

You have no doubt heard it said that when you vote for a politician, a perfect candidate is not one of the options. Therefore, you have no choice but to vote for “the lesser of two evils.” The same logic is often applied to legislators as they consider a piece of legislation. The thinking is as follows. Given the intractable differences between the two political parties, it seems impossible to get a perfect bill. Therefore, some compromise is required, and legislators may have to hold their nose and vote for a bill they somewhat dislike in order to “get stuff done”. But is this truly an inescapable dilemma to which we are all hopelessly bound?

Upon first glance, it would seem so. After all, is it not true that ... A) no candidate is perfect ... and B) unless we are going to abstain from voting altogether, the only option we have is to choose the lesser of two evils? Certainly, proposition A is true. No political candidate is perfect, and it is very unusual to find a candidate who perfectly represents your personal set of beliefs and priorities. The same may be true with legislation. But proposition B is where the real trouble begins.

Consider, if something is a “lesser evil”, isn’t it still evil? And if it’s truly evil, should we participate in it at all?

Consider some examples outside of politics. First, the evil of theft. Before you are two options, two degrees of theft. You could steal \$10,000 or you could steal \$5,000. If you steal the smaller amount, you have chosen a “lesser evil”. But have you done well? Will the Law judge you as having done a good thing because you stole less than you could have, or will you be regarded as a thief?

If it is a lesser evil to lie once than twice, is it a good thing to lie once? If you kidnap two children instead of ten, will you be considered a good person for choosing the lesser evil? If you commit adultery once against your spouse, instead of ten times, will your spouse be thankful that you didn’t indulge yourself an extra nine times? If you kill ten people, when you could have killed twenty, have you made a morally superior choice by choosing the lesser of two evils? Will the grieving families of the ten victims comfort themselves that at least you didn’t kill ten more people?

You get the idea. If something is evil, we should not choose to do it, even if it is less evil than a hypothetical alternative. An action is not justified simply because it isn’t as bad as it could be. And if this is true in the

forementioned examples, how is it not also true in the world of politics? Is there something about politics that allows us to justify lesser evils when we cannot justify them in other contexts?

### **God's moral binary**

When we talk about good and evil, we are going to have to talk about God. There's no getting around it, though many have tried. God is the exclusive author of true morality, and the sole Judge of what is right and wrong. If there is no God, there is no ultimate standard of right and wrong and there is no real point in worrying about morality at all. If morality is simply something invented by humanity, then it can be modified, radically changed from generation to generation, or abolished altogether.

That is in fact what we see happening around us. Americans have tried to exclude God from the public square and establish a set of moral principles apart from Him, and it's not working out very well. Our society is imploding. Murder (including by abortion), rape, theft, fornication, adultery, pornography, homosexuality, transgenderism, pedophilia, incest, human trafficking, profane speech, immodesty, divorce, swindling, lying, laziness, etc. – all these things are proliferating at a breakneck pace. And this coincides with our attempt to establish morality apart from God – apart from an unchanging, perfect, uncompromising Lawgiver.

The God we will stand before on Judgment Day recognizes only two moral options: good or evil. Though there are different levels of punishment according to greater levels of knowledge (Luke 20:47; Matthew 11:20-24), there is no such thing as a “lesser evil” in God's eyes. Thoughts, words and deeds are either good or evil. Notice the strict binary in the passages below.

Psalm 34:13-14: “Keep your tongue from evil and your lips from speaking deceit. Depart from evil and do good; Seek peace and pursue it.”

Psalm 37:27: “Depart from evil and do good, so you will abide forever.”

Amos 5:14-15: “Seek good and not evil, that you may live; And thus may the LORD God of hosts be with you, just as you have said! Hate evil, love good, and establish justice in the gate...”

Romans 12:9: “Let love be without hypocrisy. Abhor what is evil; cling to what is good.”

Romans 12:21: “Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.”

Something is either good *or* evil. It is not partially good or partially evil. There is no category of lesser evils in the Bible. If something is a *lesser evil* in the eyes of men, it is simply *evil* in the sight of God.

Keep in mind that God alone gets to decide what is good and what is evil. He is holy, holy, holy. He is perfect, righteous and good. He will never consult with men. He will never take a poll or lift his finger to the wind. No one has ever been His counselor. We need God to instruct us in what is right, but He does not need us to instruct Him. Because God is perfect, He will never change. Why would He? If God was to change, it would have to be in the direction of evil for He cannot become more perfect than He is.

We are not to be lukewarm or ambivalent about good and evil. According to the verses above, we must “*diligently seek good*” ... “*hate evil, love good and establish justice*” ... “*abhor what is evil and cling to what is good.*” We should be all-in for good and staunchly opposed to anything that is evil. We should not compromise or shoot for the middle or make deals with the devil.

In the world of politics, however, it is rare to find such moral clarity. On the contrary, moral clarity is often despised in the halls of government. If you stand for what is right in an uncompromising way, you are often branded as an extremist. The far right and the far left are pejorative terms. The very use of these terms implies that sensibility and rationality are to be found somewhere in the moderate middle. Categories like *good* and *evil* are considered useful only for demagoguery. Otherwise, such categories are naïve and simplistic.

## **Pro-life and Pro-choice trade places**

Nowhere is the bankruptcy of the “lesser evil” ethic more painfully evident than with respect to abortion. Ever since the Roe v. Wade decision of 1973, the Pro-life movement has been in a state of understandable consternation. Their opposition to abortion and their horror at the Supreme Court’s decision was based on the belief that life starts at conception. If life begins there – and it is difficult to argue for another starting point – then abortion is necessarily murder.

But to say that abortion is murder is an outworking of moral certainty and clarity. Unfortunately, Pro-lifers have lost their way and no longer speak with this kind of moral clarity. Though roadside signs can still be found declaring abortion to be murder, the Pro-life movement now treats abortion like healthcare – something to be regulated, not eradicated. *Do not underestimate the seriousness of this shift.* This was not a mere concession to the Left. It was a complete sell-out.

On the other side of the abortion debate is the Pro-choice movement. Since 1973, Pro-choicers have argued somewhat consistently that a fetus (a Latin term meaning “unborn offspring”) is not a real human being and is merely a dispensable part of a woman’s uterus. If it’s simply part of her body, like an appendix or a wart, then it’s nobody’s business whether she wants to rid herself of it.

Oddly enough, back in the 90s (during the Bill Clinton presidency), there was a hint of moral *uncertainty* about abortion on the part of Pro-choicers, as evinced by the popular slogan: “Abortion should be safe, legal and rare.” But if abortion is a *good* thing, if it’s simply women’s healthcare, why should it be rare? This was a tacit admission that abortion was actually a bad thing, and it betrayed the fact that the Pro-choice position was morally tenuous.

That was then. Today is a different story. Today, Pro-choicers have shed any vestige of reluctance over their position. They openly celebrate abortion as an unmitigated blessing. It is “women’s health” and “a woman’s choice”, and what could be wrong with that?

Whereas Pro-lifers increasingly argue for exceptions to be made in the case of rape and incest—concessions to the Left—Pro-choicers argue stridently for no exceptions to be made to their unambiguous position of

abortion on demand, and they take the moral high ground and excoriate as misogynistic any Pro-life effort to limit abortion in any way. Pro-lifers still oppose abortion, presumably because it is murder, but then act like it is healthcare to be regulated.

So, what we have seen since 1973 is a great reversal. The Pro-life movement has become less certain and less clear about the morality of its position, while the Pro-choice movement has become more clear about the morality of its position. Pro-lifers have behaved in a way increasingly *inconsistent* with their stated beliefs, while Pro-choicers have become increasingly *more consistent* with their stated beliefs.

This great switcheroo can be seen with painful clarity in the 2024 platform statements on abortion articulated by the Democrat and Republican parties.

Here is the DNC statement in all its militancy:

*“Democrats are committed to protecting and advancing reproductive health, rights, and justice. We believe unequivocally, like the majority of Americans, that every woman should be able to access high-quality reproductive health care services, including safe and legal abortion. We will repeal the Title X domestic gag rule and restore federal funding for Planned Parenthood, which provides vital preventive and reproductive health care for millions of people, especially low-income people, and people of color, and LGBTQ+ people, including in underserved areas. Democrats oppose and will fight to overturn federal and state laws that create barriers to reproductive health and rights. We will repeal the Hyde Amendment, and protect and codify the right to reproductive freedom. We condemn acts of violence, harassment, and intimidation of reproductive health providers, patients, and staff. We will address the discrimination and barriers that inhibit meaningful access to reproductive health care services, including those based on gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, race, income, disability, geography, and other factors. Democrats oppose restrictions on medication abortion care that are inconsistent with the most recent medical and scientific evidence and that do not protect public health. We recognize that quality, affordable comprehensive health care; medically accurate, LGBTQ+ inclusive, age-appropriate sex education; and the full range of family planning services are all essential to ensuring that people can decide if, when, and how to*

*start a family. We are proud to be the party of the Affordable Care Act, which prohibits discrimination in health care on the basis of sex and requires insurers to cover prescription contraceptives at no cost. These efforts have significantly reduced teen and unintended pregnancies by making it easier to decide whether, when, and how to have a child.”*

Meanwhile, the RNC statement has been dramatically abridged and watered down from the 2020 platform statement, falling from 766 words to 109. Here it is in all its mildness:

*“Republicans Will Protect and Defend a Vote of the People, from within the States, on the Issue of Life. We proudly stand for families and Life. We believe that the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States guarantees that no person can be denied Life or Liberty without Due Process, and that the States are, therefore, free to pass Laws protecting those Rights. After 51 years, because of us, that power has been given to the States and to a vote of the People. We will oppose Late Term Abortion, while supporting mothers and policies that advance Prenatal Care, access to Birth Control, and IVF (fertility treatments).”*

The longer 2020 RNC statement was not sound, but it is worth noting that the defense of innocent human life is now deemed to be of so little importance that it barely warrants a short paragraph.

That this is the situation before us is as tragic as it is obvious. When Pro-lifers once asserted that abortion was murder and should be banned, they had the truth on their side. Life does begin at conception. Pregnancies aren’t terminated. *Babies* are. And it makes no difference whether they are killed at 38 weeks of gestation or two weeks. Either way, it’s the taking of human life. It makes no difference whether the babies are burned with chemical solutions, dismembered and vacuumed out, or starved to death through Mifepristone and flushed down the toilet. Regardless of the method, it’s murder.

It makes no difference whether the baby was conceived as a result of rape, incest or failed birth control. How the baby was conceived is irrelevant to the *fact* of abortion being murder. If the baby was conceived by a rape, the rape doesn’t turn the abortion into something other than murder, and the abortion doesn’t un-rape the woman. When “excess

embryos” are destroyed through the practice of IVF (in vitro fertilization), it’s still murder, because life begins at conception.

Opposition to the murder of children was and still is the *implicit* reason that almost all Pro-lifers oppose abortion. There has never been a meddlesome interest in regulating women’s bodies, as Pro-choicers disingenuously claim. The issue has always been about *murder*. Indeed, that is the reason for the very name of the movement: Pro-Life. Why call it Pro-Life if the issue isn’t a matter of *life* over *death*?

The problem is – and here is a great irony – the movement called Pro-life is essentially dead. There is nothing there but a rotting, stinking corpse. It has been dead for quite some time, but most of those who are still part of the movement don’t seem to recognize its demise.

### **How Pro-life died**

*“A little leaven leavens the whole lump of dough.” – Galatians 5:9*

What happened? We needn’t spend much time wondering what happened to the Pro-choice movement. They simply became more consistent with their stated beliefs. Consequently, they became unyielding and uncompromising. They want unrestricted abortion on demand, and they are not ashamed to say so. They feel they have the moral high ground now and they conduct themselves with the confidence one would expect upon seeing their Pro-life enemies retreating and making concessions. They are not interested in being “moderate” and meeting Pro-lifers somewhere in the middle. There is no need. Pro-lifers can be counted on to do all the compromising.

The question is not what happened to the Pro-choice movement, but what happened to the Pro-life movement. The short answer is that the “lesser evil” ethic came home to roost, and *leaven* that was sprinkled into the dough of the Pro-life cause had its inevitable effect. Put a little leaven into a batch of dough and eventually it will work its way throughout the whole lump. Not a square inch will be untouched.

As with bread, so it is with your belief system and ideology. Just a little deviation from the truth (leaven), will spread and infect the entire system of thought if given enough time to progress.

With *Roe v. Wade* making abortion legal, Pro-lifers felt they had no choice but to try to *limit* the carnage of dead babies through regulatory hoops and obstacles. Instead of defying the high court through various means, they acquiesced (we all did) to Supreme Court sovereignty and embarked from the beginning on a road to moral confusion and compromise.

The Pro-life movement, before it could be called a movement, started with the clarity that abortion was murder and must be stopped. But then heaven was sprinkled in. “We must defer to the high court. We must try to regulate abortion. We must play the long game. We must nibble away at abortion rights incrementally. Saving some is better than saving none. The mothers are not murderers; they are second victims.” That was the heaven.

Pro-lifers bought into the notion that though regulations would not stop all abortions or even most, they might stop some, and stopping some would be better than stopping none. In the greater evil/lesser evil way of calculating moral outcomes, more abortions are a greater evil and less abortions are a lesser evil.

The argument went like this: if regulatory efforts could bring down the number of abortions, for instance, from 1.1 million per year to 1 million per year, then that would be a *good* thing, right? 100,000 babies would be saved. What could be morally wrong with that? Quite a number of things actually.

First, by reckoning an evil thing (the death of 1 million babies) to be a *good* thing (because it beats 1.1 million), Pro-lifers have taught their conscience to live with abortion and tolerate it at some level. In so doing, they began to accept the unacceptable as a fact of life.

The focus was fixed on how many babies *might* have been saved (a hard number to definitively prove), instead of the vastly greater number of babies that have been murdered. The so-called success of saving a few has deadened our conscience to the death of the vast majority. Think of this through the analogy of war. What military commander would congratulate himself if his strategy resulted in a 90 percent casualty rate and the loss of over a million soldiers a year? Who would call that a success? That’s not winning a war. That’s losing – badly!



Secondly, the Pro-life movement was leavened when Pro-lifers stopped treating murder (abortion) for what it was – a crime to be punished with severity. Instead, murder was treated like healthcare, something to be regulated. And this was an insidious, conscience-searing strategy.

By requiring abortion clinics to meet certain sanitation requirements, Pro-lifers unwittingly implied that it was OK to kill babies as long as it was done hygienically. By requiring abortion clinics to notify parents if the girl wanting an abortion was a minor, Pro-lifers implied that it was OK to murder the baby so long as the parents knew about it in advance. By regulating *how* babies could be killed, Pro-lifers implied that abortion was OK as long as certain gruesome procedures were not employed. By regulating the gestational age at which abortions could occur, Pro-lifers implicitly catechized the nation to believe that it was morally justified to kill babies, so long as the murders occurred early enough in pregnancy. That may not have been the intent, but it was the result. There is simply no way to teach a nation that abortion is evil by *regulating* it.

Thirdly, the Pro-life movement was leavened when it enshrined lopsided scales of justice through hypocritical partiality. If abortion is murder, then the mother who brings the baby to be murdered is an accomplice to murder, period. There is no way to avoid that conclusion, except by willful blindness and blatant disregard of judicial equity. You cannot possibly hope to convince the nation that abortion is murder while continually exonerating the murderer and treating her as a second victim instead of a perpetrator.

This is not to ignore the fact that there may be others (husbands, boyfriends, parents, etc.) who are pushing the woman toward an abortion. When that is the case, they *share* in the guilt. There is plenty of guilt to go around.

Imagine if the government made it legal to kill a certain minority group, and in response a certain hypothetical philanthropic organization rose up to oppose this – Americans for Minorities (AFM). But rather than demanding an immediate end to this despicable law, they instead advocated for the *regulation* of the murder of the minority group.

Suppose they worked to outlaw certain gruesome and bloody methods of execution – beheading for instance – but implied that the killing would be OK if it was done in a more humane way (gas chambers, perhaps). Suppose they then advocated for legislation requiring the gas chambers to be clean and sanitary. Suppose they advocated for a 24-hour-waiting period to be implemented before a minority could be gassed. How about if they required executioners to get a special license and jump through bureaucratic hoops before they could be approved as executioners.

What if they passed legislation which forbade the killing of minorities under the age of 20 but permitted the murder of all minorities over age 20. And then suppose that Americans for Minorities and legislators went around giving each other high fives for all the positive steps they took to protect minorities!

Would people be satisfied with this? Would the targeted minorities be satisfied with this? Would they thank the philanthropists for making sure that the gas chambers were properly sanitized?

But wait, it gets worse. What if AFM started talking more and more about the needs of the executioners, instead of the minorities who were being murdered? What if they started trying to gin up sympathy for the killers? And what if they started treating the killers as second victims? What if they started putting up signs along the road, which said, “Love them both”, with a picture of a murderer smiling affectionately at the minority he was about to kill? What if they passed an amendment called “Value Them Both”?

How did Pro-lifers ever become satisfied with this madness when it comes to the unborn? How did the collective Pro-life conscience become pacified by the regulation of murder, as though something wonderful has been accomplished for the unborn?

### **Where are we now?**

Since 1973, the great hope of the Pro-life movement was to elect Republican presidents who could appoint Supreme Court justices who would overturn *Roe v. Wade*. Millions upon millions of babies died each year while Pro-lifers waited for the messianic moment. And then it came. In June 2022, the despicable *Roe v. Wade* decision was struck down. It was jubilation for Pro-lifers, who had long awaited this moment of

victory. Now, finally, Pro-life states could proceed to *abolish* abortion, right? Wasn't that the original goal? Well, not exactly.

At the time of this publication, three years after the fall of Roe, abortion is still legal in every state. Unsurprisingly, blue states have gone to great lengths to increase access to abortion, and some have even offered financial help to women from other states to come and kill their children in their "sanctuary state" (California). Some red states have implemented some restrictions on abortion. Texas has banned *abortionists* from performing abortions but does not prohibit women from performing their own abortions by means of the abortion pill. Florida has enacted a 15-week ban, but 90 percent of abortions occur before 15 weeks anyway.

Then there's red-state Kansas, a state where Republicans have controlled the Senate since 1916, and voters have not voted for a Democrat for president since Lyndon Johnson. Kansas is a state where Republicans have enjoyed an uninterrupted supermajority in the Senate since 1992 and in the House since 2012. Registered Republicans outnumber registered Democrats in Kansas by an almost 2-1 margin.

If the Republican Party was the great hope of the unborn, you would think that there would be great reason for hope in deep-red Kansas. But you'd be wrong. Kansas currently has little to no restrictions on abortion and has become a destination state for people who want to kill their babies.

To be fair, this contemptible situation has not come about due to Republicans expanding abortion access. It has come about because of a 2019 decision by the Kansas Supreme Court, which argued that the Kansas Constitution grants women the right to abortion under the Kansas Constitution bill of rights. That is not a misprint. Here is a portion of their reasoning:

"Section 1 of the Kansas Constitution Bill of Rights affords protection of the right of personal autonomy, which includes the ability to control one's own body, to assert bodily integrity, and to exercise self-determination. This right allows a woman to make her own decisions regarding her body, health, family formation, and family life—decisions that can include whether to continue a pregnancy."

By the Court’s reasoning, even though abortion was practically unheard of (and not legal) in 1861, the framers surely intended that women should have the right to kill their babies some day in the future.

To counteract this court decision, the Pro-life Legislature passed a proposed amendment to the Kansas Constitution, called “Value Them Both”. After some internecine Republican wrangling about when it would be put on the ballot, the primary election date of August 4, 2022, was chosen. The amendment was as follows:

## **Value Them Both**

### **§ 22. Regulation of abortion.**

*Because Kansans value both women and children, the constitution of the state of Kansas does not require government funding of abortion and does not create or secure a right to abortion. To the extent permitted by the constitution of the United States, the people, through their elected state representatives and state senators, may pass laws regarding abortion, including, but not limited to, laws that account for circumstances of pregnancy resulting from rape or incest, or circumstances of necessity to save the life of the mother.*

Surprisingly, the amendment failed to pass in Republican Kansas, and it wasn’t even close: 59 to 40 percent. The outcome was surprising for several reasons:

1. Kansas is a deep-red state, and the dominant Republican Party has established its reputation as a Pro-life party. Why did voters vote for Pro-life Republicans and then reject a Pro-life amendment?
2. The effort to promote the amendment was herculean, with lots of money spent advertising for its passage.
3. Though the Left also spent lots of money and predictably painted the amendment in horrible colors as “radical” and a sinister plan to ban all abortions, such hyperventilating was predictable and should have been easy to see through.
4. The language of the amendment speaks for itself. There is absolutely nothing “radical” about it. In fact, it couldn’t have been more feckless.

5. Many have argued for some time that Kansas is more of a purple state, not a deep-red state. This is one of the theories explaining why Democrats get regularly elected as governors in the state. But if so, this would mean that Kansas is a “moderate” Republican state, not a “far right” state. If that is true, then the amendment should have passed with flying colors, for it couldn’t have been more “moderate”.

The title speaks of *regulation* of abortion. There’s nothing radical there. There was nothing in the amendment to offend the sensibilities of “moderate” Republican Kansas. And the last sentence of the amendment is replete with all the compromises the Pro-life movement has staked its reputation on now for decades.

Exceptions for rape, incest, and the life of the mother are what abortionists and their clients have been driving trucks through for years. What was so radical about Value Them Both? Though the amendment was ill conceived, it is surprising it did not pass in a Republican state that has been deeply indoctrinated in Pro-life compromise. We will leave the speculation of *why* it didn’t pass to others. Our interest is in examining the foundations upon which the amendment was laid. *Value Them Both* was a microcosm of what ails the Pro-life movement.

First, consider the name: *Value Them Both*. Why was it named this? Because ever since Pro-choicers began calling Pro-lifers “women haters”, the Pro-life movement has been anxious to convince the Left and women in general that they love the women who get abortions and only oppose the *act* of abortion itself.

That insecurity proved to be one of the fatal missteps of the Pro-life cause, for how can you possibly be *against* abortion and *for* those who abort? How do you value the baby *and* the one murdering the baby at the same time, when their interests are diametrically opposed? The baby has an interest in living. The woman who aborts has an interest in killing the baby so that she won’t be burdened by its care. You can’t satisfy both interests. You cannot serve two masters (Matthew 6:24).

Value them both? Do we speak this way about victims of other crimes? When we advocate for rape victims, do we make sure everyone knows that we value the rapist as much as the person raped? When we advocate

for human trafficking victims, do we labor to make sure everyone knows we value the traffickers as much as the hostages? When we advocate for child abuse victims, do we try to convince everyone that the abuser is also a victim?

No, we don't, and the reason we don't is because we think the *victims* are the ones who should receive our sympathies, not the victimizers. When we are in our right mind, we don't consider advocacy for the criminal to be consistent with our advocacy for the victims. The problem is that the Pro-life movement has not been in its right mind for a long time. It has tried to argue *subtly* that abortion is murder and should be opposed, while simultaneously trying to argue that the mother is not a murderer.

Here is another absurdity. When speaking of the murder of anyone else (besides the unborn), do we try to convince everyone how much we hate murder, while adamantly opposing any criminal penalties for the murderers? If we did, we could not invent a strategy better suited for the proliferation of murder. And such is the case with abortion.

When a woman hires a hit man to kill her husband, do we punish only the hit man and refer to the woman as a victim? No, we don't – even if she was abused by her husband. We acknowledge the abuse as a factor for her revenge, but we don't exonerate her.

Why would Pro-lifers entangle themselves in such double speak? Why treat the women who murder their babies as “second victims”? Why attempt the impossible task of trying to simultaneously condemn abortion, while affirming those who choose abortion? Why do Pro-lifers complain about unregulated abortion clinics and unsanitary conditions and reporting requirements, but don't seem to want to call a spade a spade and talk about the only reason there is for opposing abortion – because it's *murder*?

Why make exceptions for rape and incest? If abortion is murder, does it cease to be murder when the baby was conceived by rape or incest? Is it morally justifiable to kill a baby because the baby's father was a rapist?

As for the life of the mother exception – putting aside the extreme rarity of such circumstances – why can't doctors make efforts to save both the

mother and baby? Are our medical teams now incapable of attending to two patients at the same time?

Many Pro-lifers have bemoaned the failure of Value Them Both, but the truth is that it would have only returned Kansas to the “good old days” of 2019, when 6,984 babies lost their lives that year. But was that really the gold standard for morality? Is that the benchmark for acceptable carnage?

## **Politics**

The reason for the moral schizophrenia is because the Pro-Life movement is led by pragmatic lobbying organizations who seek votes above all. In the quest to secure votes to accomplish an agenda, great efforts are made to avoid offending female voters and moderate voters.

Republican legislators, in turn, are beholden to voters and to these lobbying groups for good ratings on the Pro-Life scorecard they publish. Woe to the Republican who opposes the will of *Kansans for Life*. If he wants to get elected or re-elected, he will have to tow the party line and vote in whatever way is required to get KFL approval. And the KFL-approved way is the moderate, middle-of-the road, non-radical, non-abolitionist status quo. It demands exceptions for rape, incest, and the nebulous life of the mother. The KFL way is to treat the woman who kills her baby as a second victim.

Bills to abolish abortion that have been sponsored in the House have been punted from committee to committee, never getting a vote and never seeing the light of day. Why? Because House leadership does not wish to compromise certain Republicans who represent more liberal districts and whose political survival is thought to be tenuous. They believe that allowing an abolition bill to come to the floor for a vote would put such legislators in a no-win situation. If they vote against abolishing abortion, they look like RINOs. If they vote for it, they will potentially alienate their moderate voters.

This begs the question: Putting aside the assumption that such legislators would lose their next election by voting in favor of a bill to abolish abortion, why does leadership worry so much about losing a few races? Because in so doing, Republicans will lose their supermajority.

Republicans don't want to lose their supermajority because they would then be unable to override the Democrat governor's copious vetoes. But this begs another question: What good is a Republican supermajority if it does nothing to stop the murder of babies in Kansas? What good has the Republican supermajority accomplished for perishing babies?

Is the perceived good of passing other legislation over the governor's veto worth the innocent blood that is continuously being shed in our state? Is there an issue more important than the slaughter of innocent lives? Is there an issue of greater moral urgency than infanticide? Is tax relief really the great pressing moral issue of our day?

In the end, the explanation for our moral schizophrenia is simple and unsurprising. Even though the *abolition* of abortion was the stated or implied goal of the Pro-life movement from the beginning, it is no longer the goal because such an outcome is incompatible with the political interests of Pro-life leaders.

### **Going forward**

If incrementalism—nibbling away at abortion rights until abortion is gone—was a sound strategy, we should be nearing the last bite by now. We've been nibbling for over 50 years. But the truth is that we are no closer to abolishing abortion than we were in 1973. The long-awaited repeal of *Roe v. Wade* has arrived – that day when abortion would finally be made illegal – and yet abortion is still legal in every state. Worst of all, those who have been entrusted with fighting to defend the lives of the unborn are no longer interested in abolishing abortion and they work to bury abolition bills that are sponsored by lonely abolitionist legislators.

So what is the plan going forward? Shall we double down on the incrementalism that has served us so poorly? Shall we keep nibbling? Even if one believed this once had benefit, it is impossible to argue for its efficacy now. The reality is that the liberal Kansas Supreme Court will likely strike down *any* attempt to nibble away at abortion "rights". It is time to either fight with a new purpose and strategy or raise the white flag and ignore the unborn altogether.

At this point, we have to ask: Other than possibly losing a supermajority that fails to save any unborn lives, what else is there to lose by pushing for the complete abolition of abortion? The objection is predicable: "That



will never pass. We don't have the votes. The governor will veto it. The Supreme Court will overrule it." And yet that outcome will be no different than what will happen if a mild, regulatory hurdle is erected in the hopes of hindering abortion ever so slightly. Why not pass a bill that is consistent with the reason all Pro-lifers oppose abortion? Namely, because abortion is murder. Why not treat murder like murder?

Let us chart a new path forward with the following action points:

1. We must first confess and repent of our sins. The sin of compromise; the sin of unequal justice, wherein some babies get to live and others don't and where female murderers are not prosecuted; the sin of a slow-walk, long-game, incrementalist approach to the urgency of infanticide; the sin of killing abolition bills so that we can pass tax relief bills; the sin of apathy and tolerance of abortion; the sin of accepting what amounts to a bribe to get elected—a KFL endorsement—to perpetuate this abominable incrementalism. The sin of choosing lesser evils.

Do not be deceived. These are indeed sins, and sin must be confessed in humility before God and there must be repentance (turning away from sin to obedience) for there to be any forgiveness. No repentance, no forgiveness.

Leviticus 19:15 says, "You shall do no injustice in judgment; you shall not be partial to the poor nor defer to the great, but you are to judge your neighbor fairly."

Deuteronomy 10:17-18 says, "For the LORD your God is the God of gods and the Lord of lords, the great, the mighty, and the awesome God who does not show partiality nor take a bribe. He executes justice for the orphan and the widow, and shows His love for the alien by giving him food and clothing."

Proverbs 24:11-12 says, "Deliver those who are being taken away to death, and those who are staggering to slaughter, Oh hold them back. If you say, 'See, we did not know this,' Does He not consider it who weighs the hearts? And does He not know it who keeps your soul? And will He not render to man according to his work?"

2. Everyone in the fight against abortion should pray and ask for God's help. We will not cast out the demons of abortion by the power of the devil or by human will power. Only by God's power will there be victory. But for God to lend us His power, we must do things His way and follow His precepts. Otherwise, He will be against us. And if God is against us, who can be for us?

3. Legislators should cease voting for Pro-life regulatory half-measures and instead put forth a bill to abolish abortion that grants no exceptions and that imposes punishment on women who get abortions, as well as clinics who perform them and pharmacies who sell abortifacient drugs. We must do this, in spite of an anticipated failure at any level, because it is the right, God-honoring thing to do. Legislators should be prepared to be voted out of office for doing what is right, and they should be willing to be despised, lonely, rejected by their own party and stripped of committee assignments. They should consider these costs their reward for honoring God. Jesus Christ always did what was good and right. He never compromised. He never called good evil and evil good. And His reward was to be mocked, spit upon, whipped and nailed to a cross where He was tortured to death. We are called to follow in His footsteps (1 Peter 3:17-4:1).

4. Legislators should also put forth an amendment to change the nonsensical way in which Kansas selects Supreme Court justices (i.e. the governor picking from a list provided by the Kansas Bar Association). If Pro-lifers are really so angry with the justices for their 2019 mockery of the Kansas Constitution, then why is there no movement toward such an amendment?

5. Legislators should do what they can to improve election integrity so that election results are trustworthy, but should not determine what is moral and right on the basis of polls or election outcomes. We will all stand before God one day to give an account. We will not stand before a human electorate. Galatians 1:10: "For am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? Or am I striving to please men? If I were still trying to please men, I would not be a bond-servant of Christ."

6. The attorney general and district attorneys in Kansas City and Wichita should prosecute abortion clinics and those who get abortions, in spite of the Supreme Court's resolve to overturn such prosecutions. Lower courts

should apply Kansas law and the Kansas Constitution (to which they made an oath), which guarantees all Kansas citizens (including the unborn) the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

## **Conclusion**

William Wilberforce (1759-1833) is today revered for his decades long battle in the British Parliament to abolish the slave trade and slavery itself. But when he began the struggle, he was despised, mocked and greatly outnumbered by a vast multitude of forces entrenched against him. Abolition was not popular when he began his struggle. It was considered radical and impractical. It would do more harm than good. Wilberforce was moving too fast, etc.

Wilberforce, a devout Christian, suffered many defeats in his pursuit of abolition, but he remained firm and resolute. He would not settle for half-measures, lesser evils or incremental nibbling. His fight against the slave trade lasted 20 years before he saw victory. He labored another 19 years to abolish slavery itself but was forced to retire from Parliament due to ill health. Slavery would eventually be abolished in the British Empire, seven years after Wilberforce's retirement. He received news that victory was assured three days before his death in 1833. If Wilberforce was alive today, there is no doubt he would be fighting to abolish abortion.

Another abolitionist example is closer to home, that of John Brown (1800-1859). John Brown is featured prominently at the Kansas Capitol building and is lionized as a champion of the abolition of slavery in the United States. The irony is that Brown was no incrementalist. He grew impatient with the pacifist wing of the abolition party and believed that slavery would have to be ended by force. Consequently, he took up arms and led volunteer anti-slavery forces against pro-slavery forces in Kansas and then later at Harper's Ferry, VA, where he was captured, convicted of murder and treason, and hanged in 1859. In spite of his violence (which we do not condone), Brown is revered by many today, and especially so at the Kansas Capitol. Due to his strong principles of justice and compassion on behalf of oppressed slaves, there is no doubt that if John Brown was alive today, he would advocate for the abolition of abortion.

There is a great irony in this. The Kansas Capitol pays tribute to an abolitionist of slavery, while a multitude of people who roam the halls of the Capitol have little regard for the present-day glaring injustice that

festers right under their noses. If we wish to honor the memory of men like John Brown and William Wilberforce, we would best do so by demanding yet another abolition. The abolition of abortion. Our unborn neighbors cannot speak for themselves. We must speak for them.

Let us put away the pragmatism of choosing lesser evils, let us stand unequivocally for what is just and righteous, and let us trust God with the results.

Psalm 82:1-4: “God takes His stand in His own congregation; He judges in the midst of the rulers. How long will you judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked? Vindicate the weak and fatherless; do justice to the afflicted and destitute. Rescue the weak and needy; Deliver them out of the hand of the wicked.”

AIM KS

*Lighthouse Baptist Church, St. George*

AIMKS.org—abortionismurderks@gmail.com