance or the discontinuance of steps to prolong life. Voluntary euthanasia is the clinical termination of the life of a patient who, being of sound mind but who has become the victim of debilitating illness or disease, requests that*

*such termination be carried out. *Involuntary euthanasia, in contrast, proceeds without the *informed consent of the patient because he or she is deemed incapable of assisting in the *decision-making process (e.g., as in the case of a comatose person). The ethical character of euthanasia is based on considerations such as the nature of life and *death, the definition of “quality of life” and the attempt to balance personal and societal well-being.⁹*

- c. Another source:
- d. *The Greek word euthanasia translates to “good death,” making it and mercy killing terms that can be comforting in the face of difficult medical situations. When any person, especially a family member or close friend, is experiencing pain, mental degeneration, or other adverse condition, our instinct is to relieve the person in any way possible. Sometimes, this desire to alleviate pain can become so strong in the caregiver or patient that it overrides our deeper impulse to preserve life and survive.*
- e. *This struggle is not new to humanity. In fact, one of the oldest stories in the Bible tells of Job’s desire for death in the midst of his suffering. Job laments his life, even requesting God to kill him rather than allow his pain—emotional, physical and spiritual—to continue (Job 6:8–11). Most pertinently, Job declares, “I prefer strangling and death, rather than this body of mine. I despise my life; I would not live forever. Let me alone; my days have no meaning” (Job 7:15–16).¹⁰*
- f. *Does the Bible endorse Job’s feelings? It certainly recognizes that such feelings exist. Other characters in Scripture have, in desperation, asked for an early end to their lives, including Elijah (1 Kings 19:4) and Saul (1 Chronicles 10:4). Scripture acknowledges that emotion and even logic can support the idea of a “mercy killing.” However, we do not live by emotion*

* It appears elsewhere in the book as a separate entry

* It appears elsewhere in the book as a separate entry

* It appears elsewhere in the book as a separate entry

* It appears elsewhere in the book as a separate entry

⁹ Stanley J. Grenz and Jay T. Smith, [Pocket Dictionary of Ethics](#), The IVP Pocket Reference Series (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 36.

¹⁰ Got Questions Ministries, [Got Questions? Bible Questions Answered](#) (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2002–2013).

- or logic but by faith (Romans 1:17). God has plans and an understanding we can never grasp. He is the Giver and Sustainer of life (Nehemiah 9:6), and we do not have the right to usurp His authority. Near the end of Job's story, his friend Elihu warns him, "Beware of turning to evil, which you seem to prefer to affliction" (Job 36:21). It is not our place to decide the time or manner of our death. Mercy killing is a sin against God's plan and power.¹¹*
- g. *The overriding truth that drives the conclusion that God is opposed to euthanasia is His sovereignty. We know that physical death is inevitable (Psalm 89:48; Hebrews 9:27). However, God alone is sovereign over when and how a person's death occurs. Job testifies in Job 30:23, "I know you will bring me down to death, to the place appointed for all the living." Ecclesiastes 8:8a declares, "No man has power over the wind to contain it; so no one has power over the day of his death." God has the final say over death (see also 1 Corinthians 15:26, 54–56; Hebrews 2:9, 14–15; Revelation 21:4). Euthanasia is man's way of trying to usurp that authority from God.¹²*
- h. *Psalm 89:48 (ESV) What man can live and never see death? Who can deliver his soul from the power of Sheol? Selah*
- i. *Ecclesiastes 7:14 (ESV) ¹⁴ In the day of prosperity be joyful, and in the day of adversity consider: God has made the one as well as the other, so that man may not find out anything that will be after him.*
- j. *See Romans 5:3*
- k. *Dietrich Bonhoeffer was a German theologian who had great personal experience with suffering. He was imprisoned and eventually executed by the Third Reich during World War II. While in prison, he wrote this in his Ethics, published posthumously: "The right to the end of life is reserved for God, because only God knows the goal toward which a life is being directed. God alone wishes to be the one who justifies or rejects a life."¹³*

¹¹ Got Questions Ministries, [Got Questions? Bible Questions Answered](#) (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2002–2013).

¹² Got Questions Ministries, [Got Questions? Bible Questions Answered](#) (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2002–2013).

¹³ Got Questions Ministries, [Got Questions? Bible Questions Answered](#) (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2002–2013).

The Demand for Death in Canada Grows



Breakpoint : Aug 28, 2025 4:00:00 AM

Authors: John Stonestreet and Bob Ditmer

According to a recent article in The Atlantic, assisted suicide is now so popular in Canada that doctors cannot keep up with the demand. Appropriately titled Canada is Killing Itself, the article described how Medical Assistance in Dying (or MAiD), passed just 10 years ago, now accounts for about one in 20 deaths in Canada. That number is more than the total number of combined deaths from Alzheimer's and diabetes, and it surpasses many countries where assisted dying has been legal for far longer. The shortage of "care" is not due to a lack of interest from medical professionals. Doctors are in fact flocking to join what the Atlantic article called "the world's fastest-growing euthanasia regime."

For example, Dr. Stefanie Green, a founder of the Canadian Association of MAiD Assessors and Providers, traded in her decades-long practice as a maternity doctor to end lives. Both kinds of medicine, she told The Atlantic, are "deliveries." Some doctors have reported euthanizing hundreds of patients and yet, the demand exceeds the supply.

Canada's Parliament legalized MAiD in 2016, promising increased autonomy and decreased suffering. Instead, the practice has corrupted medicine, threatened conscience rights, pressured the vulnerable, and expanded the culture of death. As the American Medical Association's official opinion articulates, "Euthanasia is fundamentally incompatible with the physician's role as healer, would be difficult or impossible to control, and would pose serious societal risks." That's especially true in single-payer health care systems like Canada has. Eventually, the decision of who should live and who should die will be determined by financial realities, justified by arbitrary ideas about "quality of life."

In fact, whenever and wherever it is legalized, the so-called “right” to die soon becomes a perceived “duty to die.” Though patients are promised “death with dignity” and an end to unnecessary suffering, patients consistently report not wanting to be “a burden” on friends or family. Many are convinced, as law and disability professor Theresia Degener described, “a life with disability is automatically less worth living and that in some cases, death is preferable.”

Despite what Canadian officials have claimed, there are no effective “safeguards.” A report last year in the New Atlantis noted hundreds of serious violations of regulations in just the Ontario province, and none have been reported to law enforcement. Although Ontario Chief Coroner Dirk Huyer boasted, “Every case is reported. Everybody has scrutiny on all these cases,” physician whistleblowers identified over 400 “issues with compliance.” These range from patients killed who were not capable of consent to communication breakdowns with pharmacists providing the deadly prescriptions. For example, only 61% of physicians notify pharmacists about the purpose of the euthanasia medications prior to dispensation, as required.

Even more troubling are reported cases of providers expediting euthanizing drugs to patients sooner than the legally required 10-day waiting period. In one case, euthanasia provider Dr. Eugenie Tjan administered the wrong drugs. When the patient did not die, the doctor had to administer different drugs to complete the assisted suicide. Huyer failed to report this, eventually admitting this was a “blatant” case of violating Canadian laws: “The family and the deceased person suffered tremendously.”

Also, according to the report, about one quarter of all euthanasia providers in Ontario were notified by the coroner’s office of a compliance issue in 2023 alone. National law states that all reports should lead to criminal investigations, but Huyer failed to report even one. Instead, he determined that all issues in question required only an “informal conversation” with the practitioner. Dr. Tjan, for example, received an email of warning and remains licensed.

To call this a “slippery slope” is an understatement. MAiD began as a practice limited to gravely ill patients at the end of life. The law has already expanded to include people suffering from serious medical conditions but not facing imminent

death. MAiD will soon be available to those suffering only from mental illness. Parliament has also recommended granting access to minors.

Assisted suicide is not a medical practice. Rather, it is a practice that corrupts medicine, risks abuse, and erodes public trust. The best-case scenario at this point is that Canada becomes a deterrent for the rest of the world, and that Christians there demonstrate courage in how they live and how they die.¹⁴

See the AP article:

“Experts see Canada’s Euthanasia Laws as Threat to Disabled
August 11, 2022 by Maria Cheng¹⁵

<https://apnews.com/article/abridged-content-2a143df48931c63b3025c3a421438a33>

- X. God is sovereign
 - a. Sometimes we are not surrendering to the Lord as sovereign.
 - b. We want our own control.
 - c. Romans 11:33–36 (ESV) ³³ *Oh, the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways!* ³⁴ “For who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been his counselor?” ³⁵ “Or who has given a gift to him that he might be repaid?” ³⁶ *For from him and through him and to him are all things. To him be glory forever. Amen.*
- XI. Many logical fallacies
 - a. With abortion, we have feelings for the woman that we see, but not the baby whom we do not see.
 - b. Sometimes we fall into the false dilemma/either-or fallacy, focusing on one or the other...
 - c. Or, an emotion fallacy/appeal to fear

¹⁴ John Stonestreet and Bob Ditmer; The Demand for Death in Canada Grows; August 28, 2025. Accessed on 10.21.2025

<https://colsoncenter.org/breakpoint/the-demand-for-death-in-canada-grows>

¹⁵ August 11, 2022; AP “Experts see Canada’s Euthanasia Laws as Threat to Disabled
August 11, 2022 by Maria Cheng; Accessed on 10.21.2025¹⁵

<https://apnews.com/article/abridged-content-2a143df48931c63b3025c3a421438a33>

- d. *Appeal to fear is a propaganda technique. Appeal to fear is used when someone makes you fear the consequences of not doing what he wants.*¹⁶
- e. Sometimes people bring up red herrings.
- f. *When someone is avoiding the question and asserting something irrelevant, we say they are introducing a red herring into the argument. A red herring is a dead fish – a dead fish that has started to become “ripe” and smelly. Dog trainers used red herrings to train their tracking dogs. They would lay out a scent trail of a raccoon (or whatever they wanted the dog to learn to track) and let the trail become old, then they would drag the red herring (which by this time was very “ripe” and smelly) across the trail and off in a different direction. Then they would train the dog to stay on the raccoon’s scent trail and ignore the red herring’s scent trail. So, a red herring is a distracting scent trail. In our context, a red herring is an irrelevant topic which distracts us from the real question.*¹⁷
- g. A long time ago:
- h. *Someone posted an article about the NY abortion law to Facebook. Many people posted in reply but someone else (connected to my church) wrote something like: “if the mother is killed that is like murder.” Her exact words:
“I personally don’t believe it’s my decision to make for someone else - if you have to choose between the life of the baby or the life of the mother, if one is murder, so is the other.”*
- i. I asked a professor of philosophy at Asbury Seminary about that and he said:
- j. *I think the main issue from the original quotation is, as you suggest, simply **one of equivalence**. Are the two situations/actions--of aborting a late-term baby and allowing a mother to die--equivalent. Well, clearly the two instances wouldn't be identical. The question, I think, is whether they are morally equivalent. I don't think logic itself is going to do all the work in solving this one. I think there are value judgments to be made on at least two issues.*

¹⁶ Bluedorn, Nathaniel; Bluedorn, Hans. *The Fallacy Detective: Thirty-Eight Lessons on How to Recognize Bad Reasoning* (p. 260). (Function). Kindle Edition.

¹⁷ Bluedorn, Nathaniel; Bluedorn, Hans. *The Fallacy Detective: Thirty-Eight Lessons on How to Recognize Bad Reasoning* (p. 30). (Function). Kindle Edition.

- k. (1) *Is an act of omission and an act of commission morally equivalent in this context.* Clearly, you're doing something in aborting a baby, whereas if you're letting a mother die, you're not actively changing/interfering with an ongoing chain of events. The question is whether this makes any kind of moral difference. In some contexts, the difference between omission and commission isn't relevant. Suppose I'm rope-climbing with my nemesis, whom I plan to kill. I could cut the rope supporting him so that he falls to his death. Or, I could put myself in a position where I know he's depending on me to secure a rope for him, but then just not secure the rope (i.e., do nothing). In the latter case, I don't think a jury would let me off the hook if I said, "Hey, I didn't do anything." The law rightly holds us responsible for acts of omission in situations like this where we could readily help someone but choose to withhold aid. The larger point is that, in some contexts, the distinction between acts of commission and acts of omission doesn't seem morally important. In some cases, of course, they are significant. (There are millions of people I could help in some way each day; but surely I'm not responsible for failing to actively seek out each of these people around the world and working to give them aid.) So the first big question is whether, in the case of allowing a mother to die (an act of omission in not aborting the baby), is this morally equivalent to the act of commission of aborting the baby? I think different ethicists have come to different conclusions about this.
- l. (2) *A second issue for ethicists will be whether it is morally significant that one's intentions are different in each case.* In aborting a baby, my intention is to kill that fetus. *Of course, my ultimate goal presumably is to save the mother's life; but it still remains true that I intend to kill the fetus.* By contrast, if a mother dies carrying a child to term it is *no one's intention that the mother dies.* Presumably, all parties are *hoping for the best* (i.e., that both the mother and baby will live), even if it seems medically certain that the mother won't make it. How significant is this difference in intentionality? Again, there are some cases where intentionality doesn't seem morally relevant. E.g., if I intend to kill my nemesis, and the way I do it is by blowing up his apartment complex, I

would be charged with the murder of all the apartment residents. It wouldn't be a good defense to say, "Well, I only intended to kill the one person." Clearly, I acted while knowing that the consequences of my action would have the effect of putting all the apartment complex residents in mortal danger. Still, in other situations intentionality does matter. Most theories of "just war" allow for some collateral damage to civilians (which isn't intended) if one's military attack is the only/best way of defeating the combatants on the other side, and if there is not other option that causes less collateral damage, and if the ongoing harm being caused by the other side is great, etc. Well, the question again is whether the different intentions in the case of aborting a baby vs. allowing a mother to die are morally significant. Ethicists again debate this.

- m. So, on these two questions I don't know that logic itself will allow us to solve them. **If the original quotation you listed sought to say that the two cases would be strictly identical, then of course this is a logical fallacy in that two actions (of aborting the baby and allowing the mother to die) clearly are not logically equivalent. But the more controversial question seems to be whether they are what we might call "morally equivalent."** The original quotation seems to me to be making the claim about this moral equivalence. ("They're both murder.") In my mind, the two questions above are big ones in trying to determine whether they really are morally equivalent. (There may well be other questions that are also relevant; but the 2 I mentioned seem to me to stand out initially.)
- n. You later mention issues like the sliding scale of what it means for a mother's "health" is in danger. This of course introduces a whole new set of issues: How reasonable is it to think that the mother might yet live? (Big difference between definitely filling a fetus and possibly allowing/causing a mother to die.) How significant is mental/emotional health, as compared to physical health? Once again lots of value judgments here that perhaps can't be settled by logic alone.
- o. And then there's the familiar issues common to all abortion debates: What is the moral significance, if any, of an unborn baby or fetus and a baby that has been born? To what extent does the government have

authority to insist that mothers care for unborn babies, given that these unborn babies are dependent on these mothers alone for their survival/life?

- p. *Well, I'm just trying to wade through the kinds of value judgments that seem to me to be at stake. My purpose is simply to note the ways in which the answers to abortion debates might not come from making sure we have logical progressions from starting points we all accept. I think most of the debate is on these starting points which involve value judgments.*
- q. *My own personal view is that we "lose our souls" as individuals and as a community when we fail to support in whatever way we can those on the margins. And unborn babies are certainly on the margins, unable even to speak for themselves. **As a Christian, I strongly lament/hate the attitude--which I think spills over into other public policy debates--that it's OK to think of people, especially vulnerable ones, as "problems" that we can just "dispense with" or "ignore"...and then we the survivors and "in crowd" will be just fine moving forward. So I'm very much hoping that you and others will continue the work in northeast Ohio of pointing others to Christ, who has the power to soften our hearts and fill us with love for the vulnerable.***¹⁸
- r. There may also be false premise in the above scenario regarding NY.
- s. Bobby Murphy shared:
- t. *There is also the problem of false premises. The reasoning of those who favor abortion generally and this state law particularly can be expressed in one or more of the following syllogisms:*
- u. *Premise #1 - To prevent one person (A) from killing another person (B) so A can live is always to commit murder.
Premise #2 - The state prevents A (a mother) from killing B (her unborn baby) so she can live
Conclusion - The state is committing murder
Premise #2 is true but premise #1 is false making the conclusion false.
Or another possible syllogism is:*
- Premise #1 - Only persons can be murdered
Premise #2 - Unborn babies are not persons*

¹⁸ Dr. Kevin Kinghorn. (I think this was September of 2019)

*Conclusion - Killing unborn babies is not murder
Premise #2 is false, making the conclusion false. This is of course the constitutional issue. Are unborn babies persons who cannot be deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness under the Constitution.
Or another possible syllogism is:*

Premise #1 - A person (A) killing another person (B) so A can live isn't murder

Premise #2 - A (the mother) kills B (the unborn baby) so A (the mother) can live

Conclusion - The mother isn't committing murder.

The issue here is whether or not premise #1 is true or false. Some Christians consider it a true premise in all contexts and others in limited contexts, one of those being the context before us. I consider it a true premise in limited self-defense and combat contexts but not in the context before us.¹⁹

Mother Theresa:

I would not have wanted to be president of the United States on February 3, 1994. Or vice president. Or a senator or congressman or any other high-ranking member of our government. Those jobs are challenging on any day, but on that day a tiny woman from India made the leaders of the most powerful government in the world feel much smaller. She didn't mean to. She didn't berate or criticize them. In fact, she spoke quite lovingly. She simply talked about how valuable human life is to God.

*The late **Mother Teresa**, founder of the Missionaries of Charity, was invited to speak at the annual National Prayer Breakfast in Washington, D.C. Even standing on a platform, the tiny nun's head was barely visible over the top of the podium. But the room was so quiet that no one failed to hear her message, loud and clear.*

¹⁹ Bobby Murphy; maybe 1.28.2019

Mother Teresa talked about the dignity and value of all life, the worthiness of all human life to be loved, something that everyone gathered at the prayer breakfast could agree with. But halfway through her talk she said,

I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because it is a war against the child, a direct killing of the innocent child, murder by the mother herself. And if we accept that a mother can kill even her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another?

And then, speaking directly into the room filled with some of the world's most powerful people, she pleaded, Please don't kill the child. I want the child. Please give me the child. I am willing to accept any child who would be aborted and to give that child to a married couple who will love the child and be loved by the child. From our children's home in Calcutta alone, we have saved over 3,000 children from abortion. These children have brought such love and joy to their adopting parents and have grown up so full of love and joy. If we remember that God loves us, and that we can love others as He loves us, then America can become a sign of peace for the world. From here [in Washington, D.C.], a sign of care for the weakest of the weak—the unborn child—must go out to the world. If you become a burning light of justice and peace in the world, then really you will be true to what the founders of this country stood for. God bless you!²⁰

This is not a political message, no this is about God's great love for each and everyone of us.

prayer

²⁰ Jeremiah, Dr. David. God Loves You (pp. 38-39). FaithWords. Kindle Edition.

