

Stupid Arguments for Abortion.

CSI has emphasized the critical nature of DNA evidence. If your DNA is found at the scene of a crime it is irrefutable evidence that you were there and either know what happened or are guilty of the crime. Why? Because your DNA is who you are. It is the genetic code that determined everything about you from the color of your eyes to the probable length of your life.

Where does your DNA come from? Your DNA is the result of your mother's egg and your father's sperm uniting to form a new unique individual. From the moment of conception you were a person with all of the characteristics which you have today.

The stupid (and I use the word advisedly) argument for abortion is that you are not a full individual until you can live without the support of your mother's body. The favorite word is "viable." If you take anyone stark naked and drop them 400 miles from civilization, in the middle of the Northern Ontario wilderness on a frosty January night, they will not be "viable." Children are not a special case; they are just more vulnerable because they are not seen or heard, and are dependent on their mother for food and shelter. Children are as completely different from their mother when unborn, as they will be when they are 5, 10 or 15 years old. The child is not a piece of extraneous tissue in the mother's body, he/she is a separate individual who is living in the mother's body.

The next stupid argument is that a woman has rights over her own body and should be allowed to terminate (perish the idea of murder) the person who is living in her body. There are questions that must be asked so we can understand the situation properly. How did this new person come to be living in the mother's body? The answer is that the child is the result of sexual intercourse in which (in the majority of cases) the mother was a willing participant. In applications for abortion only 1% of those seeking abortion did so on the basis of rape or incest. See the web site listed below:

<http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/abortion/abreasons.html>

The mother is responsible for the child living in her body. She invited the possibility of becoming pregnant by participation in sexual union. Now to escape the problems that are associated with being pregnant and spending the next twenty years raising the child to adulthood she wants to kill it and remove the "problem" for which she was fully responsible (except in the case of rape and incest). She exercised control over her body and is responsible for the person who is living in her body.

This raises other questions, which must be answered. Why is it that the public was

horrified when a mother of three in the US locked her three children in a car and rolled it into a river so they would drown? What is the qualitative difference between killing children when they are five months old or five years old?

Now let's hear another stupid argument for abortion. The child (ie, 'fetus') is not fully developed at five months and is not really a person. The viability argument is bogus. What about this one? Study of the brain in the past decades has been very interesting. Scientists once thought that the brain stopped developing at about five years old. The body obviously keeps growing until the early twenties. Now they have discovered that the brain continues to "grow" (more neuron connections being made) until we are twenty-five and we are not fully "developed" and most efficient, until we reach our mid forties. The logic of the abortion supporter's argument would go like this: You are not fully developed until you are forty five so your mother has the right, until that point of full development, to have a hit man kill you if you inconvenience her. (People would probably treat their mothers more carefully if this were true). Your DNA makes you a complete individual when you are conceived, or when you are forty-five, or eighty-five. The only difference is development. If you can kill someone at any age of development, then no one is safe.

The next stupid argument is that the child is unwanted and so should be killed. Again, note the incongruity of the public stance on the issue. In BC a number of teenagers killed a fellow classmate. She was annoying and inconvenienced them. They beat her and held her head under water until she drowned. If they had been abortionists they would have crushed her head and dismembered her. What is the difference between the mother and a group of teenagers killing the unwanted, annoying individual? None! It is simply a matter of degree. How could the child be unwanted when thousands of parents who cannot have children would love to adopt but can find no children to adopt because in Canada we kill in excess of one hundred thousand babies a year? In the thirty plus years of open abortion policy we have destroyed 3 to 4 million persons. Our more populous neighbor to the south, being ten times as large, has killed at least 30 million persons. Hitler was obviously a piker. He killed a few million in his extermination camps. He never reached the massive numbers that North America and what is called 'Western civilization' has been able to compile. Darfur, Afghanistan, and the tsunami killed hundreds of thousands. Our 'healing' edifices and clinics have killed millions.

Let's look at the practical implications, which logically flow from this campaign for death, which has been foisted upon us under the banner of "women rights." (I would be careful whose invitation to come over for a meal I accepted. Logically it would not be out of line for the lady who invited me in to terminate me if I caused her an inconvenience.)

You should not be surprised that young people are blasé about violence and the rights of others. They have been brainwashed into thinking that their convenience is a reason for doing whatever they think is necessary so that they can be comfortable. It is frightening to seriously contemplate how this next generation will treat the elderly, who will burden these young folk with demands for care. Baby boomers face a critical

shortage of people to support them in their old age, not because of a lack of wealth, but because of a lack of interest in having children when they had the opportunity. The 30-40 million North American babies who went missing since 1973 would have been the very ones who would care for the boomers, but alas, they were trashed because they were too much trouble!

The most serious consequence to this bent and practice of our society is that God holds nations as well as individuals responsible for their crimes, especially those committed against the helpless. The Western World has put Hitler, Stalin and Mao in the shade by the massive number of killings of the helpless which we have perpetuated. He will have justice, and for the unrepentant there will be no mercy from the one who said, "vengeance is mine, I will repay."

Stupid (just type into google *define: stupid*)

Here's what you get (Stupidity is the quality or condition of being stupid, or lacking intelligence. This quality can be attributed to an individual himself (John Smith is stupid) or his actions, words or beliefs (John Smith's policies are stupid). The determination of who is stupid is difficult, despite attempts to measure intelligence (and thus stupidity) such as IQ tests