

The Stunning Civil Rights Parallels Between American Slavery and Abortion

Robin Calamaio - Copyright 2009 (Minor Revisions, 2019)

freelygive-n.com

The war to recognize the civil rights of the preborn human is already in progress. This will prove to be the great civil rights issue of the 21st century, and the preborn will win on civil rights grounds. The abolition of American slavery has laid much of the groundwork. Here are three parallels. First, the slave was declared property. So too, the preborn. Second, even if recognized as human, the slave was denied the full designation of “*person*” or “*being*.” So too, the preborn. And third, financially lucrative industries, with accompanying politically powerful lobbies, were built upon the slave in this subjugated state. So too, the preborn. I will take these in order. But, first

Secular societies reject Theism as a basis for law. The preborn will not gain emancipation in the United States on Theistic grounds. Their freedom must be secured on other grounds. These grounds exist, and must be exploited. So, ... read on.

Parallel One: Property

Slaves were, by law, property - and no different than livestock. Owners had full rights over them - with no legal jeopardy for any reason. Preborns are, by law, property of the expectant mother. These owners have full rights over them - with no legal jeopardy for any reason.

If a slave escaped from his/her owner, the government viewed this as an illegal emancipation (in the South for sure) and the slave was to be captured and returned to his/her owner. This property contract was to be honored by the government and trumped any other consideration. Some believe that if a preborn survives an abortion procedure - this as an **illegal** emancipation. The owning mother had slated the preborn for death and her property rights remain valid and trump any other consideration. The government is bound to uphold that “*contract*” between her and her aborting “*doctor*.” Therefore, medical attention, or any attention, must be withheld.

Parallel Two: A Partial “*Person*” or “*Being*”

Even before the United States became a country, some knew African slaves were illegitimately declared as property. They also knew that a government “*for and by the people*” would one day recognize this, and grant them civil rights. But, at the time of this nation’s birth, the best extraction from the “*property owners*,” was a compromise - with slaves declared 3/5ths of a person. It is possible some Southerners may have agreed to this so as to enlarge population numbers - thus securing greater representation in the newly formed House of Representatives. But, I am sure most slave owners despised this “*deal*” - as **any** recognition of a slave approaching the status of “*personhood*” or “*being*” would have been anathema. Of course, Emancipationists, who knew slaves were 100% persons, were probably just as furious.

Denial of the title, “*whole person*” or human “*being*,” is the reason slaves and the preborn had/have no civil rights. If the preborn can gain this title, they gain legal standing and the right to life will be immediate. Even those who have been produced by rape or incest will

be allowed to live. Even now, some of the preborn are about 2/5ths of a person ... if they happen to be “*wanted*” by the mother, they gain a degree of “*person*” or “*being*” - and are protected from outside-the-mother attack. But, if the mother changes her mind - even in the last second before birth - the preborn’s “*person*” or “*being*” status instantly vanishes - along with the legal standing it had. So, this “*person*” status must be less than half, because it would surely vote to keep itself from the abortionist’s ... tools. We will return to this issue.

“*Being*” or “*Person*” is a Metaphysical Concept

So, who defines what constitutes “*being*” or “*person*” ... and what is it anyway? Well, your guess is as good as mine. But, no matter what is decided, the moment the magical designation of “*being*” is bestowed, there is no physical change on that human life - one way or the other. Whether assigned at conception, the third trimester, or umbilical cord separation - or whether one is deemed a partial “*person*” or a “*complete*” one, this is all random philosophical opinion that has nothing to do with the physical reality of that human life. This entire “*being*” concept is a function of Humanism - an arbitrary assignment based upon the shifting opinions of man. It is void of the hard sciences. It is at this precise point the responsible, secular, evolutionary Atheist enters.

What is Right

For millennia, what was actually taking place in the womb was a mystery. But as science has drawn back the veil, what has been discovered is astounding. It is now established scientific fact that at the instant of conception the entire genetic make-up of a unique adult is fully present. A “*clock*” is turned on and an unstoppable march has begun toward that one-of-a-kind adult. All the fertile egg needs is time, nourishment - and the absence of death - and it will become that unique adult 100% of the time. The fertile egg is the young “*Einstein*,” “*Mozart*” ... or “*Lincoln*.” This is hard science. But from an atheistic, evolutionary perspective, this preborn - this fertile egg - is infinitely more. It is **the fruit of the evolutionary victor** - and, as such, is **the most basic block** upon which any species line survives. Any one of them may be the key for that species adaptation, evolution, and survival ... or, if lost, a step toward that line’s extinction. The preborn is the engine of Evolution - the very heart of the Theory of Evolution - indeed, it is **the superlative life form** of any species. It is impossible to overstate this point. Failure to understand this is failure to understand the most cardinal element of evolutionary theory. It would be like a Biblical Theist - without a Bible - or a Deist without a “*God*.” Therefore, a pro-choice, atheistic Evolutionist is an unresolvable oxymoron. A true Evolutionist is **an extreme** pro-lifer. In fact, if scientific, evolutionary, atheistic Naturalism prevails as the basis for law, if a choice must be made between the mother’s life or the preborn’s life ... there is not even a question. The preborn will be saved at all costs. All costs.

The atheistic, evolutionary Naturalist does not actually believe in “*rights*.” Evolution is based upon **what is right** - not “*rights*.” Humanist’s invent “*rights*” in order to protect the evolutionary inferior from the evolutionary superior. Humanist’s had to create a “*right*” for the mother to kill her preborn, because this activity, on its face, is anti-Evolution. I discuss this in some detail in my ebook, “*Abortion: How (and Why) Abortion Resides in the Weakest Form of*

Human Thought and Valuation.” So, technically, atheistic Evolutionists are not interested in a “*right to life*” for the preborn. They work for recognition, in law, as to what is evolutionarily, scientifically right. I do realize that for Naturalists to engage in the concept of “*law*” is a step down. But if they won’t, or don’t, Humanists will, and do - and what you get is ... the gutting of Evolution.

Blatant Hypocrisy?

Secular Humanists claim to be Evolutionists. Yet, they are the driving force behind the abortion argument, abortion rights, abortion laws, and the abortion industry. Abortion would not exist without them. This is either a demonstration of ignorance, or hypocrisy or fraud - and is stunning beyond words. It gives a Biblical Theist, like me, a great opportunity to mock. Of course, it is possible this whole Theory of Evolution is a great fraud, and no one believes it anyway. But, if I am wrong about this, and there truly are scientists who actually do believe in Evolution, then they are either ignorant of their own theory, or are afraid to cleanse the ranks of pseudo-evolutionists who are attacking their science. Allowing Secular Humanists, who profess to be Evolutionists, to parade in the halls of a society’s power, and implement laws, practices and an industry that attacks the very heart of Evolution - is a betrayal of the theory in its most rudimentary foundation. In this matter, it is the true Evolutionists (if there are any) who are ... the blatant hypocrites.

“Being” - And a Rose

While it is difficult to create an illustration that is a perfect parallel to some situation, such an effort can still be helpful. So, I want to compare this “*being*” concept ... to a rose.

Humanists live for “*being*.” Once that magical designation is granted, all sorts of protective rights are bestowed. Pro-choice Humanists are similar to ones who live for, and love, a rose, but are totally blind to the life leading up to the rose. They look upon a backyard full of rose bushes - that are not yet sporting roses - with no regard. They see thorn-filled underbrush depleting the soil of nutrients. If these Humanists go out to trample, burn or otherwise clear the ground of these protoplasmic soil leeches ... and spot some rose buds ... that still means nothing. There is no rose. These “*rose lovers*” do not understand that the precious jewel of their love ... only arises from the rose-less bush. A scientist (in this instance, a Horticulturist) needs to educate them: “*No rose bush ... no rose.*” For our purposes, even a beginning student in any of the life sciences could help the Humanist: “*No preborn ... no beings.*” Of course, the Humanist may not be able to “*get*” this. So, in service to the Humanists, it behooves the scientist to somehow divert their attention toward some other activity for a while (like playing in traffic or something) and protect the “*rose bushes.*” If the scientist is so disposed, he/she could later present the rose lover with a house full of roses. I do realize, the Humanist may never figure out how the scientist was able to do this - and may even regard him/her as a miracle worker. But hopefully, the scientist would gain so much satisfaction by observing the Humanist’s joy in the midst of all the roses - that the details wouldn’t really matter. Accurate science is a great thing.

However, ...

I do believe there may be 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. These Humanists realize the preborn have been conclusively, and scientifically, deemed as 100% human life. The preborn are nothing else, and they can not become anything else. Umbilical cord separation is simply a marker on the human life line. So too is walking, the onset of puberty, menopause - just natural, developmental body changes along one's life line. To extend protective "*rights*" back nine short months - on this potential 100 year life span - is not really that big a step. No new rights are required - just the extension of current post-born human rights to cover the actual life line of a human. So, there is a place in the preborn's civil rights quest for sound Humanists. Surely there are some somewhere.

Parallel Three: The Money Industries, and Empires, of Slavery and Abortion

Slavery was propelled by profit. Money from slavery benefited Southern politicians in the executive, legislative and judicial branches. But, many Southern government officials **never** owned, or had any intention of **ever** owning, an African as a slave. For many, this determination arose from their personal faith or religion. But, these same Southern government officials must have also decided it would be improper to impose their religious beliefs on others under their jurisdiction - even though they had the power to do so. Concerning slavery ... they were pro-choice. I am sure they also pointed to constitutional provisions - and legal precedents - that supported slavery in defense of this pro-choice position. Does any of this sound a bit familiar? Well, let's try this.

Abortion is propelled by profit. Money from abortion benefits U.S. politicians in the executive, legislative and judicial branches. But, many U.S. government officials have **never** aborted, or have any intention of **ever** aborting, a preborn. For many, this determination arises from their personal faith or religion. But, many of these same U.S. government officials have also decided it would be improper to impose their religious beliefs on others under their jurisdiction - even though they have the power to do so. Concerning abortion ... they are pro-choice. They also point to constitutional provisions - and legal precedents - that support abortion in defense of this pro-choice position.

A pro-choice position created/creates a phenomenal conflict of interest. Slave money flowed into campaign coffers - and who knows what else. Abortion money flows into campaign coffers - and who knows what else. It has always been unrealistic to expect slavery benefiting politicians or abortion benefiting politicians to objectively consider evidences in favor of slaves or preborns as rightly being qualified for civil rights and accompanying protections and opportunities. When slaves were emancipated in The South, the industry, and its money, immediately collapsed. When the preborn gains emancipation, the industry, and its money, will immediately collapse. These politicians of two different eras are bedfellows. They knowingly, willingly, and purposefully accepted/accept cash from those who trafficked/traffic in "*subhuman*" flesh. These governing officials "*choice*" was/is to protect, promote and permanently encode into law - the wishes, philosophy, priorities, practices and businesses of their donors. Keep the cash coming.

One difference between yesterday's slave industry and today's abortion industry is the

general position of the accommodating government officials. Slavery was *generally* pushed by individual states and the Federal government *generally* pushed back - seeking to contain slavery. With abortion, it is the Federal government (starting with The Supreme Court) that is *generally* pushing abortion and individual states are *generally* pushing back - seeking to restrain abortion. States are building “underground railroads” *inside* themselves. And speaking of that ...

The Underground Railroad - Competing Legal Systems

Northern Emancipationists mounted all kinds of rescue operations for the slaves. This included societies, lobbyists, and pro-emancipationist governing officials in all branches of government - especially targeting federal officials. This was all legal. But some people also created physical systems designed to help slaves escape their property owners - The Underground Railroad. I believe this was also legal ... north of the Mason-Dixon line. Of course, Southern slave owners wanted to shut this down - and did have some success in demanding the return of their runaway property. Harboring such a one was like cattle stealing. But, from the slave owner’s view, this was just picking at the scab. They wanted to remove the entire scab of emancipation, strike down any law that restrained them from owning their “*property*,” - and hoped all the Emancipationists would then bleed to death.

South of the Mason-Dixon line, slave owners had their property systems in place that were also legal ... and kept the slaves - slaves. Both sides tried to influence one another, both sides tried to undermine one another, and both sides were ultimately irreconcilable with one another. After decades of contention, it finally became unmistakably clear: **One nation** can not stand with **two sets of laws** for the same human group. Hypocrisy and inconsistency in law just cannot continue indefinitely. All law concerning slaves would have to become uniform - one way, or the other. The entire country would have to forever declare slaves as property ... or not. They would have to be recognized as “*partial persons*,” and subhuman ... or not. “*Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*,” along with “*liberty and justice for all*,” would have to be extended to them ... or not. The South seceded. The North said, “*No*.” The rest is history.

Concerning the preborn and their legal plight - do I even need to insert them in that last two paragraphs above? I’ll let you do it. Replace “*Northern Emancipationists*” with “*Pro-lifers*” and “*Southern slave owners*” with “*Pro-choice advocates*” and “*slaves*” with “*the preborn*.” Then, put it all in present tense. After you are done, let us continue to examine more hypocrisy in law - past and present.

Circumstance, or Location, Discrimination

One reality that surely weakened the arguments for slavery, had to be what I call circumstance, or location, discrimination. Think of it this way. Picture two Africans from the same tribe - even identical twins - facing one another. One was standing on the north side of the Mason-Dixon line ... while the other was on the south. Those inches had the twins worlds apart. One was free with multitudes of civil rights, legal protections and legal recourse ... and the other was “*livestock*” - with no freedom, no legal protections and no legal recourse. The world of each twin depended upon ... the location *of the dirt* their feet stood upon. Now, how stupid is that? Law of this type is the fruit of the metaphysical insanity of man - some form of

Humanism - that is void of science or Theism. Today, two preborns can be in two wombs that are sitting side by side on a public bus. One is being carried to an abortion clinic as property to be disposed of ... and the other, who happens to be "*wanted*" by its mother, is being carried to a baby shower. Being wanted – or not – is the new Mason-Dixon line. The one heading to the abortionist has no legal standing or protections. The other is legally protected from the assault of every abortionist on the globe, or any outsider - including an expectant father who kills him/her. Just ask California prisoner, Scott Peterson.

Scott Peterson is currently in prison for murdering his wife. But additional charges were levied for the murder of his eight month old preborn son. The preborn prevailed. Scott received a separate, additional sentence. Yet, at any time in that last month, the mother could have gone to a late term abortionist (i.e., George Tiller in Kansas) and had the preborn killed - with no legal jeopardy for her, the "*doctor,*" or any of the supporting staff ... including every governing official who had a part in letting "*George*" create and open his "*business.*" Scott obviously had a lousy attorney, confused jury or inept judge ... or all the above. Law towards the preborn in the United States is in chaos. Secular Humanists are the culprits. The atheistic Evolutionist must intervene. Let's take a moment to examine the preborn's ground of legal standing, which is based upon being ...

"Wanted" - by Whom?

Evidently, Scott did *not* want this preborn. Yet, law holds a father like him liable - preborn through 18 years of age. The reason? The mother "*wanted*" this preborn. But maybe Scott did not want any children ever ... and his wife had originally agreed to that - but later changed her mind and "*forgot*" her birth control. Who knows? Stranger things have happened. Yet, by law, *her* want - even in deception - trumps Scott's want, even though half of his genes are present in the preborn ... not to mention 18 years and 9 months of financial responsibility. The point is that current law totally ignores the wishes of the father. On the flip side, how many expectant fathers wanted the preborn they sired - yet the mother decided to kill it? The fruit of the evolutionary dominant male victor - in the hands of the impregnated female? A true Evolutionist is nauseated by this. It does not matter if that impregnation is the result of adultery, fornication, rape or any other prohibited, metaphysical value imposed upon the evolutionary victor. What king lion or ruling rooster is so deposed, maligned, imprisoned - or even executed? But, it is all worse than this. Even if a dominant male yields to the metaphysical imposition of marriage - and cooperates with imposed financial liability for an entire family - he has no rights over the fate of the preborn he sires. If the wife wants to kill the preborn at any moment - she can. This should be a lesson to the atheistic Evolutionist. If you give Secular Humanists, with all their contrived "*rights,*" an inch, they will take you for more than a mile. They will take you ... to extinction.

Emancipationists

What if the expectant father and *just one* grandparent on the expectant mother's side ... wants the preborn? These Emancipationists have no legal standing. But, couldn't a legal case be mounted that demonstrates their combined genetic material in that preborn is greater than the mother's alone? Today, Emancipationists, some related to the preborn and some not,

surround expectant mothers - and are willing to take on the responsibility for that child. Yesterday, the South was surrounded by Emancipationists, some related to the slaves and some not, who were willing to take on the responsibility of freed slaves. The dirt surrounding these hapless humans was/is occupied by Emancipationists of all kinds. Additionally, both groups of Emancipationists even willingly acknowledged/acknowledge the sustenance supplied by the slave owner/mother toward their “*property*” - and have offered/offer some kind of restitution - in return for emancipation. Today’s Emancipationists are trying to get preborns ... north of the Mason-Dixon line ... in other words, let the preborn ... be born.

The Civil Rights of the “*Property Owners*”

When slavery was abolished, slave owners lost **none** of their personal liberties. The former slave owner could still exercise freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of movement and all the rest. They were simply prohibited from denying the same to fellow humans. Preborn emancipation **will not** affect the civil rights of the current “*property owners*” either. The expectant mother can still exercise freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of movement and all the rest. She will simply be prohibited from killing a preborn who had **no say** on being in her - and has **no intention** of staying in her. Apart from rape, the expectant mother is an accomplice to the preborn being found in this temporary housing situation ... and now she can kill him/her? No private citizen has ever had a legitimate right to kill another human on grounds such as these. Emancipationists worked to take **illegal** rights away from slave owners and bestow legal rights upon slaves. Pro-lifers are working for the same goal.

Slave States were identified, isolated, targeted and eventually crushed. But, the preborn population is peppered throughout the entire country. They are subject to death at any moment - a stealth killing veiled as a protected medical procedure. But, unless the pregnancy is far enough along, outsiders may have no clue a preborn is right beside them. And even when a pregnancy is obvious, if that mother does not voice her intention with that preborn, no one knows if it is in imminent danger or not - and by law, that declaration could change at any second anyway. In this matter, two mighty factors are at work against the preborn - their stage of life and the salesman “*knocking at the door.*”

Mighty Factor One: The Preborn’s Stage of Life

At birth, parents are legally accountable caretakers of a dependent. But, human life does not become dependent at birth. It is dependent at conception and remains so through **all** of infancy ... at a 100% rate. Humans must go well into the life line before attaining some percentage of independence. In the United States, many never reach much independence in their entire life span. Food, housing, medical care, utility bills - all these things - are gifts from the government. Millions - and the number is growing - are wards of the State. But even the most aggressive among us rarely achieve 100% independence. It is a matter of degree. Additionally, as one reaches advanced years, dependency usually increases - sometimes reverting back to 100%.

The danger of dependency is that it creates vulnerability. For example, contracts are legal protections because some vulnerability has been created as one is dependent upon a

trustworthy performance by another. But, the greater one's dependency - the greater one's vulnerability. **Total** dependency places one at the **total** mercy of those who carry the burden of the dependency. For the preborn, there is no culpability for their state of 100% dependency. But, there sure is vulnerability. At times, slaves, who were forced into dependency, were able to mount uprisings. The preborn have no such opportunity. This is an extreme tragedy. I wish they had the power of the prime of life as abortionists came after them with their "tools." The attack would end ... differently.

Secular Humanists are amassing quite a track record for attacking the dependent ones around them. In addition to the preborn, euthanasia for the aged population, is the next progressive stop. Secular Humanists also move aggressively, when opportunity arises, to "pull the plug" on those in some kind of vegetative state - even if there are caretakers around who would take responsibility for the burdens. A highly publicized case, in 2005, was that of Terri Schiavo. And if this economy does severely constrict, the track record of the Secular Humanist does point to the younger, "adult" wards of the State ... as next. After all, they are being sustained because ... for ... uh, now what was the reason? You see, once their utility becomes somewhat unclear - or ends - so will their "rights." Dependency and vulnerability are brothers.

Mighty Factor Two: The Salesman "Knocking at the Door"

I hate salesmen. Well, maybe I should rephrase that. After all, the last decade ... I have made my living on commission sales. So, what I hate are salesmen who know their target market, know the weaknesses of that target (timing is often critical), know how to coolly field objections and know how to lead their target into an assumptive close. Well, now that I think about it ... that's a lot of what I do. So, I guess it depends on the quality of the product and/or service being sold that really matters.

When a woman becomes pregnant, she has nine months ... to think about it. With a totally dependent being on the way - what type of emotions do you suppose might surface somewhere in those nine months? And, **what if** the father is out of the picture? And, **what if** the expectant mother is young and in a shaky external situation (food, housing, job, short on education, etc.)? If I was an abortion salesman - I know exactly who I would target with my "services." But my goal, as a "medical representative" would not be to induce labor ... but to induce panic. What an easy sell. "... *and you need to decide now! If you put this off, and the preborn becomes a premature baby, - too late! You are on the hook for the next couple of decades!*" To induce panic is where my money is. To induce labor means ... I make nothing.

The abortion industry is packed with salesmen. And these salesmen have a support system second to none. As the industry has matured, a tremendous network has been assembled. It starts with officials in all branches of government who not only provide legal cover, but also promote the industry through many of their projects. For example, the Department of Education has a Public School System full of willing advocates, curriculum, and special events. This is a target market prepped through all the formative years. What a gold mine. When the actual opportunity does arise (pregnancy), all the "advertizing" has a very good chance of paying off handsomely - especially in the more chaotic of districts. These customers know exactly where to turn. And in appreciation for such access, the industry

supports its governing officials ... well. But, this industry does not begin and end with abortions - any more than the slave industry began and ended with the purchase of a few slaves. With time, governmental protection, and some thought, new income streams have a way of surfacing. For example, ...

Breeding

Some slaves were used for breeding purposes. This gave the owners "*livestock*" to sell. The abortion industry now has an eye upon embryo breeding and harvesting. All is currently in the research phase, but if therapies come from embryonic stem cell research, the profit potential is unlimited. Massive "*test tube*" breeding will occur that produces hapless little embryo livestock - destined for consumption. And the turn around time on these investments is vastly superior to the turn around time for breeding slaves to sell.

If embryonic stem cell therapies do become reality, at some point these embryos will probably be used in medical procedures on "*wanted*" preborns (wanted preborns even now can be beneficially worked on while still in the womb). So if the unwanted preborn is used to benefit the wanted preborn, the unwanted is consumed for the wanted one. This is not unlike *black* African slave traders who sold black African slaves. The black slave traders benefited by this "*consumption.*" But, these transactions created a weakening hypocrisy in the entire slavery enterprise. Both were black Africans. Similarly, if embryonic stem cell sellers use "*unwanted*" embryos on preborns who happen to be "*wanted,*" - this consumption will create a weakening hypocrisy in the entire embryonic stem cell enterprise because both are preborns.

This is simply trafficking in human life for profit. The victims of both systems of atrocity possessed/possess his/her own unique, and complete, genetic code. Both enterprises are ultimately the same thing ... just cosmetic differences.

If I Was Today's "*Property Owner*"

... I would attack anything that even suggested the preborn is human. It is a subhuman, non-viable, blob of protoplasm - a "*leech*" feeding off the woman. I would seek to create unified Federal law that would totally crush any State or local law that granted legal standing for the preborn in any situation. I would give this law a name that sounded very noble and emancipating. I don't know ... maybe something like ... "*The Freedom of Choice Act.*" Yes, an Emancipation Proclamation for expectant mothers! Some might even compare me to Abe Lincoln ... even though it would be exactly backwards. I would get judges in place who would rule to criminalize all opposition to this Act. **No** parental notification laws. **No** required waiting periods. **No** preborn sonograms forced on emancipated expectant mothers. **No** underage pregnancy reports to any authority. **No** rulings about "*wanted*" or "*unwanted*" preborns. I would not allow any legal reference to any preborn as "*him*" or "*her.*" They would always, and forever, be an "*it.*" I would not allow picketing at an abortion clinic. In fact, I would do away with the abortion clinic - and have the procedure institutionalized in all hospitals as part of nationalized health care. I would require every physician and nurse, and all supporting staff, to perform this medical service for any emancipated expectant mother at any time during the preborn period. Failure to comply would be met with felony charges of violating her civil rights, followed by a mandatory prison sentence in the general prison

population. Those immediately involved in this crime would have all medical licenses revoked, and the hospital administrators would be fined (at least) with a special fast-track lawsuit venue established for securing damages for the abused expectant mother (using public prosecutors ... already in place). I would set up an internal paramilitary force to root out all rescue efforts - underground railroads - for the preborn. I would target pregnancy support centers and crisis centers (other than my own) - and haul all pro-life subverts before “*sympathetic-to-my-cause*” judges. I would order the burning of every copy of this document - and have it designated as hate speech. I would prosecute anyone in possession of it ... with greater penalties for disbursement of it. I would arrest and gag the author and “*lose*” the key. Yes, ... this would be my starting point in dealing with the opposition. In a secular society, I would never have to worry about Theism claims, as governance is separated from religion. The only wild card would be the awakening of the sleeping giant - the atheistic Evolutionist. But, maybe there really aren't any.

From the Other Side - The Class Action Law Suit or Class Action Lawsuits

Law in the United States has entirely mis-classified two human groups: the preborn and mothers - specifically, expectant ones. They need accurate classification - reclassification - so, isn't this the base from which class action lawsuits arise? Since you have stayed with me this far, I ask for your indulgence as I trace my legal understandings.

First, I am not a lawyer. So, some of my approach may lack the necessary intricacies for the courtroom environment. But, rather than dismiss my points on technical grounds, hear their thrust, and then add the necessary nuances to make this work in the courtroom setting.

Concerning theism in a secular system, it is not necessary to totally shut it down - just keep it, and its arguments for values, out of the legal discussion ... hence, out of law. That creates, by default, a secular law system. The values for derived law then arise from some form of Humanism - or from science. Science, in our current secular society, professes consensus to atheistic, evolutionary Darwinism. In the area of abortion - and its “rights” - these two systems are in tremendous disagreement and, I believe can be exploited in favor of the preborn. Theism is not actually necessary for the preborn to gain protections for life in a secularly governed society. Did I hear ... “Really?” Let's see.

For the Evolutionist (Naturalist), science is the **only** option for law values. It is phenomenal error to think Humanism and Naturalism agree on values. They do not. In fact, atheistic, evolutionary Naturalism may be more hostile to the values forwarded by Humanism - than is Biblical Theism. I could site endless examples in this regard. Here is one. Most Humanistic systems even agree with Biblical Theism that “*murder*” is a valid concept (even though they may disagree on what constitutes a murder). The Naturalist rejects any such concept - much less places a moral value of “*right*” or “*wrong*” upon it. No animal in nature ever “*murders*” anything. An animal might kill - but never murder. An animal might even kill in a way that seems contrary to a species progression (i.e., a hamster mother eating her young, or a human mother killing her preborn), but this is viewed as a possible evolutionary defect - not some kind of metaphysical, *moral* defect. (Of course, it is possible that after careful study, an evolutionist might conclude that such destructive behavior *is indeed a natural evolutionary process* - designed to take that species to a natural extinction, setting the stage for the advent of

some other, more adapted line of creatures. I discuss this in more detail in, "*Abortion: How (and Why) Abortion Resides in the Weakest Form of Human Thought and Valuation*," pages 18 and 19. But, even if scientists somehow prove abortion is Evolution's mechanism leading to human extinction, that would **not** affect the mis-classification by Humanists of the preborn and the expectant mother.) The point here - I am absolutely certain evolutionary science can be brought to bear in favor of the preborn (and expectant mothers) **so overwhelmingly** that current abortion reasonings, practices - and the industry itself - can be totally excised from a secularly governed society. Here are the points.

Current law in the United States classifies all expectant mothers as property owners over an entire segment of humanity. This is a **default position** that puts all expectant mothers in the same category as yesterday's slave owners. Law has placed every expectant mother ... south of the Mason-Dixon line. For the true evolutionist, such a designation is in itself - abominable. If I was an atheistic, Evolutionist woman, I would fight against this State relegated, anti-evolutionary, demeaning position with everything in me. As a defamed woman, I would seek immediate remedy by means of some sort of class action lawsuit. I would find lawyers that would demonstrate harm by this degradation. Experts from the field of Evolutionary theory would be called to explain the supremacy of preborn life over the current generation - and that *all expectant mothers* are Evolution's **queens** - gatekeepers for the future of the species - with priceless treasure developing in the womb. Concerning the preborn, I would immediately forward medical scientists who are true evolutionists, to attack the validity of the concept of "*being*" as a basis for law in a secular society. They would go into extreme detail about the preborn being human life and nothing but human life and must be treated as such. The preborn would be elevated to **the kings** of Evolution - and expectant mothers to **its queens** ... not some slave/slave owner parallel hoisted on both classes of humans by darkened Humanists.

Evolutionarily, I would demand emancipation from such erroneous, State imposed, oppressive, humiliating classifications of "*property*" and "*property owner*." I guess this might need to be two separate class action lawsuits - even though both groups have been melded together by law into this profane slave/slave owner alliance. As a woman, I would want history to show that I sought, and secured, emancipation from such a scientifically defiling classification. I would then see if lawsuits could be brought against all groups of Humanists who had violated me in this manner. That would include Planned Parenthood, NARAL, NOW, and all similar groups. I would also see if I could seek damages from past government officials (and current ones if not immune) for this travesty as well.

In these courtrooms, I would not allow any discussion about Theism. I would demand all such material be excluded from all proceedings as this is an action flowing from an atheistic evolutionary base. If defendants tried to impugn any of my witnesses with motives of a veiled Theism, I would seek to immediately file slander lawsuits against them. I would petition the court for contempt charges if they tried to muddy the course of the lawsuit with this diversion.

There are two other angles from which to legally attack on behalf of the preborn that have no parallel to the slavery situation. One is from a newer area of law and the other is from an area of currently accepted folklore.

Angle One: Age Discrimination

This is a relatively new area of civil law, primarily focused on age discrimination in the workplace in hiring, promotion, and firing practices. But, couldn't this area of emerging civil law be applied toward the preborn? If agenda driven judges can take a Constitutional right to privacy - and apply it to a mother's womb - and declare abortion a constitutional right, why can't an agenda driven judge take this age-discrimination civil right - and "*find it*" for the preborn in that mother's womb? After all, isn't it precisely because of its age - preborn - that it is open for sanctioned attack against it? Law already protects that life-line once it reaches a certain age. The preborn is discriminated against because of his/her age.

Angle Two: The Viability Myth - Unacceptable Folklore

A cornerstone argument for denying the preborn the designation of "*being*" or a "*person*" is ... the preborn is not viable outside of the womb. This position, or any similar derivation, is truly insane. The preborn are extremely viable *in their environment*. To expect, or require, they live outside of that, in order to be deemed "*viable*," is a scientific absurdity. (That last sentence was hard to write, and is still hard for me to follow, because the thinking is so cockeyed. The same logic would require that we, as adults, be able to live in their environment in order to be declared "*viable*."). Simple science must be called upon to refute this Humanistic assertion spawned from madness. Indeed, the second and third trimester are the most viable times in the entire human life line. Hard science must prevail and silence this folklore.

By the way, the extreme measures often employed to save premature "*babies*" is another glaring hypocrisy. They are called "*babies*" and have all the civil rights protections afforded any other "*person*." Yet many are artificially sustained, at great expense, until they can more fully adapt to this environment. But, the fact that any premature baby can survive in an environment he/she is not yet ready for - is a testament to that one's adaptability and hardiness. No adult can adapt to the preborn's environment. So, who actually *is* more viable?

What the Flat Earth, the Common Cold, and the Preborn Have in Common

I am of the conviction that if a society is stable long enough, eventually scientific truths prevail over cultural myths. The old guard eventually dies. At one time, most believed the earth was flat. But, that error had "*a season*." Eventually scientific truth prevailed (although there is still a "*Flat Earth Society*" on our sphere). Today, many believe the common cold comes from ... cold weather. Hence the name. But science has conclusively demonstrated that of the scores of known cold viruses, none of them care about outside temperatures. Concerning abortion, a percentage of the populace will always believe the preborn are subhuman, protoplasmic leeches - science be damned. But, scientific fact about preborn humanity will eventually triumph over the present insanity of motherhood property rights, age discrimination, and corrupted government officials, and all the rest. This might be a long, long battle (like the emancipation of American slaves), but, it could change quite rapidly. In this country, a handful of judges imposed this errant Humanism on the entire nation. The way our government is constituted, it would only take the "*conversion*" of a few select people for this entire area of law to be reversed and abandoned. Legal precedents have never permanently thwarted genuine

conversion of thought in the judiciary.

One difference between American slavery and abortion is obvious: one is litter along the highway of human history, and the other is still on the road. But, this will change. It is a matter of destiny. That will create another parallel between the two. And just as everyone involved in the slave industry - active and passive - are now seen as litter along the human highway, this too is the destiny of all involved in the abortion industry - active and passive. That is just the way it is ... and will be. Open debate, will eventually yield to science - even if Theism, in any of its forms, is absent from the debate. Just as science has dismissed flat-earth believers from its ranks, and medical science has cast out those who attribute the common cold to cold weather, so also, all abortion advocates are going to find themselves scientifically ... aborted.

Conclusion

Here is the greatest parallel between slavery and abortion. **There was/is nothing right about either one.** Every argument began/begins with flawed assumptions. The philosophy was/is groundless. The law was/is contradictory, selective, and corrupted by money and power. The rationalizations were/are twisted. The hypocrisy was/is glaring - even blinding ... to anyone with eyes. And accurate physical science was/is absolutely absent. Both are built upon blood. Both are built upon oppression. Both are demonstrations of the darkness and insanity of man. Yet, the defenders of both believe they were/are ... right.

The parallels between the American slave industry and the Abortion industry are so close in civil law and practice that one wonders if this culture has a collective, subconscious, prejudicial discriminatory streak in it. A segment of the populace regularly arises and deprives some group in its midst of basic human rights - at one time, slaves, at another, the preborn. It is bent on giving illegitimate rights to one group at the expense of another group, or class, of humans. These rights are against the will of the dominated group. Even late term preborns have been observed recoiling from the attacks of the abortionist. One would hope these victims would be granted their turn to respond. But, I believe they will be trumped by Someone else. *“Vengeance is Mine. I will repay” saith the Lord* (Ro 12:19). The Author of Biblical Theism will not always be excised from the discussion.

As an aside, I am always quite amazed when I hear an adamant abortion advocate ... who has descended from slave lines. The *very things* their forefathers **were deprived of** ... they are now actively imposing on the preborn, even in the face of scientific evidence that refutes such activity as being valid.

Personally, I approach the matters of life from a Biblical Theist perspective. That means, I study to learn God’s position on a matter, and when I am convinced I have found that, I adopt, and forward it. But concerning rejection by a secular governing system of all such values, in some ways, I can’t say that I blame them. Professing Biblical Theists disagree among themselves on almost everything. There is no consensus on money (see, *“No Tithes for the Christian”*), or Evolution and longevity models (see, *“Death and the Bible”*), or even the validity of capital punishment by government (see, *“Capital Punishment and the Bible”*). Internally, they fight over church governing structure, the role of women, end time scenarios, baptism, homosexuality, translations - the list is almost endless. They can’t even agree on what

the Bible teaches about love (See, *“Love and the Bible”*). For the Secularist, who is not the least bit interested in Biblical authority on matters anyway, these contrary positions are just more garbage. The easiest thing to do - indeed, the only thing to do - is to sweep that off the legal table and start from scratch. Increasingly, that is exactly what law in the United States is doing. And while I do not believe atheistic Evolution is correct science on many fronts (see, *“I Went From a Believer to an Unbeliever ... in Evolution”*), it can - and should - be used to refute an even weaker Humanism.

Well, I am sure there are many other parallels between slavery and abortion than what I have forwarded. If any of you can expand this train of thought, please do. But, concerning all the women’s rights arguments, well, we have heard all that from slave owners and their advocates. This has been fully weighed and found ... wanting. So, in the preborn civil rights struggle of the 21st century, on which side of this new Mason-Dixon line do you reside?

Whether you are looking for the Biblical position on Abortion
or a visual Gospel Presentation
you can find these, or other FREE ebooks at
freelygive-n.com

Robin Calamaio: BA, Bus Admin (Milligan College '90) and Master of Divinity (Emmanuel School of Religion '92).