

- Discussion:

-Following are a series of excerpts with responses to them from a debate with a liberal progressive. This exchange was both fruitless and uncivil. However, a number of points may prove to be useful in discussing the issues of abortion and race:

"You may not know it, but thugs is a real word. There are real thugs. You think it has to do with skin color. And that's the problem: thugs are people who hate with brutality."

The skin color of a man is not an issue, but how he was raised by his parents. If there is statistical data suggesting that people of a particular pigmentation commit more crimes than others, then that would be due to a cultural problem as opposed to a racial problem.

"Like you and Hamas. You're just an armchair terrorist and insurrectionist. An old bastard thug."

That is a slanderous way of handling disagreement. You do not have a clue as to what you are saying, nor do you even want one.

"And "right to life" is in quotes because it's a lie you and Craig and the other thugs tell yourselves."

Your "right to choice" is in quotes because it is a lie that you and others who believe as you do tell yourselves.

"In a free democracy, you won't let women of child bearing age determine their life."

You subscribe to a concept of individuality that encourages selfishness. Parents have an obligation to care for their children by virtue of their biology and inherent nature of such an interpersonal relationship.

Even if there was a federal piece of legislation drafted and passed allowing for abortions in a few cases (i.e. cases of rape, incest, and when a woman's life is in danger), that still would not be enough for somebody like yourself. You want abortions to be legal all the way up to the point of birth and beyond. That makes negotiating pointless.

"Because you don't care about life. Evangelicals didn't care about life until they needed a better political plan than opposing desegregation."

This is just not true. Pregnancy centers are available to women in need of them as well as adoption agencies for adults who want to take care of abandoned children. For the record, it was mostly the Southern Democrats who defended the institution of slavery and filibustered civil rights legislation.

"Do yourself a favor and learn something for the first time in 40 years: look up Paul Weyrich."

Your arrogance at your own ignorance is most stunning.

"Evangelicals considered abortion a "Catholic issue" through most of the 1970s, and there is little in the history of evangelicalism to suggest that abortion would become a point of interest."

Even if that is true, it only proves that people can be wrong about an issue and change their minds when presented with more information. It is irrelevant to the question of the morality of abortion itself. The state of medical research has changed dramatically since the 1970s.

"Even James Dobson, who later became an implacable foe of abortion, acknowledged after the Roe decision that the Bible was silent on the matter and that it was plausible for an evangelical to hold that "a developing embryo or fetus was not regarded as a full human being."

Even if the Bible is silent on the topic of abortion, it does not follow that God has given women permission to get them. It is also silent about arson, yet we know from the application of biblical principles that such behavior is wrong. The Old Testament implicitly recognizes that life begins at the moment of conception (Jeremiah 1:5). It is wrong to take innocent life. Period.

You do not even care what the Bible says, since in your mind, it is nothing but an ancient collection of writings by uneducated men. Its teachings are not the words of God in your mode of thinking. You undoubtedly embrace speculative theories about the origin and transmission of the biblical text that erode its historicity.

"In the course of the first session, Weyrich tried to make a point to his religious right brethren (no women attended the conference, as I recall). Remember, he said animatedly, that the religious right did not come together in response to the Roe decision."

Even if all these details are correct, it only proves that people can have their own opinions about various issues. They are not evidence that the pro-life movement as a whole has something to do with preserving racism or even that its roots were at all associated with such behavior patterns. Opinions are inherently subjective.

"No, Weyrich insisted, what got the movement going as a political movement was the attempt on the part of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to rescind the tax-exempt status of Bob Jones University because of its racially discriminatory policies, including a ban on interracial dating that the university maintained until 2000."

That is nothing but hype and sensationalism. The aberrant practices of Bob Jones University do not factor into the movement to protect the sanctity of human life.