

Human Dignity in a Post-Human World

Scott Klusendorf

Text: Genesis 1: 24-28 (cf. Gen. 9:6; James 3:9; Ex. 23:7; Prov. 6:16-19; Mt. 5:21)

And God said, “Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds—livestock and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds.” And it was so. And God made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds and the livestock according to their kinds, and everything that creeps on the ground according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. Then God said, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.” So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. And God blessed them. And God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth.”

I. **Intro:** David Boonin, *A Defense of Abortion*:

On my desk in my office where most of this book was written and revised, there are several pictures of my son, Eli. In one, he is gleefully dancing on the sand along the Gulf of Mexico, the cool ocean breeze wreaking havoc with his wispy hair. In a second, he is tentatively seated in the grass in his grandparents' backyard, still working to master the feat of sitting up on his own. In a third, he is only a few weeks old, clinging firmly to the arms that are holding him and still wearing the tiny hat for preserving body heat that he wore home from the hospital. Though all of the remarkable changes that these pictures preserve, he remains unmistakably the same little boy. In the top drawer of my desk, I keep another picture of Eli. This picture was taken...24 weeks before he was born. The sonogram image is murky, but it reveals clearly enough a small head tilted back slightly, and an arm raised up and bent, with the hand pointing back toward the face and the thumb extended out toward the mouth. There is no doubt in my mind that this picture, too, shows the same little boy at a very early stage in his physical development. And there is no question that the position I defend in this book entails that it would have been morally permissible to end his life at this point (Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. xiii-xiv).

For Boonin, Eli the embryo is identical to Eli the newborn, but Eli the embryo can be killed because he lacks organized cortical brain function needed to support an immediately exercisable capacity for “desires.” In short, Eli’s value is not intrinsic to his humanity; it’s linked to his functional abilities.

- II. **Topic:** “In His Image: Human Dignity in a Post Human World”
- III. **Significance:** Human dignity is no longer understood as intrinsic and God-given, as stated in the *Declaration of Independence*. Rather, dignity is now understood as our freedom to defy nature and create ourselves anew—which often means grounding human dignity in our functions, not our common human nature. (Roberta Green Ahmanson, “The New Dignity,” <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2015/11/15948/>)
- A. Mystery Passage defense of abortion (SCOTUS—*Casey*, 1992)—“At the heart of liberty is the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life.”
- B. Peter Singer—*Practical Ethics*: No newborn should be considered a person until 30 days after birth and disabled infants can be killed on the spot if it suits the interests of the parents. Fetus and newborn can both be killed because each lacks self-awareness.
- C. Impact on Gospel/evangelism: If human beings are nothing more than a collection of physical parts absent an soul that bears the image of their Maker, there can be no sin, no after life, no eternal judgment, and no need of a savior. Humans are cosmic junk and the gospel is meaningless.
- IV. **Thesis:** In a world where human dignity is up for grabs, it’s vital that pro-life Christians equip themselves to do 4 things: 1) *affirm* a biblical view of human dignity, 2) *communicate* a persuasive case for life to unchurched people, 3) *Offer* a gospel-centered alternative to post-abortion men and women, 4) *Love* our unborn neighbor.

A. Affirm a Biblical View of Human Dignity

Scripture is clear that all humans have value because they bear the image of their maker (Genesis 1:26-28; James 3:9). In laymen’s terms, that means humans are valuable in virtue of the kind of thing they are rather than some function they perform. Humans have value simple because they are human.

Because humans bear the image of God, the shedding of innocent blood is strictly forbidden (Exodus 23:7; Proverbs 6:16-19; Matthew 5:21). The Bible is not saying it’s always wrong to kill human beings, a position only a strict pacifist would hold. It’s meaning is more specific: We are never to intentionally kill innocent human beings.

As we shall see, abortion is the intentional killing of an innocent human being, a claim we will defend with science and logic. Thus, the same passages in Scripture that forbid the shedding of innocent blood apply to the unborn as they do every other human being.

Still, some are puzzled the Bible never mentions abortion. Are we to conclude abortion is morally permitted? We certainly should not! When critics assert the Bible nowhere condemns abortion, I ask one question to clarify things: Are you saying that whenever the Bible doesn't expressly condemn a behavior, it condones that behavior? When they say no, and they must, I ask, What is your point? Indeed, Scripture nowhere condemns gay bashing, but Christians universally condemn it because Scripture teaches all humans—despite the impact of sin—possess inherent dignity and worth.

The Bible's alleged silence on abortion does not mean that its authors condoned the practice, but that prohibitions against it were largely unnecessary. The Hebrews of the Old Testament and the Christians of the New Testament were not likely to kill their offspring before birth. To understand why, let's step into their world and take a look. First, children were seen as a blessing while barrenness a curse—the worst curse for a woman (Psalm 127:3-5; 1 Samuel 1:6, Genesis. 20:17-18, 30:1, 22-23). Second, immortality was expressed through one's descendants. God promises Abraham to make of him a great nation (Genesis 12:1-3) and that promise is passed on to Isaac, Jacob, etc. "Sons are a heritage from the Lord, children a reward from Him," writes the Psalmist (127:3. See also Gen. 48:16). Third, among a people surrounded by hostile nations, continuing one's family line was vital for national security. Fourth, having children was a sacred responsibility: God's promise to bless all nations through Israel was predicated on replenishing the land with offspring. Fifth, the early Christians of the New Testament were Jewish believers who inherited Jewish morality, including the commands against shedding innocent blood.

Put simply, in a culture where children are a gift and barrenness is a curse, and where a nation's destiny depends on parents having lots of children, abortion is unthinkable. Hence, the Bible's silence on abortion does not suggest permission, but that prohibitions were largely unnecessary.

Our culture is obsessed with equality. People want racial equality, income equality, and social equality—but can they account for it? Abortion-choice advocates cannot explain what makes us equal. Here's why: If humans only have value because of some developed characteristic like self-awareness that none of us share equally, it follows that since that characteristic comes in varying degrees, basic human rights come in varying degrees. Theologically, it's far more reasonable to argue that although humans differ immensely in their respective degrees of development, they are nonetheless equal because they share a common human nature made in the image of God.

The biblical view of human dignity is freeing and transformed the ancient world. In Greece and Rome, married men were expected to have extra-marital sex, almost always with household slaves forced to comply. These slaves were mere sex objects, whose value was strictly instrumental. As historian Kyle Haprer points out, the arrival of Christianity provoked a tectonic shift in the cultural understanding of human dignity, including sexual practices. The gospel proclaimed that every human being

has inestimable worth and value because every human being bears the image of God. Human beings have an eternal destiny and therefore must never be treated as objects. “Imagine what this meant to the slave woman or man who had been forced to submit his or her body to a master,” writes Roberta Green Ahmanson. “To those who did not have a voice, who indeed did not have a personal ‘face,’ Christianity said: that is most assuredly not who you are. Your body belongs to you, and it belongs to God. Whatever has been done to you and your body is covered by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. As the Apostle Paul wrote, in Christ there is neither male nor female, Jew nor Greek, slave nor free. It may be difficult for us to fully appreciate how profoundly transformative this was in the ancient world” (“The New Dignity,” *Public Discourse*, 11/24/15).

B. Communicate a persuasive case for life to unchurched people

The first step is to drag faulty assumptions into the light where they can be exposed. As C.S. Lewis once said, the most dangerous ideas are those that are simply assumed to be true. Consider this example from chapter 32 of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, where Huck contrives a story to explain to Aunt Sally his late arrival by boat:

“We blowed out a cylinder head.”

“Good gracious! Anybody hurt?”

“No’m. Killed a nigger.”

“Well, it’s lucky; because sometimes people do get hurt.”

Notice it’s simply assumed the black man is not one of us.

President Obama was no better with the unborn. In celebrating *Roe v. Wade*, he said that we need abortion because “this is a nation where everyone has a right to pursue their own dreams.” But he never told us if “everyone” includes the unborn. He just assumed it did not.

Our job, as pro-life Christians, is to expose that assumption and focus the debate on the status of the unborn. Almost no one suggests killing toddlers for the reasons they give for killing fetuses. Former ACLU President Nadine Strossen is a case in point. In one of our recent debates, she attempted to defend abortion with an appeal to reproductive freedom. To summarize her case, reproductive freedom means the ability to choose whether or not to have children. That freedom is necessary if all persons are to lead lives of self-determination, opportunity, and human dignity.

Notice the question-begging nature of her claim. She simply assumes, without argument, that the unborn are not human beings. Would she make this same claim for human freedom and self-determination if her neighbor suggested killing toddlers as well as fetuses?

In short, I was willing to buy her argument for freedom and self-determination—but only after she demonstrated that the unborn were not human beings. I agree with Frank Beckwith: It won't work to say we should be a society that supports choice when the very question who is part of that society, that is, whether or not it includes the unborn, is itself under dispute. Nadine needed to make a case against the humanity of the unborn. She wouldn't do it.

Pro-life advocates, on the other hand, actually present a case for their position. That case can be put formally as follows:

- (a) P1: It is wrong to intentionally kill an innocent human being.
- (b) P2: Abortion intentionally kills an innocent human being.
- (c) C: Therefore, abortion is morally wrong.

The science of embryology establishes that from the earliest stages of development, the unborn are distinct, living, and whole human beings. True, they have yet to grow and mature, but they are whole human beings nonetheless. Leading embryology textbooks affirm this. For example, in *The Developing Human: Clinically Oriented Embryology* (Saunders/Elsevier, 2008), Keith L. Moore & T.V.N. Persaud write: “A zygote is the beginning of a new human being. Human development begins at fertilization, the process during which a male gamete or sperm...unites with a female gamete or oocyte...to form a single cell called a zygote. This highly specialized, totipotent cell marks the beginning of each of us as a unique individual.” T.W. Sadler's *Langman's Embryology* (Saunders, 1993) states: “The development of a human begins with fertilization, a process by which the spermatozoon from the male and the oocyte from the female unite to give rise to a new organism, the zygote.” Embryologists Ronan O'Rahilly and Fabiola Müller write, “Although life is a continuous process, fertilization is a critical landmark because, under ordinary circumstances, a new, genetically distinct human organism is thereby formed” (*Human Embryology & Teratology*, 2nd edition. New York: Wiley-Liss, 1996).

That elective abortion kills a living human fetus is conceded by many who perform and defend the practice:

Dr. Warren Hern, author of *Abortion Practice*—the medical textbook that teaches abortion procedures—told a Planned Parenthood conference: “We have reached a point in this particular technology [D&E abortion] where there is no possibility of denying an act of destruction. It is before one's eyes. The sensations of dismemberment flow through the forceps like an electric current” (“What About Us? Staff Reactions to D&E,” 1978 meeting of the Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians, October 26. <http://www.drhern.com/pdfs/staffrx.pdf>)

A 1970 editorial in *California Medicine* puts it plainly: “Since the old ethic has not yet been fully displaced it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing, which continues to be socially abhorrent. The result has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact, which everyone really knows, that human life begins

at conception and is continuous whether intra-or extra-uterine until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forth under socially impeccable auspices. It is suggested that this schizophrenic sort of subterfuge is necessary because while a new ethic is being accepted the old one has not yet been rejected” (“A New Ethic for Medicine and Society,” *California Medicine*, September 1970).

Ronald Dworkin, in *Life's Dominion*, writes that abortion deliberately kills a developing embryo and is a choice for death (New York: Vintage, 1994, p. 3).

Former Planned Parenthood President Faye Wattleton tells *Ms Magazine*: “I think we have deluded ourselves into believing that people don't know that abortion is killing. So any pretense that abortion is not killing is a signal of our ambivalence, a signal that we cannot say yes, it kills a fetus” (“Speaking Frankly,” *Ms.*, May / June 1997, Volume VII, Number 6, 67).

Naomi Wolf, a prominent feminist author and abortion supporter, in *The New Republic*—“Clinging to a rhetoric about abortion in which there is no life and no death, we entangle our beliefs in a series of self-delusions, fibs and evasions. And we risk becoming precisely what our critics charge us with being: callous, selfish and casually destructive men and women who share a cheapened view of human life...we need to contextualize the fight to defend abortion rights within a moral framework that admits that the death of a fetus is a real death” (“Our Bodies, Our Souls,” *The New Republic*, October 16, 1995).

Feminist Camille Paglia is even more blunt: “Hence I have always frankly admitted that abortion is murder, the extermination of the powerless by the powerful. Liberals for the most part have shrunk from facing the ethical consequences of their embrace of abortion, which results in the annihilation of concrete individuals and not just clumps of insensate tissue” (“Fresh Blood for the Vampire,” *Salon*, September 10, 2008).

Admittedly, an early embryo doesn't look like an adult, but it does look exactly as a developing human should look like at that stage of development. Philosopher Richard Stith suggests a thought experiment for rethinking our intuitions about the early embryo. Imagine you are on a Mexican safari in pre-digital days and you've got a Polaroid Camera. For those of you under 50, a Polaroid Camera was an awkward looking device that, once you shot a picture, would spit it out allowing you to watch it develop before your eyes—usually in about 90 seconds. At just the right moment, you captured a picture of a Black Jaguar leaping across the trail in front of you. Black Jags are almost never photographed, but you got it! While you are waiting for the picture to emerge, I rip the camera from your hands and tear up the emerging picture. Will you be angry? Suppose I replied, “That's not a picture. It's just a brown smudge on a piece of paper!” Will that satisfy you? Never! You'd rightly point out, “The picture of the jaguar was already there. We just couldn't see it yet!” Likewise, you

were already there from the beginning. We just couldn't see you! ("Arguing w/ Pro-Choicers," *First Things*, November 4, 2006. <http://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2006/11/stith-arguing-with-pro-choicer>)

Pro-life advocates defend their views philosophically as well. The key question is this: Given the humanity of the unborn, does each and every human being have an equal right to life or do only some have it in virtue of some characteristic which may come and go within the course of their lifetimes?

Pro-lifers contend there is no morally significant difference between the embryo you once were and the adult you are today that would justify killing you at that earlier stage of development. Differences of size, level of development, environment, and degree of dependency are not good reasons for saying you had no right to life then but you do now. Stephen Schwarz suggests the acronym SLED as a helpful reminder of these non-essential differences:

Size: You were smaller as an embryo, but body size does not bestow value. A seven-foot basketball player is not more human and valuable than all of us simply because he is bigger.

Level of Development: True, you were less developed as an embryo, but why should that matter? Two-year old girls are less developed than 18-year old young women. The former lack a developed reproductive system, but we don't kill them because of it. For that matter, teenagers are less developed than their parents physically and intellectually, but it doesn't follow their parents deserve more fundamental rights.

Environment: Where you are has no bearing on what you are. How does a journey of eight inches down the birth canal change the essential nature of the unborn from a being we can kill to one we can't?

Degree of Dependency: Sure, you depended on your mother for survival, but since when does dependence on another human mean we can kill you? (*The Moral Question of Abortion*, Loyola University Press, 1990, pp.15-16.)

In short, humans are equal by nature not function. Although they differ immensely in their respective degrees of development, they are nonetheless equal because they share a common human nature—and they had that human nature from the moment they began to exist. If I am wrong about that, human equality is a fiction.

Abraham Lincoln made a similar point about slavery when he argued that arguments used to disqualify the slave worked equally well to disqualify whites:

You say 'A' is white and 'B' is black. It is color, then: the lighter having the right to enslave the darker? Take care. By this rule, you are a slave to the first man you meet with a fairer skin than your own.

You do not mean color exactly—You mean the whites are intellectually the superiors of the blacks, and therefore have the right to enslave them? Take care again: By this rule you are to be a slave to the first man you meet with an intellect superior to your own.

But you say it is a question of interest, and, if you can make it your interest, you have the right to enslave another. Very well. And if he can make it his interest, he has the right to enslave you (“Fragment on Slavery,” *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, vol. 2, Rutgers University Press, p. 222).

Think, for a moment, about your 10 closest friends. Would you agree that each of them has the same basic rights and that each should be treated equally? But if all of them should be treated equally, there must be some quality they all have equally that justifies that equal treatment. What is that characteristic? Only this: We all have the same human nature.

Of course, not everyone agrees. As mentioned earlier, philosopher David Boonin argues that you and I are identical to the embryos we once were. He agrees with pro-life advocates that you are identical to the embryo you once were. That is, you were the same being then as you are today. However, just because you are identical to the embryo you once were, it doesn’t follow that you have the same right to life then as you do now. In short, it’s not being a human being which bestows value, but having desires which are immediately exercisable—which doesn’t happen for the fetus until weeks 28-32. Until that point, abortion is not morally impermissible.

While I appreciate Boonin’s intellectually honesty in affirming that you are identical to your former embryonic self, I find his thesis deeply problematic. First, why is having “desires” value-giving in the first place? Boonin doesn’t say.

Second, Boonin’s argument proves too much. It disqualifies newborns. As Christopher Kaczor points out, to “desire” anything requires belief and judgment—which newborns aren’t capable of exercising until several weeks (or months) after birth!

Third, if “desires” bestow a right to life, human equality is undermined. After all, people vary in their desires to go on living.

Fourth, Stoics and Buddhists may not “desire” anything—do they forfeit their right to life? Or, to borrow from Kaczor, suppose I accidentally shoot myself in the head with a staple gun—damaging the part of my brain that controls desire. Imagine further that I survive, but no longer desire anything. Do I stop being a person with a right to life? (*The Ethics of Abortion*, Routledge, 2011, p.59.)

Finally, to cite an example from Francis J. Beckwith, suppose a doctor surgically alters the brain of a developing fetus so it never desires anything. Five years later, the

child is killed so his organs can be harvested to treat disease in others. Given he didn't desire anything when he was killed, was he harmed? Now, suppose Boonin replies that five-year olds are the kind of beings that shouldn't be treated that way. I agree. But notice what's doing the moral work here—it's not the child's immediately exercisable "desires" (he has none), but his human nature that dictates we ought to treat him a certain way.

1-Minute Soundbite: "I am pro-life because the science of embryology establishes that from the earliest stages of development, you were a distinct, living, and whole human being. And there is no essential difference between the embryo you once were and the adult you are today that justifies killing you at that earlier stage of development. Differences of size, level of development, environment, and degree of dependency are not good reasons for saying you could be killed then but not now."

C. Present a gospel-centered alternative

Abortion is a sin. It's an act of violence that intentionally kills an innocent human being. But it shouldn't surprise us. The Bible is clear. Sin is our natural orientation. It's not just that we do bad things. It's far worse. We are bad by nature (Ephesians 2, Romans 1-3). We don't start off innocent and break bad. We begin bad and stay that way. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately sick; who can understand it?" laments the prophet Jeremiah (17:9).

The gospel of Jesus Christ is that everyone reading this sentence deserves judgment. In a thousand different ways, every last one of us has rebelled against our Creator who made us for his glory. That any of us are breathing right now is a sheer act of His grace.

Think back to the dark western "Unforgiven" starring Clint Eastwood as Will Munny. Will's young sidekick, the Schofield Kid, kills a man and is shaken by second thoughts. Munny's response is devastating.

Munny: It's a hell of a thing, killing a man...

Kid: Yeah, well, I guess they had it coming.

Munny: We all got it coming, kid.

When Christ spoke of a tower that fell on unsuspecting people, he did not say the victims deserved to die while everyone else did not. Instead, He gave this stunning response: "If you don't repent, all of you will likewise perish" (Luke 13:1-9). Jesus said that everyone has it coming. And if we don't repent, we, too, will perish.

The gospel tells us that a good and holy God created humans to worship and enjoy him forever. But we rebelled against our creator, set ourselves up as kings. God, who had every right to destroy the race for its rebellion against Him, did something

remarkable. He sent Jesus, the sinless one, the second member of the Godhead, to bear in full His righteous wrath against sin.

We may bristle at that word “wrath” because it reminds us of an angry parent or vengeful authority figure. But God’s wrath is not an uncontrolled explosion of rage; it’s His settled hatred of sin. And if God is holy and just, He can’t sweep sin under the rug. He must punish it. And He did punish it, by crushing His Son on a cross for your sin and mine.

That is incredibly good news for those who’ve sinned by having an abortion. But the news gets even better. For those who trust Jesus for forgiveness, God the Father adopts them into His family as dearly loved sons and daughters. Any and every woman who chose abortion because she thought there was no other way out isn’t in need of an excuse. She, like all of us, is in need of an exchange, Christ’s righteousness for her sinfulness. For those who trust in Jesus for salvation, God gives them that righteousness—and a new family to call their own.

Many precious pro-life advocates are trying to atone for past abortions with tireless activity. Don’t go there. Good deeds do not atone for bad ones. Only Christ’s deeds can atone for them. Only one thing will fix our sinful broken lives—His grace.

The cultural counterfeit to gospel-centered forgiveness is relativism—the belief that right and wrong are up to us, meaning there are no objective standards we must get in line with. You’re okay and I’m okay. Just don’t judge me. But relativism is self-refuting. It says, “There are no moral rules, but here’s one: You must be tolerant. You must not judge.” Oh? Is that true or just your moral rule?

As James Montgomery Boice points out, the gospel leaves no doubt about our true condition:

I’m not O.K. You are not O.K. No one is O.K. And the sooner we admit that we are not okay and turn to the One who knows that we are not, but who offers us a way of salvation anyway, the better off we will be. Jesus does not excuse us; he forgives us. He calls us sinners. Yet he says, I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance” (Luke 5:32). The most important thing in life is to know that Jesus is able to save you from sin. The second most important thing is to know that you require it (Boice, *Romans*, vol. 1, p.208).

D. Love our unborn neighbor.

Is the unborn my neighbor? He is if he’s a human being and we’ve already established that he is one. So what does it mean to “love?” Biblically understood, “love” is not a feeling but a behavior. And it’s costly:

- John 14: 23-24—“He who loves Me obeys my teaching.”

- 1 John 3: 18—“Love not with words but with deeds.”
- Luke 10: The Good Samaritan not only *felt* pity for the beating victim, he *took* pity on the beating victim. Jesus said that’s what it means to love your neighbor.

I’m reminded of a touching moment in London, 2012: Michael and I were at the Imperial War Museum. I directed Michael's attention to a photo depicting the evacuation of children from London during the Blitz of 1940. I explained that the children were sent away to the countryside to escape bombing raids. At that moment, an elderly woman stepped up and said, “I was one of those children sent away” (though not one of those pictured). Taken back, I asked to hear her story. “I was sent at age four. That was the last time I saw my parents. Eleven nights later, they were both killed in a terrible bombing raid.” I asked, “What happened to you?” She smiled and said, “Oh, I had a good life. The family who took me in stepped up and adopted me.” I nearly lost it.

Consider her words: “They just stepped up.” How can you “step up” and engage?

1. Prayer Guide (Colson Center) <http://www.colsoncenter.org/21days>
2. Visit us for free pro-life apologetic resources <http://prolifetraining.com>
3. Order *The Case for Life: Equipping Christians to Engage the Culture* (Crossway, 2009).
4. Order “Life is Best” tv show <http://lifeisbest.tv>—perfect for teens and small groups/ Sunday school classes. You get 13 episodes, 29 minutes each. Fun!
5. Support your local pregnancy help center.

You will be called an “extremist” for stepping up for human dignity. Dr. King addressed this in his *Letter from the Birmingham Jail*:

But though I was initially disappointed at being categorized as an extremist, as I continued to think about the matter I gradually gained a measure of satisfaction from the label. Was not Jesus an extremist for love: “Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you.” Was not Amos an extremist for justice: “Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.” Was not Paul an extremist for the Christian gospel: “I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.” Was not Martin Luther an extremist: “Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise, so help me God.” And John Bunyan: “I will stay in jail to the end of my days before I make a butchery of my conscience.” And Abraham Lincoln: “This nation cannot survive half slave and half free.” And Thomas Jefferson: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that an men are created equal ...” So the question is not whether we will be extremists, but what kind of extremists we will be. Will we be extremists for hate or for love? Will we be extremist for the preservation of injustice or for the extension of justice? In that dramatic scene on Calvary's hill three men were crucified. We must never forget that all three were crucified for the same crime---the crime of extremism. Two were extremists for immorality, and thus fell below their environment. The other, Jesus Christ, was an

extremist for love, truth and goodness, and thereby rose above his environment. Perhaps the South, the nation and the world are in dire need of creative extremists.

Free On-Line Resources:

1. Scott Klusendorf's pro-life apologetics training (from London, UK), video w/ complete lecture notes: <http://lti-blog.blogspot.com/2015/12/pro-life-apologetics-training-from.html>
2. Scott Klusendorf, "Dead Silence: Must the Bible say Abortion is Wrong Before We can Know it is Wrong?" *Christian Research Journal*, vol.27, #1, 2004 <http://www.equip.org/PDF/DA360.pdf>
3. "The 5-Minute Pro-Lifer" <http://prolifetraining.com/resources/>

Appendix: Scriptures Cited:

Genesis 1: 24-28:

And God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds—livestock and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds." And it was so. And God made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds and the livestock according to their kinds, and everything that creeps on the ground according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. And God blessed them. And God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth."

James 3: 7-9:

For every kind of beast and bird, of reptile and sea creature, can be tamed and has been tamed by mankind, 8 but no human being can tame the tongue. It is a restless evil, full of deadly poison. With it we bless our Lord and Father, and with it we curse people lwho are made in the likeness of God.

Exodus 23: 7:

Keep far from a false charge, and do not kill the innocent and righteous, for I will not acquit the wicked.

Proverbs 6: 16-19:

There are six things that the Lord hates, seven that are an abomination to him: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that devises wicked plans, feet that

make haste to run to evil, a false witness who breathes out lies, and one who sows discord among brothers.

Matthew 5: 21-22:

You have heard that it was said to those of old, ‘You shall not murder; and whoever murders will be liable to judgment.’ But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment...

Psalm 127:3-5:

Behold, children are a heritage from the Lord, the fruit of the womb a reward. Like arrows in the hand of a warrior are the children of one's youth. Blessed is the man who fills his quiver with them! He shall not be put to shame when he speaks with his enemies in the gate.

1 Samuel 1: 6-8:

And her [Hannah's] rival used to provoke her grievously to irritate her, because the Lord had closed her womb. So it went on year by year. As often as she went up to the house of the Lord, she used to provoke her. Therefore Hannah wept and would not eat.

Genesis 30:1-2, 22-24:

When Rachel saw that she bore Jacob no children, she envied her sister. She said to Jacob, “Give me children, or I shall die!” Jacob's anger was kindled against Rachel, and he said, “Am I in the place of God, who has withheld from you the fruit of the womb?...Then God remembered Rachel, and God listened to her and opened her womb. She conceived and bore a son and said, “God has taken away my reproach.” And she called his name Joseph, saying, “May the LORD add to me another son!”

Genesis 12:1-3:

Now the LORD said to Abram, “Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you. And I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and him who dishonors you I will curse, and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed.”

Genesis 48:15-16 (Jacob's dying blessing to Joseph)

The God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, the God who has been my shepherd all my life long to this day, the angel who has redeemed me from all evil, bless the boys; and in them let my name be carried on, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.