

Abortion: How (and Why) Abortion Resides in the Weakest Form of Human Thought and Valuation

Robin Calamaio Copyright 2005

<https://freelygive-n.com>

From a social perspective, abortion is the most divisive issue in the United States. There are several reasons for this. For starters, abortion has been imposed on the society through judicial activism rather than becoming law through the constitutionally prescribed legal process. U.S. Laws are to be wrought by *elected legislators* in the *legislative* branch of government. That ensures debate, citizen input, possible amendments and compromise - or abandonment of the proposed law by withdrawal - or defeat. But abortion on demand did not become law through this process. Non-elected jurists in a non-legislative branch of government arbitrarily usurped power and legalized abortion. Of course, this could not happen without the complicity of the legislative and executive branches. They have not stopped the power grab of a judiciary that has gladly taken on legislative duties. But this innate illegality, sensed by engaged citizens, still does not fully explain why there is so much resistance by so many against abortion. After all, no one is required to have one. I believe there are deeper reasons fueling this persistent opposition to abortion. They are based in Nature and/or Theology. *That reasoning* goes much deeper than the reasoning that went into a split court decision in a nation that is a relatively new cultural “experiment.” To be specific, if you opt for atheistic, evolutionary Naturalism as your base of thought and values, there is a billion-year track record to weigh abortion against. If you opt for a Theological model, you have at least a 10,000 year history to draw from - and if you narrow this to a Biblical theology, you have the revealed will of the God of that system - who declares Himself eternal. So, a 30-year-old decision creating a “right” to kill the preborn has run into denser thickets than abortion proponents counted on - or expected.

I wish this Ebook would solve the abortion problem for all time. But it won't. However, there is one thing I will *guarantee you* as my reader. If you *work through* this material, regardless of your current position, you will never think on this subject the same. You won't. So, here's the deal. Since you have already started this, at least commit yourself to read through page 13 (the three reasons for the desire for abortion). If by then you have found nothing of value, just toss this and go on your way.

In an Ebook I wrote called, “*Capital Punishment and the Bible*,” I made this assertion: “*Sometimes (the State) allows private citizens to unrighteously wield this sword (to execute). That is always error and is always wrong. An example of this dereliction can be seen in one death activity allowed by, protected by, and sanctioned by my government - abortion.*” It is my intent to now validate this assertion. If you hold any position(s) contrary to mine, and if you are convinced your position is superior, then you should not feel threatened to read this material.

Included in the discussion on abortion will be a rather intense review of the three primary valuation bases - Naturalism, Humanism, and Theology. We will then discuss the State's role and responsibilities in reference to abortion. You will find this informative. If the end result was not lethal, you could even call this interesting.

In order to rationally approach this subject, we must first define what *it is* we are dealing with. What is a fertile egg? What is an embryo? What is a fetus? It seems reasonable to turn first to science for unbiased, empirical investigation and analysis. Once these questions are scientifically answered, we will then examine the tenets of the various competing valuation systems on the standing of the preborn human. Let's take this step by step.

The Fertile Egg: What is it?

The fertile egg is the result of a successful merging of an egg cell and a sperm cell. But there is something quite astounding about this union. The sperm cell is alive, but if left to itself, it is incapable of growing into anything else. It is also incapable of replicating itself. The same is true of the egg cell. Left to themselves, these solitary cells simply expire. They never progress past their form, and become inanimate 100% of the time. But once an egg and sperm combine, these two become one and burst into a phenomenally complex life form. With nourishment, time, and the absence of death, each fertile egg is on an unstoppable journey of becoming a unique, adult human 100% of the time. This is astounding. So it seems, at least in this sense, the fertile egg is infinitely more than the sum of its parts.

Some have called the fertile egg "*potential human life*." Scientifically, this is an erroneous statement. It is not "*potential human life*" - it *is* human life. It is *nothing else* and it cannot become *anything else*. The fertile human egg is simply the earliest stage of human life. That is what it is. This is a simple scientific fact.

Some make an issue of the fact that the fertile egg is *in the womb* of the mother. Scientifically speaking, when seeking to identify what it is, its location is totally irrelevant. If a fertile egg is in a rock, tree top, or test tube in your refrigerator, that has no relevance when accurately identifying what *it is*. Furthermore, if that egg *derives its sustenance* from that rock, tree top, or test tube in your refrigerator, that is another irrelevant point when identifying what the fertile egg itself is.

But there is something even more basic about a fertile egg than what has been pointed out thus far. It is *living matter*. This may sound like a stupid scientific observation, but if we are going to identify what the fertile egg is, and its standing, this is a significant characteristic. Many things *are not* alive. In fact, most of the matter on our planet is not alive. Indeed, there may not be any living matter anywhere else *in the entire universe*. If all matter in the universe was weighed, and all living matter was weighed, the total weight of all living matter would be so infinitely small that it would not even show up as a speck of dust on the cosmic weighing scale. Therefore, the fact

the fertile egg is alive is quite significant. It is *an exceedingly rare piece of living matter* in a world - and universe - *dominated* by inorganic matter. So, what does this mean when analyzing what the fertile egg is? And, does this have any bearing on its standing in the world and universe?

The “Life Element”

The human body is composed of twenty-eight elements. None of them are alive. None of them even hint at having something alive about them. Carbon is not alive. Iron is not alive. Lead is not alive. Calcium is not alive. Arsenic is not alive. None of the other twenty-three elements that make up our body are alive either. (For the record, scientists actually do not agree on the number of elements that make up our body. I don't know why. My guess is debate over lead or arsenic or some trace element that some may consider contaminants or something.) But it is error to say these elements *are dead* as that injects the thought that life is in some way connected with them. Organic chemistry is itself composed of elements that are, in and of themselves, *inorganic*. If we take all the elements of the human body, even in proper proportions, and put them together, all we make is an *inorganic* soup. Life, whatever it is, *is alien* to each of these elements. How *any* combinations of these non living materials come to life is a total mystery. This “life element” escapes the empirical scientist. *Something* is there, but whatever it is eludes the scientist's grasp. That in itself is mysterious because life is so obviously present when it is there - and so obviously absent when it is not. In reference to the fertile egg, pro-lifers and pro-choicers *agree* it is alive and is on a one way path to adulthood unless stopped. Neither group has produced evidence as to “*what*” makes the fertile egg alive, nor *how* that “*what*” makes the fertile egg alive. Although many pro-lifers profess to know *Who* makes the fertile egg alive, this still does not answer “*what*” the stuff of life is, or “*how*” it animates innately inanimate materials.

Incidentally, if the fertile egg lacks some of the twenty-eight elements of the adult human, then this “life element” is an even more remarkable entity than I can imagine. That means *it attracts the missing elements* at the appropriate times, and quantities, in the construction of the body. How does it know what elements it needs? And how does it know when it needs them - and in what quantity? This “life element” is feeding on the inorganics around it. But it will disappear if it doesn't get the right elements at the right times in the right quantities. *Too much* sodium, iron or calcium will result in the “life element” vacating the matter it is residing in - but so will *too little* of those elements. This is all just too astounding for a brain as small as mine to really comprehend.

The mystery of this “life element” poses a perennial problem for the atheistic Naturalist. It abounds all around us, and is even *in us*, but eludes us. The importance of such a capture cries out. *The Naturalist's failure to nail this thing down has allowed the birth and growth of something they wish had never been born.* I will identify that “something” in a moment.

So, what is a fertile egg? Each fertile egg is a one-of-a-kind entity in all of past reality, present reality, and future reality. Each one is astoundingly unique and beyond replication. And it is an exceedingly rare piece of living matter. Scientifically, this is just the tip of the iceberg in describing the physical reality of *one fertile egg*.

So, What Is the Fertile Egg's Standing in the World and Universe?

A person's particular valuation system will dictate how one answers this question. This is an extremely important point. There are basically three broad valuation systems at work in the world. These form the base for one's world view. It is from one's *chosen frame of reference* that one sets valuations on any given subject. These valuation systems go deeper than any particular governing system, and their competing values *are at the heart of all conflicts*. The three systems are Naturalism, Humanism and Theology. These three actually fall under two broad umbrellas - Physics and Metaphysics. Naturalism is under the Physics umbrella. Humanism and Theology are under the Metaphysical umbrella.

The Three Valuation Systems Simply Defined

It is important to first identify the basics of each valuation system with broad brush strokes. Once grasped, then it is possible to apply this understanding to anyone's reasoning and analyze the validity of that reasoning on any given issue. This will be worth the effort as you will be able to assess the strength of a person's position(s) in light of the strength of the foundation of his/her valuation system. This is empowering.

Naturalism is a strict system of *scientific valuations*. It is an atheistic, evolutionary, Naturalistic system that begins and ends with *physical reality*. Adherents believe all anomalies in existence *can be*, and one day *will be*, explained by empirical science. For example, the mysterious "life element" just discussed is viewed by the Naturalist as probably some kind of chemical reaction induced by the right elements in the right circumstances. They believe that one day scientific investigation will not only discover the logical workings of the phenomenon, but will also be able to replicate it. All that is needed is more experimentation and time.

Humanistic and Theological valuation systems believe there is more to our existence than simple *physical reality*. And ... we are more than just animals. The thoughts, and ensuing values of these systems, are metaphysics - *beyond* physical (after physical). While many metaphysical adherents call their assertions "*speculative*," that does not mean they consider them invalid. Each metaphysical system has core beliefs (which they strive to prove as valid) from which their particular valuations spring. While it is true that Humanistic and Theological systems deal in varying degrees with physical reality (even Christian Science soon acknowledged the reality of a toothache), they quickly launch into metaphysical beliefs, speculations and valuations.

A person operating from a purely scientific Naturalistic framework, *sees all*

metaphysical reasoning and valuation as based in fantasy. Science may wink at, and even patronizingly indulge, the more benevolent manifestations of such fantasies, but the more malignant ones (like God creating the heavens and earth in a six-day period) must be put down and censured when possible. But, until Naturalists can conclusively demonstrate the “*life element*” is the result of *a natural process*, then life will be innately held as *supernatural* on some level. People will continue to think we are more than an animal, and that Natural Law is not “*the be all and end all.*” This continued elusiveness of the “*life element*” fuels the competing metaphysical systems and keeps them in circulation. But, if scientists can capture the “*life element,*” a serious blow will be dealt to all metaphysical speculators. Once grabbed, maybe it could be bottled, or even replicated – or possibly infused where desired. Maybe it could even be injected into all kinds of inorganic things. Why not a living diamond? It is carbon based, isn't it?

Clashing Valuations

When conclusions (valuations) from Naturalism, or Humanism, or Theology clash, then error is somewhere in that mix. For example, abortions cannot be both right *and* wrong. As another example, homosexuality cannot be both right *and* wrong. In these clashes, individuals fall back on the system he/she considers most valid. Threaded throughout this next part of this treatise, abortion will be brought up, but once past this groundwork, I will focus more intensely on the particulars of the abortion issue.

The Biggest of the Problems Between Naturalism and Metaphysics

The forthcoming examples will demonstrate how Naturalism (and ensuing valuations) and *all* metaphysical systems (Humanistic *and* Theological) quickly part ways. These examples are only the first few inches of a wide and a deep - and irreconcilable - divide.

Naturalism does not recognize **murder** or **stealing** or **rape** as valid concepts. When a lion kills another lion, science does not call this “*murder.*” When hyenas wrestle away a kill from another carnivore, the hyenas are not “*thieves.*” A rooster does not wed a hen, and is not “*a rapist*” when he chases down a frantic hen trying to escape his sexual onslaught. Nor is the rooster labeled “a fornicator” or “whoremonger” for this assault *on every hen* in the barnyard. Animals are simply employing evolved skill sets so as to survive and propagate the species. Murder, stealing, and rape are purely *metaphysical* concepts. To then assign *moral values* (right and wrong) to such actions is yet *another* metaphysical step. Moral valuations hoisted upon human animals are metaphysical exercises that have nothing to do with Naturalistic, empirical, evolutionary science, thought or valuation. Therefore, Naturalistic science categorically *rejects* all such material. The lion who kills is *the victor*. The hyena who makes off with the carcass is *the winner*. And the rooster who controls *all* the sexual action in the barnyard is *the ruler*. If the Naturalist *did decide* to confer a metaphysical valuation to these actions by

this lion, hyena or rooster, the term would be “good.” But, Naturalism does not waste its time even doing that.

Division in the Metaphysical Family

While Humanistic and Theological systems both agree on *the validity* of metaphysics, agreement between the two valuation systems ends right there. The great divide is caused by a very fundamental difference. Humanistic valuations arise from *human opinion*. They are based on *human thought*. Theological valuations are presented as having *God* behind them. They *claim* to be based on *God thought*. It is impossible to overstate how huge a divide this creates between these two metaphysical valuation competitors. This will become quite evident as this Ebook unfolds.

Hybrids

To be sure, there are many *hybrid* valuation systems, as many people hold *pieces* from several systems. But if you analyze any particular value that someone forwards, *you will be brought back to one of these three bases - Naturalism, Humanism, or Theology*. It is also true that under each of these systems there are competing factions. For example, there are many different Theologies, with differing and competing values. So also, there are many competing philosophies under Humanism. For the duration of this treatise, it is my goal to speak *purely* from each base when that base is brought into the discussion. Naturalism is rooted in atheistic Evolution. Humanism is rooted in human opinion and is atheistic in practice. A Secular Humanism is the purist form. Concerning Theology, I am only interested in a tightly defined Biblical Theism and will explain why in due course.

Comparing all the Systems

In our search for a valid system of valuations, it is obvious there is physical reality, and it is also obvious man is capable of abstract reasoning. Therefore, Naturalism and Metaphysics both have starting *potential*. In an attempt to analyze what values are valid, it will be helpful to simplify matters. So, let's start with an assumption there is no Creator. With no Creator, all theological valuations are DOA (dead on arrival), and can be summarily swept off the table. In this scenario, the competition for accurate valuations is only between Naturalism and Humanism. So, let's explore this. Do not assume I subscribe to the coming materials.

If There is No Creator . . .

Science, when accurate, is a solid base for developing values. It is based on empirical data and observed fact. And when it launches into *theory*, it seeks to do so from established empirical grounds. In other words, its theories are “hunches” that previously established facts point toward. So, *Naturalism* springs from proven science

and also seeks to stay solely in the confines of theory extrapolated from accurate science. For example, even though Evolution is only a theory, Naturalism operates solely within that theory as it does not see there is any credible alternative anyway. Even if one believes life on this planet was planted by a superior alien race, that does not negate the veracity of Evolution. Whoever the first race might be, still had to develop through evolutionary, natural means.

Once we establish the basic truths of Evolution (the heart of Naturalism), then the valuations of Humanism can be stacked up against it. We will be able to see *where* and *how* the metaphysical valuations of Humanism stray from Naturalism and if there is a solid base to support that departure.

The “Something” Naturalist’s Wish Had Never Been Born

A moment ago I said, “*the failure of the Naturalist to discover the ‘life element’ has allowed the birth and growth of something they wish had never been born.*” Well, that was a bit of an overstatement. The “something” is **metaphysics**. The *birth* of metaphysics occurred at the dawn of The Age of Reason. But Naturalists really did not allow this, as it arose *naturally*. Most of our species (maybe all) were quickly swept up by this wave of a metaphysical capacity. But a few people have washed up on solid ground and rediscovered Naturalistic thought and principle. But, unfortunately for the Naturalists, metaphysical valuations are still *growing*.

Even though our metaphysical capability did arise *naturally*, it is tremendous error to automatically assume this is *a positive* mutation for our species. In fact, *the opposite* should be assumed about *any* mutation until that mutation is proven as positive. The vast majority of mutations in nature are detrimental to the individual, and sometimes the whole species. As this work unfolds, we will examine the value of this metaphysical mutation to our species.

The Difference Between Naturalism and Humanism - Distilled to One Word

The difference between Naturalism and *all* Humanistic valuation systems can be distilled into *one single word*. Even a one syllable word. Are you ready? The one word is ... “*Rights*.” This concept does not exist in Naturalism. On the other hand, Humanism, in all its expressions, is built upon “*rights*.” So, what does this mean in practical terms?

In Naturalism, “rights” are not granted to any individual, or to any group. The *most fit* of a species simply dominate and thus naturally operate in their “rightful” place. The creature most fit to survive does not have a “right” to survive - it survives because it is able to do so. It is not given a “right” to procreate - it just does. “Rights” do not need to be defined, or granted, and are as *irrelevant* (as they are *alien*) to Naturalism. Indeed, what is noticeably *absent* in scientific, atheistic, evolutionary Naturalism are “rights.” And why is that? The answer is quite simple. “*Rights*” are *metaphysical ideas designed to protect what (or who) is naturally inferior from the naturally superior*. All the primary

“rights” of Humanism run contrary to Naturalism. Interestingly, some “second generation rights” are making a curious turn back toward the natural order, but these are few and far between. These will be revealed and discussed in a moment. But as for the **primary** Humanistic “rights,” they are *unnatural metaphysical valuations imposed upon the natural order*. Let’s look at an example.

With many species, the killing (or otherwise subduing) of competitors for unchallenged access to the female(s) is evolutionary *victory*. In those species, their progression has been forwarded in this manner *for millions and millions* of years. Man has clearly been one of that group - at least through our pre-metaphysical development. But what had been *success* in nature has now, in most circles, been supplanted with a metaphysical value called *murder!* Humanism has turned evolutionary victory into murder! Not only is the victor stripped *of the prize* of reproducing after the victory, but Humanism throws the victor into jail - *often executing him for this “crime.” Other males then move in for species propagation*. This is completely opposite to *a most basic reality of Evolution*. And what is “stealing?” What is “rape?” Were we guilty of such things the moment before our species entered “The Age of Reason?” And, when we entered that Age, why did the rules change?

If the basics of Naturalism are to be replaced by “unnatural” valuations, there must be *more than* compelling reasons. There must be *overwhelmingly authoritative reasons* for such a usurpation. The importance of such proof cannot be overstated. Naturalism has been built upon, and continues to be built upon, victorious lions, winning hyenas, and ruling roosters. Only humans are abandoning Naturalism - and this is a very, very recent change in our billion-year lifeline. Naturalism was obviously successful in developing us - so upon what grounds can we now abandon it? And the creation of the “crimes” of murder, theft or rape is only the tiniest tip of the iceberg. New “rights,” with their companion new “crimes,” are being invented daily. That is why I stated a moment ago that *“metaphysical valuations are still growing.”* If these are the only two systems that exist, I do not believe there is sound reasoning for this change. Here is why.

It is quite possible man broke into The Age of Reason long before any of these unnatural metaphysical values could be enforced. How could the naturally *inferior* restrain the *superior* from “murder,” “theft,” or “rape?” Do you think the skinny little cave man convinced “Tarzan” to let him have Jane on all those cold nights? *“Tarzan, Jane and I are in love, and it would be rape for you to force yourself on her. And it would be wrong for you to pound me into the dust - at least a battery charge ... and even murder if you killed me!”* While it is possible these “ideas” restrained a few Tarzans along the way, surely the dullards woke up on a cold morning and came to their instincts. Our skinny little metaphysical ancestor then took his natural place - plaster on the wall of the cave. Jane was then taken to her natural place.

Think of it this way. What if this metaphysical capacity developed in a porpoise - or even a group of them. Would they be able to impose the unnatural metaphysical

valuations of murder, theft, or rape on others in their species? It is hard to see how mental prowess, *without accompanying physical superiority*, could prevail for long. Any successes in overthrowing Natural Law would be accomplished by charismatic individuals who *mentally* overpowered potential rivals. But it is hard to see how these speculations could remain dominant once the charismatic speculator(s) died. But, what if this metaphysical capacity developed in individuals who *were also* the naturally superior? Well, these ideas would still get nowhere. Why would the naturally superior forward *unnatural* ideas *designed to restrain their own selves* and grant “rights” to the weaker? The dawn of The Age of Reason could not have been much more than some interesting new talk around the campfire late at night. But the minute it tried to restrain Tarzan from being Tarzan, it was quickly pounded back into the ground, from whence it came. There is only one way unnatural valuations (“rights”) can really take hold. A species must move *beyond* an Age of Reason. Before our skinny little caveman could get Jane, he had to be able *to defeat* Tarzan. He needed *more than* reason. He needed *more than* a fist. He needed restraining power that extended *beyond* his fist. And he also needed to be *out of the reach* of Tarzan’s fist. He needed an *artificial* weapon. The unnatural, speculative valuations of Humanistic metaphysics got nowhere until man entered “The Artificial Age.”

The Artificial Age

Tools and weapons ushered man into “The Artificial Age.” With these, Naturalism’s sole dominance in the progression of the species *was breached*. Individuals now survive, and even reproduce, *who would not* if the natural order was still intact. Artificial devices are now systematically employed to *physically impose* metaphysical restraints. Evolutionary victors can now be subdued as “murderers,” “thieves,” and “rapists” - as “criminals.” These “crimes” spring from transgressing Humanistic “rights,” which are unnatural protections granted to individuals (and groups) who would otherwise be *naturally dominated*.

Man is one of the few species who could move into an age of artificial weapons and tools. How could our metaphysical porpoises make artificial weapons so as to impose “rights” on other porpoises? Somewhere along the way they opted for fins over hands with an opposing thumb. They are forever reduced to mental and linguistic prowess in the effort to supplant Natural Law. Without the ability to employ unnatural weaponry, those wanting to advance metaphysical concepts of murder, theft, rape - and all the “rights” arising from speculation - would continue to be overpowered by the naturally superior. Even now, in our species, societies seeking to restrain their population from the natural order of things must do so with continual vigilance and force. Naturalism is continually bubbling under the surface. This is clear as so many of our species continue to “*murder,*” “*steal,*” and “*rape,*” - *and violate every restraint invented by human, speculative metaphysics*. These “criminals” obviously feel it is their

“rightful” place to engage in these activities. How often have seemingly tamed societies reverted almost overnight into bastions of “murder,” “theft,” and “rape?” When “law and order” disappear, what replaces it? “Barbarism” you say? How about calling it what it is - Naturalism.

But there is another complication in this metaphysical imposition. There is no *agreement* as to what metaphysical valuations *are correct*. For example, if one person murders another, the penalty for this varies culture by culture - and even within cultures. Some societies even have *degrees* of murder. Murder in a passion is different from “cold-blooded” murder. But even if convicted of a premeditated, “cold-blooded,” first-degree murder, penalties vary quite markedly. This species is in tremendous confusion. And, as just allude to, when some metaphysical social experiment breaks down, Naturalistic forces bubble right back up. In short, while our species has moved past *total* domination by natural forces via “The Artificial Age,” we are now so confused that we might extinguish more than ourselves ... we might bring down the entire globe with us.

But What About Guilt Over Violating “Rights” After the Fact?

“Aren’t guilt and remorse for violating another person’s ‘rights’ an evidence of the validity of metaphysical valuations like murder, theft, and rape, etc.?” The short answer is, “No.” Remorse after a “crime” is a response arising from a brain polluted by a lifetime of metaphysical impositions. *Guilt* is a weight of illegitimate metaphysical programming that should be thrown overboard. What lion ever “felt guilty” over killing a rival? What hyena ever “felt guilty” for wresting the cheetah’s kill? What rooster ever “felt guilty” for subduing and sexually ruling every hen in the barnyard? If we see any natural reaction in nature by the victors, it is possibly *celebration* through roars or howls into the air, or unchallenged crowing in the barnyard. One thing is for sure. There is never anything resembling guilt. In fact, in our own species, it is interesting to watch how new “rights” are so hard to implement. It often takes a long time to encode new “rights” into a society, and usually only occurs when those wanting the “rights” gain power and then impose their will. Sometimes these new “rights” prevail, but sometimes revolts occur and these speculations are thrown off. Unfortunately, because we are so confused, any new order replacing an old one is laden with its own unnatural valuations and only lasts for a season before it too is overthrown. Look at our world today. What are the oldest continued governments and systems? Probably the most enduring are tribes in various pockets of the globe that operate closest to a Naturalistic model. The chief is the toughest guy, and he ultimately owns everything in his circle of power. He also rules the henhouse, and is often the primary procreator. Everyone else finds a role in that system, or is killed or banished. There are no votes.

“But Isn’t the Entrance into the Artificial Age Just Part of Our Natural Evolution?”

I suppose there are two ways of assessing man’s entrance into The Artificial Age.

One can maintain this is just a part of man's *natural* evolution, so nothing has really changed. In this vein of thought, a frail, rabid moron with a 44 magnum can eliminate a virile stud with a single shot, and go on to reproduce ... while the stud is buried. Since all weapons and tools have naturally arisen, they can be used any way a man chooses in securing his own survival and then reproduce so as to continue his lifeline. So, *weapons* can be used to kill rivals and used to subdue women for procreation. And *tools* can be used for artificially inseminating lesbians, or to harvest and consume embryos. The individual(s) successfully employing these powers are indeed the natural propagators of our species progression. Our frail, rabid moron *naturally* secured his own survival and subsequent propagation ... at the point of a gun?

But there is another way to view the development, and employment, of weapons and tools. These are *unnatural, artificial* implements that threaten, and even thwart, *natural principles* that ruled unchallenged for a billion years. The Artificial Age dawned the moment the first weapon or tool was used that catapulted one who was *naturally inferior* past the contemporary who was *naturally superior*. Before that moment, man, and all former species leading to man, had been *entirely subject to all natural law*. There was no choice otherwise. But with the invention of artificial instruments, man began breaking free *of a total subjugation by nature* and began making other choices. I do not believe a rational argument for asserting this Artificial Age *is consistent* with Natural Evolution can be forwarded. Where are the Naturalists This development in the species cries out for their involvement - and intervention. Do you doubt this claim? Read on, my friend! I have only peeled back the first layer of the onion. Many layers are yet to come.

The Strange Rise of “Second Generation Rights”

As one begins thinking naturalistically, it becomes evident that all “primary rights” in Humanism violate Naturalism. However, sometimes “rights” are introduced that are throwbacks toward Naturalism. I call these “second generation rights.” For example, some Humanistic systems do grant “rights” to “criminals.” What an irony. Humanism first makes “criminals” of evolutionary victors – as “murderers,” “thieves” and “rapists.” But then, in a surprise twist, some Humanistic systems turn around and give these “criminals” rights! It is hard to know if this is a subconscious drift back toward our natural origins, or if Naturalists have penetrated some Humanistic systems - with subversive actions. I hope it is the latter, as that will mean Naturalists will soon be involved in creating “rights” for the preborn (I am getting ahead of myself). But, in reference to these second generation rights, they are so few, and so impotent overall, they will never be more than a band-aid on our gapping metaphysical gash.

So, *What Is the Fertilized Egg's Standing in the World and Universe?!?!*

“Get back to the point of this Ebook! Quit beating around the bush! What about that fertile egg? And what status does the preborn have? When does it become ‘a

person? Does it have 'rights'? Does the government have any responsibility toward 'it'?" Before responding to these last three questions, here is a more fundamental question. "Are these valid questions in the first place?" Evolutionary Naturalism rejects them all. Questions of "status," "personhood," and "rights," are speculative "civil rights" queries - belonging to the fog of Humanistic metaphysics. When this line of questioning arises, *science* has already been deserted. Here are the correct Naturalistic questions. When assessing the fertile egg (and other preborn stages), Naturalism only asks, "What is it?" and "What is its role in evolution?" The answers are clear.

So, "What is it?" As we have seen, the fertile egg is rare living matter, completely unique: one-of-a-kind in the entire universe. And each egg is the first stage of an individual human's life. It is genetically complete.

You were once a fertile egg. You were given time, nourishment and the absence of death. That fertile egg had no choice but to become you because it was the earliest you. The fact it *was in a preborn state* had no relevance as to what it was. It was you. You it was - and only was. You now happen to be a "*postbirth*" human life form. Maybe you are further classified as a juvenile, adult or senior, but these classifications are only demarcations along your life line. The location, age, or environment in which anything might be found has no bearing on the essence of what the thing is. If a diamond is in the center of the sun, or the bottom of the ocean, or floating in space, or mounted on a ring on your finger, it is still a diamond. Human life is human life. The fertile egg is human life. It is nothing else. It can become nothing else.

You may have noticed my avoidance of the phrase "human *being*." This is by design. To me, "being" implies personhood, or a state of self-awareness, or some other assigned speculative value placed upon a human life form. Maybe I am being over sensitive. If "being" does not conjure up such thoughts in you, then, by all means, call the fertile egg, embryo and fetus, "a human being."

And, "What is its role in Evolution?" The preborn occupy a very special and unique place in Evolution. The preborn receive benevolences found nowhere else in nature. This is worth analyzing.

An Unusual Benevolent Area in Naturalism

Nature only gives rise to "brutal" valuations. It is an extremely simple system. Only the most fit survive and only the victors in this brutal, natural struggle take their rightful place and reproduce. That is about it. Even the few examples of symbiotic relationships are *not* examples of benevolent "rights" being extended from one species to another. Symbiotic relationships are mutually advantageous *to both species*. It is *right* for both of them and each is operating in their *rightful* place. It is also a present tense relationship in that it is mutually beneficial to both parties right then. There is only one area in all of Naturalism (that I can think of) that extends benevolences to one creature *at the expense* of another. It is in the preparation for, and care of, offspring. We must

examine this carefully and see how this relates to the abortion issue.

This benevolence in Nature is fairly widespread, but it is not universal. And even where it is extended, it is only a temporary reprieve from the harshness of the Natural system. The recipient must soon fend for itself. This practice of benevolence is most common in the “higher” species. But even there, the degree of benevolence varies widely from species to species. Many species go to great lengths in preparing for their offspring. Nests are built in protected places. Dens are prepared in strategic locations. Great migrations are undertaken to return to favorable locations for the coming offspring. And some parents sacrifice themselves for their future offspring (salmon) when this “preborn clock” kicks in. The universal constant in this observed phenomenon is that it costs the one granting the benevolence. This is an amazing aberration in a system ruled by survivalism. So, why is this benevolence extended?

The Natural Superiority of the Preborn Over the Mother

Well, there is your answer. While the mother is *physically* superior to her preborn (and offspring) and could readily kill it, Nature has “determined” the offspring is *naturally superior to the mother*. And why is that? It is because the preborn *are the fruit of the Evolutionary victor!* Naturalism’s base is that the most fit survive - *so they might reproduce!* As the fundamental product of the victor, the preborn are as much a part of the survival of the fittest *as is the survivor who sired them*. This is an extremely important point. The preborn, and offspring, *are at the heart* of scientific, atheistic, brutal Naturalism. They are the engine of the entire evolutionary system. They are the fruit - the crown jewel - of the most fit survivor. In the preborn lie the *natural future* of the species. Without them, new, and potentially needed, adaptations never come to the fore. And without them, that species goes extinct when the present generation dies. The preborn, and offspring, are defended until the particular species determines it is time for them to be on their own - and either succeed or fail in their generation. Therefore, in reference to the preborn, the Naturalist is adamantly *pro-life*.

This Explains Why Abortion is a “Right”

One of my primary contentions has been that all first generation metaphysical “rights” are in direct opposition to Naturalism. “Rights” are invented to protect the *naturally inferior* from the *naturally superior*. Abortion “rights” are consistent with this thesis. These “rights” defend the mother *from the offspring*. A preborn, or an infant, or a child costs a mother dearly. There is no debate or question about this. In the preborn state, pregnancy presents a multitude of challenges to the mother. Mobility is lost and vulnerability increased. The mother is fed off of before, and after, birth. The infant requires continual protection and care and it takes *years* for the mother to become free of such a tremendous responsibility. Often, mothers incur permanent detrimental repercussions from this arrangement. But Nature has made this the natural role of the

mother *because the fruit of her womb is the product of the evolutionarily victorious male*. Because the preborn are the extension of the most fit survivor, natural instincts *normally* engage to the detriment of the physically superior life form - Mom. So, the question arises, “*If this is true, why would a mother even want the ‘right’ to kill her preborn?*” There are at least three possible explanations for this unnatural desire, although the third one would be a natural ploy by others. Let’s peel back a couple more layers of this onion.

The Desire for Abortion - Reason One: A Species Wide Situation

The fact our species even has *an inclination* to destroy its preborn sets off many alarms in the thinking Naturalist. While there may be some species who destroy their own preborn, it is error to assume this is an activity harmonious in *the progression* of a species. Indeed, this may be a key to understanding *the extinction* of a species. Maybe this kind of defect naturally develops once a species has put too much pressure on its particular ecological niche. Our species may have begun a process of self-extinction. Maybe the dinosaurs trampled their own nests. The alarms are indeed sounding in the thinking Naturalist.

Evolutionists have not addressed the whole subject of species extinction very well. For every species alive today, there are *thousands and thousands* of pre-existing species that died out along the way. It is rather simplistic to lean so heavily on a meteorite or two when species extinctions happen all around us all the time. Extinctology needs to be an opened and distinct discipline in Evolution. I will give you some starting considerations all through this Ebook.

The Desire for Abortion - Reason Two: An Individual Situation

But there is another possible reason individual mothers have developed this desire to kill their preborn. They may intuitively know they *are not* carrying the fruit of a *natural* victor. The moment we entered The Artificial Age, naturally inferior males began impregnating females. This violates the natural order. Mothers may instinctively know they are carrying *inferior offspring*. Therefore, *the natural instinct* to protect the preborn, infant, or even that youth, *is never triggered*. This may explain abortion. Period. When viewed from this angle, how can the Naturalist even expect *natural instincts* to trigger when the impregnation *is not* natural? Therefore, what at first glance looks like an unnatural attack on the preborn, is really quite natural. Think back to our cave woman, Jane. Once that skinny little cave man invented a spear and felled Tarzan from a safe distance, do you think Jane felt she was now being impregnated by a *natural* victor? Before he came up with that new fangled thing, she remembered how he would slink off, battered and bruised, after a natural pounding by Tarzan. She also remembered all the times he fled to escape a pounding. And she also remembered all the times he cowered when Tarzan even ventured a displeased look in his direction. But now, that

skinny little cave man stood over a shocked and expiring Tarzan lying there with a spear through his chest. When this *artificial* victor then looked over at Jane, with a heart full of victory and pride, Jane's heart was full of something quite different. After the initial shock, a cool indifference for him, and his seed, grew in her heart. Would she have the same natural instincts for the coming, or resultant, offspring from this naturally inferior male? Would she even have the same natural instincts toward him? Who knows, this may be the root of all the *destructive* conflicts between males and females in our species today! Now, for many a millennia, all these skinny little cave men have wanted to display their little pups to the world as an evidence of their manhood. And the overpowered Janes begrudgingly sacrificed their bodies and lives for these unnatural little monsters to fulfill the pride of these tarzans (notice the little "t"). But step by step, Humanism has been coming to Jane's rescue. "Rights" have been, and are, being created for Jane. In many societies, rape is a crime, ownership by males is denied, uncontested divorce and restraining orders are granted, and finally, a "right" to privacy allows Jane to kill that skinny little cave man's fruit - and he has no say in the matter. She has no natural desire for him - or his unnatural fruit. Humanistic systems are responding to a desire of women in The Artificial Age, even though they do not understand *why* the desire exists. I guess you could say, "*Unnatural tools and weapons have created unnatural fruit, which have created an unnatural desire - abortion.*" This is all courtesy of The Artificial Age.

If this scenario is an accurate evaluation, there may be a pleasant surprise. The preborn of legitimate victors may be automatically protected. Natural instinct, in favor of the preborn, may trigger in these mothers. Therefore, the only preborn at risk are those who are the product of the little "t" tarzans. If this is all true, then the real threat to our species would be forced abortion - like China. But, maybe the "power of instinct" in atheistic Naturalism will overpower this errant, unnatural, atheistic Humanism. At least that is the hope.

The Desire for Abortion - Reason Three: Deception by Rival Groups

If a person persuades *someone else* to kill his/her *preborn offspring*, this may be a deliberate ploy. The *persuader* would be giving his/her *own offspring* a better chance to succeed and reproduce if potential rivals are killed off - *even before birth!* Maybe an angle of the survival instinct is driving this abortion frenzy. We may be more animalistic than we realize. The physically *inferior* may be using *deceptive reasoning* to persuade the physically *superior* to destroy his/her preborn! What a coup! While deception is naturally employed by many species, what is new is that the *preborn* are the target *within* the species. I know of no species that can induce a rival mother into killing her own preborn offspring. Maybe this mental prowess has made the physically weaker *more fit* to survive. And here is another possible scenario. I believe minorities in this country proportionally kill more of their preborn than does the majority. This may be a

coup by the majority *to stay* in the majority. If either of these theories are true, the primary force driving the destruction of the preborn is fueled by those *who do not kill their own preborn*. It's like taxes and give away programs. Those who promote such agendas do not want *their money and possessions confiscated* - they want others' taken away and redistributed. An objective social "science" study might find the architects, strategists, and primary promoters of abortion *preserve their own offspring*.

You Can Quit Now

If you have read to this point, and have gained nothing, you can quit now. But, if you bolt - well, just know we have only begun the material on abortion. The only way you will know what you missed is if you read the rest of this Ebook. I probably should apologize for being so manipulative. I probably should.

If the Naturalist Could Simply Dismiss Metaphysics

It would be ideal if the atheistic Naturalist could simply dismiss metaphysics altogether. Metaphysics from any base (Humanistic or Theological) are speculations that often, maybe always, cut into Naturalistic truths. It would be ideal if these fantasies could be ignored, but unfortunately, these are not *idle* fantasies. Not only have metaphysical restraints been introduced to the species (murder, theft, rape, etc., *etc.*), but, thanks to The Artificial Age, these concepts are enforced with greater and greater efficacy. While Naturalism still *has a chance* to prevail in some underdeveloped situations, in the more technological enclaves, the imposition of metaphysical fantasy is now institutionalized. The Naturalist can no longer idly sit by as the species is hijacked, and corrupted, by metaphysical illusions. Those driven by such fantasies have *artificially* seized power - and are increasingly wielding that power in more destructive, and irresponsible, ways. Consider these examples. It is one thing to allow a weaker male to stay alive, *but it is quite another matter* to jail the stronger and allow the weaker to reproduce in his stead. It is one thing to allow **unwanted** fruit of reproduction (the preborn) to come to term and then adopt it out, *but it is quite another matter* to kill it in that womb. It is one thing to protect a male homosexual from heterosexual assault, *but it quite another matter* to violate the homosexual's natural extinction by using his sperm to artificially inseminate an egg. And if his sperm is used to inseminate a lesbian's egg, who knows what will be introduced into our species. The Naturalist sees all this activity as metaphysical madness. It is beyond arrogance - it is beyond dangerous. The Naturalist must enter, and take over, the metaphysical realm. The Naturalist cannot leave the species to this metaphysical mayhem - whether Humanistic or Theological - which are contests *between losers* - many of them very dangerous losers. These losers now have extremely powerful weapons at their disposal in their scramble to enforce their particular speculative fantasies. Where are the Naturalists?

The Hypocrisy of “Benevolent” Humanism

Benevolence is the natural order for the preborn and offspring. Abortion creates an astounding twist. A Humanistic system that creates a “right” for the mother to kill her preborn *has created a brutal metaphysical valuation in the only area that is naturally benevolent!* Abortion “rights” grant lethal power in the one area lethality does not naturally exist. And here is the hypocrisy. Humanistic systems that grant the “right” for mothers to kill their preborn believe they are promoting a *benevolent* Humanism. Whether this hypocrisy is grounded in ignorance, or is a ploy by Humanists to discredit Naturalists, I do not know. Again I ask, “*Naturalists, where are you?*”

Maybe I just moved a little too fast. I can hear some Naturalists scratching their head, wondering, “*How have Humanists discredited us?*” Well, answer this. What do Humanists claim as their base for belief - especially the Secular Humanists in the West? Answer: atheistic, scientific, evolutionary *Naturalism!* They claim *Naturalism* as the base to their Humanism. Just read the Humanist Manifesto I and II if you doubt this. Ask all the “intellectuals” in our press, and academic institutions, and secular think tanks if they believe in Evolution. They all claim it as their base, and then *make a mockery of it* by violating its basic principles with all their “rights!” Free speech “rights.” Women’s “rights.” Minority “rights.” Homosexual “rights.” Abortion “rights.” Do you think Tarzan was inclined to let that skinny little cave man *freely speak* on how to run the tribe? What about Jane being able *to vote* on the tribe’s migration direction? And if Tarzan conquered some other tribe, and decided to incorporate them into his own, would he give “rights” to this *minority*? And if two skinny little cave men were humping each other in some dark corner of the cave, would the Naturalist expect Tarzan to hold them as equals - and give them “rights” to get “*married?*” This is even a speculation on top of a speculation. What is “marriage” if not a metaphysical speculation? And what if Jane wanted to *kill Tarzan’s seed* that was developing in her womb? Would Tarzan see this as her “right?” After all *it is* her body and she does have an expectation (“right”) of privacy. This is a decision between her and the medicine man. So, when we hear the cry, “*Tarzan, back off!*” are we hearing the cry of the Naturalist - or a Humanist? And who encodes all these “rights” into law - the Naturalist or a Humanist? And who locks up, and even executes, Tarzan for transgressing these “rights” - the Naturalist or a Humanist? And yet all these Humanists claim *Naturalism as their base!* For someone like me (a Biblical Theist - yet to be defined), I see this as a hoax and laugh the whole mess off the stage. But then I realize these Humanists have hijacked a system of potential merit (if there is no Creator) and *it is not right* to sweep Naturalism off along with these fraudulent Humanists. So here I am defending Naturalism from these snake-oil salesmen. I ask again, “*Naturalists, where are you? Don’t you even understand your own system of thought and valuation? Doesn’t it disturb you that your system is being debased by Humanists who use you in an attempt to give gravity to their metaphysical fantasies?*” You know ... there may not be any genuine Naturalists around. But, before

addressing that, let's sum up where the Naturalist stands on abortion.

The Naturalist is Fiercely Pro-life

From a scientific, naturalistic, atheistic evolutionary perspective, the current abortion philosophy and practices are totally errant and must be halted. There are many reasons for this. Here are a few. There are more.

First: Abortion “rights,” and the justifying “logic,” springs only from Humanistic thought and valuations. I believe Humanism is the weakest of all forms of thought. It is even weaker than false theologies. They are at least reaching beyond human opinion for an authoritative base for valuations.

Second: In our present ecosystem, I know of no creature, other than man, who has set itself to killing its *preborn* (unless some species eat their own eggs, etc., of which I am currently unaware). This destruction of the preborn, and desire for the same, is extremely unnatural and probably has not existed in our species until very recently. Even if one believes *our* species has had this desire from the start, it would be hard to assert that the unknown species of the lifeline that has led to us has ever had this same desire. There are many competing species lines moving forward at any given time and those who would self-destruct are surely doomed. The line leading to us would have certainly disappeared somewhere along the way if any of our precursors killed their preborn.

Third: The Evolutionist understands that progressive mutations arise *randomly*. To target a preborn human for death because it is “unwanted” is folly. To target it because it will “grow up poor” is equally foolish. We will examine some of these civil arguments a little later. For now, just know this; Naturalists know the next adaptations in our species may reside in any one of these “civilly” unwanted humans. This is a cardinal principle in Naturalism.

Fourth: The preborn are the fruit of the winners in life *until proven otherwise*. Lethal attack *from tools* is unnatural. These “*claws*” developed overnight and preborns have had no time to develop defenses. Naturalists must immediately come to their aid.

The Clash of Social “Science” and Naturalistic Evolutionary Life Science

In the attempt to justify their metaphysical valuations, there is one particularly erroneous practice used by Humanists. They use empirical data from the various social “science” studies, and appeal *to that* as the authoritative *scientific* base for their valuations. This is a very important point, and is worth your attentive contemplation. I hope to make this clear.

Social “sciences” study *behavior and activities*. These studies are often quite detailed and extremely interesting. The best ones are very heavy in empirical fact gathering and statistical analysis. The findings can be extremely objective, and, in that sense, give an air of “science.” But for the Naturalist, this is a very weak use of the word “science.” The word “science” should be reserved for the actual *physical sciences* of

Naturalism. These include all the life sciences (biology, zoology, genetics, etc.), physics, astronomy, chemistry and the like. The *social "sciences"* should be called, "*social observations*" or something along that line. *Political Science* should be called "*Political Observations.*" Sociology, psychology, economics, cultural anthropology - all these things should be labeled something other than "science." Here is why. By elevating *social* disciplines to the level of science, the line is blurred between *real science - hard science* (Natural science) - and social observation. Humanists take the *observations* of the social sciences as *real science* and proceed to make tremendous blunders. While Naturalists believe the gathered information from social observation can be valuable, they often come to totally opposite conclusions as the Humanist. I will now offer three examples to illustrate this point. The first is a rather absurd example, but I think it will give a starting point to illustrate the clear contrast between social and Natural analysis. But the next two examples will demonstrate two huge blunders Humanists often make when they advance social observations as "science."

Example One

It is well known that hamster mothers often eat their young. One can objectively study this *behavior* and present *accurate statistics* as to what percentage of the mothers do this. One could further determine if this activity occurs more often with first litters, or second litters, etc. One might even ascertain if this cannibalism is directed at a particular gender. All this fact gathering is social "science" activity. Once all the figures are in, the published findings might read something like this: "*44% of hamster mothers eat half of their first litters and an additional 10% of each ensuing litter with no regard to gender. This is common activity in the species - a natural behavior.*" While the empirical data might be absolutely correct, and the observed behavior is "common" and "natural," it is tremendous error to automatically conclude this behavior okay. The Naturalist takes this accurate social data and analyzes it against *known evolutionary principle* to determine if the observed behavior is positive or negative. Naturalism *does* make value judgements, but the analysis is *species progression* versus *species digression*. The Naturalist first asks, "*Is this activity an evolutionary aid, or a negative deviation?*" Social sciences *do not* judge from this base. In this example, the Naturalist would wonder if we are witnessing a species that is sending itself into extinction. It may take ten thousand years before the last hamster is on earth, but for Evolution, that is a blink of the eye. At first blush, this seems to be a tremendously negative development - and should be researched from that angle quite exhaustively. But, there may be something else going on here. The questions are myriad. "*Could this actually be a positive trait? It is possible the hamster mother instinctively knows which of her offspring are naturally inferior - and she is weeding them out ahead of time? If the hamster mother already knows who the 'losers' are in her brood, maybe she is more advanced than humans, and maybe we are evolving into that direction too - only we employ abortion. Or could this be a way of keeping*

population numbers down so as to discourage the rise of predators who search solely for hamsters as food? Or could this simply be the way a hamster mother deals with potential future rivals? Or is this some kind of early stage of a transition to a carnivore species?" These are just the first questions for the Naturalist. Social "scientists" may have one of these questions randomly pop up in their heads, but only in passing. These questions are out of their purview.

These next two examples will bring into a sharp focus the Humanist's error of mistaking social science as real science.

Example Two

Let's look at the phenomenon of homosexuality among humans. Have you ever heard this defense for homosexuality? "*Scientific observation confirms the common occurrence of homosexual activity in **many** of the higher mammal species. It has also been incorporated into those social constructs in various ways. Homosexuality is a widespread and natural activity.*" To be sure, the social "scientist" couples this conclusion *with a host of other* facts. For instance, when researching *human societies*, detailed statistical information can be forwarded that clearly demonstrates how various cultures have incorporated this activity. "*Homosexuality exists in all societal groups and has for all of recorded history. The norm is somewhere between 3 and 12 percent in any given culture. It is only because of errant social taboos that it has been hidden.*" When these studies are *coupled with the fact* that homosexuality is exhibited in all kinds of other mammal species, then Humanists make a case for the normalcy of homosexuality. Humanists embrace this "science" with great fervor. But this assessment is at total odds with the science, and assessments, of Naturalism. For starters, Naturalism asserts the billion-year process culminating in the male reproductive organ of a dog, monkey, or man, evolved for insertion into the female reproductive organ of that given species. It did not evolve to be inserted into the digestive tract of another male. And the digestive tract did not evolve to be a reproductive receptor. This activity is evolutionarily corrupt. When homosexual advocates are confronted with the *incompatibility* of this behavior with Evolution, they invariably reach for social "science" evidences - and recite the statistics of this phenomenon among various species as they make the case for normalcy. But social "science" never considers *the actual validity* of this activity. But, the opposite is true of the Naturalist. When gazing upon a homosexual, a Naturalist sees a creature standing at the end of *an unbroken billion-year lifeline*. These scientists understand they are looking at the culmination of millions and millions of successful lives (and species). What began as some simple living construct evolved into this exceedingly complex creature. But then, with just this one little development, that billion-year lifeline *goes forever silent*. Obviously, this deviation never occurred **even once** in that billion-year lifeline. If it had, this particular creature would not be here. Scientifically speaking, one cannot think of a more hostile mutation to a creature. Concerning the presence of this

phenomenon in other species, rather than seeing this *as a justification* for its presence in our species, quite the opposite is true. Alarms sound everywhere for the Naturalist. For a more comprehensive discussion on this topic, go to “*Evolution and Homosexuality.*” Social “scientists” and Naturalists think and analyze differently.

Example Three

Let’s now examine the killing of the preborn. From a social “science” perspective, one can find individual, *and societal*, reasons for their destruction. Detailed statistics can be compiled for all the varied reasons.

Individuals may decide they are too young to have the responsibility of a baby. Or, they may decide they are too poor. Sometimes, the preborn are simply in the way of educational or career goals. Sometimes, it is not wanted because the mother wants no future tie to the father. There are all kinds of reasons, and those who kill their preborn definitely constitute a percentage of any society's population.

When studying **societal** reasons for advocating for abortion, there may be several motivations. Resource preservation, through population control, may be a reason. Other times, the goal may be to reduce, or even exterminate, a certain ethnic (or economic) class. Or a society may simply conclude that the *desire for abortion* has always been with us. Therefore, it is “scientifically” reasonable to recognize, legalize and protect this pervasive human desire and activity. In fact, the goal from this social “science” would be to make abortion safe, available to all women, socially tolerated - even accepted. Sound familiar? But again, social *observation* has been substituted for the hard sciences of Naturalism. The Naturalist, as we have seen, is fiercely pro-life. And when a species *kills its preborn and also has a percentage of its surviving population as homosexual*, the Naturalist rightly wonders, “*Is the clock near midnight?*”

The Humanist’s Need, and Dependence Upon, the Social “Sciences”

As you can see, social “sciences” are often used in a manner contradictory to the science of Naturalism. It is possible Humanists are confused over what is *real science* and what are *observation studies*. This may explain the root cause of their obvious valuation blunders. Of course, these may not be “blunders” by Humanists. They may know exactly what they are doing. They may be acutely aware there is *no way* to make homosexuality and abortion compatible with Naturalism, so they have invented these soft “sciences” in an effort to hide the hard sciences of Naturalism. If these *are* ploys by Humanists, they are indeed quite cunning. But, I do not think this is the case. I believe Humanists have simply created this “science” confusion as they have stumbled along. But I do think the willing Humanist can change as he/she examines his/her own thinking and subsequent valuations. But more challenges lie ahead. You see, I will soon make the case that the Naturalist in The Artificial Age is even *more fiercely pro-life* than the simple, fiercely pro-life Naturalist. But before that material, we have a few more matters

to examine. Read on! The best is yet to come.

What Should Prevail?

When conclusions from social “sciences” *stand in opposition* to the clear principles of Naturalism, what should prevail? When Humanistic “rights” *conflict* with the hard sciences of Naturalism, what should rule as law - verifiable science or metaphysical speculative valuations? Are the *opinions* of the last ten thousand years (or so), which have occurred in only *one species on the entire globe*, more valid than natural evolutionary *law* of a billion years? One might could answer, “Yes” if Humanistic speculations were uniformly in agreement. But they are not. They are as unstable and varied as are the winds on the planet. What gives substantive basis for *a human opinion* to nullify some basic truth of evolutionary law? If there is no Creator, it is foolish to choose fickle human opinion over scientific fact *that boasts a billion years of success!* **Scientific law** has given rise to life and species success. What has human opinion done? These opinions come from thin air, proceed through thin air, and can be swept away by other thin air. “Rights” arising from Humanism, can be supplanted at a moments notice by other views, depending on who has the power to impose his/her opinion. To exchange known, successful, natural law for unstable, conflicting human speculation is a mutation of devolution. Without question, Naturalism has a superior base over all Humanistic systems. Therefore, if there is no Creator, scientific, atheistic, evolutionary Naturalism is the strongest valuation system. Science trumps opinion.

“Houston, We Have a Problem ... or Two ... or Three ...” - Natural Science’s Limitations

In fairness, it should be noted that much of hard science is still just observation studies. They tell us *what* some things are, but cannot *explain* them. The existence of “the life element” is a good example. Science *observes* that some matter is alive, and even builds entire disciplines of hard science on this fact (organic chemistry, genetics, biology, etc.) but *how* that matter is alive they cannot *explain*.

As another example, let’s return to our fertile egg. It is one cell, but it took two unique cells to make it. A sperm cell with twenty-three chromosomes penetrated an egg cell that also had twenty three chromosomes. So this mathematical equation is $1+1=1$. It is hard to call that new math when it's been around long before any of us knew that math existed. Anyway, the fertile egg is indeed one cell, but now with *forty-six* chromosomes. Now when this fertile egg begins dividing, each new cell contains an identical replica of the *forty-six* chromosomes. Millions, *billions*, *trillions* of cells then come into existence to make up the human body. Whether bone cells, muscle cells, blood cells, brain cells, skin cells - each of them have these *forty-six* chromosomes. But there is one exception to this. At some point, while still in the womb, the preborn *female* creates some unfertilized egg cells with only *twenty-three* chromosomes! These are stored until puberty, and then

released (one per month) throughout reproductive adulthood. *Males*, on the other hand, are born with *forty-six* chromosomes in every cell in their body. But at the onset of puberty, that body begins producing a bunch of little half-breeds (*twenty-three* chromosome sperm cells) at the rate of up to one-thousand *per second!* Now is all this astounding or what? Scientists may be able to accurately *observe* all this, but to *explain* this - they do not have a clue. So, in one sense, even the hard sciences are still little more than infantile observation studies.

Some maintain it is just a matter of time, and all natural processes will be explained. But, this is *more than* a statement of great optimism and faith. The more we *observe*, and the more facts we amass, the further we are from *explanations*. The mysteries - and complexities - of all the hard sciences are becoming so overwhelming that many genuine scientists are falling on their face before their data, and declaring there must be a Designer behind their particular science. Their own observations have turned their original faith into a wishful fantasy - *in their own eyes!* And their faith is being replaced by fear. This Designer is more than just real big, and real smart, and really powerful. But to whom can they turn for hard and accurate information? To Humanists? What a trap this Designer has set for the genuine hard scientist.

Has This Metaphysical Capacity Created a Wounded Animal - a Sick Species?

In nature, a wounded or sick animal can be a very dangerous animal. It is best to leave the impaired animal alone, and allow infections, or other opportunistic predators, to come along and finish it off. On the other hand, if the animal recovers, it may be able to pass on that hardiness to future offspring - thus enhancing its species survivability. From a Naturalist's perspective, our species has been wounded with this metaphysical ability. We are very sick. If this malady is not directed into a constructive direction, this "infection" will continue to spread, weaken, and destroy us. It is highly unlikely we can contradict the laws of nature and survive for long. But, there *may be* a way the Naturalist can enter the fray and lead the species into healing. The goals must be clearly defined with an unrelenting pursuit of the same. The Naturalist must win this fight ... or this species is doomed. If you do not believe this, you might in a few more paragraphs. Of course, if there is a Creator, and particularly a Creator with a metaphysical valuation system, then what I am about to forward is error before getting out of the gate. But for now, let's continue under the assumption - there is no Creator.

Is Naturalism Dead?

The Naturalist must first acknowledge that man has evolved past the point of natural Evolution. What began with simple, but effective, weapons and tools have graduated into all kinds of things that suspend natural law. Just in the medical arena, sophisticated medicines have artificially prolonged the lives of many who would have been weeded out far sooner. Many of them have brought forth offspring who would

never have come on the scene had natural Evolution continued its rule. And now, with the advent of gene therapies and modifications, we are rocketing into uncharted, and unnatural, realms of species existence. We are progressively breaking the reign of nature's laws through our inventions and biological technologies. And there is no going back. The Artificial Age is here to stay. Or is it?

As we continue this march of an artificial intrusion into what *was* a totally natural process of a billion years, Naturalists *themselves* rightly wonder if natural laws are still viable in this new age. Man has entered a post-Naturalistic age. There are now some fundamental questions the Naturalist must answer. "*Are we in any way still bound to natural evolutionary law? Does it even apply any more as we are no longer dominated by it? Can 'survival of the fittest' be successfully supplanted with a 'survival of just about anybody?'*" Humanists have already concluded a new age calls for new law. Thus, the birth of "rights." One country I know of even starts with a whole bill of them. In this wholesale transition, where are the Naturalists? Or, is Naturalism dead? Is its billion-year reign over? In a form of mockery, one might even ask, "*Is Naturalism extinct?*"

Humanists ... not so fast. You see, the Naturalist has a few valid questions too (assuming one can be found). Like, "*is The Artificial Age really here to stay?*" You will soon see the jury is out on that question. I theorize that if the metaphysical valuations of Humanists prevail, The Artificial Age will fail. If, on the other hand, Naturalists enter the arena, and develop *and implement* a metaphysical system of their own (take over the metaphysical realm), there is *a possibility* the Artificial Age is here to stay. My reasoning? There is a clock set against The Artificial Age. It is one that only Naturalists might help the species prevail against. Do you know what that clock is?

Why Naturalists Must Take Over Metaphysics in The Artificial Age

In the short term. It is really quite astounding to examine the metaphysical confusion in our species. Just look at the depository of it in one body - the United Nations. What is *united* about it? Every nation is self-interested, and the leaders of each nation want to rule over their own nation according to their own metaphysical valuation system. Some of these nations are filled with "rights" for almost every conceivable thing, while others are *a bit more* Naturalistic (strong arm rule). Do the Communist Chinese have the same metaphysical valuations as the United States? What about South Africa? What about India? What about Haiti? What about Iran? What about Norway? What about Cuba? But even the U.N. itself, the depository of all these metaphysical valuations, is itself rife with the natural impulses of theft, sexual promiscuity, and probably murder as well. A lot of Iraqis died under a U.N. Oil-For-Food program where personal financial gain trumped the actual delivery of life saving sustenance to that targeted people. By every sane account, the species appears to be on a course of mass destruction. Naturalists have a proven success system to draw from. Nature has a record of proven winners - even though parts of it are brutal. This species needs the basic

soundness of Naturalism. **Can** Naturalists deliver? **Should** Naturalists deliver? **What** should Naturalists deliver? But *why* should Naturalists be allowed to deliver anything anyway? Hasn't their day drawn to a close?

In the long term. Okay, here is where I have been heading. While it may *seem* we are breaking free from Naturalism, in reality, we are still under the total domination of Nature. The Artificial Age, with all its metaphysical valuations, is a facade that is masking *the great Natural leveler right before our eyes*. It makes its presence known to us every day, yet we are blinded to its reality. I am speaking about - the sun. It is dying. When it dies, we, and the whole planet, *die*. The Artificial Age will be totally swallowed by Naturalism. With no Creator, the Naturalist is the only hope for mankind in this circumstance. See if you agree.

The Options

I can only think of three potential options for deliverance from our dying sun. I believe Humanists are incapable of directing us to success as they are already running in all the wrong directions. The Naturalist must arise and seize the moment - and seize the species. They alone can enter our species progression *physically and metaphysically* and set a course that *might* be able to thwart our impending doom. You will see how this ties in with abortion. So, here are the three possible escapes from a dead sun.

Option One: Hope an alien race finds us and saves us before our sun dies.

Option Two: Find, and then escape to, some other life supporting ecosystem.

Option Three: Find a way to refuel or rejuvenate our sun.

Option One: An Unimaginable Disaster in the Making

Option one must be abandoned for several reasons. First, we have no clue if intelligent life exists anywhere else anyway. Our limited time, energies and capital must be focused on realistic options. Second, even if there is intelligent life elsewhere, can they find us and get to us in time? But, there are some even more basic *natural realities* which must be weighed when considering the "alien rescue" option.

Consider this: Isn't it reasonable to assume other species are having the same problem we have - a dying sun? If so, what might be the demeanor of those aliens? Our earth may look *like Eden to them* - especially if they are desperate and weary. And our sun might look very young to them when compared to the one they have fled.

Consider this: Would they really view us ... as equals? Are there some other scenarios that might actually be more likely? And what might they be?

Well ... it may be that our planet *really is* a rare jewel in space. Livable ecosystems may be so rare that, upon analysis of the planet, they might decide to eliminate any species that is producing adverse effects on the rare air, rare palatable waters, and rare plant yielding dirt. In such a case, there is one species on our globe that

pops to mind for immediate extermination.

But ... our end may not be that dramatic. Maybe they would simply analyze this ecosystem for dangers and threats *to them*. Every life form would be assessed from the microbe to man. They might decide they need to flood the planet with some kind of radiation to kill off a bacterial strain that is lethal to them. If we perish in that sanitization, well, that's just the way it goes in a universe ruled by survival of the fittest. Collateral damage, you might say.

But, then again ... there some other possible scenarios. We might be viewed as *a burden* in their quest for livable space. But, it is more likely they would consider us *competitors* in the continual search for new ecosystems. If aliens do find us, they may simply *exterminate us*, much like pests we eradicate from our living space. The cockroach has as much "right" to live on the earth as we do - but that "right" doesn't seem to help them too much. If there is some species, or species (plural), with the ability to wander the universe, we may be in *their living space* - more than they are in *ours*.

Of course ... it is possible *they won't* exterminate us. A *worse fate* may be in store. Maybe they will decide we are useful as *slave labor*. But then again, we might be more valuable as *a protein source*. We might be herded into human stockyards. Maybe Naturalism, and its laws (i.e., a brutal survival of the fittest), *extend past our atmosphere and into the far reaches of this universe!* It is beyond foolish *to assume* Naturalism only exists on our planet. Naturalists, where are you? Our calls into space may be the smell of honey to bears. These "bears" may soon rip into our ecosystem for all the honey it has to offer - including us. Maybe in our metaphysical naivety, we are calling out to ravenous wolves who have caught the scent - and are on the way. Furthermore, the species that finds us may have escaped a dying planet before (or two or three of them) and they might be *forever cured* of any kind of metaphysical naivety in exchange for a purified, distilled form of - *survival of the fittest*. Surprise, surprise. Things may always resort to this lowest common denominator after all.

If these aliens are *only intent on survival*, and if they *come to us* they will undoubtedly be technologically superior. We will be at their mercy. Our best defenses, and offenses, may be little more than toys. Our species may indeed be destined for a nightmarish destiny in the bowels of a superior race. There is no telling how they might deem our utility. Symbiotic relationships, though possible, are not the norm. Do you really think they will see us, and treat us ... *as equals*? That does not even happen in our own societies. We have permanent subcultures in every society on the globe. Some societies even label others - "Third world." Furthermore, if there are roving aliens out there, is it possible they are a subculture *from their own planet* - they being the technological victors? They may have left "inferior" subcultures behind. It would be like the Communist Chinese being the ones who escaped our planet. Do you think they would drag along some white capitalists, or Islamic fundamentalists, or African tribesmen? If roving aliens left "the inferior" behind to their dying sun, then how would

we rate in their valuation system? This universe may be more bleak than we can even imagine. But what if these roving bands were forced to leave many of their loved ones behind? They might be more interested in going back *and rescuing them* - not us.

The Dodo

I am sure you are familiar with the dodo bird. They innocently walked up to humans ... who had clubs in their hands. They are now extinct. Those poor, stupid dodos. They meant no harm. But, this system of reality boasts a hard, cold truth: naivety by any species dooms it. It is just a matter of time before an adversary will arise, exploit the weakness, and exterminate the “foolish” species. Even in the best of times, hostile life forms try to discover, and exploit, weaknesses in others. How many microbes are after us? And sometimes the aggressors who cause the extinction of a species, fail to adapt to the new environment they create, *and go into extinction along with their host!* Natural law is brutal. My point? Responsible, realistic, atheistic, Naturalists must think and act soberly - according to known natural law. It is *absurd* to assume that basic evolutionary principles stop at our atmosphere’s edge. Indeed, *the opposite must be assumed*. Naturalists should be the first to halt this insane calling into outer space. But, maybe we are just dodos. Dodos did not know they were dodos even when their skulls were being crushed. They were just doing what dodos do. Yes, maybe they are closer an evolutionary ancestor to us than we know. Maybe closer than the ape.

Option Two and Three: The Goals That Give Direction to Metaphysical Valuations

If we decide it is not prudent to hope for deliverance by the benevolent hands of aliens (or claws, or whatever constitutes their appendages), then there is but one other route for us. We must take matters into *our* own hands. Ironically, nature itself *has already created the goals* for a valid metaphysical valuation system. We must either *artificially escape this system*, or *artificially reinvigorate our sun* - or both! Before the development of tools, this was never an option. Nature was in 100% control 100% of the time. But we are only at the very beginning of breaking that mastery. We must now marshal all our resources in a gallant attempt to defy our coming, natural extinction at the hands of a life-giving (yet betraying) sun. And make no mistake about this: dying suns are going to be our perpetual problem. We are just dealing with the first one. We need *geniuses* if we are going to have any hope of success! This *urgent need* establishes the formal position of the Naturalist in relation to abortion in The Artificial Age.

Why the Naturalist in The Artificial Age is Now Even More Fiercely Pro-life

I stated this a bit earlier. Now the reasoning behind such an assertion. There is no way to know where these needed, progressive, mutated geniuses will come from. They arise *randomly*. We need brilliant scientists, theorists and inventors. We need skilled laborers to make the inventions, explorers to test the inventions, and troubleshooters to

adapt and adjust those inventions along the way. We need technical and administrative people as well as inspirational political leaders who will foster world cooperation. And we will still need artists and entertainers to give relief and refreshment to these producers. *Therefore, it is imperative to bring up as many human life forms into adulthood as possible.* Naturalists, in the Artificial Age, are even *more fiercely pro-life* than the previously fierce pro-life Naturalists of the Natural Age. This pro-life posture is **the base** of a metaphysical valuation system *developed by Naturalists* for the Artificial Age. The preborn have never needed “rights” in Naturalism - and still do not need them. The preborn have always *been right*, and continue *to be right* - even in The Artificial Age. There will never be a time the preborn *is not right*. In fact, part of our strategy to defeat nature may include entering into, and artificially accelerating, our species progression. I will give an example shortly. The Naturalist of this age must teach our species the dilemma nature has handed us, and then see what each person can contribute to this world challenge. This calls for a new *valuation* system - assuming “no Creator.”

“Scientific Metaphysics”

This is really an oxymoron. But the Naturalist’s *metaphysical* system (another linguistic and conceptual oxymoron) must be called something. I guess to label this new valuation system “scientific metaphysics” is as valid as anything else. But, this metaphysical system does not create “rights” for anyone. It is still based upon doing what *is right* for Naturalism’s goals - in this case, to overcome our coming natural doom. Our ultimate *natural* adversary is nature itself. What a twisted web we find ourselves in! Anyone, or anything, that is not an ally in winning this challenge, has no protective “rights.” And, if any *benevolences* created by these “scientific metaphysics” prove counterproductive, they can be, and should be, immediately rescinded. Also, none of these unnatural benevolences should *automatically* be extended on any alien species we might encounter. Indeed, desperation might dictate we *need* to revert back to a raw survival mode in *our search* for new homes. By necessity, we might have to view life on other planets ... as dodos. That option must always remain open. In the end, we may never really escape the most basic of all atheistic, natural law - survival of the fittest.

By the way, if one day we happen upon a planet of aliens who are living on a dying planet with no way of escape, do you think we will come to their rescue - *and then consider them our equals?* Will we take them aboard and transfer them to some Eden-type planet, and then fly off? Will we happily give them *full access* to all we have developed and discovered and entrust them with the keys to our labs, homes, and institutions? But we think that if we are discovered by aliens they will treat us as their equals - or, minimally, *with respect?* Sober, atheistic Naturalists, I am trying to separate you, and your valuation system, from pseudo evolutionists - Humanists - who are debasing you. But you just stand there, sheepishly looking at the ground, while they have an arm around you, gleefully waving to the heavens, announcing our presence and

good will - *to who knows what!* But, maybe they are like the charmer of the cobra ... *and have charmed you!* Somehow, Humanists, with a totally inferior valuation system, *are dominating* the stronger valuation system - you! It makes one wonder who is the real dodo. Maybe this treatise will act as a smelling salt, and clear the cobwebs, so you come to your senses and take your rightful place over all the forms of Humanistic thought and valuation. But, our sun's clock is ticking

It should also be noted that any metaphysical valuation based upon *human or theological* speculation would have no place in this new system. If any of those values *happen to agree* with "scientific metaphysics," that *does not* serve as validation of those speculations. For example, even though Naturalists agree with Biblical pro-lifers on abortion, Naturalism is not validating the Biblical Theology's metaphysics. They agree by accident.

The Power, Yet Fragility, of This Metaphysical Era

In spite of all I have forwarded thus far, one might still sincerely ask, "*If Humanism is so wrong, then why is it triumphing over Naturalism all over the globe? The more advanced societies are developing more and more "rights," and it seems as though the world, as a whole, is recognizing more and more rights.*" These are legitimate observations and inquiries.

On one hand, this metaphysical era is fairly powerful. And it has the potential of being quite powerful *if man can eventually overcome Nature*. That is why Naturalists must take over the metaphysical domain. They are the only ones who can possibly devise a disciplined system to defeat nature. But it is a mistake, and tremendously short-sighted, to think Nature is not a present and formidable foe. Even in our present time, the bulk of the living species are still operating in Naturalism. Just turn your television to "Animal Planet" and watch it for five minutes. To be sure, we have artificially interrupted some of this, but where we are absent, Naturalism has 100% rule. And the moment we cease imposing our tools, weapons, or valuations upon Nature, Naturalism moves right back in with **100% rule**. Not a trace of our contrary valuations remain in place. There is absolutely *no net gain*. How can one believe that The Artificial Age and Humanistic valuations *are winning* when Naturalism automatically reclaims any vacated turf? At best, we are only *interrupters* of Naturalism and not defeaters of it. If all our artificial tools and weapons disappeared today, and could never come back, what kind of species would we soon be? Well, in simplistic summary ... Tarzan would be back.

Cracks in Our Dams

Naturalism's laws don't just hover in the background. Just turn your television to "The Discovery Channel" for another five minutes. Waves of Naturalism beat against man's unnatural victories, and creates cracks in those restraining dams. For example, in the few short years the unnatural act of abortion has been performed on a mass scale in

this country, something quite subtle has been occurring. The States that advance abortion most vigorously *are not growing as fast* as the pro-life States. What a surprise. In a voting republic, dwindling numbers are not the way to keep one's policies in power. And this shift has occurred in forty short years (Of course, many of these States have also embraced homosexuality - thus accelerating slower growth rates). Abortion is a doomed "right." It is destined to fail on every count. It is just a matter of time. And its demise may be much sooner than its proponents realize (to be discussed later). It is as though Nature exploits any weakness in our metaphysical madness, creates cracks in the dam, and then seeps up through all the layers of "rights." Naturalism mocks us. But worse yet, it toys with us - like a cat does with a mouse. Even if this Artificial Age successfully defies the Waves of Naturalism for millions of years, in millions of ways, the moment our sun dies, Naturalism reclaims everything. That tsunami will roar in with 100% dominance. We, and everything we know, will drown to Naturalism. But, our situation may truly be even more perilous. It is probably ridiculous to assume our sun will simply die a slow and peaceful death. If it simply "hiccups" on its way down, we could all be fried. We are living with an inoperable aortic aneurism ready to explode at any moment.

To Speak on Naturalism - a Waste of Time?

As you know, I have repeatedly asked, "*Naturalists, where are you?*" Why have Naturalists allowed Humanists to claim Evolution as their base when they *attack Naturalism at its core*? Case in point once again, "*Behold, Tarzan the criminal!*" If he pulverizes the skinny little caveman for approaching Jane, he is jailed. If a skinny cave man is a homosexual, extra punishment is added for a "hate crime." And if Tarzan *kills* him, he is *a murderer*, possibly confined for life ... or executed. But, there are many other ways to now dispose of Tarzan. If Jane doesn't want to have sex with him, he is a "rapist" - even if he has bowed down before a requirement of "marriage!" And, if he navigates through this metaphysical morass and does impregnate Jane, she has the "right" ... to kill the fruit of his evolutionary victory? Naturalists, you really do need to respond. Secular Humanists in the United States have successfully propagated the *weakest form of human thought* through the entire public education system - even though graduate school. They pump out "Evolutionists" - who fight for "abortion rights," "homosexual rights," "minority rights," "social justice," "economic justice" ... on and on and on. And they are Naturalists? But, I have never even heard a peep from a Naturalist on this Humanistic fraud. So, where are the Naturalists? Could it be ... there aren't any? Do we all instinctively know we are more than just an animal? Maybe this discussion on Naturalism has been a waste of time - like a wolf howling to a dead, unresponsive moon. It is now time to make a hard right turn.

The Beginning of a Hard Right Turn

Science, when accurate, is a solid base. Anything that is *actually true in any realm*

is, by definition, solid. So, all **accurate** science is a firm base from which to establish valuations. But, *what if* there is more to existence than just this physical world? Specifically, *what if* supernatural realities actually do exist? *What if* there is a Creator who can suspend natural law any time He chooses? And, *what if* man really is more than an animal? That would mean metaphysical valuations, *at least the correct ones*, are real and valid! Furthermore, that would also mean Naturalistic science is only valid **to a certain point**. It could only take us so far in the quest for accurate valuations. Once crossing its valid limits, then natural science assertions would fall into error! So, here is the sixty-four *thousand* dollar question: “*Is metaphysical reasoning, and valuation, actually valid?*” If the answer is “*Yes,*” then here is the sixty-four *million* dollar question: “*Which basic system is valid, a Humanist valuation system or a Theological one?*” And if that can somehow be determined, then here is the sixty-four *quad-zillion* dollar question: “*Which valuation system under the broad umbrella of the right one (Humanist or Theological) is the right one?*” These questions are the heart of all matters. To discover the right base means one can develop, learn and employ the right valuations on all the subjects and circumstances of life! But how can one possibly discover “the right base?” Before answering this (wow ... what an assertion), we must first give a cursory glance at the umbrella of Humanism and the umbrella of Theology.

Metaphysics Arose From

Man’s metaphysical capacity arose in one of two ways. It either arose *naturally*, or man *was created* with this capacity. Naturalists believe this capacity *arose naturally*. Humanists are all over the board on this one. But, in its pure form, the Humanist is a **practical** atheist. Even if they think there may be a Creator, they dismiss Him as a valid source for valuations, and make up their own standards. At the other end of the spectrum are the Theological valuation systems. They believe man *was created* with this metaphysical ability. Let’s make a thumbnail sketch of these positions, and make some preliminary determinations on their validity.

Humanism And Naturalism and Humanism Against Naturalism. If one believes our metaphysical capacity arose *naturally* and there is *no outside authority* over it (i.e., “God”), then it is quite reasonable to expect, at least initially, there would be *no universal agreement* on valuations. And that is what is found. All kinds of values spring from the various culture pools, creating different, and competing, systems. Even though the mutation is universal, the spectrum of values looks like the spread from a shotgun blast. There are many reasons behind these varying sensibilities. Geographic isolation is one factor. And very often, a strong personality sets the direction of culture’s valuations for generations. Up to this point, Naturalists *and* Humanists are in agreement. But things quickly turn to Naturalism *against* Humanism. They are on totally different planes as to *the validity* of this metaphysical ability - and how (or if) this ability can be rightly

employed. Naturalists view the speculations of Humanism like champagne lifted up in a toast - on the Titanic as it sails out of port. Humanists celebrate each “right” they invent, but are oblivious to *the scientific fact* the Ocean below is ready to swallow it up - along with them. When that super volcano erupts, or that big asteroid hits, or the sun dies, Humanism will take **its natural place** - nonexistence. Naturalists know the only *possible* valid metaphysical system is the “*scientific metaphysical*” one proposed earlier. And that one will prove valid *only if* it is successful in taking this “*a shotgun spread*” of valuations, meld all the pellets into a single bullet, and shoot down Nature.

Theological. But what if there really is a Creator? If so, then metaphysical valuations do exist - at least for “Him.” After all, if He created this physical reality, then He existed before it and probably exists beyond it. That makes Him *more than* physical reality. That surely places Him into metaphysics (“beyond” the physical). But even if there is a Creator, it does not automatically follow this has any affect on man. Some questions still must be answered.

1. *Has the Creator determined man is to participate in metaphysics, or is man just another animal in Nature?* (Even asking this question answers it.)
2. *Is it possible to discover the Creator’s valuation system?* Maybe He does not believe there is such a thing as murder. Maybe He does. Maybe He does not believe there is such a thing as theft. But, maybe He does. Maybe rape is an invalid metaphysical valuation. But, maybe it is valid. Maybe the Creator has moral valuations, and He expects man to abide by them. But, how can we *know* that? “Sacred writings” are all over the globe - all claiming divine authorship. How can a person possibly sort all this out? For me, the answer is quite simple. But first

The Unthinkable Metaphysical Possibility

There is another nearly unspeakable, and unthinkable, possibility to our existence. If there actually is a Creator, is it *possible* He/She/It created this place, allowed us to naturally evolve and then at “the right time” injected us with the capacity to reason? And this was done to see if we could harness our metaphysical ability and save ourselves from a dying sun? Maybe the earth is really a floating petri dish. And what if this experiment includes other worlds? Perhaps different “variables” are being injected into these worlds to see which reasoning beings, if any, will defeat their natural challenges. Who knows, maybe the victor who masters nature will be rewarded with unimaginable spoils. But, then again, maybe this Creator will have Its curiosity satisfied and simply crumple up the experiment and toss it into some kind of cosmic “trash-can.” I’ve probably been exposed to too much science fiction - so forget I even brought this up.

A Closer Look at the Theological Valuations

There are many competing religions and resultant valuations. Some faithful

adherents are ready *to die* for their religion, while others are ready *to kill* in defense of theirs. There are two interesting Biblical accounts on this concern of defending God.

The first involved a judge named Gideon. One night, he toppled a couple of religious idols - the altar of Baal and the Asherah beside it. When the men of the city ascertained Gideon was the guilty party, they came to Gideon's father and demanded surrender of his son for execution. The father responded, "*will you contend for Baal, or will you deliver him?... If he is a god, let him contend for himself...*" (Jg 6:25-32). In other words, a god who is truly God can act on His own behalf and sullied honor.

Similarly, in the New Testament, the Jewish Council had ordered Peter, and the apostles, to stop preaching about Jesus and His resurrection. When they disobeyed, they were brought before the Council to account for the insolence. When the Council did not get the response they wanted, they were intent on killing them. But one of their number, Gamaliel, warned against this action. After recounting several false movements, he said, "*... stay away from these men and let them alone, for if this plan or action should be of men, it will be overthrown; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them; or else you may even be found fighting against God*" (Acts 5:17-42). If we truly do have a Creator (which I believe we do), He does not need man to protect Him, or His agenda. Indeed, it is the other way around. The assertions I am about to make (or have already made), I will be happy to defend, but please do not think I am trying to defend God. I just hope to represent Him correctly. That is my only goal in what is now coming.

The Real Deal

There is a historical marker that gives us real direction. This marker has had a profound impact on where I have turned for information on valid valuations. "*... (If) Christ has not been raised (from the dead) ... your faith is vain ... and if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless ... If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most to be pitied.*" If Jesus did not rise from the dead, "*let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die*" (1Cor 15:14,17,19 & 32). If Jesus is still in the grave, why listen to Him? Do you think He is some kind of "good teacher?" He said we need to eat His flesh and drink His blood (Jn 6:53). He also counseled us to cut off our offending hand and pluck out our offending eye (Mt 5:29,30). In fact, He offended so many people that a group of them beat Him to a pulp and nailed Him to chunks of wood - and after He was dead, they thrust a spear into Him just to make sure He was dead. Why not rather listen to Confucius, or Plato, or Mohammad, or Ghandi, or the Pope ... or some other valuations leader? But, then again, why listen to *any* mortal anyway? They have the same problem as the rest of us. It's called - death. They can't even stop personal diseases, much less death. So, why let any mortal have any say over anything you may want to do or think? Death rules them too.

Of course, if one physically walked out of the grave after being stone cold dead - that changes things. In fact, if someone did physically rise from the dead, declared he

was incapable of lying, and asserted he “lives forever,” it seems logical that dying ones (like you and me) would seek to find out every syllable he ever uttered (Tit 1:2 and Rev 1:18). Does it make any sense to entrust my views about life to scientists *who can't even figure out how one single sperm cell* - is alive - much less make one? This is the smallest and simplest of all human cells. They don't even have a clue how a *virus cell* is alive - or how it can lay dormant and then become active! Am I going to listen to their “wisdom” about *life* when there is One now standing with trillions of *eternally living cells*? (I am assuming Jesus' resurrected body consists of cells - but His body mass may be a different type of living matter). It isn't even fair to stand up these poor old dead and dying scientists against Him. And logic dictates that a resurrected, eternal Being would possess unchallenged authority on any matter He would choose to address. His views on anything would be automatically authoritative and superior to any contrary view. Even the most brilliant *Naturalist*, working strictly with the most sound of empirical data, who then forwards some contrary view, would be like a poor dodo waddling up to this eternal Being, just to be clubbed. But what about contrary *Humanistic* assertions? Clearly, those contentions have even less hope of prevailing. They arise *from opinions* rattling around in brains of fanciful speculation *void of hard science*. When I became persuaded that Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, James, Peter, and Jude were real men and reliable witnesses to Jesus' resurrection (some were first hand witnesses and some “interviewed” first hand witnesses), that settled everything for me. All this ultimately does get quite simple for me. Rise from the dead equals authority; stay in the grave ... well, you get it.

Incidentally, last I checked, Evolution is still rightly called a theory. And this theory *does* conflict with Biblical material on several fronts, and on some very substantive matters. I address some of this in, “*Death and the Bible.*” It's free at www.freelygive-n.com.

So, here is my position. There is no theological system with a credible resurrection account of the primary figure of that system - except Christianity. Genesis to Revelation has been historically recognized as its written materials. I have dismissed all other religions, and their writings, solely on the power and authority of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. That is why I am only going to present the Biblical Theistic metaphysical valuation system as a valid - the valid - system of thought. But I do agree with Paul. If Jesus **did not** rise from the dead, “*let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die*” (1Cor 15:32). Let's just party out! But, the burden lies with you to examine the evidence and disprove the claims of those witnesses cited earlier. If you can *once and for all* expose the resurrection of Jesus Christ *as a myth or hoax*, you will be instantly, and forever, famous ... well, at least until the sun expires.

Created Metaphysics - The Bible's Assertions

The Bible teaches that God created man with a unified metaphysical system. The first man, Adam, was not perfect, but he was innocent, and he did commune with his

Creator. But then something happened that shattered that single bullet into this shotgun spread. When Adam rebelled, he was separated from God and lost access to the Creator's metaphysical system. This is one part of the inheritance he bequeathed upon all of us - and is the root of our confusion over values. This has created a great void. The genesis of all Humanistic metaphysics is an attempt to fill this void, innately sensed by man, with some kind of a valid valuation construct. The quest for universal standards *is a proof*, in a round about way, there is a Creator. Man instinctively believes there is a universal valuation system - somewhere. The problem lies in *the lack of agreement* as to what constitutes the right valuations - and that is the basis of all human conflict. Some think they "have it" and seek to impose it on everybody else - by law or conquest. But all the Humanistic systems, and all false theological systems, *are smoke*. But, is there a true central fire?

Man intuitively knows he is more than an animal. Every culture in history demonstrates the universal belief there is more to *human existence* than a simple, brutal Naturalism. That is why I can't find any *real* Naturalists. I am not sure there are any. This also explains why the pseudo "evolutionists" (Humanists) apply Naturalism to everything in the universe - *except man*. This innate bias (that we are more than an animal), blinds these "Evolutionists" to their hypocrisies and inconsistencies in logic referenced earlier. Man cannot really think *naturally* because man is only *partially* natural. We are *physically* made from "the dust of the earth," but we are *mentally and emotionally (metaphysically)* made in the image of God. We are natural *and* metaphysical beings.

In this smoky confusion, it is impossible to reach consensus on metaphysical valuations. Some systems embrace polygamy while others jail citizens for it. Some systems embrace homosexuality, while others will forever reject it. Some systems select a particular racial group as superior, while others attempt to treat all groups equally. Different valuation systems are vying for acceptance and dominance. While many thinking humans are honestly seeking for a valid metaphysical system, others are afraid of having their own system challenged - and will readily kill any challengers to it. Jesus made an interesting remark about this human dilemma. "*If a blind man guides a blind man, both will fall into a pit*" (Mt 15:14). Errant Humanistic or Theological metaphysical valuation systems, or Naturalism that rejects valid metaphysics, are blind guides leading blinded individuals into a pit.

So, Bottom Line, How Do The Different Systems Rank Against Each Other?

Let's conclude this part. *If there is no Creator*, the truths of Naturalism are the strongest form of thought and valuation. The metaphysics of any system, Humanistic or Theological, are invalid speculations. *But if there is a Creator* of the physical *and* metaphysical order, and *if* that Creator has revealed His values, then *accurate science* along with those *accurate metaphysical values* form **the broadest, strongest, and**

deepest, of all possible thought and valuation. The Bible satisfies the second part of this formulation. Indeed, a full understanding of science and Biblical valuations result in 100% correct thinking and valuations. This forms an unchallenged breadth and depth of thought *far superior* to any competing system. Here is why.

First, all accurate science is embraced. After all, the Creator is the ultimate scientist. He invented all the materials and laws in the first place. The Bible is not a science book, but it is accurate in what it does say about science. But, the Bible also makes it clear that the Creator is not bound by the natural laws He made. Biblical miracles are demonstrations of this truth. Any science that denies the Creator's ability to supersede natural law has fallen into error. And any science that contradicts a Bible assertion is inaccurate, or incomplete, science.

Second, it accurately informs on the character, nature, and activity of the Creator. That one fact alone makes a Biblical Theist system broader than all other systems - *infinitely broader*.

Third, it affirms the validity of metaphysical valuations for man, *but elevates them from human opinion (Humanism) to bestowments* from that same Creator. Therefore, when one crosses into the metaphysical realm, the steps continue on solid ground. For one small example, let's again look at murder, theft, and rape. These are not only declared to be *valid* metaphysical concepts, but they are also judged to be *evil* actions. Civilly, this opens proper grounds for two tracks of human endeavor. The first track designs laws and programs to reward those who abstain from these actions. The second track designs laws and programs that correctly deal with those who violate these prohibited actions. Now civil systems can be developed (and employed) with great confidence as their values draw from the Creator's own views.

So, Where Does This Leave Humanism?

You can already answer this. "*Humanism, in all its forms, is the weakest of all thought and valuation.*" And why is it so weak? The reason is very simple. The only time a Humanistic valuation arrives at a correct valuation *is when it agrees* with accurate science or *when it agrees* with the Creator's metaphysical valuations. It contributes nothing toward truth. **It can't.** It can only add error in the noble quest of searching for valid valuations. That is why it is the weakest form of human thought and valuation. On one hand, *if there is no Creator*, any Humanistic sentiment contrary to Naturalism is error. On the other hand, *if there is a Creator*, anytime a Humanistic position arises contrary to the Creator's view, it is error. Humanism has nowhere it can go - except into error. It is institutionally trapped into the lowest form of thought and values. That is why Humanism is dead. But in its death throws, it is causing extensive damage. Read on.

Single Humanistic Error Multiplies into Double Error, Triple Error ... and Beyond

Here is one example of this common dynamic. When Humanists declare preborn

humans are subhuman, this is error *scientifically and Biblically*. It is double error. But even if this is counted as only *one* error, this is but *the beginning* of **errors** (plural). To next assert it is okay to kill the preborn is error number two *scientifically and Biblically*. To then maintain the father has *no interest* in the life of the preborn is another error *scientifically and Biblically* (Scientifically, the Naturalist views the preborn as his evolutionally victorious fruit and forward that life. Biblically, the father is responsible for the care and support of his offspring). But errors continue. To maintain the medical profession is performing a noble service by killing the preborn, is contrary to Naturalism and Biblical Theism at every turn. To the assert governing officials have no interest in, or responsibility for, the preborn, leads to a string of grievous mistakes (to soon be addressed). But, for now, as you can see, when Humanism declared the preborn as subhuman, that was but the first fracture. It quickly turned into *compounded* fractures.

Why I have Taken So Much Time on These Three Valuation Systems

There are really two reasons. **First**, the prevailing caricature of a Christian is that he/she is a real simpleton. Unfortunately, this is sometimes an accurate depiction. The reasoning does not go much deeper than: “*God said it, I believe it, and that settles it!*” This is like someone saying a thousand years ago, “*The earth is not the center of the universe.*” While both assertions are correct, some people want a little more information to support the conclusion. Concerning the abortion issue, many pro-lifers forward little more than this: “*God is the Creator of life, the preborn is alive, therefore no one has the right to take its life. End of story.*” Such simplicity drives “thinkers” crazy. While this simplistic logic is correct, I have decided to address this more substantially and challenge the logic, base assumptions and “evidences” *of competing systems*. While I may be overlooking some angles of thought you may want to challenge, there is one thing of which I am certain. Our Creator challenges *you*, one on one, to ... “*‘Present your case,’ the Lord says. ‘Bring near your case, bring forward your strong arguments,’ the King of Jacob says ... ‘State your cause, that you may be proved right’*” (Isa 41:12 and 43:26). He can field your challenges and answer your materials and objections.

But here is the **second** reason I have spent some time dissecting the various valuation systems. I know professing Christians who *are intimidated* by arguments from Naturalists, or Humanists, or even errant Theological claims. It is not necessary to avoid, sidestep, or wither before contrarian conclusions from any field of thought. With instruction, and some evaluation, Christians can *intellectually* destroy “*speculations and every lofty thing raised up against the knowledge of God*” (2Cor 10:5). Let’s now turn our attention to life - and abortion.

So, What Does the Creator Say About Life?

“*See now that I, I am He and there is no god besides Me. It is I who put to death and give life ...*” (Deut 32:39). He only has to say something one time. The amount of

wisdom and power behind these three little words, “*and give life,*” is unspeakable. As scientists search into the reality of any living entity’s components, the complexity and mystery of life have become *more and more overwhelming*. Life is *alien* to all the physical elements on the planet. The Creator infuses life into naturally inorganic matter and it becomes living matter. Anything alive is a miracle. And anything that is alive is alive because the Creator *has made it alive*. This “life element” is so far beyond our capacity that He doesn’t even bother us with its “mechanics.” He just lets us know He is the Author of it and the ultimate possessor of it. He grants it as He wishes and withdraws it as He wishes (See Jn 5:21, 1Tim 6:13, Ro 4:17, and Acts17:25). And, in case anyone misses this ...

God Clearly States He Has Made All Humans

“Know that the Lord Himself is God; it is He who made us and not we ourselves” (Ps 100:3).

*“It is I who made the earth, **and created man upon it**”* (Isa 45:12).

And That Includes “Defective” Ones

When Moses was trying to avoid going before Pharaoh (citing his slowness of speech and lack of eloquence), God made these revealing statements. “*Who has made man’s mouth? Or who makes him dumb or deaf, or seeing or blind? Is it not I, the Lord?*” (Ex 4:11). This may look like three questions, but they are three statements. See also John 9:3.

*“...who are you, O man, who answers back to God? The thing **molded** will not say to **the molder**, ‘Why did you make me like this,’ will it? Or does not the potter have a right over the clay, to make from the same lump one vessel for honorable use, and another for common use?”* (Ro 9:20,21). Tough stuff.

*“Woe to the one who quarrels with **his Maker** - an earthenware vessel among the vessels of earth!”* (Isa 45:9).

And This Work Begins in the Womb

David stated, “*For Thou didst form my inward parts; **Thou didst weave me in my mother’s womb** ...*” (Ps 139:13).

*“Did not He who **made me in the womb**, make him (a slave), and the same One fashion **us in the womb?**”* (Job 31:15 - Job was talking about the need to respond to complaints by slaves against himself. Slaves were made by God in the womb, too).

*“...when Elizabeth heard Mary’s greeting, **the baby leapt in her womb** ... for joy”* (Lk 1:41,44).

*“Just as you do not know the path of the wind, and how bones are formed in the womb of the pregnant woman, or how **the spirit enters the bones in the womb**, so you do not know the activity of God **who makes all things**”* (Eccl 11:5).

God is responsible for opening, or closing, the womb in relation to conception (Gen 29:31, and 1Sam 1:5). Biblical Theology places the “hands” of the Creator in all human life - from the fertile egg forward. Of course, His activity predates the fertile egg, as the sperm and unfertilized egg are alive because of His actions. So, even though fertilization explodes into the construction of a new human, the Creator’s active labor was already in full swing.

“That Makes the Womb ...”

If the information just presented is actually from the Creator, then that makes the womb ... *His workplace*. That means any time “the hands of man” enter that place, they are entering directly into the workplace of the Creator. The most important of things in life are usually very simple. That was a very simple statement.

Attacking Human Life in the Womb

For “the hands of man” to attack human life in a woman’s womb - at any stage of development - is ... well, let’s just say, not a very good idea. But, maybe I should be a bit more bold in this assertion. How about this: *“To attack and kill human life in the womb is the most vile, vicious, and heinous of all civil offenses. It is as cowardly as it is lethal and is an atrocious act of injustice. To call abortion, ‘an abomination’ is too gentle a term.”* I guess that is a bit more clear. Charges this strong must be backed up.

The Exodus Passage

“And if men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child so that she has a miscarriage, yet there is no further injury, he shall surely be fined as the woman’s husband may demand of him; and he shall pay as the judges decide. But if there is any further injury, then you shall appoint as a penalty life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise” (Ex 21:22-25).

This passage has been used to challenge pro-life advocates. The argument goes something like this: *“How do you explain this passage? It is clear the preborn is not given the same value as a full human. The death of the preborn **only results in a fine**. The death of the mother (if that occurs), calls for **the execution** of the perpetrator. It is clear the mother is more valuable. The preborn is not considered a person and has no legal standing. Commentaries on this passage even say this. So, how can you pro-lifers levy a charge of **first degree murder** for abortion, when this passage only has a fine? You guys like to skip over this passage don’t you?”* Yes, many do. But, let’s really take a look at this.

I will start by saying I do wish the charge for the accidental killing of the preborn would have been a manslaughter charge. In the Law, an accidental killing was manslaughter - not a fine. The “killer” had to immediately flee to one of the six cities of

refuge. Then came a trial. If it was determined this *actually was* an accidental killing, the “manslayer” had to stay inside the boundaries of the chosen city of refuge until the death of the high priest. If that manslayer left the city prematurely, and the blood avenger found him/her, the avenger could kill the manslayer (Num 35:9-15, 22-28, 32). But this is not the case with the accidental killing of the preborn. Only a fine was required along with judicial review. So, if the Law is a valid guide for how to govern sinners (particularly in civil matters as I previously asserted in the Ebook, “*Capital Punishment and the Bible*”), I will have to be happy with a fine for the accidental killing of the preborn. So, each time a preborn is *accidentally killed* a fine is to be levied as the father demands. But, what if the preborn is *deliberately* killed? We will return to this question.

Double Jeopardy

So, does the Exodus passage declare the preborn is not “a person,” and has no legal standing? Actually, this passage does not support such conclusions. *First*, the accidental killing of a preborn was *a crime* even if **no** injury occurred to the mother. The death triggered a series of public, legal events. None of the outcomes were positive for the offending party(s). The husband began the process and was free to demand whatever he financially wanted from the offender. A civil judge then entered the fray, apparently to decide how the offender was to pay what was demanded. If the preborn had no legal standing, there would be no fine for killing it. But the judge’s duties did not end there. This leads to the *second* point. The mother was to be examined, and if she was physically injured in any way, that same injury was to be inflicted on the perpetrator(s) of the *accident* ... “*life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise (welt for welt)*” (Ex 21:23,24). Whoa! “*Life for life!*” If the pregnant woman died, so also the perpetrator(s) died. What was normally a manslaughter charge (she was accidentally killed) suddenly escalated into a *capital offense!* The presence of a preborn is the only reason for such an escalation. It is clearly more than a blob of protoplasm. These men were fighting *each other*, and may not *have even known* a woman was around their “battlefield.” - *much less pregnant*. But to *accidentally* kill her, even though oblivious to her, or her pregnancy, *meant death*. This is not a little particular.

The preborn clearly has standing, as these penalties attest. All this legal jeopardy occurred for *accidental harm!* But what if “accidental” injury occurs to a mother while there is a *deliberate attack* on her preborn? We will come back to this, too.

“Answer the questions! What if the killing of the preborn is not accidental? What if injury to, or death of, the mother occurs when deliberately attacking her preborn?”

Well, let’s first assume the penalties *are the same* for an accidental incident (the Exodus passage) and a planned invasion (an abortion). This is clearly error, but let’s do that anyway and see what effect this would have on the abortion industry.

To begin, instead of *receiving* money for killing a preborn, the abortionist *would pay a fine* to the father as he might demand. So, if fines for killing the preborn were levied, the abortion industry would soon go belly up. Next, if the abortionist “accidentally” harmed the mother in any way, that same harm would be inflicted upon the abortionist. If she was accidentally bruised, the abortionist would receive the same bruise. If she bled, the abortionist would bleed the same amount. And if she died, the abortionist’s life would be required. So, to inflict the same harm on the abortionist as the mother “accidentally” received in any of the abortionist’s procedures - well, that would end the industry in short order.

As far as harming the mother - well, there are accidents, and then there are accidents. It is clear the Bible views a pregnant woman’s body as a *highly protected zone*. If an abortionist “accidentally” harms a woman while attacking her preborn, how much of an “accident” is this?

For the sake of argument, let’s just say all the penalties of this Exodus passage apply to the abortion industry. Let’s levy all the penalties as if abortion was accidental harm. As a pro-lifer, I could live with this state of law.

“Wait a minute! Abortion is at the request of the pregnant woman. You are comparing apples to oranges!”

The protests continue: *“Abortion is not the loss of a wanted preborn, but the purposeful termination of an unwanted pregnancy. This is not an accident, like your Bible passage, so none of that material is relevant. And many times the father gladly pays for the abortion. He is not demanding a fine to be levied on the abortionist! Furthermore, judges have ruled it is a legal right of the mother to kill her preborn. It is her body. Civil judges are not seeking to lay blame on anyone. The medical professional is simply providing a safe and sanitary service - at the mother’s request!”* There are other ancillary points, but these are the main ones. And these points are correct. All these primary actors are in agreement on the killing of the preborn. The mother wants it dead, the father’s wishes are ultimately irrelevant, the judge wants the mother to freely decide what she wants, and the medical professional stands ready to serve the lawful request of the mother - for a fee. So, what’s the beef? Well, problems lie in each of the decisions, but the greatest travesty lies in the conclusion - abortion is a valid choice.

There are two huge assumptions *that must be true* for abortion to be a valid choice. First, the preborn must truly have *no legal standing*. Second, there must be *no* Creator of the preborn who has *an interest* in the preborn. It is at this point I want to give you a test. Of the three systems of thought we have examined (with their resultant valuations) where does this “abortion reasoning” rest?

Question One: Does it rest in Naturalism? You already know the answer to this. The preborn lie at the heart of Naturalism - in standing and interest. The Naturalist of any age recognizes the natural, superior standing of the preborn over the mother, father,

judges, and abortionists. *Before* the Artificial Age, the preborn were the fruit of the evolutionary victor; and *in* the Artificial Age, the need for geniuses to overcome our impending doom grant *standing* to the preborn. Naturalists adamantly grant *standing* and *interest* to the preborn. This entire “abortion reasoning” is foreign to Naturalism.

Question Two: Does “abortion thought” arise from Biblical Theism? That is not even worthy of a response. The Creator not only makes the preborn alive, but also actively fashions each one in the womb. He has *an interest* in everything He makes - especially humans. This interest alone grants *standing*. Each shred of abortion reasoning is alien to Biblical Theology.

Question Three and Beyond: So where does “abortion thought” rest? Abortion rests only in Humanism. It has no other home. But, you already knew that. We will look at some of the arguments for abortion forwarded by Humanists, but first ...

Abortion is not an Accidental Killing ...

and there is a Creator. The passage in Exodus actually *is irrelevant* to the abortion issue - as asserted in the complaint of “apples and oranges” above. Abortion is absolutely the *furthest thing* from *an accidental killing*. It is clearly planned, diligently prepared for, and is a very deliberate activity by all the participants. *It is totally the opposite of an accident*. It is even carried out - *by appointment!* How much more *planned* can an action be? So, here is how abortion works out before the Creator. This is based upon logic and deduction from teachings in the Bible. These statements will be listed in bullet form, and then concisely addressed.

- He is the Maker and Owner of all things.
- He is the giver of life.
- The human body has a destiny.
- The most vulnerable among us are to be protected by the stronger.
- Civilly, man can only end human life if one has been duly convicted of a capital offense.
- Abortion violates every tenant of life before the Creator. So, what charge is to levied on the perpetrators of this activity?

Bullet One: He is the Maker and Owner of All Things

Even the most casual Bible reader quickly understands this claim. It permeates the Bible. “*All things came into being through Him (Jesus); and apart from Him nothing came into being that has come into being*” (Jn 1:3). “*For in Him all things were created, both in the heavens and on earth, visible and invisible ...*” (Col 1:16). “*... for all the earth is Mine*” (Ex 19:5). “*Who has given to Me that I should repay him? Whatever is under the whole heaven is Mine*” (Job 41:11). The Creator made everything and He owns everything. That includes the preborn. It is Humanistic error to believe the

mother “owns” the preborn and she can do with it as she wishes.

Bullet Two: He is the Giver of Life

Even the most casual Bible reader understands this claim, too. “... *it is I who put to death and give life*” (Deut 32:39). He has full authority over life.

Bullet Three: The Human Body Has a Destiny

The Bible asserts there is only *one physical thing* to be eternally preserved from this entire present creation - *the physical body of each human being*. Each body is to be resurrected and is destined for eternity in the new heavens and earth - or else Hell. “*Do not marvel at this; for an hour is coming in which all who are in the tombs shall hear His voice (Jesus’), and shall come forth; those who did the good to a resurrection of life, and those who did the evil to a resurrection of judgement*” (Jn 5:28,29). When speaking to Christians in tribulation, Jesus stated, “*you will be hated by all on account of My name. Yet not a hair on your head will perish*” (Lk 21:17,18). In the Revelation, we are given a glimpse of the Great White Throne Judgement. We are told, “*the sea gave up the dead which were in it ... and they were judged ... and if anyone’s name was not found written in the book of life, he was thrown into the lake of fire*” (Read Rev 20:11-15). Each body will be changed into an immortal, imperishable body. ICorinthians 15 details this, especially verses 20-23 and 35-54. He will supersede known natural law to do this. That is no big deal to the One who created all the natural laws in the first place. Miracles are simply *a suspension* of natural law, or *a replacement* with other law, by the One who invents all the laws in the first place. He thinks them all up, sets them in the places He wants them, but is not bound or controlled by them.

It is not absolutely clear to me if the coming new heavens and earth will be remade from present materials (after being melted down), or if God is going to use new materials – or possibly a combination of both options (2Pet 3:10-13).

Bullet Four: The Most Vulnerable Among Us are to be Protected by the Stronger

God has always commanded special consideration for the most vulnerable in society. Again, this is another well known Bible tenet. In the Law, orphans, widows, and strangers were given special rights. These were *commanded* in Law. For example, the tithe of the third and sixth years, of a seven-year “tithe cycle,” was to be deposited in the local cities (not taken to Jerusalem), and orphans, widows, and strangers could take of it at will (Deut 14:28,29). Also, the corners of the fields were to be left unharvested so these groups could come and harvest their own food (Lev 19:9,10 - a working welfare system). Blind persons were to be specially protected (Lev19:14). And every fiftieth year was The Year of Jubilee. Families, who had somehow lost their land, were given fresh starts as it reverted back to them (Lev 25:39-42). This prevented a permanent underclass. This theme of protecting the vulnerable continues in the New Testament:

“And this is pure and undefiled religion in the sight of our God and Father; to look after orphans and widows in their distress, and to keep oneself unpolluted by the world” (Ja 1:27). When a person is assisting a widow or orphan in their need, that *to God* is religious activity. (Also, the moment an individual is saying, “No,” to some sin action is a religious moment.) So, how does this relate to abortion?

The preborn state is the most vulnerable time in a human’s existence. *A newborn’s cry* can potentially arrest murderous intent as a conscience might be pricked. Later, *a baby’s smile*, and soon evidenced unique traits, can stir a heart into a protective mode. Later still, *a young child* can *run away* from perceived threats. Then, at some point, a person can physically *defend* himself/herself. Even on a sickbed, pre-arrangements can be made for protection, if that need is sensed. Abortion is a lethal attack against an individual in his/her most vulnerable point in life. God expects the stronger to protect the weaker - particularly those innocent of wrongdoing.

Bullet Five: Civilly, Man Can Only End Human Life if One has been Duly Convicted of a Capital Offense

In the normal course of civil affairs, the only time a human can take another human’s life is in response to a capital offense. Executions are delegated by God to the State. Due process is required, and the executioner(s) is to be sanctioned by the State. I discuss all this in detail in the Ebook, *“Capital Punishment and the Bible.”* Clearly the preborn are *innocent humans*. It is an offense to act *in any way* against those lives. That last sentence is a massive understatement.

Bullet Six: Abortion Violates Every Tenet of Life Before the Creator. So, what charge is to levied on the perpetrators of this activity?

Abortion does violate *every single tenet of life* before the Creator. It is an attack against a unique human life that is *innocent* of wrongdoing. It is an attack by the more powerful **against** *the most vulnerable*. The mother has no valid “right” to attack that distinct human, and the “doctor” certainly has no right to do so. A preborn is *not owned* by either of them. Abortion is an attack *in an active workplace of the Creator* as He is “weaving” each person in the womb. For the “hands of man” to invade that place with lethal intent is an offense against the Creator of the highest order. This attack is a *deliberate invasion* into a protected zone with death in its mind, its heart, and its hands. A premeditated act, that unlawfully takes the life of a fellow human, is murder in the first degree. Abortion is first degree murder.

“The Bible Does Not Say Abortion is First Degree Murder - So How can You?”

You are right. In fact, the Bible does not say anything about abortion. Everything I have stated is based upon logic and deduction from Bible declarations about life, the womb, capital offenses, and the responsibility of the strong toward the more vulnerable.

“But, it is Error to Apply Western Logic to the Bible!”

Some people do assert that. The argument goes *something* like this: *“The Bible is a Book of moral principles related through stories. It was never intended to have Western logic and deduction applied to it. It is mostly oral tradition handed down through the generations. And those stories picked up various embellishments along the way. You are applying Western logic on a Middle Eastern mind set. It is error to take the Bible literally, and it was not intended to be viewed as a science book, or even an accurate accounting of historical fact.”* Well, ... good try. My study of the Bible has not validated assertions like those stated above. In fact, my experience has been just the opposite. While I will readily agree the Bible is not a science book, what it does say about science is accurate. For example, He makes a very simple statement about the creation of man. *“... the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground ...”* (Gen 2:7). Sure enough, detailed physical science, even to the subatomic level, confirms we are indeed *“from the ground”* - all (possibly) 28 elements of us. Also, the discerning reader can distinguish between symbolic language, allegory, poetry, parables - and genuine historical accounts. In fact, logic *is required* - Western or otherwise, to gain a proper understanding of the Bible. It is not a book of mysticism or secrets. *“For thus says the Lord, who created the heavens (He is the God who formed the earth and made it, He established it and did not create it a waste place, but formed it to be inhabited), I am the Lord, and there is none else. I have not spoken in secret, in some dark land; I did not say to the offspring of Jacob, ‘Seek Me in a waste place’; I, the Lord, speak righteousness declaring things that are upright”* (Isa 45:18,19). The mysteries of the Bible lie in *how He does things* - not in *what He thinks* about things. God can, and does, handle my logic quite skillfully. In fact, He challenges my thinking, and regularly exposes it as shallow, biased, incomplete, and illogical. I have found the Author of the Bible to be simple, yet often complex, straightforward, yet often nuanced. He is often exceedingly laconic (says a lot in a few words), and at other times puts forth ordinances in laborious detail. When He laconically states He formed man from the dust of the earth, the books on man’s physiology are endless. And the materials yet to be written will overload the minds of the most brilliant scientists the world will ever produce. On the other hand, when charging the Levitical priesthood - well, let’s just say there are details aplenty. I do admit, the God of the Bible has puzzled me on more than one occasion, as I have been surprised by *some* of His convictions and resultant actions. But, over the years, I have come to the conclusion that any contrarian views on my part are due to flaws in my understanding - and there will be a satisfactory resolution at some point. I will not have to *pretend to believe* His logic and priorities and conclusions and actions are valid. I will *know* they are - 100% of the time - past, present and future. It took me *time* to come to this conclusion, and logic brought me to it. And I am Western.

Before addressing the Humanist’s arguments for abortion, there is one other use of

the preborn that needs address.

Embryonic Stem Cell Endeavors

There are several ways to approach this subject. But since I have been approaching abortion from the three world views, it seems reasonable to continue this path. Let's first examine the Naturalistic view, then the Biblical Theological view, and then the Humanistic view. But first, what are "Embryonic Stem Cell Endeavors"?

Stem cells are extracted from human embryos in the hope that those cells may one day be used to cure various maladies in other human beings. As of this writing, the cells are being used for research and experimentation in the hope of finding those cures. There is only a five-day window in the development of the embryo when this harvest can occur. Presently, embryonic stem cells taken for this research require the death of the embryo. If embryonic stem cell research one day results in cures for other humans, then full scale cultivation and harvesting of embryos will ensue. It is my understanding the current crop of embryos being used for research are excess "test tube" embryos headed for death anyway as they were never intended to be implanted into a womb.

Some claim we may be able to obtain these cells without killing the embryo. One, or possibly two, stem cells could be extracted from the eight cell mass with no harm to the embryo. However, this might preclude the possibility of those stem cells forming another embryo (thus wiping out an identical twin, etc.). But, if stem cell extraction is delayed until the cell mass stage, the stem cell itself will be past the window of forming its own embryo - so, a potential twin or triplet, etc. will not be killed. Whether these claims of a benign stem cell extraction are accurate or not, I do not know. But, at the time of this writing, embryonic stem cell endeavors require the life of the embryo.

The Naturalistic View

The Naturalist is for the life of the human embryo over any present, malady-ridden human. Beneficial mutations arise randomly, and the new life of any species has always been the engine that drives evolution. But, even more importantly, we are aware of our impending doom (our sun is dying) and any one of these embryos might possess the needed genius to save our species - and world - from this coming fate. Currently, stem cell research is just research and a relatively few embryos have been killed. But even this loss is totally unacceptable to the Naturalist, as our next Einstein may already be strewn in some lab somewhere.

Now let me ask you a question. When a species *consumes* those of its own species, what is this called? I was going to give you a moment to think of the answer, but you already know it. And, you are right. It is cannibalism. Therapies coming from embryonic stem cell harvesting will be a sophisticated form of cannibalism.

I hear the protests even now. "*What kind of radical lunacy is that? Cannibalism? Cannibalism is the **eating** of the flesh of ones own species! Nobody **is eating** an embryo!*"

*They will enter sick bodies by injection, or implant, or pills or some way other than eating. And besides that, eating is **for nutrition** - and the embryos will be consumed for medicinal purposes! These embryos will be used to heal people from all kinds of horrific diseases. Do you want to let these people suffer and die? And what if it is **your mom** or **dad** that can be cured? What if it is **your child**? What if it is **you**? You will change your tone real quick. And what if*” I know this person is still ... a bit upset, but I am temporarily cutting him/her off in an attempt to tone things down a bit.

Embryonic stem cell therapies will be the consumption of one genetically complete (and unique) human life form - by another genetically complete (and unique) human life form. Any biologist, researcher, or doctor who denies this physical reality has left the realm of science – and opted for some kind of metaphysical speculation. And, to restate the obvious, an embryo *is human flesh*. It is nothing else ... and it cannot become anything else. It’s just very young and small - and unable to defend itself.

As far as “*eating*” an embryo, from the embryo’s point of view, whether injected into the receiving body, or chewed up by the recipient - this is a distinction without a difference. The embryo’s life is ended - consumed by a member of its own species. And the receiving body does not care *how* the needed materials come into it. So, this is *at least* “*a sophisticated form of cannibalism.*” But, the more I think about it, this is probably just plain old cannibalism with a high tech twist.

Concerning the objection that makes a distinction between “*nutrition versus medicine,*” our body uses food often to heal and repair itself – so, foods are *medicinal* in that sense. Our body uses any consumed material in whatever way is most advantageous to itself.

And if it is my mom or dad, or child (or me) who would be cured by this cannibalism, what does that have to do with anything? Does personal need supplant fact? Well, it might for the Humanist, but never for the Naturalist/Evolutionist or Biblical Theist.

If we were harvesting the embryonic stem cells of a pig, cow or chicken for consumption, I am not sure the Naturalist would be automatically alarmed about this. After all, many of us eat those animals all the time. We would simply be sustaining ourselves, at their expense, in another way. That is just part of survival of the fittest. But there is no scenario where the Naturalist countenances a species growing and consuming *its own preborn*. Even *the desire* to do such a thing sounds deafening alarms in all true Naturalists. This concern dovetails directly back to the current inadequacies of viable materials on the causes of extinction in species. Surely the desire, and practice, of the cannibalization of one’s preborn population would be a part of self-extinction science. Maybe the dinosaurs started eating their own eggs.

But, I hear some say, “*Ah! But these research embryos are frozen “extras” destined for the dump. They are not designated to grow up. And if cures are found, the embryos grown for harvest would be grown **only for that purpose** - none of them ever*”

intended, or allowed, to develop past that five-day window.” This is not the speech of the Naturalist for many reasons – some of which I have already shared. But, this whole test tube embryo thing introduces ... well, read on.

The Test Tube – Untapped Promise?

The ability to make “*test tube*” embryos opens a whole new world ... for the thinking, non-cannibalistic Evolutionist. Rather than growing embryos *for harvest* ... why not grow them *for birth and unique adulthood*? With current technologies, the “*test tube*” could be modified to imitate *a real womb*. Maybe a “*rubberized womb*” ... with a simulated heartbeat – and programming that imitates a mother’s daily range of activity. But here is the best part. The fluids around the developing preborn, plus all nutrients going through a fabricated umbilical cord *could be absolutely free of all pollutants!* No crack babies, alcohol damaged babies, tobacco damaged babies, or junk food damaged babies. These newborns would have no impurities *other than what was present in the first two original cells!* What an *enhancement* to evolutionary development! Many women might even choose to forego the entire pregnancy ordeal and bear their children in this manner. No more vaginal deliveries, and the only C-sections would be those performed on the rubberized womb.

So what makes more sense scientifically? Cannibalize the coming generation for a current, malady-ridden, older one, or to bring all embryos to fruition as they may hold the beneficial mutations we desperately need? For the Naturalist/Evolutionist, the answer is evident.

The Biblical Theist View

Before the advent of artificial insemination, egg fertilization only occurred in the womb at the discretion of the Creator. But even in the “test tube,” man cannot *make* the egg fertile or *make* the egg grow into an embryo. These “test tube” embryos are not life *created* by humans. They are simply the result of humans *manipulating* human life. *Manipulating* life does not translate into *creator rights* over life. Let’s step back a second and consider this from another angle. If medical people manipulate my life through gene therapies, or adult stem cell therapies, they never assert they have some kind of creator rights over me. Similarly, had they implanted me as an embryo into my mother’s womb in one of their clinics, they would not assert some kind of “creator rights” over me. Embryos that have been manipulated *into life* are not reduced to fodder for cannibalization or the garbage dump. These “throw away” embryos are as human as you and I. Whoever manipulates these humans into life are responsible for that one’s well being. The manipulator becomes a surrogate parent.

Man will always be subject to the decrees, standards and judgments of the Creator of life. The Author of the Bible claims to be that Creator, and there is no indication He ever intends on losing, delegating, or otherwise relinquishing this position of sole

dominion. The “*spark*” that makes something alive - the “*magic*” that causes innately inorganic elements to come to life - will always rest with Him. I believe the “*life element*” (as I call it) will always elude man. He will never figure it out, replicate it, or bottle it. “*See now that I, I am He, and there is no god besides Me. It is I who put to death and give life ...*” (Deut 32:39).

So, here is how I believe this works out. Once alive, no human can act against the life of another human unless that human is guilty of a capital offense. And even in that instance, due process is a given. The embryo is fully - and only - human life. The Author of life levies charges against humans who unrighteously assault other humans. These attacks on embryos are a premeditated killing ... with an additional charge of cannibalism. “*All unrighteousness is sin*” (1 Jn 5:17).

The Bible maintains that human life is the most important “object” in our observable physical universe. When this life is over, I would not want to stand before our Creator as an advocate for, or researcher of, these embryonic stem cell endeavors. If I had to choose between being a lying, adulterous, murdering drunk - or being an embryonic stem cell research advocate or participant - I would choose to be the lying, adulterous, murdering drunk. The eternal punishment will be less severe.

The Humanistic View

It is only here that embryonic stem cell endeavors have a home. Because the embryo has been declared nonhuman, or subhuman, then anything can be done with this blob of protoplasm. The life of the embryo can be experimented with, removed, or given to another human. After all, an embryo is only the size of this period. (Your eye just skipped it).

For the Humanist, any consideration contrary to the embryo’s life ... *trumps* that life. For example, *the curiosity of researchers* trump the embryo’s life. *The cries for cures* trump the embryo’s life. *Economic gains for a State* (i.e., California) trump the embryo’s life. Politicians, who smell *the gain of votes*, trump the embryo’s life. *Any grounds* which the Humanist envisions as some kind of gain for somebody - other than the embryo - *trump the embryo’s life*. The unscientific declaration that “*the preborn is not human life,*” fosters all kinds of predictable atrocities. As subhuman living tissue, they can be flushed down the stool, cannibalized, dissected - anything the Humanist desires. With science gone and Biblical Theism gone, the sole authority for valuation is someone’s *opinion* - grounded in nothing. The “*substance*” of Humanism ... is thin air.

Humanists’ Arguments Against the Preborn Human

Some of Their Common Questions and Assertions About Preborn Humans

“When does human life become ‘a person’?”

This is a major point for pro-abortion Humanists. Until a magical moment is

reached and a preborn becomes “a person,” the preborn is a nonperson. It depends on which Humanist you are talking with as to when “personhood” arrives. Many assert the preborn become “a person” when the umbilical cord is cut. For other Humanists, if the preborn *is wanted* by one or more of the parents, then it is “a person” to some degree while in the womb. Other Humanists are becoming increasingly squeamish when viewing the preborn with the new, and improving, in-the-womb imaging. They see a preborn acting, and reacting, in its environment. They watch it blinking, drinking, sucking its thumb, reacting to sound and pain, hiccupping - and maybe even dreaming. It is acting - like a baby. So, it depends which Humanist you are talking with as to what *opinion* you will hear on the “personhood” issue. But all Humanists do agree on one point. Before the moment when “personhood” is reached, anyone can do anything he/she wants with the preborn. It is a subhuman blob of protoplasm. Subhuman.

From a Naturalistic, scientific, evolutionary perspective, the question of “personhood” is as ridiculous as it is irrelevant. This “personhood” question is an attempt to separate humans from *simply being an animal*. I know of no one who examines other species and wonders when they reach “dog-hood” or “cow-hood.” Well, maybe some Humanists do. But, preborn dogs are simply dogs not yet born, and preborn cows are simply cows not yet born. In the quest to properly identify the substance and status of the preborn, for one to have *as a foundational inquiry*, “*when does human life become ‘a person’?*” - is questioning arising from the fog of metaphysical speculation. It injects a series of irrelevant questions that cloud the pursuit of objective scientific inquiry and accurate evaluation. This “personhood” query is immediately, and forever, rejected by Naturalists. The preborn human is simply a human not yet born.

But this “personhood” issue does raise some *common sense* inquiries Humanists need to answer. For the moment, let’s assume this “personhood” assertion has merit. For the Humanist, it is clear that “personhood” is viewed as a good and valuable thing. Humanists live and breathe to create, and fight for, “rights” for “persons.” So, here is the first question. Since “personhood” is a treasured bedrock of Humanism, why do Humanists fail to fight for, and adamantly protect, the only “thing” on the globe that can reach that noble height? Humanists know a preborn only needs a little time and nourishment and, with the absence of death, it will reach “personhood” 100% of the time! The *maximum* waiting period for this new and unique “person” *is nine short months!* And, in the case of partial birth abortion, the waiting period is only another minute or two - and priceless “personhood” is a reality. Why is the only fount for “personhood” *expendable?* And the preborn may be the only fount for “personhood” *in the entire Universe!* To assert the “personhood” of the mother trumps the coming “personhood” of the preborn is an insufficient answer. The mother already has her “personhood,” and two “personhoods” are surely better than one. Snuffing out the preborn is similar to taking the position that coal is worthless because it is not a diamond. So, feel free to destroy all the coal. Of course, there will be no new diamonds.

Where are the Humanists?

If we discovered a dodo nest with three or four eggs, would it be okay if we sat down and made a dodo omelette? After all, the “stuff” in those eggs has not reached “dodo-hood.” Or if the dodo mother showed up and began attacking those eggs, would we think it okay and let her destroy them? To be consistent, the Humanist would have to maintain the preborn dodo is not a dodo, so the omelette maker and the egg-attacking mother dodo are not doing anything wrong or even questionable. But don’t expect a Naturalist to concur with the Humanist. And a Biblical Theist would love the chance to see more of the Creator’s handiwork. I would love to see a dodo. Here again, the Humanist is standing there all alone. And as we have been learning, anytime you see the Humanist standing in territory that is not occupied by the Naturalist, or Biblical Theist, the Humanist is standing in error. Humanism is consistent in its errors upon errors.

“The preborn are not viable as they cannot survive outside the womb.”

This charge is a confused mental knot. To begin, the preborn cannot be expected to survive *outside* the womb. They are designed for the environment *in the womb*. And after the first trimester, they are exceptionally viable. At that point, the womb *is the safest* of all environments in the human life cycle - *with viability* at its peak. (I do realize that abortion may be making this last statement incorrect.) We do not expect a fish to be viable in desert sand, or an eagle to be viable thirty feet under the ocean - or a pregnant, naked Mom to be viable at the North Pole. They are not designed for those environments. So, how can anyone expect the preborn to be viable outside the womb?

Secondly, how is it that *a newborn* is considered “viable?” If left alone, it will die 100% of the time. A newborn may be able to breathe on its own, but that is about it. The responsibility for care *may* shift after birth, but the newborn is just as dependent as it was as a preborn - 100%.

If we are speaking about *survivability*, actually, after the first trimester, the preborn is much more viable than a newborn, toddler or even a young child. While in the womb, protection from predators is afforded by an adult of the species around the clock - Mom. And attacks by microorganisms must first get by Mom, too. Food is in ready supply, and all waste products are continuously taken away. Once *out* of the womb, viability/survivability drops dramatically. Predators arise from every side. They include true hunters (lions, etc.) but also inadvertent fatal encounters with snakes, spiders - or malaria carrying mosquitoes. And who falls to bacterial and viral onslaughts - the preborn or postborn? Who is subject to starvation? Who gets left in a car with the windows rolled up in the summer? Who drowns in the backyard swimming pool? Who walks behind a car and gets run over? Even in the most attentive of environments, lethal juvenile errors abound. In reality, separation from the mother through birth finds the human *less viable* - that is if we are truly talking about survivability.

The “Rights” of a Woman Over Her Own Body

The assertion goes something like this; “*A woman has rights over her own body. The preborn is part of her body. Just as a mother has the right to kill a cancerous growth or a parasite, she also has the right to kill a preborn. It has no more right to feed off her body than does the cancerous tumor or parasite.*”

Concerning a woman’s right over her own body, we have already established that first generation “rights” always run contrary to Naturalism. The “right” to kill the preborn is a classic example. If there is no Creator, the preborn is *superior* to the mother, as it is the fruit of the most fit male who survived and reproduced. On the other hand, theologically, the Biblical Creator is the Author of life and is active in the womb, weaving each individual. No one can act against that life as it is not guilty of a capital offense. Abortion is completely out of bounds in Naturalism and Biblical Theism. This woman’s “right” (more properly, a *mother’s* “right”) to kill her preborn only lives in Humanism. And it is death.

Concerning the cancer analogy, several things about this reasoning are quite strange. For starters, we do not normally attack a part of our body that is operating normally. Pregnancy is a normal function of the reproductive system. Indeed, that is its purpose. On the other hand, it does make sense to attack a cancerous tumor. That is an aberrant growth that will kill us. It will never come out on its own and let us get back to our original state, so we must go after it. But a preborn is nothing like a cancerous growth. It is made from an egg cell that was not aberrantly multiplying itself out of control. Mom releases one per month and that cell presented itself to a potential incoming sperm cell. In this case, the egg received an outside sperm cell, and now a very deliberate and predictable and organized growth began. Mom's body also creates a benevolent environment to positively accommodate its growth and well-being. This is nothing like cancer. Second, a preborn has no intention of staying in the mother. Of the billions and billions of births, I do not know if any preborn ever stayed inside a mother for twelve months. Or eleven. Maybe never even ten. The preborn has no intention of setting up permanent residence. Once it exits, the mother pretty much returns to her original state. Cancers do not begin like, act like, or end like the preborn. And once a cancer tumor is forcibly exited, that living mass dies. But once the preborn exits, it might grow up to be the next President. These two growths have nothing in common. At least apples and oranges are both fruit. A cancer and a preborn are on opposite poles of **human** organic material.

But, what about the assertion that a preborn is a parasite? Well, this makes no sense either. For starters, a parasite has the DNA of a totally different species. On the other hand, a preborn gets half of its DNA from the mother (her self-produced egg), and the other half is supplied from a male *of the mother’s own species*. So, a preborn is completely, and only, *human* life. A parasite is an alien in every sense of the word. It is *an invader* into the body, makes its *own place* of residence, and *forcibly* takes

sustenance from that body. A preborn does nothing of the sort. Not only does the mother produce the egg and then create the space for a preborn to develop - but she *supplies sustenance to the preborn* through an umbilical cord. No mother has ever grown an umbilical cord to any parasite. Furthermore, a parasite has no intention of exiting - but must be neutralized if there is any hope the afflicted one can return to an original state. A preborn has every intention of exiting, with the mother pretty much returning to her original state. Parasites do not begin like, act like, or end like the preborn. These two life forms have nothing in common. Again, at least apples and oranges are both fruit. A parasite and a preborn are on opposite poles of *animal* organic material.

To compare the preborn to a cancer or a parasite shows a lack of scientific understanding of all three. *To attack* the preborn on these grounds is based on Humanistic reasoning that is as unsound as human thought can get.

But, there is one other major point to be made concerning the rights to one's own body. The preborn ... also has a body. Every cell of its body (from the first cell forward) has a complete, and unique, genetic make-up separate from the mother. A preborn even develops his/her own circulatory system in that body with a blood type independent of the mother. Has any Humanist ever considered that a preborn's *body* may have inherent rights? Why can the mother rightly kill a preborn's *body* when a preborn has had no say as to its location? The mother, in almost all cases, has had *much more input* as to the location of a preborn's body than the preborn ever had. But there has also been an amazing discovery about the preborn's body since this ebook was written in 2005. It turns out that the instant the egg becomes fertile it begins sending out directives for its own growth and survival to the surrounding environment – inside Mom. It is not that Mom is changing her body to accommodate the preborn's body – but the preborn's body is sending directives *to Mom*. It's body is making *her* body change – not the other way around. I think moms intuitively know this. I cannot count the times when I have heard a mother asked, “When are you due?” Reply, with a smile, “*November 14. But, this baby will come when she's ready. She has a mind of his own!*” The researcher I read on this discovery stated that this will change everything in the abortion debate. Science can defeat Humanism in a secular society and that is my hope for the preborn. I have another article that forwards a potential strategy in this vein entitled, “The Stunning Civil Rights Parallels Between American Slavery and Abortion.”

There are more arguments and charges against the preborn than these, but they all desert Naturalism and Biblical Theism and dwell in the bowels of Humanistic thought and valuation. That is just the way it is.

“But, there is a difference between being pro-choice and being pro-abortion. You cannot lump the two together!”

Many *individuals* assert they are not *for* abortion. They are for women to be able to *make their own choice* with no interference - governmental or otherwise. Therefore,

one can be pro-choice *publicly*, but pro-life *privately*. One might even believe life begins at conception, but because this is a *religious* belief, it is wrong to impose that on another. In a secular society that espouses freedom of religion, and freedom *from* religion, this sounds reasonable (Of course, you Naturalists are now equipped to stand for the preborn on atheistic, evolutionary grounds - so, this religious objection has been nixed!). After all, who says, "*I am for abortion!*"? I have never heard one judge, or one politician, say he/she is *for abortion*. They are *for choice* and want a private citizen - the mother - to make the call on the fate of the preborn. This decision, pregnancy by pregnancy, is placed squarely upon *that one individual*. Humanists believe the government, and all of society, has no vested interest in the preborn.

But, what about *the organizations* that promote abortion as an option for women? Are they *pro-abortion*? Here again, none of them publicly assert they are *for abortion*. They are *for choice*. And, what about the abortionist and all his/her staff. Are they *for abortion*? While I have never seen a study addressing this, I would wager the overwhelming majority assert they are *not* pro-abortion. They are *pro-choice* and are just providing a service to mothers who have decided to end the life of their preborn. And they would not mind if all their business disappeared. *Everyone* in the abortion debate places the responsibility for this choice squarely on one individual - Mom.

Now I realize *there are times* when judges, politicians, abortion promotion organizations and abortion providers do step across that line and become pro-abortion advocates. If a preborn is the result of rape or incest, or is unwanted, or a threat to the mother's life, or even her health ... end "it." Problem solved. If it is found to be defective before birth, there are increasing numbers of advocates calling for termination. But even in these scenarios, our temporary pro-abortionists quickly retreat back behind the pro-choice line, all the while wringing their hands as they lament the "tragedy of abortion." And the choice and responsibility for action returns to that one individual again - Mom.

But, what about Mom? How many Moms, who have chosen abortion, say they are *for abortion*? I do not know the answer to this. But I have a suspicion. I bet the overwhelming majority of these mothers profess they are *pro-choice*. Few would say they are **for** abortion.

This brings me back to my initial point. From the preborn's body and point of view, the claim of *pro-choice* versus *pro-abortion* is a distinction without a difference. Very few of the preborn succumb to *pro-abortionists*, but they are being exterminated by the millions by the *pro-choice* coalition. What a wide ranging, lethal, hostile army is arrayed against the preborn - and they are all *pro-choice* people! Could *pro-abortionists* devise more vicious ways to kill the preborn than what is already practiced by the *pro-choice* crowd? While I do not know the exact stage of development when a preborn feels pain, that "switch" turns on long before birth. The preborn are victims of tremendously violent - and painful - "procedures." This is all beyond words.

Unfortunately, protection by governments for abortion (or, in some cases,

government involvement), has expedited the ability of the abortionist to pursue his/her profession. There must be the protective umbrella of a permissive government for abortion to flourish. That is why it is almost irrelevant if the government *performs* abortions (China) or *allows* them (USA). And the tools of this trade are quite new - and extremely lethal. A few years ago, many may have *contemplated* the desire for abortion, but governmental prohibitions, and crude tools, created so much risk, the preborn were protected *by that risk*. But much of that protective barrier has now vanished for the preborn in today's world.

At the time of this writing, the abortionist in the USA is a private citizen. Abortionists have one primary objective in their dealings with the preborn. Their skill, craft, and energies are directed at killing them. Whether saline solutions, vacuums, knives, or drills - all their tools are targeted to this end. Abortionists do not know *how* these "things" are alive, but they have developed several methods to remove that life "spark." After their work, all the elements that made up a preborn are still present, but the abortionist has sufficiently scrambled them so the "*life element*" has disappeared. This is the abortionist's chosen profession. There is one verse that sums this up. "*The dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty*" (Ps74:20). When the medical profession leaves the Creator out of its pursuits, dark places are created. Abortionists have indeed created "*habitations of cruelty*." And, the high-tech, cannibalistic, embryonic stem cell advocates are feverishly creating similar habitations. All who support such endeavors are supplying bricks for construction.

Mom

Since many governments have placed the abortion decision squarely on the woman ... Mom ... well, I want to talk to you. But first, let's get a few things out of the way. I am a man, so I understand I have *no right* to speak on this subject. This is a woman's issue. I do not *carry* the child, I do not *bear* the child, and I am not *responsible* for the child. I do not go through the *physical trauma* associated with the whole ordeal of pregnancy and birth - and I am not the one *at risk* for complications. Let's see ... what else? Oh, yeah. I do not know what it is like to carry the child of a man *whom I now want nothing to do with*. Also, I am approaching this subject *with logic* when the entire subject is loaded with emotion, risk, and impact *on the rest of one's life*. Well, I am glad we got all that out of the way.

Mom, for a moment I want you to forget religion. Also, forget all the civil rights contentions. Let's address this from a scientific base. If you search every mountaintop, dive to the bottom of every ocean, search every cave on earth, and scour every nest of every living thing, you will not find a fertile human egg *anywhere*. Now, I want you to stand outside and look up into a clear night sky. You are not seeing even the tiniest fraction of the stars out there and you are seeing almost nothing of the immensity of the universe. But in all that space and matter, you will not be able to find *one* fertile human

egg. The truth is, the human race comes to fruition from one place - your womb. There aren't yet any of my proposed "rubberized" wombs either. If you are an atheistic evolutionist, you understand you may produce the next beneficial adaptation to our species from your womb. And because it is impossible to know, or predict, which wombs hold the vital keys to our progression and survival as a species, this understanding makes you staunchly pro-life. But if you reject science as your base of belief, and embrace the weakest of all systems, Humanism, you still accept the fact that your womb is the only place that produces "persons." It produces the world's leaders, artists, inventors, doctors, teachers, thinkers, law enforcers, etc. And again, no one knows who will come from any particular womb. Many of the world's greatest citizens have arisen from the most humble of circumstances. Conversely, many of our sorriest citizens have sprung from "wanted preborns" with the most privileged of backgrounds. The future of our world develops in your womb. That's just the way it is. But knowing this, and knowing how needy this world is, even as a right thinking Humanist, you too are staunchly pro-life. None of us can predict what womb will produce those "persons" the world will need.

So Mom, here is the bottom line. If you are hard-core, evolutionary, atheistic Naturalist, (dedicated to hard science), or, if you are a hard-core, "pro-personhood" Humanist (steeped in civil rights), you really are a hard-core pro-lifer ... and I didn't even bring up the Bible.

All Humanists who have opted for the "*rights of the mother*" at the expense of *the life of the preborn* will be proven to be on the wrong side of this civil rights issue - just like the pro-slavery advocates were humiliated in time. The preborn will win this struggle. Even the cannibalistic Humanist will be turned back from his/her embryonic stem cell appetite. The time is coming when the youngest of the human family will be granted equal protection under the law.

Mom, do you want to be with the winners - or the losers? That is really "the choice" you are presented with on the abortion issue.

O Governing Official...

Let's now turn our attention to the government's role in the abortion issue. While many view "The State" as a faceless institution (a behemoth of impersonal laws, bureaucracies and buildings), a Biblical Theist does not recognize this definition. The State is simply a collection of accountable individuals. It is by design I address each of the following sections to "Governing *Officials*"- not a faceless, "State." After defining a governing official's role before the Creator, we will look at the hopes, the fears, and my advice to, governing officials concerning abortion.

The Role and Responsibility of Governing Officials

Romans 13:1-4, concisely defines the role and responsibility of governing

officials. *“Let every person be in subjection to the governing authorities For rulers are not a cause of fear for good behavior, but for evil. Do you want to have no fear of authority? Do what is good and you will have praise from the same; **for it is a minister of God** to you for good. But if you do what is evil, be afraid; for it does not bear the sword for nothing; **for it is a minister of God**, an avenger who brings wrath upon the one who practices evil ...”* (Ro 13:1-4).

Governing authorities are called *“theou gar diakonos”* - a *deacon* of God, a *servant* of God, a **minister** of God! Each government official is *a minister of God* and is *to serve* those under his/her charge. I wonder how many governing officials know this? Their primary charge from their Creator is to support law-abiding producers and punish evildoers. For a more complete discussion, get my Ebook, *“Capital Punishment and the Bible”*. But, for our purposes here, just realize the Creator calls governing officials *His ministers*. If that does not send shock waves in *each person* in a governing role

The Hopes of Governing Officials Concerning Abortion

These are their most important hopes.

1. Conception is a random, natural event. The preborn is subhuman - not “a person” and has no rights. It is a nameless, faceless blob of protoplasm - a “growth” inside a woman. So, while abortion kills tissue that is alive, this destruction is not the taking of “a life.”
2. The Church/State separation governing construct is valid. So, if there is a Creator, and even a Creator interested in the preborn, abortion is a religious question and the government can rightly excuse itself from the entire issue. After all, many religious sects believe life and personhood begin at conception, but not all of them do. As this drifts into the religious arena, even a deeply religious governing official is confronted with this question. *“What right do I have in imposing my moral/religious views on those under my jurisdiction?”* So, the governing authority takes the perceived high road and delegates the fate of this living “thing” to the mother.
3. A woman’s privacy trumps the life of the preborn. Bumper stickers stating, *“Get the government out of my womb!”* capulate the valid position.
4. It is okay to delegate “the sword” to private citizens to be used against the preborn.
5. There is no Creator of the preborn to whom the governing official must account.

“We are not saying abortion is good or right - nor are we participating in it. We are simply passing this decision off to the woman and her doctor. It is the woman’s body and she has a privacy right. This is a health issue out of the legitimate jurisdiction of government.” The Humanist governing official has placed all of his/her hopes on the validity of the positions above.

The Fears of Governing Officials

At least these *should cause fear*. If any are correct, there is great reason to fear.

1. The preborn is human. (But, if there is no one to account to, so what?)
2. A Church/State governmental construct does not release governing authorities from the Creator's moral expectations and requirements for governance.
3. The Creator has *made* each preborn. He has a vested interest in each one. A mother's "right to privacy" does not trump this. The Creator owns His work - *including mother* and preborn.
4. Governing officials who kill the preborn, or allow the preborn to be killed, have erred in their responsibility with "the sword." They have either errantly wielded it (i.e., China), or erred by delegating it to private citizens (i.e., USA).
5. Governing officials hold accountable positions before the Creator – and He has the willingness, and ability, to call each governing official before Him to account for his/her role in each act of abortion. The blood of these "things" will be required of each culpable governing official. This includes accountability for all the hapless embryos of the stem cell endeavors.

If any of these "fears" are true, then any governing official who crosses *any* of these markers will be found as a lethal *agent* toward the most defenseless of the human family.

"Now therefore, O kings, act wisely; take warning, O judges (leaders) of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear Do homage to the Son (Kiss the Son), lest He become angry, and you be destroyed in your way ..." (Ps 2:10-12). Jesus is either The Ruler over all authorities - or He is not. (See Mt 28:18, Phil 2:9-11, Col 1:16, Rev 19:16, etc., etc., etc.).

O Governing Official ...

Do not view this material as *a threat* toward you. View it as *a warning*. At this point, I think you should see what I have presented in this way. *"If it is even **remotely possible** this pro-life material is correct, then I must do whatever it takes to avoid any complicity in abortion. When my short life ends, I must make sure I have no culpability before a Creator like the one described in this Ebook."* But, here is my full disclosure.

I believe we are responsible for our direct actions - and also *our influences* in the actions of others. If our activities assist others in making positive choices, we will be rewarded for that - and if our activities assist others toward negative choices, we will be "rewarded" for that too. ITimothy 5:24 says, *"The sins of some men are quite evident, going before them to judgement: for others, their sins follow."* Concerning abortion, here is how this will work out. Each preborn who has died under Roe V. Wade will be levied against those Supreme Court jurists who legalized abortion. Those killed *before* the jurist died went as a sin *"before them to judgement."* Those preborns who are killed *after* the jurist has left this life are sins following after. And each jurist will also account for *the suffering* inflicted from that "decision" - suffering of the mother, father, friends, grandparents ... and that of the preborn. Each passing hour stacks up more and more offenses for which those justices will account. *But lawmakers who have failed to*

confront and vacate what was an illegal usurpation of power (legislators are charged with creating law, not renegade jurists) *will also have their share in these “spoils.”* The vengeance coming from the Creator of life is going to be more astounding than anyone can imagine - even me.

What Should Individuals Who Serve in Government Do?

As a governing official, I would avoid complicity in this activity at all costs. *In my own self interest* I would absolutely distance myself from any phase of this attack on the preborn. Whether contraception that produces the death of a preborn, or the harvesting of embryonic stem cells, or giving “the sword” to abortionists ... I would do whatever was necessary to make sure the Creator of that life *would have no case against me.* The threats, railings, and wails of Planned Parenthood, NOW, NARAL, or the Democrat Party would become more and more distant as my appointment with that Creator draws ever closer. Let them vote me out, impeach me, or otherwise depose me. And, if they must, let them kill me. *“My friends, do not fear those who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will warn you whom to fear: fear the One who after He has killed has authority to cast into Hell; yes, I tell you, fear Him!”* (Lk 12:4,5). *“It is a terrifying thing to fall into the hands of the living God”* (Heb 10:31). Like is so often the case in the Bible, this is a massive understatement. But abstinence or passivity in abortion activity is not enough. Governing officials are charged with the welfare of each person under his/her jurisdiction. God expects governing officials to shut down abortion.

The Biggest Error - That Pesky Life Element

All who support abortion rights are operating with a fatal assumption. They have adopted **the opinion** of the atheistic, evolutionary, naturalist - *before science has proven the opinion is true!* And what is that opinion? The “*spark*” that makes non-living elements come to life is just some kind of natural phenomenon. Life “*happens*” when the right chemical combination occurs in the right environment. What a huge blunder. Until scientists can isolate, identify, replicate or otherwise discover the “*life element,*” self interest should restrain one from rushing to kill innocent human life. Abortion’s primary purpose is to sufficiently scramble living material until that “*life element*” vacates. How it got there, what it is, and where it goes nobody knows. Abortion activity only knows how to make it leave. So, ... what if this is the truth? *“See now that I, I am He, and there is no god besides Me; It is I who put to death **and give life** ...”* (Deut 32:39). What might such a Creator do to abortion rights supporters?

But, Governing Official, You Are Not All Alone

The Creator is cataloguing each one’s contribution toward the death of His created preborns. Let’s do a little pre-cataloguing. Obviously, *the person* killing the preborn is culpable. But there are many “*supporting ligaments*” to that person’s hands. There is *the staff* at the clinic - “nurses,” assistants, administrators, landlords, etc. Then there are

the suppliers of the materials used in the attacks. That includes the inventors of the implements used to kill. Next, are the members of the *formal* organizations promoting abortion. That includes personnel, lobbyists, and financial supporters. But, there are also the “drive-by” abortion advocates. These are abortion supporters who use whatever platform they have to promote it. This includes actors, writers, musicians, editorialists, etc. Their “successful” influence will come back *to them* on the Judgment of the Great Day. Even an “off the cuff” remark that influences someone toward abortion, will draw the Creator’s responsive action. A pro-**choice** claim will bring no respite before Him.

O Participating Governing Official ...

Do not think your pro-choice voting block, lobbyists, or advisors will come to your aid on Judgment Day. They will be in their own terror. While the Creator will be meting out the “reward” due them for *their* errant actions *and influences*, those same “friends” will be busy declaring *you* made *your own choices* and those choices should not fall back on them. But, don’t worry. He will not let them successfully shift blame. All Planned Parenthood people, lawyers - all the pro-abortion advocates - will not escape their culpability. Each of them will be scrambling, *in a vain attempt*, to save themselves from “the wrath” (Ro 12:19). O Governing Official - *know* that your pro-choice “friends,” who currently assert you have no responsibility for the premeditated killing of the preborn, will turn on you on that Great and Terrible Day. In this matter, *I* am your friend. But you must listen *now*. I won’t be able to help you then.

So, Why Have I Written This Ebook?

This material is for Naturalists (even though there may not be any) and Biblical Theists. Most Humanists are probably long gone by now. It’s doubtful they can get through this material. They do not have the emotional capacity to get through this. Whether or not they possess the *mental* capacity is irrelevant because their emotional state dominates. Emotions are fine (fear, anger, joy, etc.), but being *emotional* limits the reasoning capacity. This is evidenced by irrational reactions *to things that should not elicit such reactions*. To be specific, scientific fact, and clear logic from those facts, should not elicit denial, anger, fear or hysteria. But, in Humanists, they do. Witness their reaction to *Nature’s position* on abortion and homosexuality. Abortion *kills the fruit* of the most fit survivor, while the homosexual deviation causes the creature *to bear no fruit* - immediately ending a billion-year lifeline. Both of these activities strike at the heart of successful Natural Evolution. Yet Humanists *embrace* these aberrations with the greatest of fervor. Their advocacy is a passionate “cause.” They have no clue that Naturalism thoroughly repudiates these “causes.” In fact, most Humanists truly believe Naturalism supports their cause!

Humanists do not understand their entire system of thought *rests only upon human opinion*, with **no** moorings in science - and certainly none in Biblical Theism.

But when faced with their error, instead of running *to fact*, they run *from it*. And to whom do they run? In the USA, they run to judges, of like-mind, who impose these groundless human opinions on the nation. “Rights” to abort, or “rights” for homosexuals to “marry,” are just a couple of examples. How confused is this? What Evolutionist thinks Jane’s employment of the medicine man, to take his tools and go up inside of her to chop up Tarzan's baby, is a progressive adaptation? Or, what evolutionarily *successful* Tarzan would seek sex with, or “marry,” another Tarzan - or our skinny little caveman? Yet Humanists, who embrace these positions, *label themselves* as “Progressives”!

In one sense, I do wish this Ebook could benefit Humanists. But for success, I would probably need to make my case in a friendly, soft, and gently persuasive manner. In this, I have probably failed. So, I may as well state a few more intemperate (yet accurate) statements. Humanists do more than simple judicial lawmaking in their attack on the preborn. They also petition judges to pass laws *to protect the abortion clinics - and access to them*. And they seek judgements to censure materials like this and have it classified as “hate speech” that incites “hate crimes.” One who perpetuates *genuine* Naturalism, with its logic and valuations, or one who perpetuates *genuine* Biblical valuations, they want silenced. Unfortunately, artificial weapons and tools, along with Humanistic governmental constructs, often give them the ability to impose their errant will and valuations. That is why Humanists cannot be ignored. They are present, destructive, and dangerous. But their cause for abortion, or any of their errant priorities, is doomed. Even if they completely dominate the planet from pole to pole, and even agree on a common Humanistic metaphysical system, they are destined to succumb to Naturalism - or else the Biblical Creator - depending on which is actually the Ruler. If Naturalism is ruler, then when our sun ultimately betrays us, the voices of all Humanists will fall silent - forever. Naturalism will coldly reclaim its 100% dominance over this globe’s thin layer of life-supporting crust. On the other hand, if the Biblical Creator is the Ruler, Humanists are still doomed. He has stated there is a timer set against this age, and when it goes off, His metaphysical valuation system will roll in with 100% dominance. Any being, action, or thought raised up against His determinations will be eternally obliterated.

So, reality is as follows. Humanism resides in “no man’s land.” It is either doomed to Naturalism, or to the Biblical Creator. It cannot win either way. It springs from human opinion based upon the opinions of humans. Its thoughts have no moorings in hard science or Biblical Theism. It can only rule if Naturalism is held at bay, or the Creator chooses to back off. When either one rises up, Humanism is dead.

So, to whom am I writing? Who am I seeking to reach? I am writing to anyone who is seeking to find, and then live in, the viable valuation system. The choice is between Naturalism or Biblical Theism. And if Jesus did not rise from the dead, then throw Biblical Theism in with all the other religions of the world. I would then agree with Paul on this matter. If Jesus did not rise from the dead, “*let us eat and drink, for*

tomorrow we die” (1Cor 15:32). At one time, I ... was a Naturalist. No more.

The Political Left

The political left in the USA is composed of Secular Humanists. Amazingly, they believe they are the *intellectually* superior when, in truth, they spend their lives reasoning in the strata of the weakest of human thought patterns. And these same Humanists profess to be broad-minded. This is but the first of many self-deceptions. They are not only errant-minded, and shallow-minded, but they are also exceedingly narrow-minded. For example, many of the points forwarded in this Ebook they have never thought of, and they will not openly pursue. And many of these points have been dramatically parred down in an attempt to keep this work a manageable size. But, here is a better example. Humanists do all in their power to keep Creation Science out of the public schools and public domain. Even *the thought* of Creationism referred to as “science” galls the Secular Humanist. Simultaneously, they refuse to acknowledge Evolution as a *theory*. But, that is what it is. (And it is an *unraveling theory* as empirical data of the hard sciences continues accumulating). The broad-minded *welcome all* competing theories and eagerly allow the contentions of variant views to be fully and publicly aired. But, this is not the thinking of the Left in the USA. They cannot mentally, or emotionally, tolerate such intercourse. In this example, Evolution would be *downgraded* to “scientific theory,” and Creationism would be simultaneously *upgraded* from myth to “scientific theory.” This is insufferable as each “theory” would then start on equal footing. This they cannot allow.

Secular Humanists *are not liberal*. They are despotic, and censures of thought contrary to their own - evidences be damned. Secular Humanists *are not progressive either*. What is progressive about oppression and a peremptory intolerance? That has always been the way in all the worlds’ tyrannies. Humanists boast of progressive “civil rights,” yet, in reference to the preborn, they are on the wrong side of the greatest civil rights issue of our time - maybe of all time, as it crosses all races, nationalities, and economic classes. But herein lies the greatest of ironies. Humanists only want Evolution taught - yet it refutes their entire system of “rights.” It is amazing Naturalists have not called the Humanists on this.

Conclusion

Personally, I do not believe the Naturalism I have espoused in this Ebook. I do not believe man evolved, or is evolving. But it repulses me that Humanists continue to claim Naturalism as their base - and Naturalists have not challenged them. So, I have taken the Naturalist’s position for them. On the other hand, I do believe in the validity of metaphysical thought and values. We are more than what Naturalism is willing to grant. We are more than the physical elements that compose our body, and this world is subject to more than observable physical law. But, Humanism must be rejected as a viable

metaphysical option because it has no substantive base. I recently heard a Secular Humanist insist that valid *moral absolutes* can be established apart from any reference to, or reliance upon, a deity. But with no God, what can these *moral absolutes* be based upon? They cannot be based upon Naturalism. Naturalism has no “moral” absolutes. So, where can this Humanist derive his moral absolutes? His opinion? Consensus opinion? Human opinion never rises above being human opinion - even if billions agree upon the opinion. There is no real weight, no real authority, no valid substance behind human opinion. There just isn't - no matter how much one wishes it to be otherwise.

The real problem with the Humanist is that when his/her opinion violates Naturalism or Biblical Theism, *the opinion is chosen as authoritative*. Of course, that is what makes one ... a Humanist.

At the beginning of this work, I promised that if you worked through this material, you would be able to trace any thought, or valuation, back to its origins. Well, now you can. Any thought, or value, that stays within the bounds of evolutionary principle, and the genuine hard sciences, belongs to Naturalism. But once thoughts, or values, go past the physical truths of this physical realm, metaphysics have been entered into. The valuations of metaphysics are most easily recognized by “rights.” These breaches to evolutionary principles are either backed by human opinion or the Creator's decrees. If you learn the morals of the Creator (just read the Bible and pay attention to commands addressing morality), you will be able to assess when a thought, or value, is based upon human opinion or the Creator's pronouncement. It's that simple.

Conclusion on Abortion

There will never be a conclusion *to* abortion until the entire practice ceases. But, as far as some conclusions *about* abortion, we can do that now. The real, bottom-line question in the abortion debate is this: “*Does one human have the right to inject himself/herself into the lifeline of another human and stop that life line?*” The answer is, “No.” The only exception, in the course of normal civil affairs, is execution by The State for a capital offense, after due process.

Let's return to the subtitle of this Ebook for a moment. “***Abortion: How (and Why) Abortion Resides in the Weakest Form of Human Thought and Valuation.***”

Question 1: So, *how* does abortion reside in Humanism?

Answer: By means of “*rights*.” These are unnatural grants (anti-Naturalism), and, in this instance, this “*right*” also conflicts with Biblical metaphysical valuations.

Question 2: And, *why* does abortion reside in Humanism?

Answer: Because there are no laws in Humanism. Many people want to believe we are more than just animals (so, Naturalism's Laws are jettisoned), but at the same time, they do not want to be subject to an Authority higher than themselves (so, Deism is

jettisoned). Thus, the birth of Humanism. Humanism creates a forum *free* from Naturalism's Law *and* the Creator's Law. In this free zone, humans can make up their own law (notice the little "I"). But these laws are nothing but human opinions. Abortion resides in this free zone.

The preborn have a host of enemies arrayed against them. But, *none of them* are Naturalists and *none of them* come from Biblical Theism. The true Naturalist *of any age*, and the Biblical Creationist are comrades on this matter as long as human life exists - even if the reasons are completely different. The preborn's enemies are Humanists. Only Humanists invent and promote the thinking that justifies the lethal attack upon them. Humanists create lethal "rights" for the mother, they develop governmental constructs allowing the termination of the preborn, and they produce the medical personnel to carry out the services. I have contended, and still contend, that *every thought* that in some way justifies the attack on the preborn is wrong. The Humanist believes the mother is superior to the preborn. But, that is wrong. The Humanist believes it is acceptable to end an "unwanted pregnancy." But, that is wrong. The Humanist believes embryonic stem cell research and therapies so as to cure sick people is good. But, cannibalism is wrong. The Humanist believes government should step aside and let the mother decide this private issue. But, that is wrong. In man's entire spectrum of thought, the justification for killing the preborn comes from the weakest of all soils - Humanism.

The Coming Onslaught in Humanist Ranks

It is time to take a risk. Even though confident of the assertions above, I think it is only fair to make a demarcation in the Humanist circles. There is one other reason abortion will not continue its rule. Its demise will be hastened by the hands of fellow Humanists. Can you believe I just said that? Well, maybe I should rephrase that. Abortion's demise *should be* accelerated by the hands of fellow Humanists. Here's why.

I do believe there are some Humanists who actually *do believe* in the validity of accurate science. I do not know who they are, or where they are, but there actually may be some. As *these* Humanists realize the preborn have been conclusively, *and scientifically*, recognized as 100% human life, the plight of the preborn will become a *civil rights issue*. Actually, it already is. This group of humans is being *discriminated against* simply because of *their age* and *their circumstance*. In other words, they are at the wrong place at the wrong time. The more sound of the Humanists have never recognized that such a situation of fate relegates the victim to prey for a predator. They will not allow such discrimination to stand against a whole segment of the human family - especially when legal precedent (along with accurate science) provides a conclusive base for attacking such discrimination. Examples are now in order.

In the United States, there is already legal precedent prohibiting discrimination based upon *one's age*. In the workplace, there are increasing sanctions levied against employers for age-based discrimination. But, just as important, is legal precedent which

prohibits discrimination based upon one's circumstance. Such discrimination has been soundly overthrown. Originally, slaves in the United States were declared three-fifths a person (Article 1, Section 2, of The Constitution of the United States). They were not considered a whole person *because of their circumstance*. They were *property* - the possession of another human, and lived in the owner's domain (plantation, etc.). The preborn today find themselves in a similar legal situation - though their plight is even more perilous. They are not even *part of a person*. But, like the slave, they have the misfortune of being legally declared the property - the possession - of another human. This time, Mom. These monarchs have the full weight of the law behind them as they decide on life or death for the owned human. And, like the slave, the preborn do reside *in the domain* of their legal owner - in this instance, their mother's womb. Of course, in the current irrationality of the abortion thought of our time, upon umbilical cord separation, the preborn is *set free* - magically a whole person under our Constitution - no longer the property of the mother. Mom, and all abortion connected industries, then lose the right to kill the human. In fact, if they now attack and kill this new whole person, The State can prosecute - and even execute them - for murder! Mom is now *a legal caretaker* and can be punished in many ways for violating that legal responsibility. But, only two substantive changes occurred in the preborn's life that afforded all these *civil rights protections* - the preborn's age and environment! The breathing of air instead of amniotic fluid is only *a process change*. This is clearly *age-based discrimination* and *circumstance-based discrimination*. Even slaves were free from age-based discrimination. These civil rights violations against the preborn will be rectified by the more sound of Humanists who are grounded in some semblance of scientific understanding - and who are cognizant of Humanistic history. They have regularly joined like minded, issue-based coalitions (in this case, genuine Naturalists and Biblical Theists) in fighting to rectify civil injustices. The preborn need an "Emancipation Declaration" declared and implemented for them. The person(s) who accomplishes this, will go down in history as one of the greatest humanitarians of all time. I wonder who will become the next "Abe Lincoln"?

As one other side note, the more sound of Humanists have often been able to identify inconsistencies in discriminatory law, and have then used those *as wedges* to finally overthrow the predominant injustice. For example, when slavery was legal in this country, a *free* African in a *non-slave State* was counted "a whole person" - even if he/she came from the same tribe as a slave in a slave State. This was an undeniable hypocrisy of law. Similarly, concerning the preborn, there are many instances today when people are prosecuted for killing a "wanted" preborn. As recently as 2005, a California man (Scott Peterson) was given the death penalty for killing his wife *and* eight month old *preborn son*. It was determined this was *a wanted* child, so the father received wrath for that killing *from the State*. However, if the wife had decided she wanted to kill that preborn son, she not only could have done that with no legal

consequence, but if *the father* had wanted that child, that would have been of no help to the hapless preborn son. This is *at least hypocrisy* in law - especially in the context of legal marriage with all the legal ramifications a wedded man incurs by that legal arrangement. And even if the marriage dissolves, many legal responsibilities remain on a husband/father. But what if the preborn is wanted by others - i.e., brothers, sisters, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, adoptive applicants, Naturalists, Deists, or sane Humanists? Even the weight of all these interested parties are of no relevance under current law. This is *at least madness* in law. Society, on many levels, does have an interest in the preborn and should be helping a mother see past short term consequences of pregnancy, and attendant crises, and see the long view. Who knows who is developing in that womb? So, how can the fickleness of “wanted” or “unwanted” - determined solely by the mother - be *a permanent basis in law* over the preborn human’s *life*? Such wanton recklessness in law in the more stable of societies never prevails. Current abortion law in the United States is markedly *unsettled* law.

But, What About Legal Precedent?

Humanists have never felt bound by legal precedent when there is a denial of human rights based upon age or circumstance of life. This is especially true when *an entire segment of humanity* is discriminated against - and killed at will. Precedent by The Third Reich toward Jews was not allowed to continue after that government’s defeat. Precedent of the three-fifths personhood of slaves was overthrown. Roe V. Wade, and all relative discriminatory legal precedent (whether initiated in the judicial, legislative or executive branch), will become a bloody pile of refuse littering the roadside of the human stumble through history. Precedent does not trump discrimination. Humanists - the more sound of you - *Where are you?* You know the preborn are humans. And you know they are not in their mother’s womb by any choice of their own - and they do not intend on staying there. *If unwanted, they are simply in the wrong place at the wrong time.* I know your conscience, when accurately informed - and then formed - will not allow the injustice of abortion to stand. Even though I have castigated your entire system of thought, and subsequent valuations, you have an opportunity get back at me. I have given you a crack in the door for a degree of redemption. Go for it.

Many Thanks

I owe many thanks to several people and groups, for making this Ebook. First, I must acknowledge all the instructors I had along the way who taught Evolution. While I doubt most of them grasped much of the consequence of their theory, they taught it well enough that I could extrapolate it to many of its conclusions. It definitely helped me to be able to identify contrary metaphysical assertions belonging to Humanism and Deism. Next, I owe a great debt to Secular Humanists. As they have been forced to defend abortion (and other “rights”), they have unwittingly exposed the weaknesses in their

thoughts and the flaws in their opinions. Had they been able to keep their mouths closed, it may have been more difficult to ascertain the points and degrees of their weak-mindedness. Thanks to Planned Parenthood, The Humanist Manifesto 1 and 2, The National Organization of Women, the Democrat Party and all those on their Presidential ticket for the last thirty years - and those waiting in the wings. They all helped me a lot.

On the other side of the ledger, I would like to acknowledge Don Fricks, Director of a Pregnancy Support Center, for a comment on the non-viability of infants. His remark triggered that section of this work.

Our Creator has spared me from death on several occasions. I hope part of the reason is before your eyes. Anything accurate in this work I credit to Him, and all error is mine. That is not humility. It is just reality.

I understand that pro-choice Humanists, of all persuasions, want the material presented here to be error. They *especially* want me to be wrong on the parts about the preborn. Indeed, they *need me to be wrong*. But, I do not think that I am. They have lost.

<https://freelygive-n.com>