

**Question: Shouldn't a woman have the right to choose?**

**Quick Response: My body, my choice-no matter how it is justified, ultimately, it is always a murder, and there is no way around that. Why should the law allow a woman the right to choose to kill her unborn child?**

Since abortion is impossible to justify on the merits ([it kills a living human being, remember](#)), "choice" has become the foundation of its political justification. Abortion advocates don't want to talk about [facts or science](#), but they love to talk about "choice". *"This is America...We're free to choose...You can't legislate morality!"* Nothing has so clouded and confused the politics of this debate more than the misconstrued application of this one little term. The bottom line is this. Choice is nothing apart from the context to which it is applied. Individual choices are either recognized or restricted based upon the circumstances at hand. That's how our laws work. You simply cannot talk about choice in isolation.

For thirty years, however, abortion advocates have sought to bestow upon choice a nobility all its own, a nobility it has no claim to. They refuse to be called "pro-abortion", but they gladly accept the label "pro-choice" (despite the fact that there are countless other issues for which they are decidedly *not* pro-choice). The fact is, laws against rape, murder, assault, theft, speeding, drunk-driving and even smoking are all "anti-choice". They take away legal protection from one particular choice in order to protect a more foundational freedom. All such laws are "legislating morality". That's the only way society can survive. Personal choices that infringe on the life or livelihood of another human being must be legislated against. Therefore, anyone who defends legal abortion by simply arguing that people must be free to make their own choices is either ignorant or dishonest.

Furthermore, in almost 99% of all U.S. abortions<sup>1</sup>, the woman having the abortion *chose* to have sexual intercourse in the first place. Therefore, it could just as easily be argued that these women already made their choice when they chose to engage in behavior that often leads to pregnancy. Ultimately, restricting a woman's right to abortion does *not* restrict a woman's right to not be pregnant. Abstinence does that. Abortion simply ends the pregnancy of an already pregnant woman by killing the embryo or fetus living within her.

In the end, we are only free to choose so long as that choice doesn't kill or harm someone else, and our government exists to take away those choices that do. Nobody argues that a man should be free to choose when the context is sexual assault. What a fool he would be to try and justify rape by saying, "My body, my choice." Why? Because rape is a violent assault which involves more than just one body. And so is abortion. The heart of the issue

is not "choice". The real question is humanity, and nothing short of anarchy can guarantee the perfect freedom of choice.

There is nothing intrinsically noble about the concept choice. In the 1858 debates between Stephen Douglas and Abraham Lincoln, Douglas stated "individuals should be allowed to make their own choices about whether to own slaves or not". He was for "choice".

### **Common mistakes to avoid when arguing this point:**

- 1. Don't allow the pro-abortionist to justify "choice" with misleading "injustices":**
  - A woman can't compete equally with a man without "reproductive freedom".
  - If I carry this baby to term I will have to quit school.
  - If I carry this baby to term I will have to abandon my career.
  - I will suffer for the rest of my life never knowing where my child was placed for adoption.
  - I cannot afford to raise this child
  - Every child should be a wanted child

Remind the pro-abortionist that what they are saying is that the only way a pregnant woman can accomplish anything is for her to kill her baby and that the temporary condition and its inconveniences trump the child's very right to exist. Remind the pro-abortionist that mothers of born children don't have the right to kill their offspring if they can't afford to raise them? No one makes such an absurd and heartless argument because we know that no amount of financial hardship is sufficient rational for killing another human being, an innocent child. This is a great opportunity to point out that there are over 3,000 pro-life mother-helping centers around the country willing to help both the mother and the baby. Remind the pro-abortionist that they don't argue that a mother should be free to kill their "unwanted" children *after* birth because they acknowledge these children are living, human beings with full rights of personhood. The only reason they argue that mothers should be free to kill their "unwanted" children before birth is because they're ignoring the scientific reality that these children, too, are living human beings. Remind the pro-abortionist that there are no "unwanted" children in the broadest sense. Even if the biological parents want nothing to do with their offspring, there are families all over the nation waiting desperately to adopt a baby -including families who are willing to adopt diseased babies of any race or ethnicity. Ironically, as long as women give into the expectation that they ought to kill their children in order to get further in this world (that is, compete equally with men), they really are "second-class" citizens.