Agree to Disagree (Impromptu Conversation-Part Two)

Gina asserted, “I just don’t think I have the right to tell anyone else what to do.” “Well, I agree, but this involves a separate human being that deserves a voice.” (Not to mention that telling others “what to do” is the purpose of having laws, and every civilized society must have these checks and balances. As soon as someone says, “Don’t tell me what to do,” then they’re telling you what to do! There is no such thing as moral neutrality.) Gina went on to say that abortion bans were hurting women and they were being denied care. When I assured her that every state (*every state*, I emphasized) has an “exception for the life of the mother” clause, she responded, “Not in Texas. It happens all the time.” Furthermore, she continued, making abortion illegal will not stop it and women will just have a “back alley abortion.” My brief responses included

- If a woman is denied care, she needs to sue her doctor for malpractice because the law is on her side. (The abortion industry likes to blur the terms “abortion” and “miscarriage” together to muddy the waters and stoke an atmosphere of fear.)
- No law stops a nefarious activity entirely. This is not justification for legalizing it. (Should murder and rape be legalized because our laws don’t eliminate it?)
- The abortion pill has become the new back-alley abortion. Unsupervised women are being put at physical and mental risk with this unregulated and increasingly common practice.

Gina stated that we don’t need to have babies to shore up the population because “We have billions of people in the world; we’ll be alright.” It isn’t a concern for the U.S. yet, but has certainly become a problem in European countries such as France and Italy. China is having a heck of a time in the aftermath of their “one-child policy” in which boys were chosen predominately over girls. Without women, a civilization will cease to exist for lack of offspring. The actual (bogus) argument often used by abortion advocates is that we are in danger of becoming overpopulated and “where would we put all these babies?!” This is why we counter with, “The U.S. needs a 2.1 replacement rate to maintain our population, and we are presently at 1.6.” Aborting babies to counteract overpopulation is not just immoral, it’s unnecessary.

Gina confidently stated that she would not have the child if she became pregnant because she would not want to deal with the “crying and stuff.” “What about adoption?” I countered. “I wouldn’t want to know that I had a child out there.” Hmm. I just let that statement hang in the air (rather than voice what I was thinking, “So you’d rather kill it?”) Even a compassionate woman such as she can have selfish motives. She went on with a cavalier approach, “If my mom had aborted me, I wouldn’t know the difference.” (Neither would a sleeping or comatose person). But her mom would know, and she would, too, if she chose abortion. She may be “alright” with it, but I shared that thousands of women have experienced horrible pain and regret as a result of this decision.

I concluded our discussion by acknowledging that, although we held polar opposite views on this issue, they were based on our individual and deeply-held values. My value being, of course, that the bottom line is the humanity of the child in the womb. A life that deserves protection and respect. Every single pro-choice argument can be countered with this fact, “The ‘fetus’ in the womb is a human being.” Her value may be equally sincere, even compassionate, but, sadly, misplaced. For this reason, I treaded (trod?) lightly, for challenging one’s dogma head on is rarely as effective as listening first, responding second. A more Michelangelo-type approach of chipping away at the marble over time to produce a cohesive and beautiful sculpture may yield better results.

Gina’s parting words on the subject were a pleasantly-surprised, “See, we can disagree and still get along!” This in itself is a victory, for I may be the only “extreme” pro-lifer she knows. Putting a friendly, non-judgmental face to the cause helps foster relationship and facilitate change. The opposite only perpetuates a stereotype that most of us don’t want to claim.