

# The Major Gloss in the Abortion War

Robin Calamaio Copyright 2025

[www.freelygive-n.com](http://www.freelygive-n.com)

## Introduction

Before exposing the *major gloss* in the abortion war, it might be worth identifying the *major point* in the abortion narrative. It centers on the woman's body. "*I have the right to my own body,*" including "... *my right to privacy*" or "... *my right to choose,*" etc. The major point is that the woman has the sole right to her own body and if she becomes pregnant she can do whatever she wants with "*the thing*" that is forming inside of her. But, what exactly is forming inside of her?

The focus in this article is the preborn ... unless material about the mother is needed in the discussion. Megaphones about the mother's concerns have already been deployed for decades. So, as you work through the forthcoming material, if any of those megaphones start blaring - thus diverting your focus from the preborn - mute them - and regain focus from the vantage point of the preborn himself/herself.

Before addressing what this "*thing*" is, I struggled with the title of this treatise. The first draft was, "**The Major Gloss in the Abortion Debate.**" But that triggered the thought of contentions over words and meanings - semantics. But, for the preborn, and for the whole of our preborn population, to be reduced to a "*debate*" is denigrating fodder. Indeed, the preborn's very life or death depends on which "*debater*" prevails. Life or death? That is the language ... of war. Thus, the title.

## The Current Landscape

As it now stands, the rights of the woman dominate each point in this war - whether legal, political, educational, philosophical or

financial. Even if concerns of the preborn are in focus on some point, all still reverts to the preemptory rights of the mother and that rules the day. The ultimate goal of all pro-abortion advocates is that no one is to have any say in any way in any woman's decision concerning her pregnancy. It is "*her body, her decision.*" Period. This position is so dominant that if a preborn somehow survives an abortionist's attack - the mother's intention for that preborn must still be honored. That preborn was slated for death and to death it must go.

Concerning the abortionist and all abortion advocates, the primary goal is to kill this "*thing*" growing inside the mother's body. That is objective one. But, it turns out that many side businesses have been spawned from this activity - creating an entire industry. There is a vast market for securing and selling ... what ... from the preborn? Parts. Parts of the preborn are sold for a myriad of purposes. And what are these parts of the hapless preborn called? The prevailing verbiage is "*fetal tissue.*" But, where is this fetal tissue found? (Appendix 1).

Whether the marketable product is from a kidney lining, or liver, or brain, these materials are formed in, have resided in, and are extracted from - *inside* the preborn. This means that whatever goods the abortion industry businesses want from the preborn, those agents must penetrate ... its body. And there is the gloss of the entire abortion debate - the *body* of the preborn.

### **The Preborn's Body**

Just before birth, everyone acknowledges the preborn has a body. That is what exits the mother's body. But, at what point, when *inside* the mother, did the preborn gain his/her body? Well, the fertile egg is the first stage of the preborn's life. Is that a body? This must be answered yes or no. If "*no,*" then what is the fertile egg? And, for our interests here, when then does the preborn ... have a body? Once this

physical reality is scientifically settled, then talk of its status, or any discussion about metaphysical “*rights*” for the preborn, can ensue on solid footing.

It is worth noting at this point that words like “*zygote*” (fertilized egg), or “*embryo*” (a few days later), or “*blastocyst*” (days after that) or “*fetus*” (for the rest of the preborn’s journey), are just words that do not address this “*preborn body*” question. These words are simply invented markers placed on the lifeline of the preborn that do not touch the essence of this question about the preborn’s body. And that is what we are after.

### **The Start ... The Fertile Egg**

The preborn’s existence begins with a fertilized egg. So, what is that? To answer this question with even a semblance of justice would require a series of books. But, it is not enough to only examine the fertile egg. Precursor materials - and events - that culminate in the reality of a fertile egg also need to be investigated if there is any hope of understanding what this “*thing*” is. That is more volumes of books. I cannot do that, so simple statements will have to suffice. But, note that each point I will forward is just a tiny splinter of an entire plank in the preborn’s reality - and ensuing war upon it.

The first thing of note is that the fertile egg is *living* matter. It is composed of *inorganic* elements ... but, is somehow alive. When stacked against all the matter in the universe, *living* matter would not even register infinitesimal. It is smaller than that. Shouldn’t such an exceedingly rare *form of matter* be afforded great ... I don’t know ... investigation, care, deference, respect, intrigue, wonder? *How* can inorganic elements come to life anyway? Questions addressing this physical reality abound. Abortion advocates display no understanding

of just this part of the preborn phenomenon - that the fertile egg is extremely rare *living* matter. So, what else might be of note?

The fertile egg is genetically complete, totally and forever one of a kind, and half of the time ... it is a different sex from the mother. The XY (male) or XX (female) chromosomal combination is already set. So, the fertile egg is actually a *male or female* fertile egg. Reread these three sentences. That is why at the end of the second paragraph in the *Introduction* above, I said, "... *the preborn himself/herself.*" This is stunning. I did say, "*volumes of books*" should be written.

Concerning this genetic material in the fertile egg, at no point will it ever mix with the mother's genetic material. Whether the fertile egg's *cell wall*, or *the lining* surrounding the early cluster of cells, or the preborn's *skin* (formed about one month in), some barrier always maintains this genetic separation (along with the nucleus' wall) for the entirety of the preborn's stay in the mother. And it is not just the sex that is already present in that genetic material, but also the blood type, Rh factor, etc., etc., etc. - all of which may be totally different from the mother. So, at the instant of fertilization, an entirely new and totally unique life form is physically in existence. (Appendix 2).

More observations. The fertile egg of a human mother is solely human and can not develop into anything else. It is simply the first stage of an entirely new lifeline. Also, at the instant of fertilization, a "*clock*" turns on and if granted time, nourishment and the absence of death, that fertile egg will become a unique adult 100% of the time. Such scientific certainty is, in itself, arresting on its face. The fertile egg fully embodies all the elements of that new lifeline. The key word in that last sentence is "*embodies.*" There it is. The preborn's earliest body is that fertile egg. And how can I say that?

First, concerning the abortionist proper, none of them consider the preborn, at any stage of his/her life, to be a true “*part*” of the woman’s body. From fertile egg forward, it is a *foreign* body. The primary goal is to excise this foreign body from the mother’s body with as little physical damage to the mother’s body as possible. Chosen tools for this removal depend on the preborn’s current stage of life. If a fertile egg, the “*morning after pill*” may be the tool. Later on, various implements and solutions are used. Women, who have lived and died without ever becoming pregnant, are not medically diagnosed as having walked through life ... with a missing body part. (Appendix 3).

The second reason the fertile egg is actually the earliest stage of the human body centers on the “*fetal tissue*” industry. None of the material they seek can be gained unless the protective barrier around this foreign body *is breeched*. If those agents want material from the fertile egg (in that first 24 hours of life), the protective *cell wall* must be breeched - followed by extraction. If the desired goods from the preborn happen to fall in the initial days after that, the protective *lining* that segregates the preborn from the mother must be breeched - followed by extraction. Then, at about the one month mark, the preborn’s *skin* must be breeched - followed by extraction. This dynamic never deviates from fertile egg to birth. So, in order to procure any fetal tissue, the preborn must be invaded by penetrating his/her current barrier that keeps that body distinct from the mother’s body. Absent this attack on the preborn ... there is no securing of any “*fetal tissue*.” No breeching of the preborn - results in immediate termination of all sales (and research activities) of the abortion industry. That is not the “*termination*” ... abortion advocates seek.

It should also be noted there are one celled creatures like amoeba and protozoa. As we study them under a microscope, we do not hesitate to recognize that single cell *as their body*. They are segregated by a cell

wall from the outside world, are genetically complete, and act and interact with their environment. So, too the fertile egg. For example ...

Relatively recently, two discoveries about a newly created fertile egg were revealed. First, at the instant of fertilization, the cell wall immediately thickens and second, an electric shock is generated to repel other sperm cells who are seeking entrance. These two actions are generated from *within* the newly fertilized egg. This is *not* a protective event generated by the mother's body. The fertile egg has gone on the offensive in self-generated actions. One pro abortion "*doctor*," said (in alarm), "*This changes the entire abortion debate!*" He rightly understood ... this "*thing*" is acting independently of the mother with an agenda of its own. He probably also suspected other discoveries would soon follow - revealing that the preborn is the one sending signals to the mother's body to accommodate it for its short stay in her body. I actually think many mothers innately know they are not in charge of the preborn's course. For example, when nearing delivery and asked, "*When is that baby coming?*" - I have often heard, "*You will have to ask him (her). This baby has a mind of its own!*" (Appendix 4).

### **Let's Now Examine The Fertile Egg's Backstory**

In calling the fertile egg, "*the fertile egg*," doesn't that mean there is an infertile egg? So, ... what is it - and what is its connection to a fertile egg? Well, here we are again. Volumes of books are needed. But, bullet points will have to do. So, ... where does *it* come from, and what is its connection to the fertilized egg?

For starters, the infertile egg, just like the fertile egg, is *living* matter - so, it too is part of that rare category of matter. Next, it is an individual cell and is only found inside the female. But, it is a very unique cell. It only contains 1/2 of the woman's chromosome material inside its nucleus. The other 30 trillion cells in her body have the entire

23 chromosomes. What?? When did this happen? How *could* this happen? Let's step back a moment.

In the already infinitesimally small amount of matter that is somehow alive, this 1/2 chromosomal cell ("*half breed*" I call it) comprises an even infinitesimally *smaller* space in what is already the infinitesimal realm of living matter. So, how small an area? Let's do some math.

All the eggs a female will ever have - have already been developed in her body before birth. They then reside in that female until puberty at which time one is released one per month (normally) until the supply is exhausted. So, if puberty starts at 12 years old and she remains reproductively viable until she is 52, that is 40 years. So, 12 eggs x 40 years = 480 infertile eggs are present at her birth. Compared to the 30 trillion cells that make up her body, these half breeds are outnumbered 62.5 billion to one. So, these eggs are an extremely tiny amount of a woman's living matter ... in what is already an infinitesimally rare form of matter overall.

Since these cells only contain half the chromosomes of the other 30 trillion cells of her body, is it correct to say the infertile egg is genetically incomplete? I don't think so. Each infertile egg possesses a complete cell wall, it does have a nucleus, it is alive and genetically complete *for its purpose* ... even though a half breed.

Speaking of its purpose ... what is its purpose? It has but one. Reproduction. But, it never reproduces *itself* like many other cells in the woman's body. And once its one-time presentation in this monthly cycle arrives, if it remains unfertilized, it is simply expelled and meets an unceremonious end. No fertilization results in no furtherance of the species. If this happens to every egg a female produces, the 4 billion

year unbroken lifeline that led to her ... goes extinct. So, what can fertilize it?

It is at this juncture, I do not envy the evolutionist. Sexual reproduction is so astoundingly complex and so threatening to its originators - it is hard to convey how daunting is the task to explain this phenomenon. First, how could any full cell just "*decide*" to create another cell - but perfectly excise exactly half the genetic material as the rest of itself? To say this "*just evolved*" is its own immense gloss. The first one would be a mutant cell, yet have a complete cell wall, a nucleus, etc. ... but just half the chromosome matrix? And since this is now the sole mode for reproduction, if this does not work, extinction of that lifeline is immediate. So, what might go wrong?

For starters, an unfertilized egg cannot fertilize itself. This is an exceedingly precarious position for any species. Why? Because it is now totally dependent on some outside party for reproduction. But, we soon discover that an unfertilized egg - even from a member of the same species - cannot fertilize it either. The risk of survival of the lifeline that led to the one mutating this egg has now exponentially increased. So, what can fertilize an egg? A member of that same species would need to mutate, at the same time and place, a perfectly mirroring - yet opposite - "*half breed*" cell also dedicated only for reproduction. That phenom (in its own right) we call ... a sperm cell. Of course, if the first half breed was indeed a sperm cell, the same reproduction problems exist ... just in reverse. Like I said earlier, I do not envy the evolutionist in believing this all "*just happened.*" Such "*science*" is more aligned with science fiction. What a massive faith the evolutionist possesses - especially in light of this next part. So, how does a sperm cell mirror the infertile egg cell and how is it opposite?



It *mirrors* the infertile egg in many ways. Here are a few examples. It is living matter, it has exactly half the chromosomal material of its generating body, it is a complete cell (with a cell wall, nucleus, etc.) and, just like the infertile egg, it is now that creature's sole mechanism for reproduction. This mutated sperm cell, just like the mutated infertile egg cell, cannot replicate itself. And if it cannot find, and bond with, a mirroring infertile egg, it, like its counterpart, will simply meet an unceremonious end. Also if no sperm cells from that generating creature ever successfully bond with a mirroring egg, that 4 billion year lifeline immediately terminates - just like the creature mutating the infertile egg that never has one fertilized. Books.

But, this sperm cell *is opposite* the mirroring egg cell in some very marked ways. For starters, while a viable egg never leaves the female's body, the sperm cell, on the other hand, is always ejected from the male. It journeys into an outside environment and keeps going until it merges with an egg ... or runs out of steam and dies. This outside environment must be benevolent to the sperm cell as it seeks to find an infertile egg ... as it then seeks to penetrate its cell wall. So, how does that sperm "*chew through*" the cell wall and the nuclear membrane of the egg - with neither breach being lethal? And what happens to its own cell wall, nucleus lining and other cellular matter that it sheds inside the egg as its mirroring half chromosomal matrix perfectly aligns, and merges with, the egg's half chromosomal matrix? Questions compound.

You may have noticed I kept referring to the sperm cell as "*it*." In truth, the sperm cell is either an "X" or "Y" - thus, a female sperm or a male sperm. The infertile egg is always "X" (female). The sperm's gender ultimately determines the sex of the fertile egg - lasting from fertilization to ensuing adult. So, in this chromosomal area of a completed matrix, the sperm cell *might* mirror the egg ("X") or it might

be opposite (“Y”). But, there is another opposite thing about the sperm cell ... that, to me, sounds more like science fiction than science.

At birth, a male has *zero* sperm cells. Zero. For years, the trillions of cells constituting his body have a full compliment of chromosomes. Then at the moment of puberty, say 12 years old or so, his body instantly “*decides*” to create half breeds that can perfectly match an egg inside some female somewhere. But, the male’s half breed generation differs from the female’s half breed generation in another astounding way. Each ejaculation contains between 15 to 150 *million* sperm cells. I have no idea how may half breeds a male generates in a lifetime. It could be a 1,000,000,000,000 sperms versus 480 infertile eggs. Science fiction is not this spectacular.

Even if the points I have forwarded thus far are somehow reasonably explained, only a couple trees of a vast forest will have been addressed. Thousands and thousands of intricate mutations would need to occur at the same time, and same place, in the same species for sexual reproduction to become reality. Half chromosomal cells that mirror ... but are yet opposites? What environmental forces could be at play to push and successfully complete such a mutated reproduction scenario? “*Incremental changes*” leading to ... sexual reproduction?

I do not envy the Naturalist when trying to explain this from a framing of random evolutionary development. For starters, any *partial* development(s) in such a transition would not serve the current life form well - and would probably doom it outright. If these systems, and all the organs involved, do not develop and come online at the same time, extinction is certain. Furthermore, each element of this reproduction dynamic must happen in the correct order and timing. This is mind boggling, especially knowing what I have forwarded are only tiny crumbs of this physical reality. To say this is an extremely

complex - and high risk - mode for reproduction (as compared to asexual cell division in propagation of a species), is a massive understatement. This presents any true evolutionary theorist a nightmare to explain as this is the most crucial aspect to any life form ... its ability to reproduce.

### **So, Here is the Math of the Fertile Egg**

Part of the marvel of the fertilized egg is that it even upends math. Successful reproduction means one sperm cell plus one egg cell equals one fertile egg cell, so,  $1+1=1$ . What kind of math is that? Added another way, two cells with two cell walls and two nuclei when added together become one cell with one cell wall and one nucleus. So,  $2+2+2=1\&1\&1$ . Good grief.

### **The Fertile Egg ... and “*The Clock*”**

I want to return to one bullet point about the fertile egg that I rushed through early in this article. I said, “*at the instant of fertilization, a ‘clock’ turns on and if granted time, nourishment and the absence of death, that fertile egg will become a unique adult 100% of the time.*” Let’s take a closer look at this “*clock.*”

As just discussed, both the infertile egg and sperm cannot replicate themselves and, if left in their half breed state, they will simply expire. That is the overwhelming fate of almost all half breed cells. How many women have 480 babies and how many men father a trillion children? But, when an infertile egg and sperm *do* merge, a powerhouse comes into being. At that instant of fertilization, some kind of “*clock*” turns on inside that single cell - that fertile egg. This mechanism did not exist before the egg became fertile. There is nothing that suggests either half breed cell - sperm or infertile egg - had the mechanism that brings this “*clock*” into existence. But, there it is -

inside every genetically complete fertile egg! When it starts, all ensuing growth and development is quite predictable - as evidenced by the medical markers of zygote, embryo, blastocyst, fetus, infant, child, etc., etc. It is ever present in each stage of life in that new lifeform - until that individual's demise. Since this "*clock*" starts *in* the fertile egg - and that same clock stays in that new lifeform until its demise - this is, in my view, another evidence that the preborn's body begins with the fertile egg.

I have no idea if this undiscovered "*clock*" is a driving force in this new body ... or if it is just an accompanying force. It seems to me this "*clock*" should be an area of exceedingly diligent investigation. If it can be located, can it be kept on ... or even stuck at the zenith of life? Could it at least be slowed once at that pinnacle?

So, the instant this "*clock*" turns on, with time, nourishment and the absence of death, a 30 trillion celled body explodes into reality. And that body can potentially become a bridge in the next phase of that 4 billion year lifeline if it is successful in reproduction at some point in its life. This trajectory is completely opposite any half breed cell that never becomes part of a fertile egg. Concerning the entire abortion complex, their mission is to inject themselves, with their tools, into this developing body's lifeline and scramble the parts of that body to stop this one-way clock. That is what they do. So, ...

### **What is the Preborn's Standing From Fertile Egg Though Birth?**

By standing - this is broader than just a narrow legal view of "*standing*." What I am asking is, what is the preborn's place in this physical world? What is its value? One will answer this according to the worldview one adopts - or an entire society adopts. With this said, that does not mean that whatever is adopted is actually correct.

There are three main systems of thought, or worldviews, from which values arise. One is Naturalism, one is Humanism and the other is Theism. Each of these have their own cardinal elements in spite of factions under each umbrella. Any norm/policy/law that governs any person, or group, can be traced back to one of these worldviews - forming the base for the adopted value. So, let's explore this.

**Naturalism** promises a sole adherence to physical science. At least that is its promise. Evolution is the life science part of Naturalism, but it remains ... a theory. Unfortunately, many evolutionists blur the line between actual scientific fact, that grounds Naturalism, and their evolutionary theory. But, one of Naturalism's cardinal platform planks is this: there is no such thing as "*rights*." A true evolutionist does not acknowledge the validity of "*rights*." That is a *metaphysical* concept (beyond physical) that has no place in the sciences of Naturalism - inorganic or organic. Naturalism simply forwards, whatever is - is what is right.

**Humanism**, on the other hand, is a system replete with "*rights*." These are *human opinions* of what is right and wrong - and the ensuing "*rights*" are the sole product of human thinking - thus the label, Humanism. There is no "*god*" involved in any of their metaphysical valuations. Concerning its relationship to Naturalism, when expedient, Naturalism's hard sciences are embraced, but abandoned when inconvenient. It is here the Humanist often blurs that line by using "*soft sciences*" like Political Science, Psychological Science, Social Science, etc., which should really be called "*Political Observation Studies*," etc., so as not to be confused with the hard sciences of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics, etc. (Appendix 5).

**Theism**, like Humanism, is also a metaphysical system but it attributes all valid "*rights*" as coming from God - not human opinion.

As a Biblical theist, I am of the persuasion that all other theism factions under the Theism umbrella are actually just other forms of Humanism. All errant religions/theisms are actually just human opinions about “god” ... a “god” they can embrace on their own preferred terms. So, I place them all back under Humanism’s umbrella, under the faction, “*Theistic Humanism*.”

One reason humans have created false theisms is to give their metaphysical value system more weight. They appeal to “god” as the source of their values/norms/laws and that is much harder to challenge because of this assertion of authority. My only concern about the preborn’s standing is in reference to Biblical Theism.

As an aside, all the accurate science found in Naturalism a Biblical theist affirms - but credits the God of the Bible as the Creator of these physical realities. Therefore, all manners of physical research and discovery are welcomed. (Appendix 6).

So, what is the preborn’s standing in these three worldviews?

### **Naturalism/Evolution and the Preborn**

If a person chooses to believe in evolutionary theory, each fertile egg stands at the end of a particular 4 billion year, unbroken chain, of living matter. This scientific truth, from the evolutionist’s camp, is massively important. Killing any fertile egg strikes at the very heart of their entire theory. Why? Because a fertile egg is the fruit of the evolutionary victor and, as such, may hold essential mutations/adaptations for the continued existence of that species. Furthermore, such mutations/adaptations arise randomly, so each fertile egg is of equal value to any other. Reasons to kill a fertile egg (or any stage in a preborn’s life) based upon not being “*wanted*” or being a problem of “*economic hardship*” or “*rape*” etc., come from a plastic metaphysic

imposed on scientific Naturalism/Evolution. The preborn, from fertile egg through birth, is the superior lifeform - even over both parents.

*“Rights”* for the mother to kill her preborn come from what I call the Barbaric Wing of Humanism’s metaphysical fog. (Appendix 7).

The true evolutionist is driven by natural science alone. As Naturalists, they are adamant pro-lifers. Adamant and aggressive. If any evolutionist is not, it is because that *“evolutionist”* does not understand the theory professed to be believed. I contend that true evolutionists are an even greater opponent to each *“pro-choice”* individual than even the most firm Biblical pro-lifer. Why? Because, the Biblical theist ultimately yields to, *“Vengeance is Mine. I will repay”* (Deut 32:35 & Heb 10:30). The genuine evolutionist knows no such restraint. This life is all there is and they will do, in real time, whatever is necessary in confronting this lethal attack on our preborn population. And the urgency of such intervention is increased because artificial means - not natural means - are used in this preborn assault. Whether a pharmaceutical drug or some physical instrument - these are weapons of recent origin in our species development. Before such inventions, the first 3.99999 billion years of our 4 billion year progression, no artificial tools or metaphysical values were imposed on the preborn. Evolutionists know this. But, there is another reason evolutionists are adamant pro-lifers. It involves ... our sun.

In a very weird twist of random fate, our species developed the ability to think beyond surface level instincts. For example, many plants and animals have a relationship with the sun. But, we have gone well beyond simply basking in its warmth. At one point, someone realized it caused life to prosper, so, it was called, *“god.”* Later, inquiring minds determined it was an inorganic energy source ... actually a star to which we happen to be very close. Then someone discovered that this star, like all others, has a lifespan. Then the somber

realization was perceived that when it dies ... we die. But, it is really worse than that. As it ages, a hiccup could fry us all and easily end all life on earth. In other words, our fragile, life sustaining biosphere has a lethal clock set against it. So, what is needed? Geniuses in many fields who can figure out how to get us to another biosphere(s) in the universe. Geniuses arise randomly - so every fertile egg in our species must be guarded. The true evolutionist cannot abide a cannibalization of what may be our next Einstein. This is another reason for such an adamant pro-life stance. (Appendix 8).

So, as stated earlier, Naturalism/Evolution deems the preborn the superior life form as it is the fruit of the evolutionary victor with potential mutations critical to that species furtherance. Evolutionists are adamant pro-lifers of the preborn population from fertile egg through birth (Appendix 9).

### **Biblical Theism and the Preborn**

The Biblical Theist defers solely to Bible statements on this (or any other) matter. For starters, anything that is alive ... God takes full credit for that reality as He alone makes alive. The preborn, from fertile egg through birth, is clearly alive. Second, God alone “*opens*” or “*closes*” the womb (conception, i.e., Gen 30:22 and 1Sam 1:5-6). And third, the womb is His workplace as He weaves the preborn (Ps 139:13-16). Simply stated, the preborn is God’s turf. (Appendix 10).

### **Humanism and the Preborn**

Sometimes the preborn are granted standing and sometimes standing is withheld. How is this determined? If the preborn is wanted by the mother, it has standing. If the preborn is not wanted by the mother, it has no standing. But, that does not mean the preborn has “*rights*” - just standing. Only the mother has “*rights*”. Humanism is



the only worldview - the only system of valuations - where abortion and all spinoff industries exist. This thinking needs to be dissected in a very precise manner. Originally, I was going to make this a long appendix as I wanted the flow of this article to come to a conclusion without a major sidebar. Why? Because the central focus here is to establish the physical body of the preborn. But, as Humanism is the sole adversary to the preborn population, I think it is appropriate to address some of thinking here before a rather lengthy appendix later.

The true intent of this article is to confront humanists one by one. They are the preborn's only enemies. I *do* believe this is a winnable group and, in this effort, I can completely leave out Biblical Theism's stance toward the preborn. How can I do this? It is really quite simple. All I need to do is get humanists to embrace the evolutionary theory they profess to believe. But simple does not mean easy. I readily acknowledge there are some very real hurdles in this endeavor. The biggest is the mindset of humanists.

### **Humanism's Arrogance**

Humanism is a worldview of the physical *and* the metaphysical. The physical side espouses atheistic Naturalism (Evolution being the life science part of Naturalism) and the metaphysical side espouses human opinion (ultimately expressed by "*rights*"). It is clear by their writings they truly believe their thinking is superior to naturalists and theists. That's the problem. When they supplant Naturalism's evolution processes with "*rights*" at desired points, they still think they are true to evolution. And why tell themselves this? Well, they don't really have a choice. Why no choice? Because humanists are atheists. "*As non-theists, we begin with humans, not God, nature not deity*" (Humanist Manifesto II, First: paragraph 2). "*Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as the result of a continuous*

*process*” (Humanist Manifesto I - second point). So, with no God, evolution is the *only* option for origins. But, the harshness of Evolution, in some areas, is not something humanists can abide. So, they have invented all kinds of metaphysical “*rights*” that are contrary to evolution. These “*rights*” almost always protect the evolutionarily inferior from the evolutionarily superior - maybe always. But, humanists believe their invented metaphysical “*rights*” are *superior* to physical evolution’s 4 billion year track record. For example ...

When a lion defeats a rival and even kills him, is the lion guilty of assault, battery and murder? When a rooster runs down all the hens of the barnyard, is it guilty of sexual assault, sexual battery, false imprisonment and rape? When a hyena successfully wrests away a lion’s kill, is it a thief? Yet, humanists impose such things on fellow humans when they know the first 3.99999 billion years of our species successful, unbroken lifeline never had such realities. It is only the last .000001 years of our lifeline that a “*light bulb*” came on and humanists started a species-wide campaign to defy evolution - by inventing and imposing such *metaphysical* restraints. So, the victorious roar of the lion, or the boisterous crowing of the rooster or the laughs of the hyena are now, in our species, replaced by arrest, prosecution, imprisonment and even execution. Humanists decided that “*rights*” should now rule over Evolution’s barbarism. The naturally inferior must be protected from Evolution’s natural victors - who are now deemed criminals and offenders. So, humanists believe their thinking is superior to what got us here, supplanting Evolution’s core dynamics, and yet, with a straight face, boldly claim they are evolutionists! And rather than being challenged by any real evolutionists (if there are any), they press forward inventing new “*rights*” all the time to protect the evolutionary inferior from the evolutionary superior - i.e., homosexual rights, transgender rights, universal basic income rights, etc., etc., etc.

Women's rights are a part of this, including the mother's right to abort (See Appendix 11).

Concerning this *metaphysical* side of Humanism, where do they come up with their values they now impose on the species? Well, in this arena, they have a competitor. Theism. Theisms assert we are not animals and there are right behaviors and wrong behaviors and these are authored by "*God.*" When addressing Theisms, humanists view them all as errant, yet, like they do with physical Evolution, they pick and choose parts they want. "*We appreciate the need to preserve the best ethical teachings in the religious traditions of humankind, many which we share in common*" (Humanist Manifesto II, first: paragraph 4). But, crediting these "*ethical teachings*" to God is, in their view, an unfortunate *human* blunder. These "*best ethical teachings*" have been generated *by humans* who errantly credit them to "*God.*" So, humanists are reclaiming these best points and putting them where they belong - under Humanism. Of course the parts they do not like (i.e., a God who hears and answers prayers, or can do supernatural things ... like create the universe and all life) they relegate to fantasy.

In reality, Humanism plagiarizes from Naturalism and Theism. They lift what they consider the best from Naturalism (physical) and the best from theisms (metaphysical). The only original material they have is some human opinion that violates Naturalism (a physical principle) or Theism (a metaphysical position). But, each time they do that, they wander into the weakest form of human thought - and indeed - error. But, ... do you think they believe this? Not at all. They truly believe they hold the high ground with superior thinking and ensuing values/law. The greatest hurdle to winning humanists to the side of the preborn lies in the arrogance of the humanist.

## **So, why do I think they are somehow winnable?**

Humanism at its core ... is pro-human. The Humanist Manifestos I, II and III make that clear. Humanism focuses upon the integrity of each human - with each one being able to pursue his/her desires while not harming others in the process. Innate to this are protections for *one's own body*. As an example that applies to this article, humanists insist that a woman has a right to her body, and others must have consent to do anything with, or to, her body. But, the body of the preborn is never recognized, even one who survives a botched abortion. Fortunately, many Humanists are beginning to recognize the preborn does indeed *also* have a body. Science and technology has been playing a significant role in this (ultrasound technologies, etc.) and, as a result, some are calling for restrictions on abortion. Some advocate for bans on late term abortions while others advocate for first trimester only abortions. Still others are even calling for no abortion after the first heartbeat - three weeks. These voices have not yet matured to the point of declaring "*rights*" for the preborn - but I know science will get them there - along with their belief in evolution - and I hope this article can be part of that push. For me, the beauty of this is I do not need for humanists to become Biblical theists in order to protect the preborn population. All I have to do is get them to embrace the Naturalism/ Evolution they profess. They will then crown the preborn with long overdue "*rights*" to his/her body and actually join real evolutionists - at least on this issue. Bottomline, if humanists embrace the evolutionary theory they profess, they will extend all "*rights*" to each human life from fertile egg forward. It actually is that simple.

Some might contend that all the pushes for abortion restrictions are really coming from genuine evolutionists or theists. To some degree, that is indeed true. But, I also think this push may be coming from what I label as Benevolent Humanists (as far as this preborn topic

is concerned) under Humanism's umbrella. These individuals are more scientifically and/or evolutionary literate than the Barbaric Humanists (or Malicious Humanists ... whatever you want to call them) who, for whatever reasons, are unable (or unwilling) to reason in critical, investigative thought.

So, here is where things stand. True evolutionists and true Biblical theists do not waver in their reasoned positions for, and protections of, our preborn population. The reasoning is different, but both camps are unwavering on the side of the preborn. It is only in Humanism where absolute confusion reigns on the standing and attitude toward our entire preborn population ... of humanity! Is that irony or what? Humanism is the only worldview that is anti-human toward our entire preborn population! Wow! Every preborn would confirm this if he/she had the ability.

Humanism is truly the weakest form of all human thought and valuation. Every point where they swerve away from Naturalism or Biblical Theism they descend into blunder. And any point where Humanism does indeed have some solid footing - they have confiscated that from the other two worldviews. While this article is only addressing the humanist's position on our preborn population, if I had the time I could demonstrate this on many other deviations they make from the evolutionary theory they profess, or Biblical Theism they reject. (Appendix 12 for more on Humanism).

## **The Conclusion**

So how can the Humanist be moved into granting "*rights*" to the preborn? The recognition of its body is key. A cardinal plank humanists forward is the concept of consent - that access to one's body can only be done with consent. No preborn has ever consented to being snuffed out, researched and experimented upon, or being made part of some

product line. If able, each preborn would advocate for its right to life and self determination. Once the preborn's body is recognized for what it is - a body - then the science based humanist will apply their system of rights to the preborn over what has become an overreach in woman's rights. Benevolent solutions *for both* the preborn and the mother will then be striven for as *both* of their bodies would be respected. No one has a right to violate either body. Solutions to this end would be vigorously sought and explored in good faith as opposed to the one-sided barbarism currently displayed by so many humanists.

Earlier in this article I stated, *"Currently, the woman's concerns, particularly her body, dominate all considerations in this war - legally, politically, educationally, philosophically and financially. Whether the argument is pro or con, all sides grant this power position to the woman before any facet about abortion is addressed."* My goal is for this to be rewritten and say this: *"Now, the **preborn's** concerns, particularly his/her body, dominate all considerations in this war - legally, politically, educationally, philosophically and financially. Whether the argument is pro or con, all sides must grant this power position to the preborn before any facet about abortion is addressed."*

A primary intent of this article has been to establish that the human body begins at the fertile egg. If you think otherwise, then *when* does the human body begin? And if you come up with some arbitrary point after the fertile egg and declare, *"You are now a body"* - what was that rare living matter before this declaration?

This *"body"* question is not an issue for the naturalist/evolutionist or the Biblical theist. From fertile egg through birth, the preborn human is simply in the early stages of his/her unique lifeline. My goal is to confront and persuade humanists to embrace the science they profess. If they do, they will grant rights to the preborn from fertile egg through

birth. While the granting of a “*right to life*” or a “*right to one’s own body*” is not a naturalistic concept, it would find the humanist in a more sane/sound position than the current, fickle “*wanted vs. unwanted*” value system imposed on this entire segment of the human population. So even though the naturalist might scoff at this metaphysical “*rights*” grant as a fantasy, that would at least align humanists with Naturalism - resulting in the right thing. Such an adoption by humanists would find all three worldviews (and subsequent value systems) in agreement - even though the naturalist, benevolent humanist and Biblical theist all have differing reasonings for protecting the preborn population from the barbaric humanists.

So, the ultimate goal of this treatise is to rally the value systems of sound theology, sound scientific Naturalism and sound benevolent Humanism (which advocates sound human rights) - all with the view of building a wall of protection around our preborn population. This will send forth an electric shock so as to repel the barbaric humanists from attacking *the body* of the preborn ... from fertile egg through birth.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Appendix 1

To use the word “*industry*” in describing either abortion proper or the varied entrepreneurial offshoots arising from it - is a defilement of that word. But, I have heard this used in relation to abortion - giving it a perception of being productive activity. The same dynamic is in play with the phrasing, “*the porn industry*.” The goal is for these activities to be viewed as bringing value to the marketplace. The word “*industry*” should be reserved for enterprises that provide goods or services that truly benefit consumers like the automotive *industry*, aerospace *industry*, construction *industries*, etc. Whether abortion or pornography, both of these activities are littered with devastation emotionally, mentally, financially ... it is hard to find longterm positive outcomes by any on the receiving end of these activities.

## Appendix 2

Many mothers have real struggles with “*morning sickness*.” For some, this is actually “*all day sickness*.” I have wondered if this might be related to the genetic differences between preborn and mother. Even though the preborn’s genetic material stays in its own body from fertile egg through birth (always segregated from the mother’s DNA), could this still somehow be contributing to this trouble? The preborn is often a different sex, different blood type, Rh factor, etc. But since half of its chromosomal matrix is identical with the mother, maybe it does not register as *totally* foreign - so, mom just gets “*sick*” instead of full blown rejection - like some organ transplant. I say, “*sick*” in quotes because it is not sickness like a viral or bacterial assault or any other type of disease. This is its own unique malady - like nothing else. This is just some open speculation on my part - and another sea of research for someone - the root cause of this unique “*sickness*.” Maybe this is happening and I just don’t know it. I hope so.



### Appendix 3

Some refer to the preborn as a parasite, like a leech, because it feeds off the mother's body. But, a leech, or some other parasite, is not human as it is a wholly different species with totally different genetics. The preborn, though in its own body and genetically segregated from the mother, does get half of its genetic material from the mother - and is indeed human life, and cannot become anything else. So, the preborn, while totally unique and truly human, is still not actually *part* of the mother - like a necessary organ or other body part. Abortionists operates in this understanding from the fertile egg forward. They know the preborn is a foreign *body* growing in a mother with no designs of staying in her. It is not a necessary part of a woman's body - and is targeted with that knowledge in mind.

### Appendix 4

To begin, unfortunately I did not save the story of the person who made this declaration. AI can probably locate it. In one way, that doesn't really matter as this discovery is what matters - the fertile egg self generating directives for its own life and progress.

In my view, the fertile egg is a one celled body that is much more sophisticated than any one cell creature. The one cell creature never becomes anything more. But, the one cell fertile egg explodes into a thirty trillion cell body. The fertile egg is environmentally active in all the substantive ways as one celled creatures but it has a chromosomal matrix in its nucleus that makes it a powerhouse in the rarified air of living matter. The physical reality of all these matters being addressed in this article are truly incomprehensible and astounding.

## Appendix 5

Earlier in the paragraph I stated, *“when expedient, the hard sciences of Naturalism’s core are sometimes referenced, but abandoned when inconvenient.”* Here is an example of this dynamic. The author(s) and adherents of The Humanist Manifesto 1 & 2 profess belief in atheistic evolution. So, the male lion who kills a rival, or a hyena that steals prey from a leopard, or a rooster who chases down the hens in a barnyard - is not a murderer, thief or rapist. But, if a man does any of these things, he has violated the *“rights”* of his victim and charges of murder, theft or rape are levied - followed by arrest, imprisonment or even execution. So, on one hand, a Humanist might align with the thinking of the Naturalist in some area, professing fidelity to science, only to do a complete 180% turn when natural physical science challenges their metaphysical valuations construct. In other words, human opinion supplants natural science. *“Rights”* are designed to protect the naturally inferior from the naturally superior. This is absolutely the case with the entire abortion *“debate.”* The preborn is the naturally superior as it is the fruit of the evolutionary victor. I discuss this at length (including why a species might attack its preborn) again in *“How (and Why) Abortion Exists in the Weakest Form of Human Thought and Valuation”* at <https://freelygive-n.com>

## Appendix 6

One group of scientists I have really benefited from are at the Institute For Creation Research at [icr.org](http://icr.org). There are geologists, geneticists, engineers in various fields, paleobiochemists, physicists, etc. - many with doctorates from major universities all over. But in working with the research going on in their field (the bulk of that coming from scientists asserting their belief in evolution and longevity models) as well as their own projects, these scientists start with the

assumption of a literal six day creation as presented in the Bible's book of Genesis and also a universal flood in Noah's day - that is also in recorded in Genesis. Operating from these two bedrocks, they then analyze current research and discoveries (along with their own work), and ask how accurate science by others can be incorporated into a young earth/universe and a universal, one-time flood without violating any actual, accurate science. What genuine scientist wants to operate in fantasy? Their materials are quite compelling - and ongoing.

As a Biblical theist, I can appreciate Naturalism in its *true* form as it *never* crosses into any metaphysical realm. And since I believe the Author of the Bible created all matter and energy, all such research is just discovering the mechanisms God created. Concerning the phenomenon of life (living matter) the theory of evolution, which naturalists forward, is the only option they have. Humanists claim this theory as well as both Naturalism and Humanism build from an atheistic base - everything has developed naturally on its own with no creator, no designer, no superior outside force. It is here I happily engage in the many "*bridges*" they gloss over - in their theory of evolution itself as well as the metaphysical blunders in Humanism. I even do this with naturalists before they even entertain the life sciences upon which they impose a theory of evolution - that many assume/declare as factual science. For example, even before life began anywhere, naturalists make an assumption that impacts all their major conclusions. And what is that error? They *assume* all the primary, natural, physical laws they discover and reason from ... are *eternal laws* - timeless norms. The Bible flatly refutes that. This assumption by all naturalists (and all humanists by extension) I call, "*the mother of all errors*." Biblically, the natural laws of the original created order (and finally expressed in the Garden of Eden) are *nothing* like the trough of degeneration in which we now find ourselves. Death was nonexistent, and all animals were herbivores (Gen 1:30). I believe the miracles in

the Bible are simply a piercing of the natural laws of this current order with insertions of some physical law of time past - or some law that will be part of the promised coming eternal state ... a preview of coming events, you might say. So we are now - temporarily - in an environmental trough of degenerative physical laws, and I discuss this at some length in my free ebook, "*Death and the Bible*" at <https://freelygive-n.com>

But, for the here and now, true naturalists still are a stronger form of thought than any humanist plagiaristic system - but, both worldviews are plagued with glaring glosses at many key points as well as operating with varied flawed, basic assumptions.

#### Appendix 7

In my ebook on abortion, I discuss, in more detail, the abortion "*rights*" invention as an assault on this foundational plank of evolutionary theory, starting at page 7 up to page 20 in "*How (and Why) Abortion Exists in the Weakest Form of Human Thought and Valuation*". It is free at <https://freelygive-n.com>

#### Appendix 8

For more of a discussion about this, read pages 22 to 28 in the same free ebook, "*How (and Why) Abortion Exists in the Weakest Form of Human Thought and Valuation*" at <https://freelygive-n.com>

#### Appendix 9

The only way naturalists/evolutionists would embrace abortion is in the context of extinctology studies - in other words, in our case, the mutation of reason and subsequent metaphysical abilities are lethal to the species, so abortion is a natural development from this negative mutation - with the result of entirely "*selecting out of existence*" our

species. I do develop this thinking again in, *“How (and Why) Abortion Exists in the Weakest Form of Human Thought and Valuation”* at <https://freelygive-n.com> - page 12.

## Appendix 10

Concerning my own personal convictions on these matters, this is probably as good of place as any to briefly assert where I stand. This is not necessary for the goals of this article, so it is in an appendix, as the Biblical theist view is not even needed for this preborn assault, and global tragedy, to be ended.

I am a young earth, literal six day Biblical creationist. The Bible’s teaching about death has contributed in great part in bringing me to this position. I explore this in some detail in my free ebook, *“Death and the Bible”* at <https://freelygive-n.com>. As a hint, death was not part of the original creation. It was inserted when Adam sinned. All negatives in this environment are offshoots of this sin/death - diseases, accidents, moral mayhem and destruction - and the physical laws were altered/changed at the Fall. Read the Genesis creation account very carefully. The finished creation is not like the reality we now live in. If you are scientifically minded, research the [ice.org](https://ice.org) database for articles by Dr. Vernon Cupps where he discusses flaws (circular reasoning) in the varied dating methods. Some of his materials went over my head, but this might be of value to you.

Also, at the Fall, the metaphysical ability of man was shattered ... and he discovered, and began participating in, moral error. God calls that sin. Man discovered evil.

Bottom line, God Himself is behind everything that is true in our physical reality and metaphysical reality. He is the God of truth. He unflinchingly states, *“There is no wisdom and no understanding and no*

*counsel against the Lord*” (Pr 21:30) - none that will prevail anyway. With some thought and granted insight, every point of Evolution and every “right” of Humanism that stands opposed to Him, can be successfully reasoned against, exposed and brought down ... in the minds of the willing. That is the key - minds of the willing. Paul said, “*Therefore, knowing the fear of the Lord, **we persuade men***” (2Cor 5:11). To the contrarian, God challenges that one to “*present your case ... bring forward your strong arguments*” (Isa 41:21). But, one must be willing to truly “*examine everything carefully, and the hold fast to that which is good*” (1Thes 5:21). Anything that is actually true - is good.

Concerning life, anything that is alive ... God alone takes full credit for this reality (Deut 32:39, Neh 9:6, Jb 12:10). Man will always be relegated to manipulating life or, as in the case of abortion, snuffing it out. Concerning a human taking the life of another human, the only grounds, in a civil setting, okayed by God is if one has committed, and then been convicted of, some capital offense. This penalty is imposed only after judicial process by a current governance body. For a list of potential capital offenses see/download “*Capital Punishment and the Bible*” at <https://freelygive-n.com> ). Under the Mosaic Law (the only theocratic governance system ever established by God in this age - and it has come and gone), there was also a distinction between murder and manslaughter. Murder involved, “*lying in wait*” - which we call premeditation (See Numbers 35:9-34). Obviously, the preborn is not capable of having committed any capital offense. Yet, it is attacked ... by humans ... by appointment ... in a facility ... with tools ... staffed with an accompanying support system (\$) ... all lying in wait. This is premeditation on steroids. It truly is ... murder in the first degree.

If this article persuades even one humanist to stand down from this attack on the preborn, the effort will be worth it. Why? If the Biblical position about the preborn is indeed correct, which I believe is

so, to enter into His workplace (the womb) with lethal intent is not a matter between you and me - but, between you and Him. Now, if He has no ability to enforce His view on this issue, then do whatever you want. But, if He does have power for crossing Him, that changes everything ... or at least it should if one is sane. It is my studied advice that the person who distances himself/herself from this entire industry does a great service to their own self. And to become an advocate for, and protector of, our preborn population - that will even be better.

## Appendix 11

The first major article I ever wrote is entitled, “*Evolution and Homosexuality*”. It is written to evolutionists ... asking why they have allowed humanists to hijack their system, and defile Naturalism’s promise of pure science. Humanists declare themselves as evolutionists and yet declare homosexuality as a viable alternative lifestyle. But, the true evolutionist knows this development in an individual is the most lethal mutation that can be imagined. This deviation places a silent, yet immediate, “X” on him/her. So, overnight a four *billion* year, unbroken lifeline ... goes forever extinct. No development could be more lethal to any sexually reproducing species. I even ask in that article if this might be what happened to the dinosaurs - thus explaining their sudden extinction. But, my main point was to confront evolutionists. But, it has been crickets. But, that is what I expected. Why? Because I do not believe there really are any genuine evolutionists. There is just a group of anti-theist humanists who invented a pseudo-science “*theory*” as a cover to give them an air of intellectualism as they reject any theism claims for human conduct and accountability - especially Biblical Theism’s value system.

## Appendix 12

In the forthcoming focus on Humanism, I think you will find some surprises from one who is a Biblical theist. While I am absolutely convinced that the position of the Author of the Bible in this abortion war is correct and will alone prevail, I am setting aside all Biblical Theism points in the body of this article. They are not needed in the quest for the full blown protection of the preborn in every nation on earth - from fertile egg through birth. How can I say that?

Humanists are dedicated to “*rights*” for each individual human so each one can pursue whatever things they want - as long as such activity does not violate the rights of another. Consent by an individual is required if any boundary of one’s fundamental rights is to be crossed. This is a core value in interactions with other humans. I have heard this summed up by, “*your rights end where mine begin.*” Or, alternately, “*my rights end where yours begin.*” My rights are not to be abridged by any other human, but, I also am not to violate any one else’s rights.

Think about our preborn population when reading the following statements. “*We assert that humanism will: (a) affirm life rather than deny it; (b) seek to elicit the possibilities of life, not flee from it; and (c) endeavor to establish the conditions of a satisfactory life for all, not merely for the few.*” (Humanist Manifesto 1 from point 15). “*Humanity, to survive, requires bold and daring measures. We need to extend the uses of scientific method, not renounce them, to fuse reason with compassion in order to build constructive social and moral values .... The ultimate goal should be the fulfillment of the potential for growth in each human personality - not for the favored few, but for all of humankind*” (Humanist Manifest 2 paragraph 8). “*The preciousness and dignity of the individual person is a central humanist value*” (Humanist Manifest 2, fifth point). “*Man will learn to face the crises of*



*life in terms of his knowledge of their naturalness and probability. Reasonable and manly attitudes will be fostered by education and supported by custom”* (Humanist Manifesto 1 from point 11).

Now read this: “*The right to birth control, abortion and divorce should be recognized*” (Humanist Manifest 2, sixth point). In Humanist Manifesto I, II, and III, the word, “*abortion*” is referenced just one time - and you just read it. And it is sandwiched between birth control and divorce - when all three of these are entirely different discussions. This assertion offers no reasoning either pro or con in the abortion war. It is just blurted out with no explanation of how this conclusion aligns with the entire value system forwarded in these documents about human life. This is an astounding gloss on an extremely volatile matter among humans. And Humanism is intellectually superior to Naturalism and Biblical Theism?

My point is that if there are Humanists who are actually committed to science and to the theory of evolution then they can be turned into pro-life warriors. They will then “*fuse reason with compassion*” and will fight for the best outcomes for *both* the mother *and* the preborn. And if true to the scientific theory they herald as the bedrock for Humanism, the preborn will even be acknowledged as the premier lifeform of the two. Fortunately, it is relatively rare that one life will need to be chosen over the other as the vast majority of the time both mother and preborn can indeed live and individually thrive. Technological advances also further enhance positive outcomes. And even if the mother chooses to give up her child, the scientifically grounded, indeed *human* grounded humanist, will do everything possible for the success of both parties - furnishing whatever support is required for that reality. That would be a Humanism that lives up to what it professes ... for humanity, indeed, for the individual human.

Also, as an aside, if the humanist is based in science, arguments about when human life becomes “*a person*” or when human life becomes “*a human being*,” or embracing some ridiculous “*viability*” narrative (every newborn is completely dependent on others) - all that will be forever jettisoned. The preborn population will be embraced instead of being subjected to many of the same arguments as American slaveholders used in their domination that people group (Go read, “*The Stunning Parallels Between American Slavery and Abortion*” by yours truly at <https://freelygive-n.com>).

It is at this point, let’s spend a moment discussing “*pro-choice*” which is embraced by many humanists. They profess, quite loudly, they are not pro-abortion ... they are *pro-choice*. Many also assert they are also pro-adoption. But, in spite of all the bluster, they still leave the preborn’s fate with each woman as it is “*her body, her choice*.” Some even seek to take pressure off the woman for this choice by saying, “*this is a decision between her **and her doctor***.” Of course, that “*doctor*” is one who presents abortion as a viable option to address this “*problem*” - and is often the abortionist proper. Clinics like Planned Parenthood, or other family planning centers, who provide all the services to help in the mechanics of getting an abortion ... are staffed by humanists. Everyone involved in this are humanists who have rejected science and also God.

In an attempt to give perspective to some issue, it is often helpful to use an illustration from an entirely different scenario. While all elements of the illustration may not make for exact parallels, it can still be helpful in bringing perspective to the original subject matter being analyzed. I want to compare the pro-choice advocate to a man who owns a vast game reserve.

Let's assume the reserve owner does not hunt at all. Let's further assume the reserve owner has no interaction with any hunter who comes into his property. On this reserve, one can hunt year around with no quantity limits. Also, there is no prohibition on the method of kill. Additionally, what is killed can be dumped, consumed or sold off. In all this activity the reserve owner is not involved.

If objections arise about any of the activities occurring on his reserve, the reserve owner insists he no responsibility for the activity that happened as he never took part in any of it. So, would this claim stand in a court of law? Pro-choice humanists are part of the vast reserve of Humanism. Allowing unfettered abortion in their house, even though they may not participate in the actual works, does not make them innocent of what they are allowing in their house.

Any long lasting position must be based on accurate knowledge and correct understandings that are then followed by sound applications. Reforms are designed to enhance this as new information enters the arena. I am of the conviction all of the most important issues in the abortion war have been errant from the start. Motives behind this are ultimately irrelevant. What is relevant is the preborn should actually be center stage in this human reality of life. Specifically - *the preborn's body*. And there is the gloss in the abortion war.

Because the preborn is not able to consent to the invasion of the barbaric Humanist, it must be assumed that the preborn does choose to live - and once born, the societal construct should also grant an assumption that he/she would choose liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Benevolent Humanism recognizes these as innate rights and any other position toward the preborn, or soon to be post-born, is to be repulsed as a violation of his/her rights.