

# OpenTheo

## A Case for Life

July 30, 2022



### **Knight & Rose Show** - Wintery Knight and Desert Rose

Wintery Knight and Desert Rose describe a logical argument for making baby ending illegal. We talk about the scientific evidence for the humanity of the unborn. We describe and answer a dozen arguments for legalized baby ending. We talk about whether unborn children should have human rights from birth or only after they achieve "personhood". We recommend pro-life resources. We talk about WK's heroic friend Kevin.

Please subscribe, like, comment, and share.

Show notes: <https://winteryknight.com/2022/07/31/knight-and-rose-show-episode-16-a-case-for-life/>

Subscribe to the audio podcast here: <https://knightandrose.podbean.com/>

Audio RSS feed: <https://feed.podbean.com/knightandrose/feed.xml>

YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/@knightandroseshow>

Rumble: <https://rumble.com/c/knightandroseshow>

Odysee: <https://odysee.com/@KnightAndRoseShow>

Music attribution: Strength Of The Titans by Kevin MacLeod Link:  
<https://incompetech.filmmusic.io/song/5744-strength-of-the-titans> License:  
<https://filmmusic.io/standard-license>

## **Transcript**

Welcome to the Knight & Rose Show where we discuss practical ways of living out an authentic Christian worldview. Today's topic is A Case for Life. I'm Wintery Knight.

And I'm Desert Rose. Welcome Rose. So, have you got an argument for why we should make abortion illegal? I do, yes.

So, the basic argument goes like this. Premise number one, deliberately targeting innocent human beings for destruction should be illegal. Premise number two, unborn humans are innocent human beings.

Conclusion, therefore, deliberately targeting unborn humans for destruction should be illegal. Excellent. So, premise one seems to me to be uncontroversial.

But what's the evidence for premise two, unborn humans are innocent human beings? This evidence comes from science. So, while we can't quote every scientist, one scientist has actually collected the conclusions from embryology textbooks. Dr. Maureen Condick is an associate professor at the University of Utah.

She specializes in neurobiology. She obtained her PhD from the University of California at Berkeley. Wow.

She has served on the National Science Board. And she's widely published as a scientist whose works have appeared in a variety of peer-reviewed journals. Wow.

That's like 25 people on the National Science Board. Yes. Yes.

Very prestigious honor. Yeah. She's really good.

Go ahead. Yeah. Time only permits me to quote one of the textbooks in her list.

So, let me quote the developing human clinically oriented embryology, the 10th edition. It says, "Human development begins at fertilization when a sperm fuses with an oocyte to form a single cell, the zygote. This highly specialized totipotent cell, meaning capable of giving rise to any cell type, marks the beginning of each of us as a unique individual." So, I'd love to read more of the quotes that she has that are from a variety of different embryology textbooks, but we will link to her full list in the show notes.

Yeah. That's useful for debating this issue. Just pound them with the scientific evidence.

Yes. So, that's a nice tight argument. And you've got the backing of mainstream peer-reviewed science.

I think it's undeniable that unborn children are definitely alive because there's definitely self-directed development there. It's a human DNA structure. There's no question about that.

And their chromosomal structure is different from both the mother and the father. So, this is a self-directed living organism that has DNA distinct from the mother and father. So, it's clearly not part of the woman's body.

Yeah, exactly. Right. And abortion supporters agree with this.

So, Peter Singer, for example, supports elective abortion. In fact, Peter Singer supports the killing of newborns. He's a professor out of Princeton and an atheist.

And he writes, "Whether a being is a member of a given species is something that can be determined scientifically by an examination of the nature of the chromosomes in the cells of living organisms. In this sense, there is no doubt that from the first moments of its existence, an embryo conceived from human sperm and egg is a human being." That's from his book *Practical Ethics*, second edition. And then Wayne Sumner, who also supports elective abortion writes, "A human fetus is not a non-human animal.

It is a stage of human being." That's from his work *Abortion and Moral Theory*. I love these shows where we go out and get the quotations from people who disagree with us who are prestigious and they substantiate the main premise in our argument. This is nice.

I don't know that people who come to this argument realize how much this argument for defending the unborn is like the Clum argument or the fine-tuning argument. This is tight. You can have a lot of fun with this argument.

Okay, let's look at the objections because people aren't just going to give it to us or they're going to disagree with us. So some people claim that the unborn are not human because unborn children are not big enough to have acquired human rights. Or they say, "Being in the womb means that you haven't yet got your human rights yet." Or, "The fact that they're dependent on the mother in order to live, that means that they don't have human rights." So that's a collection of four objections.

What would you say to those? Yeah, so let's look at those. I've heard all of these a lot as well. So regarding size, a human being's value is not based on their size.

It's not? Yeah, this is a ridiculous argument. A four-year-old girl is smaller than a teenager, but that doesn't mean the four-year-old has less of a right to live than a teenager. Let's consider level of development.

Same argument. Again, this does not determine a human being's value. A four-year-old girl, again, is not developed enough to have children, whereas a teenager is developed enough to have children.

But that doesn't mean that the four-year-old, again, has less of a right to live than the teenager. A human being's value is also not based on location. A person has the same value, whether they are underwater or on land or in a plane or on the moon or wherever they are.

What about Jupiter? Even Jupiter, yes. Yeah. I mean, location, there's no basis for saying that based on their location means that they are not human or they don't have the same rights.



So... Yeah. Let me answer that because I've heard of that one. What they're saying is they're saying, "Well, I'm in the privacy of my own home and this is a family decision.

This is none of anyone's business if we're going to end our unborn child." But if you trot out your toddler, then they would have... If we let them have this argument, they would be able to end their toddler in the privacy of their own home and say, "This is just a private family matter. We've gotten tired of having this many little rambunctious people in our house." Yes, exactly. Then they would say, "Oh, no, no, no, no, no.

Toddlers are completely different than the unborn." And we would say, "Ah, but according to the scientific evidence, they're not. They're both equal human beings." Yes, that's exactly right. That's exactly right.

Yeah. I will often phrase it as a question. Oh, so you think as long as it's done in the privacy of your own home, it's okay to kill your toddlers.

Wow. Do you practice that right? They don't like that. Yeah.

So another argument that I often hear is, "But it's such a financial burden. How dare you force people to have another child if they can't afford another child. That would just be too much of a financial burden." Yeah.

So, yeah. Yeah, same thing. I'm seeing how this works.

You don't get to end your toddlers because they're a financial burden on you. So if they're going to say that that's a good reason to allow you to end another human being, then that would also apply to toddlers. And I know they're not going to say that.

Exactly. And I like to tell them even, "Well, have you considered taking out your teenager because actually your teenager is going to be a lot more expensive." Oh my God. They want everything.

Smartphones and new cars and tuition for college. Get rid of them. I mean, if this argument goes through, not literally YouTube.

Yeah, exactly. So another argument is, "Well, you should enforce your views on others." Yeah. Basically what they're saying is, "We can't have a pro-life law because that would infringe on the autonomy of women to decide whether their unborn children have a right to life." So they have their personal view and we're passing a law that overrides their personal view.

But now let's try it out the toddler. Suppose a woman says, "I have a personal view that says that toddlers don't have a right to life. Should we have a law against that?" I mean, if we let their argument go through, we couldn't have a law against that because that would be infringing on the woman's right not to have us force our view on her.

Right. Yeah, exactly. And this is actually a self-refuting view because they're trying to force their views on others as well, all the while, just by making this argument.

That's right. Another common argument I hear is safety. People will say, "Well, if we restrict abortion, then women will be forced to get dangerous back alley abortions." This is actually one of my favorites to respond to, but I... Go ahead.

Go ahead. Okay. So I like to point out to them, "Well, if we're going to make crimes legal in order to protect the offender, then burglary should certainly be legal too, right? Because after all, I mean, sometimes burglars get hurt because people defend themselves and they defend their home from illegal intruders." They would in my house.

Go ahead. That's right. That's right.

Mine as well, thanks to you and my concealed carry. So yeah. So by this logic, I mean, really all other crimes should probably be legal as well because that would make it safer to commit them.

But this is ridiculous. We don't make burglary legal so that it's safer for criminals. And likewise, we should not make abortion legal so that it's safer for abortionists.

If we're dispensing of a human life, a living human being, then it's not something we need to make easier or safer. Right. Got any more? Yeah.

Yeah. So another argument I hear is, "Well, reproductive freedom is necessary to preserve a woman's right to self-determination, to opportunity, freedom, happiness." This is one I hear a lot. I've heard that one as well and even troubling from Christians.

Oh, well. Yeah. Yeah.

Like they say, "Well, we have to..." It's only fair that women have the same freedom as men. So we have to allow them to have this reproductive right. But the response, again, to try to have the toddler, basically toddlers are a pain in the butt for women and they have to adjust their lives in order to handle the needs of these toddlers.

So... Undoubtedly, yes. Toddlers, in fact, are a bigger hindrance to a woman's freedom and self-determination and opportunity and possibly happiness, depending on where she's seeking her happiness from. For sure.

Because, I mean, when the unborn, you can just take to work with you and he or she doesn't try or get antsy or destroy things. So yeah, if this is the logic, then you should certainly be able to end the life of your toddlers. But obviously, that's ridiculous.

I've seen women in offices where I've been working until like seven or eight months. So toddlers are way more restrictive of self-determination, opportunity, freedom, and happiness. Yeah.

So another one would be that it isn't the role of government to legislate, like, morality. This is actually very silly, a very silly argument. So the fact of the matter is that all laws are based on the moral consensus of the voters.

If it were not the role of government to legislate morality, then we couldn't ban the ending of toddlers either. But all laws are based in some sort of morality. To say that's not the role of government to legislate morality is factually incorrect.

It's not the role of government to whimsically and arbitrarily legislate anything. It has to be based in morality. We pass certain laws or support certain laws because we believe that there's something right or wrong that needs to be legislated.

Yeah. Like, the reason why you can't go 80 in a 40 zone in a residential neighborhood, it's not arbitrary. It's because people think you don't have enough time to stop if a dog or a child runs out on the street where they're supposed to be playing.

Right. There's a backing of you should not violate the right to life of other people by being reckless, which is exactly how pro-life or see abortion. Yeah.

And then, you know, I'll mention one more and that's the issue of rape. Obviously, rape is an absolutely horrific event, but people will say a woman should never be forced to keep the offspring of a rape because that child will remind her of that event for the rest of her life. And so, you know, even though, yes, rape is absolutely a terrible crime, as I've said, this doesn't affect the scientific evidence for the humanity of the unborn.

Right. We shouldn't punish an innocent child for the crime of his or her father. It does not make a crime better to commit another crime.

What about the toddler? Can we use the toddler? Yes, exactly. Yes. If this were a good argument, then women could also end toddlers who were the product of rape, but we don't hear people advocating for, you know, ending the lives of their toddlers or my dad thinks that I look a lot like my mom.

And I've thought about, you know, what if my mom were to commit some awful crime against my dad, let's say. And my dad decided based on this argument, well, I remind him a lot of my mom and I look a lot like my mom. And so would he have the right to end my life? I'm not comfortable with that.

Shocker. So nothing scientifically is changing between me versus a toddler versus the unborn, as far as us being distinct, whole human beings. I know you're really good at this.

You probably got a lot more in your back pocket, but I feel like we should call the list there and just draw some common conclusions. So what was really going on in those seven objections to the right to life of the unborn? In every one of those cases, the

abortion supporter is assuming that the unborn are not human beings. But again, we already saw that the scientific evidence proves that they are human beings.

And so if we can point that out to people and make them think about it, then I think that changes the conversation quite a bit. Yeah. And I hope that we've trained everyone to remember to use Scott Clusendorf's technique of trotting out the toddler whenever someone makes an argument for abortion rights.

Just see if this same criterion that they're proposing would also apply to young children. Exactly. It might cause them to think a second time.

Okay. Let's look at this from a different perspective. So some people are trying to argue for abortion rights by differentiating between a human and a person.

I don't know if you've heard of this. So they basically say, here's a criterion that the unborn child doesn't meet for personhood. And this is very, very, very important for having human rights.

And so if they don't have this, then they don't have human rights. And therefore, because they're not a person and therefore it's okay to end them. Why don't you give us a response? Explain the argument a bit and then give us a response.

Yeah. Well, this actually reminds me a bit of the leftist attempt to distinguish between sex and gender today. They say, well, sure, you can be born male or female, but that's just your sex.

Then once the person gets a little older, they need to determine what their gender is and they can choose their gender. But that is a made up and unfounded distinction that they're making. So here in this argument, they're doing the same thing by trying to make an unfounded distinction between a human and a person.

That's very self-serving, but go ahead. People will see when they see the argument. So they will say, well, the unborn may be a human being, but they're not a person because I have these arbitrary characteristics.

They won't say that, of course, arbitrary, but there are these characteristics that define personhood that the unborn may not meet or doesn't meet. And so they'll use characteristics like sentience, self-awareness, reflective decision making, the ability to think about their choices and make a rational, thoughtful decision. They'll talk about the person or the unborn's inability to interact with their environment around them, or they'll say, well, they're not viable outside the womb.

That's the one I've heard the most. Yeah, exactly. So the thing is, there's no widespread agreement on what personhood is, but these are just a sampling of some of the main characteristics that people use to say that the unborn aren't persons.



Again, even if there is at some point some sort of consensus from the left, that doesn't change the fact that this is a made up distinction that has no grounding in science or reality. Okay, while you were listing out those characteristics for being able to have personhood, I did think of a couple of objections to those points. But what do you think is wrong with defining personhood based on these particular capabilities? Yeah, well, first of all, they make the right to life dependent on a person's functions or a person's abilities rather than on their nature.

And this is not a road that people want to walk down, whether they may think it is or not, it may be convenient for their argument right now. But I mean, let's say we do want to make a person's right to life dependent on their abilities, then why not value the lives of men who are stronger over the lives of women who tend to be weaker? Or why not value the life or provide the right to life to computer scientists who have very practical skills and just dispense of the, I don't know, gender theory. Another problem with that with this, these characteristics that I think I already mentioned is that they're arbitrary.

Previously, people who have made this argument, very powerful people have included into this list, things like skin color, ethnicity, religion, as characteristics which define personhood and use it to justify killing, for example, black people, Jewish people. The Tutsis in Burundi were killed by the Hutus because the Hutus thought, "Oh, well, because of their different tribe, their different ethnicity, they're not fully persons, so we can just take them out and feel good about it." So, I mean, why not add to this list the ability to earn income or to adequately provide for your family or anything else that we might personally value at this time and place in history? Yeah, it's amazing because the people on the secular left are always tarring us with, "We're the ones who are unpersoning a bunch of, a group of people and taking away their rights." And it's like, "Wow, you are the kings and queens of this. This is your entire worldview." Because man, if they don't, if they're not in favor of abortion rights, like that's their religion, they're the experts at taking a group of people and saying they're not persons.

We don't have to care about them. They don't have any rights. Anyway.

Yeah, well, I often say if you want to know what the left is up to, just look at what they're accusing the right of doing. That's funny. Yeah, funny and true.

So, yeah, so you had that list of characteristics necessary for personhood. This is what I thought of when you're reading them as saying, "These things, they're not either there or not there. They exist in degrees." So, some people are more rational than others and some people have more self-awareness than others.

Right. Some people are more viable outside the womb than others. So, are we going to say that there's a grade for human rights where some people are more deserving of life than others? I mean, just think about where that's been applied in history.

Right. Well, it was another secular leftist regime in Germany that thought that that was a wonderful thing to do to say human rights are for some people but not others based on these characteristics. Yeah, and then it also brings up the issue of, well, then is it acceptable to kill people someone who's in a medically induced coma because they're not currently self-aware, because they're not currently making decisions, they're not thinking rationally at the moment, they're not sentient at the moment? I mean, going back to the trotting out the toddler, can we kill two-month-olds who don't engage in reflective decision making or rational thought? Peter Singer thinks that.

Yes, he does. That guy you quoted before. You're right.

Yeah, he does. He does. Yeah, and what about, I mean, Alzheimer's patients or, and actually, I know a lot of leftists who will say, "Yeah, we should take all of them out as well." That's crazy.

People act like there's nothing to gain from caring about other people who are human but who are in need a little bit. Like there's no benefit. How would you cultivate your compassion and caring and self-sacrifice if you don't have people that you're obligated to who impose a burden on you? We're going to lose the ability to be good.

Maybe that's a topic for another podcast. Yeah, that's a really good point. Yeah, and I also think with regard to self-awareness and sentience and such, I think about anybody of any age and any health and any skill level who are sleeping, is it then going to be okay to take people out in their sleep because they're temporarily not self-aware? Yeah, it just goes to show that these criteria that they're proposing for personhood don't work.

By the way, I have to put this into the podcast so I remember to include it in the show notes. Francis J. Beckwith is one of the people I read when I was sorting out what my position was going to be on this issue. So I read his book, Politically Correct Death.

He has a series of articles that I think are available online and he talks about these characteristics that define personhood. And he talks about whether it's legitimate to say that a characteristic that you don't have yet, but you will have at some point, is any different from a characteristic you don't have right now. So right now, I'm in a coma.

But if I come out of the coma, I'm going to have all these things that they want. So what's the difference between not killing someone who's in a coma versus not killing someone who's an unborn child who is also saying, "Yes, just give me a minute. I'm not quite ready for that yet, but I am going to be able to do all these things." So if you aren't willing to get rid of the first one, then on what grounds can you say, "Oh, but this is this not yet is totally different from the not now." So I'll put that in the show notes.

It was a really nice series of articles from a first-class philosopher. I don't agree with him on everything, but some nice work. Yeah, absolutely.

Yeah. Another problem with this personhood versus human being argument is that with regard to viability specifically, that depends entirely on which country you're in, what technology is available at your particular hospital, what year you're born. So in the US, 15 years ago, viability was not expected or reasonable until around 25 weeks in the womb.

Today in the US, it's 19 weeks. And one day not too long from now, an embryo will actually be viable outside the womb from conception on. So can we really say that what is appropriate and good today is actually murder tomorrow or in a few years when there's a little bit more technology? Yeah, this was actually a major factor if we read the Roe B. Wade decision of 1973.

Wow. So I think that's a big part of, you mentioned that you hear that argument a lot about viability. That's probably a big reason.

And then also, as we learn more about the unborn through technology and medical advances, we actually are discovering that unborn babies are actively demonstrating more of these characteristics than was previously thought. So they do actually have a lot of these characteristics and we just weren't aware of it. Yeah, I blogged about this before, like anytime I see these stories about 20 weeks, 22 weeks, healthy baby is able to survive outside the womb.

I always blog on those to sort of show people how these things are changing. So I'll definitely put a link to one or two of my posts about that in the show notes. But listen, I want to come back to something I had said before about this Christian abortion provider who was saying, "Listen, I have to do this in order for women to have equality with men and men can engage in recreational premarital sex and walk away from the pregnancy.

So we have to allow women also walk away from unwanted pregnancy so that they'll have equality." This is something that is really frustrating for me. Yes. Let's get your answer first and we'll talk about it more.

Yeah. Well, my first thought is life isn't always fair. That's reality.

And we're going to have a really hard time in life if we can't accept that. But if we want to make it fairer, then there should be a heavy penalty for men who abandon their unborn children, not a path to make it easier for women to get rid of their children they have conceived through their own choices. One wrong does not justify another wrong.

Yeah. I watch a lot of men's channels and the surprising thing about men is they're very concerned about how things are unfair for them, but they don't object to this. It's very surprising.

This would be a wonderful way to deter people from engaging in recreational... You have to look at the incentives. If you say to men, "You're going to be financially liable for a

child that you helped conceive," they might think twice about who they're choosing to have recreational sex with. And people are thinking, "Oh, no, WK.

You can't side against men. You really are supportive of men. I'm not supportive of these men, okay? People misunderstand this about me.

I'm not supportive of the kind of hot bad boys who are wrecking women's lives by having this recreational sex with them and walking away from it. That's not me and it's not the men who are like me." So I think the deterring reckless irresponsible sex by making it difficult for men and women, I think that's fair. If both of them have consequences from this, then maybe they will think twice about engaging in reckless irresponsible behavior that's likely to hurt the child.

Yeah. So that does make women unhappy though. When you say to them, "So what you're saying is you're saying I have to be careful about the men that I go to bed with, that I can't choose men that I'm attracted to, that I have to make them commit first.

This is a big burden on me." So what do you make of that? Yeah, that's exactly what I'm saying. I'm just saying. First of all, the right to life always trumps the right to an individual's happiness.

So in the real world, people's individual rights come into conflict and there are times when one right must be prioritized over another right. So freedom of speech, for example, is a right that we all have in the United States, but it's restricted when we use it to threaten the lives of others. And similarly, the right to the pursuit of happiness must be restricted when it demands taking the life of another.

So no, it's not asking too much of women to say, "Choose better men and only have sex when you're in a relationship that is committed and welcomes every unborn child." That's exactly what I'm saying. That sounds good to me. Changing topics of it.

A while back, I mentored a young lady who had become a Christian after having an abortion and we're still friends today. So what would you say to a woman like her who has an abortion and then becomes a Christian after? Is she forgiven for what she did before? What does Christianity offer women who have abortions? Yeah, I'm really glad you asked that. This comes up a lot in conversations I have as well.

When women find out that I am against abortion, they'll come to me privately and say, "But I had an abortion. So what about... But then I became a Christian and what about me? Are you railing against me?" And my response is, look, the gospel of Jesus Christ is a message of forgiveness and hope and grace. It's the story of God himself willfully stepping down from his position of perfect power and intimacy within the Trinity, perfect beauty to come and dwell among humans, to experience every temptation and weakness, humiliation, suffering, in order to die in the place of his enemies, to die for

people.

We're in rebellion against him and he's gonna give his life to rescue us. Exactly. This is the story of the ultimate sacrifice and forgiveness and love to reconcile us to the Father, not for people who deserve it, but for people who don't because none of us deserves it.

Right. So if you ask Jesus for forgiveness and commit to following him, you're forgiven. You don't have to live with guilt or anger or self-hatred.

God will turn your tragedy and your heartache into something valuable and significant that leads to hope and redemption, something that leads to character development and beauty. So we can't ever be so arrogant as to think that our own sin is the one that God wasn't great enough or good enough or powerful enough to forgive and to redeem. He is big enough, good enough, great enough to redeem and to forgive all of our sins.

We just need to ask and to surrender our lives to him. Okay. So yeah, we're getting near the end, but I did have something I wanted to ask you.

So we just started early voting in my state. So I decided to go out and meet the candidates at an event that they were doing outside the place where you vote in my county. So I was just walking along all the stalls and I met this candidate for mayor of the county and we were talking about the Roe v. Wade decision and whether it was good to have done it at the federal level or the state level.

And I said, Oh, it's great to push it down to the states. You know, that's a good first step. And he said, is it though? Is it really or should we seek a federal solution? I said, we should take what we can get and we should keep moving.

So people, the reason I'm bringing this up is because I wanted to ask you, are we done with this issue? I mean, I don't think we're done. And so that's why we're doing this episode is to remind people that there are a lot of states that are still having legalized abortions for all nine months of pregnancy. And we're not going to solve this from the Supreme Court.

It's going to be individual pro lifers who are learning how to be persuasive with their neighbors. But what do you think about this? Yeah, I would say that the battle is now just beginning with this overturning of Roe v. Wade, or it's resuming once again, we're left off, you know, maybe in 1973. And so, but for my lifetime, for our lifetime, the battle is just beginning because without a federal mandate saying that women have to be allowed access to abortions, it's up to the states to make those decisions.

And so now we have the opportunity to persuade people, it's no longer decided by nine individuals who we have no access to who have lifetime appointments. It's now back in the hands of legislators who we vote for, right, or don't vote for. And so it's almost like we have even more work to do now than we did before.

Yes, absolutely. Yes. And how do you feel? Remember that thing at the beginning of the podcast that I said about how I said, this is a tight argument, like I make fun of philosophers, but I ran the script past a few of my philosophy friends and they okayed it.

They okay the argument and said, yeah, that's valid. I don't like to argue when I feel that the issue is not like computer science. So I'm actually, we're actually planning a show right now on the hiddenness of God.

And I was very uncomfortable, not with you, but with the philosopher who's helping me to plan this script, because I said, oh, this issue is so like, I can't see the equations. I don't see the graphs, you know, why are we talking about possibilities? Give me certainties, you know, like the embryology textbooks. So I would really prefer to debate with people when I have the data.

Right. And this argument we have is tight and the embryology textbooks are solid. And the objections are ridiculous.

I'm sorry, but they are. It's self-serving. It's really a, it's really a character issue right now where we're dealing with people who are like, I just want to be bad.

I just want to be irresponsible. I just want to be reckless. Yeah.

And I want to call bad good and I want to call irresponsible, responsible. And I want to call recklessness, wisdom and goodness. What's holding Christians back from enjoying the fun.

And this is a serious business, but what's holding Christians back for enjoying the fact that we have the upper hand. This is like Bruce Lee taking on, you know, a gang of those helpless karate students, you know, in the movies. It's really bad for their side and very good for our side.

Do you like to win? I like winning. Absolutely. What do you think about that? What's your strategy for getting Christians to be interested in conservatives to say, this is fun.

I should get involved in this. Yeah. I think that a lot of Christians don't like talking about this and don't have fun talking about it because they don't know the evidence.

I mean, when was the last time you heard the evidence talked about in church or the evidence for why abortion is wrong, you know, in a book that was a top 100, you know, bestseller of the year. People are not learning the evidence, which we've talked about earlier in an earlier podcast. And so I try to introduce Christians to this evidence anytime I have an opportunity.

I tell the Christians in my life, if you have not read these books, if you don't know this argument inside and out, then you need to stop and read these books and learn this

argument and be able to engage at a moment's notice. And this comes up on Facebook and social media and all the time. I'll post something completely unrelated to abortion and like just that, you know, there's such a thing as objective morality or something like that.

And I'll get responses about how there's nothing wrong with abortion. It just seems completely out of place with people, a lot, you know, women who have had abortions and are living in guilt and have not repented. Seem to want to justify themselves and defend themselves even when the issue hasn't been brought up.

And so... - Are we just like scared to offend them or something? We want them to like us?  
- Yeah, I think that's another big problem in the church is that we have this culture of people pleasing, of not understanding the call of the Christian life, the sacrifice, that following Christ means you're not going to be liked by everyone. And we also have this culture that says, "Just be nice above all." And culturally, we're told that disagreeing with someone is mean, it's not nice. And so if the church is saying, "Just be nice," and we're being bombarded all throughout the culture with, "Yeah, just be nice and don't disagree with anyone because it could make them feel bad," then we've got a bunch of silent Christians, which is completely opposed to opposite of the way that Jesus lived his life.

- Yeah, what I'd really like is for people to be good at arguing with someone who has a crisis pregnancy. I'd also like them to be good at arguing with people about feminism and why men and women should not be engaging in recreational sex that's likely to produce a crisis pregnancy. So go ahead and give us a couple of, since you mentioned advising people, go ahead and just give us a couple resources that you recommend and then I'm going to close with a story about my friend, Kevin.

- Okay. Yeah, so two of my favorite books on this topic are *The Case for Life* by Scott Klusendorf and *Pro-Life Answers to Pro-Choice Arguments* by Randy Alcorn. I've read a lot of books on abortion and these two are my favorite and I would recommend that everybody read these, learn the argument, and be prepared again at a moment's notice to make the case for life.

- Yeah, that's excellent. There's a couple more advanced ones I might recommend. I think one of them is *Defending Life* by Frances J. Beckwith and then there's another one by Chris Kaxer.

I'll put those in the show notes. But I wanted to talk about, so I mentioned that girl that I mentored who had the abortion. She got married to a guy named Kevin and he is an amazing guy.

So I just have to tell this story about the kinds of things. He's a devout Christian and a Calvinist and he spends a lot of time reading theology and it affects how he acts, his priorities and so on. So they had a friend who was considering kind of an acquaintance

who was considering an abortion in a crisis pregnancy and he decided he was texting the girl's father and saying, "When are we going to get serious about talking to her about this?" And he was trying to get in conversations with her and he actually was getting kind of shut out.

So he decided to take a day off work in order to hang out outside the hospital in the hopes that he would be able to counsel her to not have the abortion. And unfortunately, the day went by and she did have it and she never came out to talk to him. But yeah, there was a chance that he could get in trouble with the law and he just decided to do all of this.

So I'm just saying- And took the day off of work. That's excellent. Yeah, I love that.

He's an amazing man and he does things that are shocking and surprising to me in his integration of his Christian faith. We talked about self-sacrificial love for your neighbor and we had a whole episode on Christian versus atheist morality and about the difference between self-interest and seeking to compel people to celebrate you and saying, "There, I'm moral. All of my tribe says I'm moral." This is Christian morality.

Christian morality is when you take a hit in order to protect someone else. Yes. And I just want to raise that story to let people know how pro-life is done by professionals.

And if you want to be a hero, you want to be a knight, and you want to be a soldier and disagree and enter into conflict with the people who are opposed to the kingdom, this is how you do it. What do you think about Kevin? Oh, that's excellent. From everything I've heard, he sounds absolutely excellent.

And this is the way, like you said, to be a Christian and to be a hero, to be a knight. These are the people we celebrate and honor and lift up because they're the people who are sacrificing their own convenience, comfort, ease, even their own lives at times for the sake of others. That's when we honor someone.

That's when we give them awards. That's what, you know, for the military. That's when we praise them and thank them.

We do not praise people for doing what is in their own selfish interests. And so these people who are saying, "But it feels better to be happy now. It feels better to have autonomy or to have more opportunities in my career," or whatever they may say, "It feels too hard or too much of a financial burden to have a child or another child." Well, following what makes things more convenient and easier for you may feel good for the moment, but these are not the people I'm impressed with.

These are not the people I want to align myself with. We need to celebrate people like Kevin who sacrifice their own ease and comfort for the sake of others. I agree.



All right. I think that's a good place for us to end. If you enjoyed the show, please like, comment, share, and subscribe.

You can find the references for this episode on [wintryknight.com](http://wintryknight.com). That's W-I-N-T-E-R-Y-K-N-I-G-H-T.com. We appreciate you taking the time to listen and we'll see you again in the next one.

[Music]