

6. But the bodily autonomy argument is flawed in ways that go beyond that utterly fallacious and misleading hypothetical. It's flawed because nobody is crazy enough to consistently apply it to pregnant women.

According to bodily autonomy, a mother could not be judged harshly for smoking, drinking, doing coke, and going skydiving (hopefully not all in the same day) while 6 months pregnant. If you really believe that a woman's body is autonomous — that she has absolute jurisdiction over it — then you *must* defend a mother who does things that could seriously harm her unborn child, even if she hasn't chosen to abort it. This is not a slippery slope argument; this is a reasonable and inevitable application of your principle.

7. The bodily autonomy argument is flawed because it requires you to support abortion at every stage of development.

I'm throwing this in here because most pro-aborts will not (vocally) defend abortion at 8 or 9 months. But — if bodily autonomy is your claim — you must. Is a woman's body less autonomous when she's been pregnant for 35 weeks? There is no way around it: bodily autonomy means that it is moral to kill a fully formed baby, at seven months, or eight months, or nine months.

8. The bodily autonomy argument is flawed because you can't limit it to pregnant women.

You say that our bodies cannot be 'used' without our 'consent.' Why should this apply only to pregnancy and organ donations? Children, at any age, create profound demands on their parents' bodies. Whether it's waking up in the middle of the night for the crying baby, working long hours to pay for their food and clothing, carrying them around when they cannot walk, staying home when you'd like to go out, going out (to bring them to the doctor, or school, or soccer practice) when you'd like to stay in, etc, etc, etc, and so forth. An argument for absolute bodily autonomy means that it can't be illegal, or considered immoral, for a parent to decline to do any of these things, so long as their decision was made in the name of bodily autonomy.

The Matt Walsh Blog - March 4, 2014
<http://themattwalshblog.com/2014/03/04/i-am-afraid-of-this-indisputable-pro-choice-argument/>

In Psalm 139:13-16 we are told, **"For You formed my inward parts; You covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; Marvelous are Your works, And that my soul knows very well. My frame was not hidden from You, When I was made in secret, And skillfully wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Your eyes saw my substance, being yet unformed. And in Your book they all were written, The days fashioned for me, When as yet there were none of them."** In Psalm 119:73 we are told, **"Your hands have made me and fashioned me; Give me understanding, that I may learn Your commandments."** And in Jeremiah 1:5 we are told, **"Before I formed you in the womb I knew you; Before you were born I sanctified you; I ordained you a prophet to the nations."**

One of the greatest travesties that has come upon our nation is the 1973 court case of Roe versus Wade that legalized the murder of innocent children in the womb. From that point to March 6, 2014 at 12 noon there have been 57,190,110 abortions, murders done in this country. And in this world, since 1980 until March 6, 2014 there have been 1,287,270,880 abortions or murder committed!

Now you may be taken back by calling abortion "murder" but that is exactly what it is! A baby's heart starts beating from 14-28 days after conception (usually before the mother even knows she is pregnant). By the 30th day almost every organ has started to form. By six weeks he begins to move his arms and legs. And by 43 days his brain waves can be read. By the time this baby is 8 weeks old, he has his very own fingerprints, he can urinate, make a strong fist, and can feel pain.

According to a London study, ***"Even the unborn feel pain, according to preliminary evidence by British researchers . . . Fisk and his colleagues found a dramatic rise in fetal stress hormones when they inserted a needle into the fetuses for blood transfusions. This is the same chemical response that occurs when children and adults feel pain."***

We are fearfully and wonderfully made by our Creator, let us not take the precious life of an unborn child away by murdering them. The safest place for an unborn child is the mother's womb, let's not change that! (John 3:16-21, John 14:6, Romans 3:21, 6:23, 10:9-10)



1208 South 10th Street, Manitowoc, WI 54220
Phone: (920) 682-6163 * Fax: (920) 682-4605
Web Page: ccmanitowoc.org / E-mail: info@ccmanitowoc.org

Indisputable Pro-Choice Argument?

Matt Walsh wrote on his blog:

I couldn't help but open an email with the subject line: "You're afraid of this pro-choice argument" Afraid? I'm afraid of a lot of things. Actually, five things: spiders, asteroids, ghosts, head lice, and malaria. But arguments? Especially pro-abortion arguments? Definitely not on the list. I might be frustrated by them; annoyed, angered, even disturbed, but afraid? I don't think so.

Here's Rachel, trying to strike fear into my heart:

Dear Matt, ever since I first read your blog I knew you were a cowardly fake. It wasn't until I started reading some of your anti-choice articles that my suspicions were truly confirmed. You spend a lot of time picking the low hanging fruit. You attack the weakest abortion rights arguments while ignoring the glaring weaknesses in your own position.

If you had the guts or the brains you'd try to respond to the most important abortion rights argument... bodily autonomy or bodily integrity. This means that we have the final jurisdiction over our own bodies. Nobody can claim a right to our body that goes above our own right. Nobody can use our bodies without consent. We cannot be forced to donate organs or blood to someone else. A fetus must survive on a woman's body so the woman has a right to withdrawal her consent and her body at any time.

This is the pro-choice argument that no anti-choice fanatic... especially one as stubborn and simpleminded as you... could ever possibly dispute. If you still don't understand, try to imagine this hypothetical...

Imagine that you wake up one morning in a hospital bed. In the bed next to you is a famous singer. He is unconscious and all of these tubes are connected from him to you. A doctor comes in and explains that the singer became sick and you are the only person with the right blood type to match his. They need you to remain hooked up to him until he recovers... they tell you it should only take nine months. Until then, he needs to use all of your organs... your kidneys, liver, lungs, everything... just to survive. If you unplug yourself, he will die. So do you think you are obligated to stay plugged in? Does he have a right to live off of you like this? Should you be FORCED to stay connected to him?

That's what situation the pregnant woman is in. Instead of harping on all of these irrelevant issues, I wish you'd be brave enough to address it from this angle. It is immoral to require a woman to sustain a fetus and it is moral for a woman to make a decision with her body based on what is right for her. How can you argue against this?

But I guess your blog is more about preaching to the choir than actually being intelligent and bold in your writing. What a shame.

-Rachel

Dear Rachel,

You're right. You win. I have no response. I can't think of any reason why you're wrong about any of the points you raised.

Well, I can't think of any reason — except for, like, ten reasons. So I'll start with five reasons why that hypothetical is flawed, and move on to five additional reasons why your overall argument is flawed.

Here we go:

1. Your analogy is flawed because it presupposes that the relationship between mother and child is no more significant, and carries with it no more responsibility, than the relationship between a person and some random stranger in a hospital bed.

This is absurd. If we're trying to make this hypothetical as close to pregnancy as possible, shouldn't the sick singer (or violinist, according to the original iteration of this hypothetical) at least be your child? Your argument doesn't work because the fact that your child is *your child*, and not some strange adult from across town, is precisely the point.

Hidden cleverly in this hypothetical is the insinuation that one cannot agree that an unborn child has a right to his mother's body, without agreeing that *anyone* in the entire world, in any context, for any reason, at any point, for any period of time, has a right to a woman's body.

Nice try, Rachel.

Just because a mother is expected to be a mother doesn't mean she's also expected to be a slave, a prostitute, and a forced organ donor to talented musical artists. Indeed, the extent of our responsibility to a person hinges in many ways on our relationship to them. You would, I assume, agree that you have a responsibility to your born children, wouldn't you? And your responsibility to them extends far beyond your responsibility to your neighbor, or your plumber, or your trash collector, doesn't it? The relationship matters. Your hypothetical fails because it pretends that relationships are irrelevant.

2. Your analogy is flawed because it leaves out an important detail: how did the singer become ill in the first place?

Aside from cases of rape, a child is only conceived because two people intentionally committed a particular act which has, literally billions of times, resulted in the conception of a human life.

This singer came down with a terrible sickness. You might feel pity for him, but you didn't cause him to be sick. You didn't put him in this state. You had absolutely nothing to do with it. The same cannot be said when a child is conceived.

3. Your analogy is flawed because, when framed properly, it doesn't strengthen your moral position — it defeats it.

The hypothetical should be this: your *own child* becomes very sick *because of something you did*. He needs a blood transfusion and you are the only match. Would you refuse to give him your blood because it infringes on your bodily autonomy? Could this be morally justified? You put your kid in the hospital and now you will choose to watch him die because he 'doesn't have a right to your blood.' THIS scenario would be the closest to abortion. And, if you are consistent in your affinity for 'bodily autonomy,' you could not criticize parents who'd rather let their child die than be inconvenienced by a blood transfusion.

4. But, no matter how you frame the hypothetical, it is still flawed because it ignores one crucial thing: natural order.

An unborn child is exactly where he is supposed to be. He couldn't possibly be anywhere else. This is the fundamental difference between two people hooked up to machines on a hospital bed, and a 'fetus' connected to his mother inside her womb. The former represents unnatural and extraordinary measures, while the latter represents something natural and ordinary. The unborn child is where Nature (or God, as I call Him) intends it to be.

The unborn child is not, in any scientific or medical sense, an intruder or a parasite. These words have meanings, and unborn babies do not fit the bill. They are where they are supposed to be. They are where they belong. A fish belongs in water, just as an unborn child belongs in his mother's womb.

5. Beyond all of these points, the analogy is flawed because abortion is not the same as 'unplugging' a person from medical equipment.

It might be quite sanitary and pleasant to refer to abortion as a woman 'withdrawing support' from her child, but the procedure goes beyond this. During a 'termination,' the baby is actively killed. It is crushed, dismembered, poisoned, or torn apart. It is killed. It is actively, actually, purposefully, intentionally killed.

In fact, even in the original hypothetical — where you're hooked up to a singer in a hospital bed — while it would be acceptable to unplug yourself, it would NOT be morally or legally permissible to shoot the poor guy in the head. A person's physical reliance on you does not give you the moral (or legal, usually) right to murder them. 'Withdrawing support' is precisely what an abortion *isn't*. If it was, then the baby would be delivered and left to die in the corner of the room. Of course, this *is* how some abortionists conduct business, but it's illegal. If they're caught, they go to jail.