

feel better about what's happening.

A *miscarriage* is not murder because it is *not* something the mother purposefully chooses to do to the baby. But abortion is indeed a choice. Indeed, the pro-abortion crowd has been proudly telling us it's a choice for decades. Abortion is a choice to end the life of the baby, and when you unjustly choose to end another person's life, you murder them.

It is understandable why pro-choicers have refused to call abortion murder. They want to keep abortion legal, and murder is not legal. What is more puzzling, however, is the reluctance of pro-lifers to call abortion murder. If abortion is not murder, then why is there a pro-life movement at all? What is the great cause for which it fights if not to protect unborn children from being murdered?

Here we have a great cognitive dissonance. On the one hand, if abortion is healthcare, as the Left claims it is, then we should all be for it. Pro-life organizations should immediately close up shop, quit taking donations, and quit lobbying for abortion to be incrementally restrained. Why restrain healthcare?

On the other hand, if abortion is murder, then abortion should be banned entirely (no exceptions), and all who participate in abortion (including mothers) should be prosecuted as murderers. This is simple and straightforward logic. It is difficult to see how to navigate a middle way between these two irreconcilable positions (healthcare vs. murder).

Yes, abortion is a great *problem*. It is, in fact, an existential crisis. Since 1973, we have murdered over 63 million children under color of law (as of the date of this publication). The blood of these children cries out from the ground for justice, and God is enraged.

So what is the solution to this shameful problem? There can be only one. It is not complicated. The solution is to repent of our apathy and treat abortion like murder, since that's what it is. A system for prosecuting murderers does not need to be constructed from the ground up. One already exists. It simply needs to be used. Murderers must be prosecuted and punished.

The excuses

Yes, but ...

There's those two famous words. Here are the excuses typically given for why that would never work.

Yes, but... we can't pass a bill to criminalize abortion because the Governor will simply veto it.

Answer: Then make the Governor veto it and override her veto. The Legislature has proven capable of overriding a number of vetoes on issues considered sufficiently important. Why isn't abortion amongst those issues?

Yes, but... our supermajority is fragile. We have Republicans who are more moderate and they reside in more liberal districts. If we make them vote on such a bill, they will be caught in a no-win situation. If they vote against a bill to abolish abortion, they'll look like they're in favor of abortion to pro-life voters. But if they vote to criminalize abortion, they'll look extreme to the more liberal constituents of their district. We can't sacrifice our supermajority. If we do, we can't get other good things done, like tax reform, etc.

Answer: What good is a supermajority if it can't protect unborn children from being murdered in the womb? What consolation is a better economy during a holocaust? How will the wrath of God be appeased by the economy-stimulating bills our supermajority passes while the unborn continue to be slaughtered? Passing tax reform won't alleviate the severity of our judgment before God while we continue to turn a deaf ear to the cries of innocent blood. Protecting a supermajority while not protecting innocent human life is sin.

Yes, but... even if we override the Governor's veto, the Court will merely strike down a bill to criminalize abortion. Why pass such a bill if it won't succeed?

Answer: Make the Court strike it down and prove that the Court is really the only obstacle. Right now, it appears that all three branches are indifferent to the unborn. Why should the sin of the Governor and the Court encourage the Legislature to sin as well? Why not impeach the justices? This is a provision in the Kansas Constitution that falls to the House of Representatives. Why not use it? Judges are supposed to administer justice. They are duty-bound to prosecute the guilty and protect the innocent. There could be no greater dereliction of duty on the part of a judge than approving the murder of innocent children. Justices can be impeached by the Legislature for high crimes and misdemeanors. There can be no higher crime than winking at the murder of innocent children.

Yes, but... if we impeach the justices, we'll look like extremists.

Answer: Maybe. Maybe not. Whose censure do you fear more – that of the media, the voter or God?

Yes, but... we're dealing with the problem of the Court by an amendment to change the way we select justices. If it passes, we'll be able to select better judges in the future. It is more politically shrewd to wait on that process.

Answer: It is good to amend the Constitution to change the asinine way Kansas selects justices. This is long overdue. But it won't help children dying now. Suppose the amendment doesn't pass. What then? What if the amendment passes, and new judges are selected, only to find out the new judges are not that opposed to abortion after all? Disappointment with much-heralded "conservative" justices is not a new phenomenon. Furthermore, even if the amendment passes and judges are selected who regard the life of the innocent, how long will that take? How many children must die waiting for the amendment to pass, waiting for the current crop of bad judges to reach their expiration date and waiting for better judges to be appointed? When children are being murdered now, the time for decisive and swift action is *now*, not tens of thousands of dead babies later.

Yes, but... Kansas voters had a chance to show that they were opposed to abortion when they voted on Value Them Both in 2022, and they voted it down. So, the voters don't seem to care about the abortion problem that much, and they certainly will not be in favor of criminalizing mothers who get abortions.

Answer: Value Them Both was an unjust amendment that sought to perpetuate the status quo of regulating murder (abortion), rather than criminalizing it. Why it failed is anybody's guess. In any case, the failure of VTB is irrelevant. A legislator should take a righteous stand that would honor God and not worry about voters and re-election. What does it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his soul (Mark 8:36)?

Yes, but... Kansans for Life is against criminalizing women, as are the national pro-life organizations. If I vote for a bill that criminalizes abortion, I'll get a bad pro-life rating from these organizations and I'll probably lose my next election.

Answer: These organizations are morally compromised and have refused to support true justice for the unborn. It should not be your goal to get a good rating from them. If you lose your next election, so be it. It is better to do right than be re-elected. It is better to please God than pro-life organizations.

Yes, but... House and Senate leadership are not in favor of a bill to criminalize abortion. They have made it clear that they will not support it, and they will remove me from my committee if I defy them on this. If I'm removed from committees, I become a useless legislator.

Answer: No one who stands for righteousness is useless. You should seek to please God, not leadership. If they oppose true justice for the unborn, God's judgment will fall on them. Don't go down in judgment with them. If they remove you from your committee, so be it.

Yes, but ... with all these obstacles in the way to passing a bill to abolish abortion, it is best to simply work within the limitations of the system and accomplish what we can. It is best to try to limit abortion in some way and wait for the stars to align before we try to abolish abortion.

Answer: We have been waiting for over 50 years for "the stars to align", and what do we have to show for it? 63 million dead babies and counting. Our "patience" has not been a virtuous one, but a sinful one. The end of Roe v. Wade has not ushered us into the Promised Land. Regulating abortion in increments has not brought us any closer to ending it than we were in 1973. While some red states have boasted over regulating "clinics" out of business, DIY abortions via the pill have continued apace, and they now account for over 50 percent of the abortions nationwide. The time for apathy masquerading as patience is over. The time for obedience to God is now. It is always *now*. There is nothing to wait for. How many more babies must die while we wait for a more politically advantageous landscape? On what basis do we expect the landscape to become more favorable?

Conclusion

Many reasons have been given as to why the timing is supposedly not right for legislators to abolish abortion, but do those reasons hold water before the great throne of judgment in heaven? That is the only question that ultimately matters. Proverbs 14:12 says, "There is a way which seems right to a man, but its end is the way of death."

The pro-life way of patiently waiting for an improved political playing field, regulating infant murder instead of prosecuting it, has seemed right to pro-life legislators, but it is a way that has ended in death. Death to millions of babies, and death to the American conscience.

When Jesus arrived on the scene nearly 2,000 years ago, His message was not, "Wait until you are dealt a better hand of cards." His message was, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew 4:17).

www.aimks.org

Yes, but ...

You've probably met the sort of person who has mastered the art of excuse making. He's a person with multiple problems he wants to talk about, but has never met a solution he liked. He's good at complaining about various problems, but when his friends offer viable solutions, he always finds some insurmountable difficulty with any recommendation offered.

If the man is unemployed and having trouble paying his bills, the apparent solution would be for him to get a job. But when various jobs are suggested, he rejects them all one by one. "Yes, but that job won't work for me because..." His favorite two words are "Yes, but..."

Eventually, the man's friends will abandon all efforts to help him because it will become clear that he doesn't actually want help. He would rather be poor than work. He wants to *not* work and to have a comfortable lifestyle at the same time.

Something very similar happens in the political realm. There are problems to solve, various solutions are set forth, and some politicians, party leaders or even whole political parties seem to prefer complaining about the problem over solving it. When solutions are proposed, they are shot down with the same favorite two words of all excuse makers: "Yes, but ..."

The problem and the solution

Take the problem of abortion. Is abortion a problem? *Problem* is a word that doesn't begin to describe the enormity of abortion. Life begins at fertilization, and every abortion is the willful ending of that life in the womb. Therefore, abortion is *murder*, whether people like to call it that or not. Abortion is simply a euphemism that allows us to keep sugarcoating the reality and