



## Director's Message

Dear Brothers in Christ,

This issue will highlight some of the more common pro-abortion "arguments"/slogans and then provide you with effective responses so you can expose and defeat the propaganda of the culture of death with the truth.

Every pro-lifer should know how to debate. After prayer, knowing how to engage in logical and persuasive dialogue is an important skill for the pro-life apostolate. Accomplished speakers and homilists are of incalculable value to the pro-life movement. They can shine the light of truth wherever they go. They are effective evangelizers because they can persuade people. They can shift a comfortable person from the fence of neutrality onto the field of action. They can also influence the public by efficiently slicing through the thick pro-abortion curtain of lies and half-truths. Any pro-lifer in a leadership position, especially the priest or pastor, should know how to present the life issues in a concise and powerful way to all of his flock.



John Fusto, Director SFLI

### Contents

**Page 2** *Abortion Slogans Refuted.*

**Page 8** *Recommended Resources*

We hope these aids to pro-life debating will be helpful and that you will one day be dedicated pastors in a world that is hungry for truth.

God bless all of you!

John W. Fusto  
Human Life International  
International Network Manager

**"A fool's mouth is his ruin, and his lips are a snare to himself."**

— Solomon, in Proverbs 18:7.



# Abortion Slogans Refuted

**Pro-Abortion Slogan #1:** “*We demand the freedom to choose! Freedom of choice!*”

**Summary of the Pro-Life Response.**

- (1) **CLARIFICATION:** We must distinguish between licit and illicit freedoms.
- (2) **PARALLELISM:** Unlimited “freedom to choose” means simple anarchy.
- (3) **MAXIM:** No freedom is absolute.

Background: “Freedom to Choose!” is an ideal, but misleading, slogan. Who could be against freedom, “choice” and personal independence? The “freedom to choose” slogan is short, catchy, and appeals to the independence in all of us.

Rebuttal of the Slogan: This devious slogan has two sides to it. While appealing to the freedom-lover in all of us, pro-aborts simultaneously believe that pro-life activists are somehow anti-freedom by calling us “anti-choice.”

However, this pro-abortion slogan promotes anarchy, not ‘choice.’ If we took the slogan “Freedom of Choice” at face value, the “freedom to choose” would supersede all other freedoms. Rapists could claim the “freedom to choose” rape. Thieves could claim the “freedom” to rob and steal.

If you use these examples, a few pro-aborts will be sharp enough to point out that murder, rape and assault involve a victim. This will give you a fine opportunity to stress that abortion also has a victim -- the most helpless and innocent victim of all -- and death by dismemberment or slow salt-poisoning is a fate far worse than being beaten up or even raped.

The point here is that no freedom is absolute, and, if the pro-abort insists that this is not true, demand an example of an absolute freedom. All freedoms have limits on them, and for good reason. Unlimited personal freedom eventually means anarchy, licentiousness, and personal slavery.

The logical and correct conclusion is that, in order

to avoid total anarchy, *all* choices cannot be legal or protected as “rights.” In fact, God gave us the Ten Commandments to give us limits to so-called “freedom” — and these limits are for our good and the good of society around us.

Moreover, most countries have numerous laws, orders, and local ordinances of every type controlling or curtailing activities from capital murder to double-parking, and each one of these restrictions limits our “freedom of choice” to some extent.

When seen in this light, the slogan “freedom of choice” is revealed as a hollow expression, void of any practical meaning. The *real* meaning of ‘pro-choice’ for the anti-lifers is: Anything goes, *even murder!*

In fact, we *are* ‘pro-choice’ when it comes to getting pregnant! But we can never uphold the right to kill someone else.

Extending the “Freedom to Choose.”

When people remove themselves from basic moral principles and decide that their guiding principle is freedom (regardless of whether it is licit or illicit), there is no limit to the atrocities they can justify. The same people who fought so hard for the “freedom to choose” abortion are also fighting for the “freedom to choose” euthanasia and same sex “marriage.”

**Pro-Abortion Slogan #2:** “*Don’t force your morality off on me!*”

**Summary of the Pro-Life Response.**

- (1) **CLARIFICATION:** “Of *course* I’m trying to force my morality on you! Isn’t that the purpose of all public debate -- to convince others of the validity of one’s views?”
- (2) **PARALLELISM:** “Aren’t *you* trying to do the same thing, right here, right now, by defending the ‘pro-choice’ position?”
- (3) **CLARIFICATION:** “What do you mean by that? What you *really* object to is my mere presence here, defending the pro-life position”

Background: Pro-lifers should not be offended by this slogan. Of course we're trying to "force our morality" on other people! Is this not the purpose of all activism, debate and public discourse -- to convince others of the morality and/or correctness of one's views? If a pro-lifer is trying to force his morality on others, his pro-abortion debating opponent is equally guilty of trying to force *his* [im]morality on the pro-lifer!

Analysis of the Slogan: Of course, a pro-abort who uses this slogan is not *really* objecting to pro-lifers trying to "force their morality" on him, because that would imply some sort of coercion on the part of pro-lifers or cooperation on the part of the pro-abort, neither of which is likely to happen. What the pro-abort is *really* saying is that he objects to the pro-lifer's mere presence and his "audacity" in taking a stand for life. Nothing would please pro-aborts more than to have the pro-life viewpoint outlawed entirely. When a pro-abort uses this slogan, he is basically telling pro-lifers to "shut up!" As William Barclay has said, "There is nothing that the world would like so much as a silent Church."

If a pro-abort uses this "last resort" slogan, the pro-lifer can be assured that he is winning the debate. He can answer it by using the process of clarification: "What do you mean by that?"

**Pro-Abortion Slogan #3: "Abortion should be a decision between a woman and her doctor."**

#### Summary of the Pro-Life Response.

(1) **CLARIFICATION: "Abortion has as much to do with health care as capital punishment does. Abortion is *killing*, pure and simple."**

(2) **CLARIFICATION: "There is almost never any degree of consultation between the abortionist and the woman before the assembly line-type procedure."**

(3) **CLARIFICATION: "Abortion mills/'clinics' are in it for the money, not because they 'care about women.'"**

The "woman and her doctor" slogan craftily presents a homey image of an intimate and caring consultation abortion process that is in fact extremely rare. Pro-aborts using this slogan know that it implies that pro-lifers are meddling in one of the most sacrosanct



professional relationships: that of the doctor and his patient.

In reality, more than 99 percent of all abortions are performed for non-medical reasons, despite the false classification as "therapeutic." In the United States, less than one percent of all abortions are complex enough to require the attentions of a physician before the procedure itself, as shown in Chapter 19 of The Facts of Life, "United States Abortion Statistics." Hence the touted "doctor-patient relationship" with regard to abortions simply does not exist. Dr. Bernard Nathanson and other reformed abortionists have accurately likened convenience abortions to cosmetic surgery.

Stand Aside, There's Money To Be Made!

**President of HLI**  
Rev. Thomas J. Euteneuer

**Director SFLI**  
John Fusto

**Consultants**  
Joseph Meaney  
Brian Clowes, Ph.D.

**Copy Editor**  
Anthony Mioni

*Seminarians for Life International* is published quarterly. To order copies or subscribe to the newsletter contact:

Human Life International  
Attn: *Seminarians for Life International*  
4 Family Life Lane  
Front Royal, Virginia 22630  
USA

Email: [semsforlife@hli.org](mailto:semsforlife@hli.org)  
Phone: 540-635-7884

Information about SFLI is also available on our website: [www.hli.org/seminariansforlifeinternational](http://www.hli.org/seminariansforlifeinternational).

*Seminarians for Life* is a trademark of Human Life International, Inc.® Please contact HLI for permission to reprint any of our material or request use of the name *Seminarians for Life*. For more information about HLI, please visit [www.hli.org](http://www.hli.org).



When a woman visits an abortion mill, the usual procedure is for a “counselor” to talk with her in an attempt to steer her towards abortion, and then send her to the nurses who will prep her for the kill. As several former abortionists have described, the first time a woman ever sees the doctor is when she is lying on her back, half-naked, with her feet in the stirrups.

In truth, the abortionist has no reason to see the woman (who has hired him to kill her child) until he walks into the room. American mega-abortionist Edward Allred has boasted about his “assembly line” abortion mills and has said that “We try to use the physician for his technical skill and reduce the one-to-one relationship with the patient. We usually see the patient for the first time on the operation table and then not again. More contact is just not efficient.”

What this multimillionaire abortionist means, of course, is that “More contact (i.e., time with the patient) will lose me money.” Dr. Beverly McMillan, another reformed abortionist, speaks from experience when she describes how abortion mills are nothing more than money-makers for unscrupulous business-

men who cut every possible corner, including those in the area of patient safety.

Perhaps pro-lifers could describe some particularly serious incident of malpractice by an abortionist who killed or butchered a woman, and then tie this to the typical situation in today’s large-volume, assembly-line abortion mills.

**Pro-Abortion Slogan #4: “You are too naive to see that the world is overpopulated.”**

**Summary of the Pro-Life Response.**

**(1) CLARIFICATION:** “*Why* do you think the world is overpopulated?”

**(2) REFUTATION:** “The world population will never again double. It will peak at about eight billion and then begin to decline.”

**(3) CLARIFICATION:** “Imagine for a moment that the world population was one billion instead of six billion. Would you support the ‘right’ to abortion then?”

Clarify First: Whenever a pro-abort person makes the sweeping claim that the world is overpopulated, you must first get him to clarify what he means or ask him why he thinks the world is overpopulated. Don’t settle for the tired old claim that “everyone knows.” You must make him produce a theory or a statistic to back up his claim.

A general principle to remember is this: Whenever pro-population control people or organizations use statistics to justify their claims regarding world overpopulation, their numbers are either exaggerations or outright lies.

The most common allegation pro-aborts make is that “88 million people are added to the world’s population each year.” The “88 million” number is repeated *ad nauseam* by every population control organization in the world, from the Association for Voluntary Surgical Contraception to Zero Population Growth.

However, world population increase has *never* equaled 88 million per year. According to the United Nations Population Information Network (POPIN), the annual world population increase peaked at 87.1 million during the time period 1985-1990, then rapidly plunged

to a projected 63.3 million during the time period 2005-2010.

The fact of the matter is, for decades, population alarmists have been claiming that the world's population doubles every 37 years, but in reality, according to all United Nations projections, *the population of the world will never again double!*

According to the United Nation's Population Information Network (POPIN), the world's population as of the beginning of 2007 was 6.6 billion. It will peak at about 7.7 billion in the year 2040, and then will begin to decline. Europe's population, in fact, is already declining, and the continent loses two million people a year. Despite the efforts of France, Germany, and several other European nations to boost their birthrates, not one European nation has even a replacement birthrate of 2.1 children per completed family. African birthrates as well are steadily declining. Thus, the over-used and erroneous myth of overpopulation can be refuted by the facts.

**Pro-Abortion Slogan #5: "Abortion is [twenty, thirty, fifty, pick a number] times safer than childbirth."**

#### **Summary of the Pro-Life Response.**

(1) **CLARIFICATION:** **We can rarely tell who will die of either cause, so why base important life decisions on these statistics?**

(2) **EXTENSION of "premise":** **"If abortion really is safer than childbirth, doesn't this mean that every pregnant woman should get an abortion? If not, why not?"**

(3) **PARALLELISM:** **"The risks of a woman dying from swimming, bicycling or traveling by car or airplane are much greater than those associated with either abortion or childbirth. Does this mean that women should never swim, ski, ride a bicycle or travel?"**

The pro-lifer can ensnare his opponent in an unbreakable trap simply by having him clarify his statement. In other words, *why* is he asserting that abortion is safer than childbirth?

You can expose the faulty logic underlying this dubious and invariably unsubstantiated claim by using the principle of parallelism: If the only concern was for the

(born) woman's welfare, then *every* pregnant woman should get an abortion!

In fact, there are some pro-aborts who actually claim that *all abortions are medically necessary* simply because the mother does not want the baby. Abortionist Jane Hodgson betrayed the extreme nature of the pro-abortion mentality when she stated under oath that "In my medical judgment, every pregnancy that is not wanted by the patient, I feel there is a medical indication to abort a pregnancy where it is not wanted. In good faith, I would recommend on a medical basis, you understand, that, and it would be 100% ... I think they are all medically necessary ... Occasionally we will advise these women to carry their pregnancy to term, but most of these are medically necessary because I am considering the woman's physical, mental, emotional and social and welfare and family and environment and all that ... I am concerned with the quality of life, not physical existence."

This pro-abortion "childbirth vs. abortion" argument is therefore nothing more than a verbal trick, and is precisely analogous to saying that every woman over the age of 30 should have both breasts removed due to an increased chance of dying from breast cancer!

The Truth, Please.

In reality, the death rate for childbirth is 5.4 per 100,000 pregnancies, and the death rate for abortions is 33% higher at 7.2 per 100,000 pregnancies. These rates are such due to two reasons.

First, while the figure usually quoted by pro-aborts for abortion mortality is about 3.0 per 100,000, but this number does not include women who die of abortion-related complications *after* they leave the abortuary. If these deaths are factored in, the actual abortion mortality ratio is about 7.2 per 100,000.

Secondly, the standard pro-abortion figure for childbirth mortality is about 10.0 per 100,000. However, this figure includes deaths from miscarriage and ectopic pregnancies (which are not relevant to the "unsafeness" of childbirth), *and* deaths from abortions! Once these unrelated deaths are removed, the actual childbirth mortality ratio is about 5.4 per 100,000.

Necessary Precautionary Measures.



# Abortion violates women's rights

If a pro-abort insists upon alleging that abortion is safer than childbirth, the pro-lifer should show that, under this “logic”, every woman should avoid *any* activity that is more dangerous than childbirth *or* abortion to safeguard her life and health. For example, she should stay in her house and avoid traveling by any means whatever, and should get her breasts and all reproductive organs surgically removed as soon as possible -- preferably by age 15, before trouble has a chance to begin.

She should avoid all bodies of water and should never take a bath or shower during her lifetime, since more women die in baths than from abortion and childbirth combined. And, of course, if the pro-abort smokes, tell her that she is 356 times more likely to die of smoking-caused diseases than she is of childbirth. If her real motive in recommending abortion is *safety*, why is she smoking?

Abortion: Contributor to Maternal “Health”?

Planned Parenthood speakers in particular like to claim that “maternal health has improved 53% [60%, 70% pick a number] since (the legalization of abortion.)” The purpose of this statement, of course, is to imply that the availability of abortion has made it “safer” to have children, and that, if “anti-choice fanatics” succeed in “turning the clock back,” it won’t only be the women who are seeking back-alley abortions that will start dying. *All* women will be at risk!

What pro-aborts fail to reveal is that an improvement in maternal health is merely a continuation of a trend that began long before abortion was legalized, and that it has absolutely nothing at all to do with the increased availability of abortion. The decrease in maternal mortality was entirely due to improved medical practice and technology.

**Pro-Abortion Slogan #6: “We really don’t know when life begins,” and “The fetus is just potential life.”**

**Summary of the Pro-Life Response.**

(1) **EXTRAPOLATION/CLARIFICATION:** “So when *does* life begin, in your opinion? And how can you prove your assertion?”

(2) **CLARIFICATION:** “The burden of proof should be on those who want to kill pre-born babies, not those who want to defend them.”

(3) **REFUTATION of the “potential life” slogan in a three-step process, as described below.**

(4) **CLARIFICATION:** “Give me a clear definition of the term ‘potential life.’”

Background. This is a truly contemptible slogan, and you should treat it as such. What this slogan really means is: “I don’t care when life begins!” Pro-life debaters have a golden opportunity to hammer their opponents on this one.

Generally, if anyone says that they don’t know when life begins, they are admitting that abortion might be taking a life, but that they really don’t care one way or the other. After all, if a truly moral person is uncertain of whether or not an action will take human life, he will refrain from taking that action.

Pro-lifers will often encounter a pro-abortion debater who will assert that (1) we don’t know when life begins and then, when pressed, will say that (2) life begins at birth. Ask him or her how the two are compatible: How do they know that life begins at birth if they don’t know when life begins?

Tell a parallel story. It is very useful to paint “word pictures” for an audience. This tactic has several advantages. It aids understanding, it gets attention, and it causes people to remember a message for a longer period of time.

The principle of parallelism allows an audience to consider the following situation, which uses precisely the same ‘logic’ being offered by the pro-abort person.

A demolition crew prepares to knock down an old apartment building in a poor area. A crew member approaches the foreman and asks if they should check inside the building to insure that there are no transients or homeless people who have taken up residence there. But the foreman replies “We don’t really know if anyone is in there. So go ahead and knock it down!”

Err on the side of life! A Boeing 747 jetliner packed

with 400 people doesn't take off if the captain suspects the existence of even the tiniest malfunction. What would happen if a major drug company marketed a drug without properly testing it? In matters of public safety, we always err on the side of life!

Most societies do not allow behavior that may take life, even if the chance of such an occurrence is small. We are not allowed to shoot a rifle in the general direction of a freeway just because human life might be hit. We are not allowed to poison Halloween treats on a supermarket shelf, just because human life might be harmed. And there are many local laws and ordinances that forbid smoking in crowded areas, because second-hand smoke may be injurious to others!

Yet abortion-lovers are saying that abortion should be allowed just because we might not be taking human life (since they really don't know when life begins, after all).



A pro-lifer can easily tie up his debating opponent by getting him to define precisely when life begins, and then by asking him what the difference is between a fetus one day before this mythical dividing line and one day after. This tactic is particularly illuminating if the pro-abortion says that life begins at "quickening."

"The Fetus is Just Potential Life." A pro-lifer can clarify and refute the "potential life" slogan in a simple three-step process;

- (1) establish that "potential life" represents a class of entities that simply do not exist;
- (2) show that the fetus is not dead; and
- (3) conclude by the process of elimination that it must therefore be alive.

"Potential life" is nothing more a bogus term fabricated by pro-aborts. Pro-aborts who insist that "life" is a metaphysical term, not a biological term, also lean heavily on it. In other words, they say that every woman can decide for herself whether or not her "fetus" is alive.

Every entity on the face of the earth, animate or inanimate, is either "alive" or "not alive" (of course, the

description "not alive" means that an entity was either previously alive or never alive). Bacteria, cattle, and people are alive. Clouds, rocks, and corpses are not alive. There is no "in-between" term, because either an entity possesses the spark of life or it does not. Just as a woman cannot be "potentially pregnant," an entity cannot be "potentially alive."

The argument that there is some in-between area between life and death is used by pro-aborts and pro-euthanasiasts today just as enthusiastically as Nazis and slave owners used it in the past. Given that all things are either alive or not alive, the pro-lifer must now compel his opponent to concede that the fetus is not dead. After all, if the fetus were dead, it would not be growing, the natural miscarriage process would occur, and the woman would lose the child. Therefore, she would not need an abortion in the first place!

Alternatively, the pro-life debater could demand of his opponent a rigorous medical definition of "potential life" and how it differs from "life." Since no such definition exists, the pro-abortion will look foolish, since he is basing the killing of an entire class of human beings upon mere verbal engineering.

The natural conclusion of the above analyses is that the fetus is indeed fully alive in every meaning of the term. Anyone who insists otherwise is being either deliberately dishonest in order to advance the anti-life agenda, or is deceiving themselves.

A pro-lifer might want to ask his pro-abortion opponent if he believes in the morality of fetal organ transplants for Parkinson's disease, epilepsy, and other disorders. It is also illuminating to ask him if he thinks that fetal organ experimentation is ethical. He will usually be compelled by his philosophy to answer "Yes."

The pro-lifer should then outline the obvious conclusion that fetal tissue used for such purposes must be alive -- it would be useless if it were dead! How can live tissue come from a non-living organism? The obvious conclusion, once again, is that pre-born children are alive.

Some anti-life groups and individuals acknowledge that pre-born children are alive and are human, but still deny that they are persons.

This is a desperately dangerous attitude. When we

acknowledge that we are killing human beings -- for whatever reason -- but deny them personhood, literally no one is safe!

The Nazis fell into this trap. They acknowledged only that they were destroying “human weeds” and “life not worth living,” and officially classified their living human victims as “non-persons.” Most U.S. slave owners also fell into this trap. They acknowledged the obvious life in their slaves (after all, dead slaves can’t work), and their obvious humanity (other species weren’t intelligent enough to follow orders), but drew the line at their personhood. Slaves were, according to the United States Supreme Court’s 1857 Dred Scott v. Sanford decision, officially “non-persons.”

Where will this kind of thinking take us? It is easy to

predict where this line of reasoning inevitably leads. To grant life and humanity to an individual, but then withhold his personhood, is the most powerful tool of oppression and genocide.

Inconvenient and (almost) invisible pre-borns are the easiest to dispose of, so they have become the first to be eliminated. The killing ground has now inevitably expanded from the uterus to private hospital rooms and out-of-the-way nursing homes. Finally, entire classes of “imperfect” human beings will lose their personhood because they don’t measure up to the high standards of the decision-makers.

We shouldn’t take these predictions lightly. This process has happened before. And, if we are not vigilant and fearless in battle, it will inevitably happen again!

## Recommended Resources

### Books:

Pope John Paul II. *Evangelium Vitae (The Gospel of Life)*. Pope John Paul II’s great encyclical on life. The pro-lifer’s essential reference.

Clowes, Brian. *The Facts of Life*. Human Life International, 2001. Answers to the full range of life issues from the Catholic perspective.

Crutcher, Mark. *On Message: The Pro-Life Handbook*. Life Dynamics, Inc., 2005. This handbook takes on the toughest issues in the abortion controversy and gives the answers to the most difficult abortion questions. This is a powerful debating tool for the pro-lifer.

Nathanson, Bernard N., M.D. *The Hand of God*. Life Cycle Books, LTD., 1996. Former abortionist, convert to Catholicism, Dr. Nathanson’s book is a definitive defense of the pro-life position on abortion and a revealing exposé inside the culture of death.

Alcorn, Randy. *Pro-Life Answers to Pro-Choice Arguments*. Multnomah Publishers, 2000. Comprehensive overview of all pro-life issues, with real answers to real questions.

### Websites:

<http://www.hli.org>  
Contains valuable information on life issues.

[www.abortiontv.com](http://www.abortiontv.com) The Internet’s #1 abortion information source.™ Includes everything schools, government, and abortion clinics are afraid to tell or show you.

[www.priestsforlife.org](http://www.priestsforlife.org) Contains many valuable pro-life resources from the entirely Catholic perspective.

<http://prochoiceviolence.com/>  
Exposes and documents high level of violence committed by the anti-life movement

### Electronic Resources:

*Human Life International Pro-Life CD Library*. The world’s first pro-life library on CD. A comprehensive and unparalleled resource for pro-lifers. Produced and distributed by Human Life International (HLI) and available at [www.hli.org](http://www.hli.org).

Most of the above cited materials are available through Human Life International. Go to [www.hli.org](http://www.hli.org) or call 540-635-7884.