

4 WAYS TO DEFEND YOUR
PRO-LIFE POSITION

CARE  NET®
.....



CONTENT

4 New Pro-Choice Argument Reveals the Need for a New Pro-Life Message

by Ardee Coolidge

7 What Pro-Life Men Should Say When Told to “Shut Up” about Abortion

by Roland C Warren

10 A Pro-Choice Dilemma: Should Men Be Forced to Pay Child Support?

by Roland C Warren

12 Why “Apologetics” Alone Won’t Save Many Babies From Abortion

by Vincent DiCaro

© 2020 Care Net. *4 Ways to Defend Your Pro-Life Position*. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means — electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or any other — except for brief quotations in printed reviews, without the prior permission of the publisher. Available for download at care-net.org.

Care Net
44180 Riverside Parkway, Suite 200, Lansdowne, VA 20176
Phone: 703-554-8734 | Fax: 703-554-8735
Email: info@care-net.org

This resource is designed for general informational/educational purposes and should not be relied upon as a substitute for the direct counsel or advice of any licensed professional, including but not limited to attorney, professional counselor, accountant, therapist, psychiatrist, psychologist, or physician. Care Net is not responsible or liable for any claim, loss, or damage, of any kind, directly or indirectly resulting from use of or reliance on this resource and expressly disclaims all express or implied representations or warranties about the information, accuracy, relevance, timeliness, completeness, or appropriateness for any particular purpose of any kind, including without limitation any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. This guidance does not constitute the practice of law in any particular jurisdiction; no attorney-client relationship is established in connection with purchase or usage of this resource. In no event shall Care Net be liable for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, incidental, exemplary, contractual or consequential damages, or any damages whatsoever of any kind, resulting from any loss.



INTRODUCTION

Do you want to make clearer, better, and, most importantly, more Christ-like arguments to defend your pro-life position? The articles contained in this ebook, all of which are published on [Care Net's blog](#), will help you do just that. You will learn how to answer common pro-choice arguments and respond to them with a pro-life worldview based on compassion and love. Moreover, you will learn that, while “pro-life apologetics” is important, it is not the only tool you will need in your toolbelt to defend your pro-life position.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

To read more articles like this, and to watch videos and access other resources covering topics such as pregnancy center ministry, motherhood, marriage, and the Pro Abundant Life movement, visit [Care Net's blog subscription page](#).

To subscribe and listen to CareCast™, Care Net's podcast on family, faith, and life with Roland Warren (Care Net's president and CEO) and Vincent DiCaro (Care Net's chief outreach officer), visit <https://www.care-net.org/podcast>.

Follow Care Net on social media

[Care Net's Facebook page](#)

[Care Net's Twitter feed](#)



NEW PRO-CHOICE ARGUMENT REVEALS THE NEED FOR A NEW PRO-LIFE MESSAGE

By [Ardee Coolidge](#)

Some have [argued](#) that churches need to get out of the abortion debate. It is too divisive and involves too personal of a decision. However, [new polling data](#) from the Barna Group shows that churchgoers want more conversations about abortion -- as well as marriage and family issues -- not less. Pastors and members cite these areas as some of the most important issues facing the United States.

Let me explain why this matters... a lot.

The pro-life movement has always found its most passionate voices from within the church. Barna's research indicates that there is an opportunity for a more holistic approach to abortion: One that does not ignore family issues, but addresses the relationship between marriage, fatherhood, families, and abortion.

And Christians are not the only ones calling for a change in the abortion conversation. A dramatic shift in pro-choice rhetoric is already taking place. After years of ignoring science and logic, leading voices of the pro-choice movement have started referring to the unborn child as a life. In 2013, Salon magazine published an [article](#) where its reporter argued that abortion takes a life, but that it is "a **life** worth sacrificing." In NARAL's most recent [video](#), a comedian says she wants an abortion because, "*My body is doing a thing that is not incubating a **person** and I would like to continue doing that thing. It's my choice, ok?*"

Even the Democratic nominee for President of the United States, Hillary Clinton [said](#) in March that, "the **unborn person** doesn't have constitutional rights."

This shift in pro-choice rhetoric is also chilling. For the first time, public figures of the movement are openly and casually arguing that some *lives* matter more than others. They are no longer dehumanizing the fetus, denying it's a life, person, or child, but are now arguing that it is all of those things, but with no rights and no value.

This shift in pro-choice rhetoric and Barna’s research of churchgoers offers an opportunity to pro-life people to craft a more effective message than the one we’ve primarily relied on for decades.

For years, pro-life people have passionately argued that the fetus is a life and that abortion kills that life. Various, powerful arguments have been used in debates to show that there is no logical distinction between the child in the womb and the one outside; both are clearly living human persons.

Our arguments were predicated on the hope that by just getting people to realize that a life was being killed, they would become pro-life. *What we forgot was that history is filled with examples of the powerful preying on the weak, fully knowing that their victims were alive.*

Whether it was the slave owner in the Antebellum South or the Nazi prison guard in World War II, few believed that the slave on the auction block or the prisoner on their way to the gas chamber was not a person.

They were persons worth selling and sacrificing. They were alive, but only partly human.

Accordingly, it is time that we recognize that being pro-life is simply not enough.

If we are ever to see the hearts and minds of our culture change on the issue of abortion, we must advocate for more than just the recognition that the unborn is a life. We must begin to address the surrounding worldview that led to the unplanned pregnancy in the first place - that caused that woman and her partner to feel that the only way forward was to sacrifice the life in her womb.

We must recognize that the decisions that lead to broken wombs start in broken hearts.

This is why we must become “pro-abundant life” people. This represents more than a shift in rhetoric, but a fundamental shift in our approach to abortion. This shift requires focusing on four key areas.

Marriage. It is one thing to save a baby; it is another thing to raise one. When Christ was born, God did not see fit to have Him raised in a single-parent home. He chose Mary *and* Joseph to lead and parent His son. While the numbers of children raised in single-parent homes has skyrocketed over the past 50 years, our response to this brokenness should not be to simply accept it. We should preach, teach, and model the value of raising children in the environment most conducive to abundant life. This requires embracing loving marriages between mothers and fathers in our homes, churches, and communities.

Fatherhood. Just as women do not get pregnant alone, abortion decisions do not happen in a vacuum. According to our [research](#), the father of the baby was the most often consulted (60%) and greatest influence (38%) within the decision to terminate. If we want to see abortion numbers

decrease, we need to stop pretending this issue is decided by a woman and her doctor and start addressing the most important influence in her decision: the father.

Men need to see that fatherhood is more than keeping the baby - it is providing for it and its mother and being involved in its life. Involved fathers provide children with [the best chance to thrive](#).

Christ. True and lasting transformation is not found in clever analogies (as powerful as those can be), nor will it come from simply choosing to keep a baby. It is found in the person of Jesus Christ. As we proclaim the message of abundant life, we must point people to the source of such life, for He is the only one that can transform their hearts.

Overturn Roe v Wade in our hearts. If people did not desire abortion, then it would not matter what the law said about the procedure. There would be little demand. If we are serious about the issue of life, then we must do more than put pro-life license plates on our cars. Barna shows our churches need more than that. I do not believe Christ will tell us, “Well done,” if we convinced a woman to keep her child and did nothing to help her face the circumstances that caused her to consider abortion in the first place. We must come alongside her with the material, emotional, financial, and spiritual support she desperately needs.

We must recognize that women who attend church regularly account for more than [36% of abortions](#). This means that these women and men believed that Planned Parenthood would be a better cure for their brokenness than our churches. It is time that our churches were made up of [life disciples](#) – men and women empowered with the gospel to meet the material and spiritual needs of their neighbors

The pro-choice movement has decided to accept our argument that the fetus is a life. Rather than simply draw attention to the callousness of this position, it is time we respond with the message so powerful that it took Christ Himself to deliver it:

“The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy. I came that they may have **life** and have it **abundantly**.”

Originally published on Aug 9, 2016 at

<https://www.care-net.org/abundant-life-blog/new-pro-choice-argument-reveals-the-need-for-a-new-pro-life-message>



WHAT PRO-LIFE MEN SHOULD SAY WHEN TOLD TO “SHUT UP” ABOUT ABORTION

By [Roland C Warren](#)

When considering what is best for our society, we don't just consider the views of those most directly impacted to the exclusion of all others. To do so would be an injustice, especially to those who are vulnerable.

I recently met a young man from an Ivy League university that started a pro-life group on his campus. I am always excited to see men take a proactive stand for the sanctity of life, so I thanked him for his leadership. And then I asked if there was a particular obstacle he faced where I could be helpful. Without hesitation, he told me the pro-choice folks on campus often tell him that since he cannot get pregnant and face the burden of an unplanned pregnancy, what he says or thinks about abortion does not matter.

As a man who is president of Care Net — one of the nation's largest networks of pregnancy centers that offers women compassion, hope and help, as well as realistic alternatives to abortion — I have heard this challenge to men so often that I have coined it the “no womb/no say” perspective. In short, since a man does not have a womb to carry an unborn child, he should have no say in what happens to an unborn child in the womb.

Now, without analysis, this may seem to make sense. And, as a result, too many men have let this argument be the kryptonite that keeps them from getting involved in the pro-life movement as equal partners with women. However, when you really consider the underlying principle of this line of thinking, it quickly becomes clear that it may be a good “sound bite,” but it is clearly not “sound logic.”

That said, before I deal with the logic aspect, I would be remiss if I did not address the fact that those who use this argument are being disingenuous. A few years ago, the pro-choice movement started a very aggressive initiative to get men to support abortion rights. This effort challenged men to be “Bro-Choice” and even take a pledge.

Note what Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity (URGE), a major proponent of this campaign, says on its [website](#): “Pro-choice men can be a powerful force in helping move our policy agenda

forward, which is exactly why URGE leads the way in recruiting and elevating their voices within this movement. By building a network of outspoken, actively engaged men, we are building the power necessary to move policy and win on our issues.”

After reading URGE’s perspective, I was reminded of the old quip, “When I want your opinion, I will give it to you!” It also reminded of a bumper sticker I saw a few years ago on the car of a pro-choice woman. It said, “I don’t want my reproductive rights decided by a bunch of grey-haired white guys!” Of course, this woman missed the irony that abortion was made legal by a group of those guys: the Supreme Court in 1973. If old white guys can’t get it right now, isn’t it possible that they got it wrong then? In any case, for the “Bro Choice” advocates, it’s perfectly fine and even required for men to engage in the abortion debate — as long as they come down on the “right” side.

Now, the “no womb/no say” perspective is also very problematic when you consider it through the lens of logic. Essentially, the principle underlying the view is this: *Unless one is impacted by an issue or action in the most direct way, one should have no agency in making decisions about that issue or action.*

So let’s consider a few situations.

Should a woman who is a stay-at-home mom and, therefore, makes no income outside the home, have a say on tax policy? After all, she doesn’t directly pay taxes for an income. Or, should someone who does not own a gun or has never been injured by a gun have a say in what our nation’s gun law should be? Again, a non-gun owner is not going to be directly impacted if the access to guns is limited.

And, when you consider this perspective in light of our nation’s history, it’s especially troubling. For example, consider the Civil War. The South was primarily an agrarian society that, in large measure, was structured and directly dependent on slave labor. Indeed, a key aspect of the South’s “states’ rights” argument was that since the North’s society and economic system would not be as directly impacted by the abolition of slavery, the North should have no say. Indeed, “no slaves/no say” was the South’s proverbial battle cry.

Also consider the issue of voting rights in the United States. From our nation’s founding, voting rights were limited to property owning or tax paying white males, who were about 6 percent of the population. So the notion was “no property/no say.” And even when voting rights were extended to other men, women were excluded. Why? Because the view held by many men was that women were not and should not be as directly involved in the economic and civil aspect of American society as men. Consequently, these men held a “womb/no say” perspective when it came to voting rights. Well, the Women’s Suffrage movement challenged this perspective, and in 1920, with the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, women were given the right to vote ... by men.

You see, in all of the above examples, we have rightly rejected the principle that undergirds the “no womb/no say” perspective. Why? Because when considering what is best for our society, we don’t

just consider the views of those most directly impacted to the exclusion of all others. To do so would be an injustice, especially to those who are vulnerable.

Rather, we give an equal say and even encourage the voices of those who are affected, even if only indirectly. Indeed, a stay-at-home mom is affected by tax policy, so she has an equal right and is encouraged to vote. Our nation's gun laws affect the safety of the communities where the non-gun owners live and raise their children, so they must have an equal say in the laws that are enacted. The moral stain and injustice of slavery affected those in the North, so they had agency and an obligation to fight a bloody war to eliminate it. The laws that were passed in this nation affected women's rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, so it was an injustice to deny them the right to vote.

Accordingly, when an unborn child is killed in the womb, especially if it is his child, it deeply affects a man. So, doesn't it make sense for him to have a say, too?

Originally published on May 8, 2018 at

<https://www.care-net.org/abundant-life-blog/what-pro-life-men-should-say-when-told-to-shut-up-about-abortion>



A PRO-CHOICE DILEMMA: SHOULD MEN BE FORCED TO PAY CHILD SUPPORT?

By [Roland C Warren](#)

Several months ago, I wrote a post titled, “[What a Pro-Life Man Should Say When Told to Shut Up about Abortion](#).” The objective of the post was to address and debunk what I call the “no womb/no say” logic that is deployed to silence men in the abortion debate. Moreover, I wanted to expose and address the underlying principle of this logic, which is: unless one is impacted by an issue or action in the most direct way, one should have no agency in making decisions about that issue or action.

In any case, as you can imagine, this post generated quite a debate in the comments section. One thread of comments caught my attention; a woman posted a comment about “control” and essentially said that to be against abortion is to be in favor of “forced parenting” for women. So, I posted this question:

“Since your primary issue is “control,” here’s a question for you. Should a man be forced by the state to pay child support for a child that he did not want prior to birth? If so, why?”

Now, there is a backstory regarding why I asked this question. I used to be president of National Fatherhood Initiative and, during my tenure, there was a movement by some to legally codify a man’s right to a “financial abortion,” which meant that he would not be forced to pay child support in the case of an unwanted pregnancy. Using “what is good for the goose is good for the gander” pro-choice logic, the proponents of this movement asserted that since women and men are equal, if women have the right to avoid parenting through a physical abortion, men should have a similar right through a financial abortion. In short, if a man does not want to be a father—physically, emotionally or financially — he should not be forced to be one.

In any case, sensing the logic and equality conundrum, the woman I questioned above responded that a man should not be forced to pay child support...but she added a caveat. She offered that the man must have used birth control or supported his sexual partner using birth control, including abortion.

Her response is instructive and problematic for a number of reasons. First, it is truly amazing the mental gymnastics that people will go through in order to support abortion. In this case, this woman is willing to create chaos in our court system and in the lives of countless women and children by

giving men the right to pass the responsibilities for their actions onto others. Unfortunately, abortion is a “sacrament” for some and there is little that they won’t sacrifice at its altar to protect and support it.

In any case, one should reject financial abortions for men, as I do, for the same reason that one should reject surgical/medical abortions for women. (I address the reasons in more detail in an article titled, [“Are All Abortions Equal?”](#)) In short, since life begins at conception, not birth, so does motherhood and fatherhood. Therefore, the unborn child, from conception on, is a human life worthy of protection.

Moreover, the issue here is not one of intent but rather one of potential. Specifically, when one has sex, one’s intent can vary. Some folks have sex with the intent to have a child, while others have no intention at all to have one. However, in both cases, even with the best birth control, if one is fertile, there is the potential to have a child. Every man and woman knows this. Therefore, it’s the knowledge of the potential to have a child that makes a man and a woman responsible for the life that they created together.

Second, in her attempt to protect abortion, the commenter actually ends up denying the legitimacy of abortion for most women. Specifically, she says that denying a man a financial abortion is just fine if he has not used birth control. If so, wouldn’t the “goose/gander” logic apply here as well? Therefore, a woman who does not use birth control should be denied a surgical/medical abortion as well. Since the vast majority of abortions result from the failure to use birth control – not the failure of birth control — the vast majority of abortions today would be illegitimate based on the pro-choice commenter’s logic.

That said, the bottom line issue is not really about “forced parenting.” The issue is about women and men accepting responsibility for their actions rather than sacrificing the life of a vulnerable person for their actions. Indeed, I know how scary and challenging an unplanned pregnancy situation can be because I faced one as a 20-year-old college student. (You can see my story [here](#).) Assuredly, our actions have long-lasting consequences, but we are much less likely to regret our actions in the future when we don’t make the innocent pay for them in the present.

Now, I suspect you are wondering how the woman responded when I laid out all of the logic above. Well, she responded with a snarky post laced with condescension. Frankly, I expected as much. Unfortunately for many, when they can’t attack the logic, they attack the person. Indeed, facts are pesky things.

Originally published on Oct 30, 2018 at

<https://www.care-net.org/abundant-life-blog/a-pro-choice-dilemma-should-men-be-forced-to-pay-child-support>



WHY “APOLOGETICS” ALONE WON’T SAVE MANY BABIES FROM ABORTION

By [Vincent DiCaro](#)

Confusing apologetics with compassionate care will cause us to ignore or undervalue the real issues that abortion-minded women and men face. Most women and men choose abortion because they are unable to see how they will support themselves and their baby, not because they think its a clump of cells.

“Because that would be killing my baby.”

Those are the words of a young woman who called Care Net’s Pregnancy Decision Line two weeks ago. After revealing that she thought she would feel sad about an abortion, our pregnancy decision coach had asked her she thought that sadness would come from. The above was her answer... she knew that having an abortion would be killing her own baby.

This is not uncommon. Many of the women and men Care Net serves in our 1,100+ affiliated pregnancy centers and through our *Pregnancy Decision Line* know full well that abortion is the intentional ending of a human life. They are not confused about this simple truth.

The reason this is so important is that there are too many voices in the pro-life movement who are convinced that if we can just make a better argument about the humanity of the unborn, we will “win” the battle. If we can just convince people that human life begins at conception, there will be far fewer abortions.

The problem with this line of thinking is twofold.

First, it confuses apologetics with compassionate care. Second, most people, like the young woman who called our Pregnancy Decision Line, already know this, and therefore, there are other more important factors we must address if we hope to save their unborn child’s life.

Before I sound as though I am against apologetics – using reason and logic to make a defense or argument – I should clarify that I am an ardent proponent of good apologetics. Indeed, I believe they are a critical tool... but only for a specific purpose. Namely, a good pro-life apologetic is

necessary to win arguments in the court of public opinion. They are great for revealing the illogical and inconsistent views of many pro-choice advocates and for promoting the logic and coherence of the pro-life position. In fact, Care Net uses apologetics in many of the posts on this very blog.

But this is where the distinction must be drawn; Care Net is under no illusion that the tactics used to win an argument with a pro-choice person are the same tactics to be used to help a woman choose life for her unborn child. Unfortunately, we fear this distinction is not fully understood by some in the pro-life movement. There are those who believe that an effective pro-life apologetic in the debate room is also an effective tool in the counseling room.

And this leads to the second problem. Confusing apologetics with compassionate care will cause us to ignore or undervalue the real issues that abortion-minded women and men face.

Take our young woman whose quote opened this article. If your approach with her was to “talk her out of abortion” by convincing her that she was carrying a human life inside her womb, what would you have done when she said, “Yes, I know it’s a life...”? If all you are equipped with is an effective argument about the truth of fetal development, what would you have done when our caller spoke to you about her fears? Indeed, our very real caller revealed that she was considering abortion because of her fear about how her family would react to her pregnancy, her fear about her ability to finish school, and her fear about not being ready to be a parent.

To address those fears, you need a tool belt full of very different tools than even the best apologetic can give you. You need to know the intricacies of active and interpretive listening, mirroring, crisis intervention, and “care-frontation.” You need to know about resources available to help people work through issues like finding a job, building parenting and relationship skills, and dealing with addictions.

Indeed, most women and men choose abortion because they are unable to see how they will support – emotionally, financially, physically, socially, spiritually – themselves and their baby, not because they are confused about the unborn child’s personhood.

The bottom line is that there is a big difference between apologetics and care; between winning an argument and ministering to hearts and minds. Care Net has learned this in our 25 years of pregnancy center ministry. We have learned that we must share compassion, hope, help and the transformative power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to those who approach us with their difficult pregnancy decisions. This work is hard, it takes time and dedication... and it has resulted in the saving of over 600,000 unborn lives in the last 9 years.

Regardless, there are many great apologetics tools available to help you be more effective in articulating the pro-life position. For starters, we recommend *Why Pro Life?* by Randy Alcorn, which you can [download for free](#) here on our website. But if you are interested in learning how to minister

to women and men considering abortion, you must have a different set of tools. You can start with our free ebook, *[Ten Things Not To Do When a Woman Says She Wants an Abortion](#)*.

We are hopeful that you will be equipped for two very important, but two very different battles. The battle to win debates and change minds, and the battle to save lives and transform hearts.

Originally published on April 12, 2018 at

<https://www.care-net.org/abundant-life-blog/why-apologetics-wont-alone-save-many-babies-from-abortion>

CARE NET®

.....



© 2020 CARE NET. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
44180 RIVERSIDE PARKWAY, SUITE 200
LANSDOWNE, VA 20176
703-554-8734 | CARE-NET.ORG