


Answering the Objections



STUDENT INTERACTIVE

DEMONSTRATING MASTERY

Try to answer the following questions without using your notes. The answers are found at the end of session 4.

- In denying the personhood of the unborn, how has the pro-abortionist shifted the argument?*

Instead of _____,

they _____.

They shift the argument from _____

_____ to _____.
- What is the first question to ask when someone says the unborn is a human being, but not a person?*

_____?
- What three problems do we find with lists that try to establish the qualifications for human personhood?*

 1. They exclude _____.
 2. They include _____.
 3. They appear _____.
- Write out the four elements of the SLED test.*

S _____

L _____

E _____

D _____
- What term describes the destruction of large groups of human beings simply because of their physical appearance?*

- What does it mean when we say human beings have intrinsic value?*

Human beings are _____,

not for _____.



"Making Abortion Unthinkable" © 2001 Gregory Koukl, Scott Klusendorf, Stand to Reason, 1-800-2-REASON or www.str.org

N O T E S

I. REVIEW

A IN THE LAST SESSION, WE ANSWERED THE PRO-ABORTIONIST CHALLENGE, "JUST BEING HUMAN DOES NOT MAKE YOU A PERSON." WE ARGUED THAT . . .

1. Human beings can't be disqualified as persons simply because . . .
 - a. *They aren't the right size.*
 - b. *They don't have the right level of development.*
 - c. *They're not in the right environment.*
 - d. *They have too much physical dependency.*
2. *All human beings have intrinsic value.*

B IN THIS SESSION, WE WILL USE WHAT WE LEARNED TO EXPOSE FOUR COMMON FLAWS OF PRO-ABORTION RHETORIC.

- **Flaw #1:** Pro-abortion rhetoric often attacks the pro-lifer instead of the arguments.
- **Flaw #2:** Pro-abortion rhetoric often assumes the unborn are not valuable human beings.
- **Flaw #3:** Pro-abortion rhetoric often confuses objective claims with subjective claims.
- **Flaw #4:** Pro-abortion rhetoric often confuses *functioning* as a person with *being* a person.

C WHAT IS RHETORIC?

STUDENT INTERACTIVE



Take a moment and think about the word "rhetoric." What does it mean? Why do you think we're using it here to describe pro-abortion views? Briefly discuss your ideas with your partner. (2 minutes)

1. The word "rhetoric" originally referred to the art of using words skillfully.
2. The word has since taken a negative meaning, referring to the use of language in a clever but misleading way as a propaganda tool. This is what we mean when we refer to pro-abortion "rhetoric."
3. Because the pro-abortion cause is deeply flawed, the only way pro-abortionists can avoid exposure is to use rhetoric that distracts attention from the argument and the facts.



NOTES

II. *FLAW* #1: PRO-ABORTION RHETORIC OFTEN ATTACKS THE PRO-LIFER INSTEAD OF THE ARGUMENTS.

A THE AD HOMINEM FALLACY

1. Abortion advocates know that if they are forced to defend the act of dismembering a defenseless child, they will lose.
2. Instead, they attack the character of pro-lifers.
3. In logic, this attack is commonly referred to as the *ad hominem* fallacy, which literally means “to the man.”
4. By attacking the man rather than the argument, abortion advocates divert attention off the main issue.

Here are three common examples...

B “IT IS HYPOCRITICAL FOR PRO-LIFERS TO OPPOSE ABORTION UNLESS THEY ARE WILLING TO CARE FOR THE WOMAN AND HER CHILD.”

1. It simply does not follow that because one objects to the killing of innocent human being, he must be willing to care for those that survive.
 - a. *Imagine, for example, how bizarre it would sound if someone argued, “You have no right telling me not to beat my wife unless you’re willing to marry her,” or, “Unless you are willing to hire ex-slaves for your business, you have no right to oppose slavery.” (Indeed, slave owners used this very argument a century ago.)*
 - b. *Of course, abortion advocates will respond to our objection against their logic by saying, “That’s different! You’re treating the unborn as if they are human beings, like slaves are.”*
 - 1) This response destroys their whole “hypocrisy” argument.
 - 2) It proves that the real issue is *not* the hypocrisy of pro-life behavior, but “What is the unborn?”
2. It also doesn’t follow that abortion is justified when pro-lifers fail to care for those involved in a crisis pregnancy (both mother and baby).
3. Even so, pro-lifers *are* willing to care for those involved in crisis pregnancies.
 - a. *Roughly 4,000 national and international pro-life service providers are dedicated to the well-being of mothers in crisis who choose life for their children.*
 - b. *They provide medical aid, pregnancy support, housing, baby clothing, cribs, food, adoption services — even post-abortion counseling services — all at no cost.*



N O T E S

© “MEN SHOULDN’T HAVE ANYTHING TO SAY ABOUT ABORTION. IT’S A WOMAN’S ISSUE.”

STUDENT INTERACTIVE



Think for a moment about what’s wrong with this challenge. How would you reply? Break up into groups of two or three and share your ideas. (3 minutes)

1. This challenge ignores the issue of abortion and attacks the gender of the pro-lifer. It is, therefore, an *ad hominem* attack.
2. As Francis Beckwith has pointed out, this attack is hardly relevant, since arguments don’t have sexual organs.
 - a. *Gender has nothing to do with the validity of an argument.*
 - b. *This reply is sexist, pure and simple.*
3. If this attack were valid, should women be silent when men molest children?
4. Interestingly, the *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion on demand in 1973 was decided by *male* judges.

① “YOU DON’T CARE THAT UNWANTED CHILDREN WILL BE ABUSED. THE PRO-CHOICE MOTTO IS ‘EVERY CHILD A WANTED CHILD.’”

1. When an objection begins with “You don’t care . . .”, you know it is a personal attack that strays from the argument.
2. The “Every child a wanted child” defense disguises an insidious moral equation.
 - a. *Killing a child is less offensive than abusing him.*
 - b. *Molestation is more evil than murder.*
 - c. *In fact, they offer killing the child through abortion as an antidote for abuse.*
3. The slogan should be changed from “Every child a *wanted* child” to “Every child a *valued* child.” This makes us responsible for valuing the human beings in our care instead of discarding them when they become burdensome.

Each of the above examples does nothing to refute the pro-life position that it’s wrong to kill unborn human beings. Instead, they attack the individual pro-lifer.



AMBASSADOR SKILLS

The quickest way to deal with an *ad hominem* attack is to simply point it out, but with a question. When someone attacks you rather than the argument, ask, “I’m a little confused about your response. Even if you were right about my character, could you explain to me exactly what my character has to do with whether or not it’s right to kill innocent human beings?”



N O T E S

III. *FLAW #2: PRO-ABORTION RHETORIC OFTEN ASSUMES THE UNBORN ARE NOT VALUABLE HUMAN BEINGS.*

A THE “BEGGING THE QUESTION” FALLACY

1. Abortion advocates must show that the unborn are not valuable human beings in order to justify abortion on demand.
2. Rather than proving this with facts and arguments, many abortion advocates simply assume it.
3. When you assume the very thing you ought to be proving, you’re guilty of a logical fallacy known as “begging the question.”¹

STUDENT INTERACTIVE



Think of the following statements:

“Women have a right to control their own bodies.”

“Without legal abortion, women will die from illegal back-alley abortions.”

Each of these statements assumes something vital. What is it? Break up into pairs and discuss it with your partner. (3 minutes)

Here are some common examples . . .

B “WOMEN HAVE A RIGHT TO CONTROL THEIR OWN BODIES.”

1. The statement assumes there is only one body involved in the abortion act — the mother’s.
 - a. *Whether or not abortion involves one body or two is precisely the point at issue.*
 - b. *Hence, this statement begs the question.*
2. The question of whether or not abortion destroys an innocent human being must be answered before the appeal to bodily rights can be made. We must answer whether we have a right to use our bodies to harm innocent human beings.

C “WITHOUT LEGAL ABORTION, WOMEN WILL DIE FROM ILLEGAL BACK-ALLEY ABORTIONS.”

1. This argument is the same as saying, “Because some people may die attempting to kill their unborn child, the state should make it safe and legal for them to do so.”
2. This argument still begs the question by assuming the unborn are not human.
3. Even pro-abortion philosopher Mary Anne Warren knows this is sloppy thinking: “The fact that restricting access to abortion has tragic side effects does not, in itself, show that restrictions are unjustified — since murder is wrong regardless of the consequences of forbidding it.”²



“Making Abortion Unthinkable” © 2001 Gregory Kouss, Scott Klusendorf, Stand to Reason, 1-800-2-REASON or www.str.org

N O T E S

GOING DEEPER: INFORMATION FOR SELF-STUDY

① “NO ONE KNOWS WHEN LIFE BEGINS.”

1. Again, this statement begs the question because it assumes life begins at birth, which abortion advocates must prove instead of take for granted.
2. By promoting abortion based on the assumption that no one knows when life begins, abortion advocates *really do* think they know when life begins — at birth, therefore justifying abortion.
3. In the *Roe v. Wade* trial, Justice Harry Blackmun (who wrote the opinion of the Court) insisted that the Court, in the absence of a moral, theological, and scientific consensus, should not propose one theory of life over another. Hence, they decided abortion should be legal.
 - a. *In making this decision, the court hardly took a neutral position because it in fact assumed who was and was not a person.*
 - 1) By allowing abortion, the court essentially assumed that fetuses were not fully human — otherwise, abortion would be unjustifiable homicide.
 - 2) In other words, the Court took a position on who was and was not a member of the human community – and asserted the unborn were not.
 - b. *The Court didn’t prove that the unborn were not human beings; it merely assumed this point, all the while claiming neutrality. This is begging the question.*

IV. *F* LAW #3: PRO-ABORTION RHETORIC OFTEN CONFUSES OBJECTIVE CLAIMS WITH SUBJECTIVE CLAIMS.

Ⓐ THE “MORAL RELATIVISM” FALLACY

1. Abortion advocates assume that right and wrong is different for different people.
 - a. *This assumption manifests itself in statements like, “You have your truth; I have my truth. Therefore, we should be tolerant of all views. Maybe abortion is wrong for you, but it might be right for others.”*
 - b. *This flaw turns the pro-life moral claim about abortion (“Abortion is wrong”) into a preference claim (“I don’t like abortion”). Of course, this misses our point entirely.*
2. Twisting objective claims into subjective claims is known as “moral relativism” — the view that there are no objective standards of right and wrong, only personal preferences, like tastes in ice cream.



N O T E S

STUDENT INTERACTIVE



Think of the following statements:

"If you don't like abortion, don't have one."

"That's just your view."

"I'm personally opposed to abortion, but I don't want to impose my view on others."

How would you respond? Break up into pairs and discuss it with your partner. (3 minutes)

Here are some common examples . . .

B "IF YOU DON'T LIKE ABORTION, DON'T HAVE ONE."

1. This is one of the most common ways that abortion advocates relativize the pro-life position. They treat our view as a mere preference that we're forcing on others.
2. However, it's not that we don't *like* abortion and would *prefer* that people not have one. We think abortion is *wrong*, whether we like it or not.
3. This argument confuses our moral claim with a preference claim. Don't let this kind of dismissal stand.



AMBASSADOR SKILLS

If someone tells you, "If you don't like abortion, don't have one," you can respond by asking them, "Does it follow that if you don't like slavery, you just shouldn't own a slave?" This question quickly clarifies the point that we aren't talking about subjective preference claims but objective moral claims.

C "THAT'S JUST YOUR VIEW."

1. This argument again attempts to marginalize the pro-life view by making it relative, a mere "personal" belief.
2. Once on the television show *Politically Incorrect*, supermodel Kathy Ireland gave a carefully reasoned scientific and philosophic defense for the pro-life position, to which the show's host, Bill Maher, shot back, "Kathy, that's just your view."
 - a. *What's wrong with this response? Maher was confusing a moral claim with a preference claim.*
 - b. *Ireland wasn't claiming it was "just her view." She was making a moral judgment.*
 - c. *Instead of dealing with the argument itself, Maher glibly and simply dismissed her.*
 - d. *Curiously, Bill Maher didn't respond this way about his own view or the views of his liberal guests.*



N O T E S

D “I’M PERSONALLY OPPOSED TO ABORTION, BUT I DON’T WANT TO IMPOSE MY VIEW ON OTHERS.”

1. This relativistic response is known as the “modified pro-choice” position.
2. Though this view may seem difficult to oppose, it’s actually very easy to upend if you ask the right question.
 - a. Ask the person, “Why do **you** personally oppose abortion?” Invariably they will reply, “I oppose it because I think abortion kills a human baby, but that’s my own personal view.”
 - b. At that point, repeat their words back to them, but take the spin off it: “Let me see if I understand you. You actually believe abortion kills a human child, but you think women should be allowed to kill their children if they want to.”
 - c. If they object to your wording, ask them what part of their view you misunderstood. The fact is, that is the view they hold. You just carried it out to its logical conclusion.
3. Would these same people argue that if they personally opposed slavery, they would not protest if a neighbor wanted to own one? This was precisely what Stephen Douglas argued in his debates with Abraham Lincoln.³
 - a. This argument did not work with slavery, and it will not work with abortion.
 - b. Either elective abortion kills a defenseless child or it does not. If it does, we should not tolerate it.

GOING DEEPER: INFORMATION FOR SELF-STUDY

E “DON’T FORCE YOUR MORALITY ON ME.”

1. This comment again assumes that morality is relative, that right and wrong should be determined by each individual and that no judgments are allowed.
2. However, this view is almost always self-defeating (among other problems) because relativists cannot live by their own rules.⁴
 - a. The relativist believes that “forcing your morality” on another person is wrong.
 - b. But this claim **itself** is a moral point of view the relativist is “forcing” on you.
3. As an example, note this conversation Scott Klusendorf had with a student on campus.⁵

Student: You made some good points in your talk, but you shouldn’t force your morality on me or anyone else who wants an abortion. It’s our choice.

Scott: Are you saying I’m wrong?

Student: What do you mean?

Scott: Well, you think I’m wrong, don’t you? If not, why are you correcting me? And if so, then you’re forcing your morality on me, aren’t you?

Student: No, I just want to know why you are telling people what they can and cannot do with their lives.



NOTES

Scott: Are you saying I shouldn't do that, that it's wrong? If so, then why are you telling me what I can and cannot do?

Student (regrouping): I'm confused. Look, the simple fact is that pro-choicers are not forcing women to have abortions, but you want to force women to be mothers. If you don't like abortion, don't have one. But you shouldn't force your beliefs on others. All I am saying is that pro-life people should be tolerant of other views.

Scott: Is that your view?

Student: Yes.

Scott: Why are you forcing it on me? That's not very tolerant, is it?

Student: What do you mean? I think women should have a choice and you don't. It's your view that's intolerant, wouldn't you say?

Scott: Okay, so you think I'm wrong. What is it you want pro-lifers like me to do?

Student: You should let women decide for themselves and tolerate other views.

Scott: Tell me, what exactly do pro-choicers believe?

Student: We believe everyone should decide for themselves and tolerate other views.

Scott: So you are demanding that pro-lifers become pro-choicers.

Student: What?

Scott: With all due respect, here's what I hear you saying. Unless I agree with you, you will not tolerate my view. Privately, you'll let me think whatever I want, but you don't want me to act as if my view is true. It seems you think tolerance is a virtue if and only if people agree with you.

Put succinctly, the student's argument for tolerance was a patronizing form of intolerance. She spoke of moral neutrality, but tried to force her views on Scott.

V. *FLAW* #4: PRO-ABORTION RHETORIC OFTEN CONFUSES FUNCTIONING AS A PERSON WITH BEING A PERSON.

1. In the last session, we talked about abortion advocates' attempts to disqualify the unborn as valuable persons by using an arbitrary list of qualifications (the SLED test). Flaw #4 is an example of that effort.
2. According to abortion advocates, a person is defined by what he can and cannot do. In order to be considered a person, one must function a certain way.
3. This mentality is called "functionalism."
4. Abortion advocates like Mary Anne Warren claim that a "person" is a living entity with feelings, self-awareness, and the ability to interact with his or her environment. Because the fetus can do none of these things, she says, it cannot be a true person.⁶



N O T E S

STUDENT INTERACTIVE



We have a specific strategy (covered last session) for dealing with this kind of approach. It involves three problems that arise with any list of qualities that determine personhood. Gather quickly in groups of four and write down these problems. (2 minutes)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

5. All lists of qualities that determine personhood have three problems:
 - a. *They exclude obvious examples of persons* (such as newborn infants, people who are asleep or in a coma, or people who are handicapped).
 - b. *They include obvious examples of non-persons* (such as animals — especially “higher” primates — and even machines, in some cases).
 - c. *They appear arbitrary and self-serving, used as tools of the powerful to oppress the weak who are in the way and can’t defend themselves.*
6. Functionalism is seriously flawed.
 - a. *First, one can fail to function as a person while still being a person.*
 - 1) People under anesthesia or in a deep sleep cannot feel pain, are not self-aware, and cannot reason. Neither can those in reversible comas.
 - 2) We still value these individuals as persons, even though they are not currently *functioning* as persons.
 - 3) Remember the question we asked ourselves — “Even if I lost all of my functions, wouldn’t I still be me?”

Here’s the reason why one can fail to *function* as a person and yet still *be* a person . . .

- b. *Second, the rights of individuals in our society are not based on **current** (actual) capacities, but on **inherent** capacities.*
 - 1) This sounds complex, but we make this distinction all the time.
 - a) *Newborn humans have fewer actual capacities than day-old calves.⁷ Baby humans are rather unimpressive in terms of environmental awareness, mobility, and the like, yet we don’t put the calf in the nursery and the infant in the barn. We understand that although the infant currently lacks many **functional** abilities, it nonetheless has the **inherent** capacity to function as a person.*
 - b) *People who are unconscious or in a coma cannot presently function as persons, but they still have the inherent capacity to perform personal acts. That is why we do not kill them.*
 - 2) If individual rights are grounded in current capacities, calves should enjoy greater moral status than newborns, and unconscious and comatose humans can justifiably be killed.
 - 3) From the moment of conception, the unborn human has the natural, inherent capacity to function as a person. The only thing he lacks is the **current** capacity to do so.



NOTES

- 4) That newborns cannot yet speak, reason, or perform personal acts means only that he cannot yet *function* as a person, not that he lacks the essential *being* of a person.

That's why . . .

c. *Third, one must be a person first in order to function as a person.*

- 1) Frogs do not become persons simply because they feel pain or interact with their environment.
- 2) We develop the ability to act as persons only because we already are personal beings to begin with.⁸

VI. WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED IN THIS SESSION?

A WE LEARNED TO EXPOSE FOUR COMMON FLAWS OF PRO-ABORTION RHETORIC.

- **Flaw #1:** Pro-abortion rhetoric often attacks the pro-lifer instead of the arguments.
- **Flaw #2:** Pro-abortion rhetoric often assumes the unborn are not valuable human beings.
- **Flaw #3:** Pro-abortion rhetoric often confuses objective claims with subjective claims.
- **Flaw #4:** Pro-abortion rhetoric often confuses *functioning* as a person with *being* a person.

B WE DON'T HAVE TO TAKE A BEATING WHEN WE SPEAK OUT AGAINST ABORTION.

To persuasively defend the pro-life view, do the four things we taught you:

- Restore meaning to the word "abortion" by properly using graphic visual aids.
- Simplify the abortion issue by focusing on only one question: What is the unborn?
- Offer a sound, reasonable, coherent argument.
- Answer the objections of pro-abortion rhetoric.



N O T E S

GOING DEEPER: INFORMATION FOR SELF-STUDY

C A WORD ABOUT HONESTY

1. When dealing with the abortion issue, pro-abortion advocates have to answer an important question: Are they interested in what's true and right, or are they merely interested in what's pleasurable and convenient?
 - a. *Many reject or ignore contrary points instead of refuting them.*
 - b. *Rejecting or ignoring contrary points proves that their initial justifications were only rationalizations all along.*
2. Why do people respond this way?
 - a. *The moral demands of the truth are often an unpleasant burden to bear.*
 - b. *We take refuge behind the claim that the question is complicated, when it's not really difficult at all.*
3. Those who are interested in what's true let their judgments rest on the evidence and are loyal to what's right and good, not to what's convenient.
4. Virtually every pro-lifer will abandon the fight if it can be proved that the unborn is not a human person worthy of protection, just like every other human being.
 - a. *We're not interested in snooping around bedrooms, arbitrarily restricting freedoms, or passing laws because of deep-seated bigotry or a devious desire to control private choices.*
 - b. *We are concerned because abortion may possibly take the life of an innocent human being simply because she's in the way and can't defend herself.*
5. How do we know whether abortion takes the life of an innocent human being or not? By answering the most critical question in the abortion controversy: What is the unborn?

D KNOWING THE RIGHT THING TO DO

1. In making any moral decision, we always have three options.
 - a. *"What's the easiest way out?"*
 - 1) The easy course is usually obvious.
 - 2) However, questions of right and wrong aren't concerned with the easy road.
 - 3) When making decisions about right and wrong, we ask what is good, not easy; we ask what is virtuous, not convenient.
 - b. *"What are my rights?"*
 - 1) This question only determines what is legal, not what is right or good.
 - 2) This question confuses *having* a right with what *is* right. Many things not restricted by law are wrong just the same.
 - 3) The claim "It's my right!" is the last refuge of the libertine.
 - c. *"What is the right thing to do?"*
 - 1) To know the right thing to do, we must carefully consider the facts.
 - 2) We must ask what appropriate moral rules apply.
 - 3) Once these things have been done, we should do the right thing.



N O T E S

E ONE LAST QUESTION: WERE YOU EVER AN UNBORN CHILD?

1. It doesn't seem to make sense to say you once were a sperm or an egg.
 - a. *Does it make sense, though, to talk about yourself before you were born? Did you turn in your mother's womb or kick when you were startled by a loud noise? Did you suck your thumb?*
 - b. *Were those **your** experiences or someone else's?*
2. If you were once the unborn child your mother carried, then you must accept an undeniable truth: An abortion would have killed *you* — not a potential you, a possible you, or a future you. Abortion would have killed *you*.
3. The tragedy of abortion is that it kills more than a human body. It kills a precious, unborn, human person.



N O T E S

STUDENT INTERACTIVE



SELF-ASSESSMENT

Try to answer the following questions without using your notes.

1. What is an *ad hominem* fallacy?

- When you attack the _____ instead of the _____.

2. What is a better slogan than “Every child a wanted child”?

- “Every child a _____ child.”

3. What is “begging the question”?

- When you _____ what you’re trying to _____.

4. What is moral relativism?

- There are no _____ standards of _____ and _____, only _____ preferences.

5. Give two responses to the statement “If you don’t like abortion, don’t have one.”

- If you don’t like _____, don’t own a slave.
- I’m not saying I don’t _____ abortion. I’m saying I think it’s _____.

6. What key question should you always ask when someone says, “I’m personally opposed to abortion, but I don’t want to impose my view on others”?

- “Why do _____ personally _____ abortion?”

7. What are some of the problems with disqualifying some humans as persons because they don’t function as persons?

- You can fail to _____ as a person and yet still _____ a person.
- Individual rights are not based on _____ capacities, but on _____ capacities.
- One must _____ a person first in order to _____ as a person.



N O T E S

SELF-ASSESSMENT WITH ANSWERS

1. What is an *ad hominem* fallacy?
 - When you attack the person instead of the argument.
2. What is a better slogan than “Every child a *wanted* child”?
 - “Every child a *valued* child.”
3. What is “begging the question”?
 - When you assume what you’re trying to prove.
4. What is moral relativism?
 - There are no objective standards of right and wrong, only personal preferences.
5. Give two responses to the statement “If you don’t like abortion, don’t have one.”
 - If you don’t like slavery, don’t own a slave.
 - I’m not saying I don’t like abortion. I’m saying I think it’s wrong.
6. What key question should you always ask when someone says, “I’m personally opposed to abortion, but I don’t want to impose my view on others”?
 - “Why do you personally oppose abortion?”
7. What are some of the problems with disqualifying some humans as persons because they don’t function as persons?
 - You can fail to function as a person and yet still be a person.
 - Individual rights are not based on current (actual) capacities, but on inherent capacities.
 - One must be a person first in order to function as a person.

STUDENT INTERACTIVE



Break into groups and reflect on what you’ve learned during this course. What was most meaningful and helpful to you? What specific insights have you gained? How do you plan to use what you have learned?



N O T E S

RESOURCES TO HELP YOU INTELLIGENTLY DEFEND LIFE

1-800-2-REASON / WWW.STR.ORG

1. *Harder Truth*: This seven-minute video graphically depicts abortion. It's an excellent resource for audiences from seventh grade and up.
2. *Making Abortion Unthinkable — Speaker's Resource* by Scott Klusendorf (published by Stand to Reason). This lengthy speaker's manual contains documents from pro-abortion sources that actually prove the pro-life position. It's a perfect resource for reports, presentations, or debates. (267 pages)
3. *Precious Unborn Human Persons* by Gregory Koukl (published by Stand to Reason). A concise defense of the full humanity and the full personhood of the unborn from the time of conception. (32 pages)
4. *Politically Correct Death: Answering Arguments for Abortion Rights* by Francis J. Beckwith (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1993). Perhaps the single best book on defending pro-life views. (256 pages)
5. *Pro-Life 101: Making Your Case on Campus* (STR audio tapes). Scott Klusendorf defends the pro-life view at a college fraternity using arguments presented in this course. (Includes debate tapes)
6. *Relativism: Feet Firmly Planted in Mid Air* by Gregory Koukl and Francis Beckwith (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1998). A straightforward refutation of moral relativism. (188 pages)
7. *Body and Soul* by Scott Rae and J. P. Moreland (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000). Contains a defense for the existence of the human soul. A rigorous read, but worth the time investment. (381 pages)
8. *Pro-Life Primer* by Gregory Koukl (STR audio tapes). This two-tape audio set is a summary of the key apologetics issues confronting the pro-life movement and what must be done to persuasively communicate the case against elective abortion. Includes "The Death of Humanness" and "Precious Unborn Human Persons." (Includes notes)

RESOURCES FROM OUTSIDE STAND TO REASON:

1. Stephen Schwarz, *The Moral Question of Abortion* (Chicago, Ill.: Loyola University Press, 1990). Professor Schwarz presents a compelling case for the pro-life view using cogent philosophical arguments.
2. Peter Kreeft, *The Unaborted Socrates* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1983). A dramatic and humorous dialogue on the morality of abortion. A must-read for pro-life apologists.



"Making Abortion Unthinkable" © 2001 Gregory Koukl, Scott Klusendorf, Stand to Reason, 1-800-2-REASON or www.str.org

N O T E S

ENDNOTES

- 1 See Frank Beckwith, *Politically Correct Death* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1993), 53 – 68.
- 2 Mary Anne Warren, “On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion,” in *The Problem of Abortion*, ed. Joel Feinberg et al. (Belmont: Wadsworth, 1984), 103.
- 3 R. W. Johannsen, ed., *The Lincoln Douglas Debates* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1965), 27. See also Roy P. Basler, ed., *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1953), vol. 3, 256 – 7, as cited in Hadley Arkes, *First Things: An Inquiry into the First Principles of Morals and Justice* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986), 24.
- 4 For a full refutation of relativism, see Gregory Koukl and Francis Beckwith, *Relativism: Feet Firmly Planted in Mid Air* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1998).
- 5 The tone you set for these types of exchanges should be polite and calm, never combative.
- 6 Mary Anne Warren, “On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion,” 102 – 119.
- 7 An example is provided by Beckwith in *Politically Correct Death*, 110.
- 8 Peter Kreeft, “Human Personhood,” in *ALL About Issues*, January – February 1992, 29.

