



Challenge



"...but try the spirits whether they are of God..." (1 Jno. 4:1)

Volume 8

Winter 2008

Number One

Editorial:

Challenge as a publication has been down for several years as one can see from the main page of the *Challenge* website at <http://www.challenge2.org>.

We apologize for this, but due to my illnesses for the last eight years I had little choice in this matter. However, we are back to take up the fight where we left off. While I have been debating, again, for a year or so, I haven't been able to get the publication back up. While it will no longer, primarily, be a paper publication, we will begin with an electronic publication each quarter. As we have in the past we will use this publication to carry on the fight with error. While we will deal with atheism/skepticism and evolution vs. creation for the most part, we will also deal with other issues.

One of the things that we will continue to do in this publication is to give equal space to our opponents. As long as people treat each other with respect (which includes no cursing, name calling, or using foul language), they will be able to write for this publication. All Biblical passages (used by proponents of the integrity of the Bible) will be taken from the King James Version, The American Standard of 1901 or the New King James Version. I am sure that skeptics/atheists will want to use other versions, but those on our side will be restricted to those versions that I have listed. My personal

belief is that the King James Version is the most accurate version that we have. The American Standard of 1901 comes in second with the New King James coming third. Any other version will have to be pre-approved, and there must be a specific reason for using it.

We hope to be able to keep *Challenge* up and running from this time forward. There will be a paper version of *Challenge* if you should desire it. We won't be spending as much on it as we did in the past. I am still working on getting all the back issues on the website as of yet, but I will just as soon as I can get them. It may take some time. However, we begin with Volume 8 because the last issue printed was in Volume 7. We hope to be with you for a long time to come. All are invited to respond to anything that you feel is necessary. The only other restriction will be space. All articles need to be limited to no more than 8,000 words unless you are quoting an article from another site. Thank you and we look forward to working with you again.

Contents of this issue:

Editorial, <i>Jerry McDonald</i>	Page 1
Thermodynamics and God's Existence, <i>Jerry McDonald</i>	Page 2
The Age of the Earth, <i>Thomas H. McDonald</i>	Page 6
Does Life Exist at the Moment of Conception?--A Response To Farrell Till, <i>Jerry McDonald</i>	Page 9

THERMODYNAMICS AND THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Jerry D. McDonald

Introductory Matters

Evangelical evolutionists are constantly active in their efforts to discredit the existence of God. Their reasons for this have little or nothing to do with the evidence for or against God's existence, but their desire to have him removed from society so they don't have to be reminded of him, and/or their obligations towards him. Many books have surfaced, of late, in a worldwide effort to remove God from people's thoughts. Some of these books are written by men like Richard Dawkins "*The Blind Watchmaker*," "*The God Delusion*," and Arthur Strahler "*Science and Earth History*," as well as with others which lash out at creationists teachings. Many arguments are made, and much time and money is expended to this end.

The evolutionist argues for an old age of the universe, and that how it came into existence as a matter of random chance, rather than intelligent design. Chaisson & McMillan wrote:

"Within this human-centered view clearly evident, Figure 28.1 identifies seven major evolutionary phases that have contributed to development of life on our planet: *particulate, galactic, stellar, planetary, chemical, biological, and cultural* evolution. Matter formed from energy in the early universe, then cooled and clumped to form galaxies and stars. Within galaxies, generation after generation of stars formed and died, seeding the interstellar medium with heavy elements so that, when our Sun formed billions of years after the first star blazed, the rocky planet Earth formed along with it. Eventually, on Earth, life appeared and slowly evolved into the diverse environment we see today.

Together, these evolutionary phases represent the grand sweep of **cosmic evolution**—the continuous transformation of matter and energy that has led to the

appearance of life on our planet...The fossil record leaves no doubt that biological organisms have changed over time—all scientists accept the reality of *biological evolution*. As conditions on Earth shifted and Earth's surface evolved those organisms that could best take advantage of their new surroundings succeeded and thrived—often at the expense of organisms that could not make the necessary adjustments and consequently became extinct. WHAT LED TO THESE CHANGES? CHANCE." ¹

One of the arguments they commonly employ is the argument on the first and second laws of Thermodynamics.

"The **first law of thermodynamics** is simply an expression of the conservation of energy principle, and it asserts that *energy* is a thermodynamic property."² The conservation of energy simply states "that during an interaction, energy can change from one form to another but the total amount of energy remains constant. That is, energy cannot be created or destroyed."³ It is sometimes said that because this law states that energy can neither be created nor destroyed that it means that matter has been here all along and was not created by anyone, including God.

"The **second law of thermodynamics** asserts that energy has *quality* as well as *quantity*, and actual processes occur in the direction of decreasing quality of energy."⁴ This law simply states that in a closed system things tend to run towards disorder, which is called **entropy**. Since energy or matter can neither be created nor destroyed it does not decrease in quantity.

The word **thermodynamics** itself "stems from the Greek words *therme* (heat) and *dynamis* (power), which is most descriptive of the early efforts to convert heat into power."⁵ The authors go on to say that the name is broadly interpreted today to include all aspects of energy transformation as well as the properties of matter. This is where the evolutionist comes up with the idea that the first law states that matter can neither be created nor destroyed.

Originally, however, the law applied just to energy, which is why it was called the conservation of energy.

The Problem Stated

The problem is that if energy can neither be created nor destroyed at all, then God could not have created matter, which is a form of energy. This is a problem for the creationist, while the problem for the evolutionist is that, according to evolutionary theory, everything started as disorder and headed towards order, but the reality is that everything started out as order, and is headed towards disorder.

The Problem Resolved

First we have to look at problem # 1; the first law of thermodynamics. Can matter be created or destroyed? Science says no, and on the basis of it being done naturally, we have to agree: Nature cannot create energy, nor can it destroy it, nature can only change it from one form to another. However, God is not nature, he is **super-nature** or **supernatural**. In other words, he is superior to nature, he transcends and overrides nature. There are many things that God can do **supernaturally** because he has the ability to set the laws of nature aside and exceed them. Skeptics/atheists automatically rule out the possibility of the supernatural, and proceed on the assumption that everything must be explained naturally.

When Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead (John 11:43), he set aside the laws of nature, and superseded them bringing a man (who had been dead for four days) back to life. When God created man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (Genesis 2:7) he set the laws of nature aside and superseded them. Left to nature alone, Adam would never have been brought to life, nor would Lazarus have ever been raised from the dead. Why? Because life, naturally, cannot come from lifelessness, nor can it come back to life once it is dead. In order for either one of these things to happen there would have to be supernatural intervention. This is also true with the creation and destruction of energy or matter. Thus, the first problem is resolved.

The second problem is one for the evolutionist. Whether one is an atheistic evolutionist (one who does not believe in God's existence) or a theistic evolutionist (one who believes in God, but believes that God used evolutionary processes to bring everything into existence—which would include Old Earth Creationists and/or Progressive Creationists), the problem cannot be resolved because evolution says that everything started at a stage of disorder and supposedly goes towards order. However, reality shows us that everything started in a stage of order, and is headed towards disorder. Both, the fall of man and the Genesis flood brought disorder to order. Every natural disaster brings disorder to order.

Discussion

The Bible states: *"In the beginning God **created** the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."*⁶ The word "created" here comes from the Hebrew word *"בָּרָא* bâ râ' *baw-raw'* A primitive root; (absolutely) to *create*; (qualified) to *cut down* (a wood), *select, feed* (as formative processes): - choose, create (creator), cut down, dispatch, do, make (fat)."⁷ When Jesus spoke to the Pharisees, after they had asked him if it was lawful to put away one's wife for every cause, he said *"unto them, Have ye not read, that he which **made** them at the beginning **made** them male and female"*⁸ He used the word *ποίηω* which means *"to make, form or construct."*⁹ Both words mean the same thing; to make or create something.

When God created the universe, the earth and all of its inhabitants (including man) he set the laws of nature aside and **supernaturally** created energy, matter and then those things that he had made out of energy (matter). He has the ability to supersede the laws of nature, and has done so on occasion as he did regarding Joshua's long day. The Bible repeatedly tells us of his ability to set natural law aside, supernaturally intervene.

Some atheistic evolutionist would have us believe that matter has always existed in a non-living state, and then came to life bringing with it all of the benefits of life from lifelessness. In the first place matter is a form of energy and secondly, there is no

such thing as “non-living” energy. Energy is defined as:

“1a: dynamic quality <narrative~> b: the capacity of acting or being active...A fundamental entity of nature that is transferred between parts of a system in the production of physical change within the system and usu. regarded as the capacity of doing work.”¹⁰

This tells us that energy cannot, ever, have been non-living. The very definition of the word shows that it is active and always has been since its creation. Thus energy cannot be created (naturally) nor can it be destroyed (naturally). Where did the non-living matter come from? Since matter is a form of energy, it had to be active. The word “matter” is defined as:

“Material substance that occupies space, has mass, and is composed predominately of atoms consisting of protons, neutrons, and electrons, that constitute the observable universe, and that is interconvertible with energy.”¹¹

Therefore, there is no such thing as non-living matter, because it has atoms consisting of protons, neutrons, and electrons all of which are active. A question comes up “an animal is made up of matter, doesn’t it die?” and the answer is “yes, the animal dies, but the matter which made up the body of the animal doesn’t die. It just changes from one form into another.” The body dies, deteriorates and the atoms which made up the body then change form and become something else that is living, such as bacteria in the soil which causes plant life to grow because it acts as food or fertilizer.

Our world is quite remarkable when you consider that nothing is naturally wasted. An animal dies, deteriorates and becomes food for plant life or bacteria in the soil and other animals eat the plant life and it gives them strength.

Though it is elementary, the movie “The Lion King” shows how that in the circle of life nothing is naturally wasted. This would not happen if matter could ever be non-living.

Evolution states that either matter has always existed in a non-living state and that it became living (although they aren’t quite sure how) which is a violation of the first law of thermodynamics, or that nothing was in existence and there was a great explosion in space bringing forth the living matter; which also violates the first law of thermodynamics. Regardless of the theory, evolution violates the first law of thermodynamics.

Now, what about the second law of thermodynamics? Evolutionists teach that evolution does not violate the second law of thermodynamics.

“The Second Law is focused on the concept of entropy. This is a quantity that measures the state of disorder in a system. The Second law, restated in terms of entropy, is ‘The entropy of an isolated system never decreases. It can only state the same or increase’ (Giancoli 1995)... The key to understanding the Second Law’s relevance to evolution is the word ‘isolated.’ The Second Law is only true for closed systems.”¹²

One of the ways that evolutionists confuse people is their usage of words like “**increase of entropy.**” Most people don’t understand what the words mean, and they think that they mean that things are staying the same or that they are getting better. However, the words “**increase of entropy**” mean:

“1: a measure of the unavailable energy in a closed thermodynamic system that is also usu. considered to be a measure of the system’s disorder, that is a property of the system’s state and that varies disorder, that is a property of the system’s state, and that varies directly with any reversible change in heat in the system and inversely with the temperature of the system; *broadly*; the degree of disorder or uncertainty in a system. 2 a. The degradation of matter and energy in the universe to an ultimate state of inert uniformity b: a process of degradation or running down or a trend to disorder. 3: CHAOS, DISORGANIZATION, RANDOMNESS.”¹³

So we can see that the increase of entropy refers to disorganization, disorder or running down. Therefore, the meaning is that the disorganization of a system increases, but it never decreases. If it

decreased things would get better, but since entropy increases things tend to get worse.

Now for those who understand what entropy is the evolutionist argues that this is only for closed systems and since the earth draws energy from the sun, it isn't a closed system! Well, the earth isn't a closed system, to be sure, but the universe is. Some evolutionists argue that there is no proof that the universe is a closed system, but the increasing entropy of the sun and other parts of the universe (such as stars) which are headed towards disorder show that it is a closed system. However many such as Arthur Strahler, who wrote, "Now, the only truly isolated system of which we can conceive is the universe itself, provided that the universe is finite in extent"¹⁴ understand that the universe is a closed system. Those who agree that the universe is a closed system, argue that the net entropy is very slight for the universe. However slight it may be, the point is, it is still moving towards disorder; entropy is still increasing.

There is the movement to show that even in a closed system energy can be stored in parts of open systems within the closed system which will bring order back after so much disorder has taken place. Strahler wrote:

"Within the limits of the universe are many open subsystems within which entropy change can be negative to the accompaniment of the construction of highly ordered states of matter. The largest of the open subsystems are galaxy clusters and galaxies; within there are small subsystems—luminous gas clouds and stars. Many stars have planetary systems, and within each solar system the individual planets and other orbiting objects form another set of subsystems. Each planet, in turn, includes numerous subsystems. Associated with a typical energy subsystem is a subsystem of matter that may be closed or open. Subsystems of all types and scales continue to be formed. After the growth stage of decreasing entropy is completed, the system may enter a steady state, and this may be followed by a decay state in which system

entropy increases along with increasing disorder, until the system goes out of existence."¹⁵

Strahler's argument here is that within the closed system of the universe are a number of open systems which feed energy to the closed system. However, as he was forced to admit that after the decreasing entropy is complete the system may enter a steady state and then be followed by a state of increasing entropy until the system goes out of existence. His final words were "Meantime, the universe as a whole proceeds on its general course toward increased entropy and increasing disorder."¹⁶

Regardless of how many subsystems there are which can store energy to replace the used energy and bring a semblance of order back to the disorder, the universe continues towards disorder. In other words, it continues to run down and die. They argue that the second law applies to both open and closed systems, but this is true only when the open systems are subsystems of a closed system.

Questions

1. Does organic evolution violate the first law of thermodynamics? The answer is undoubtedly yes. The reason is because the first law states that energy cannot be naturally created nor destroyed. The Big Bang Theory states that out of nothing energy exploded and this explosion created matter and thus all that we have in the universe. However energy cannot create itself and nature cannot create it. All nature can do is transform it from one form to another.
2. Does organic evolution violate the second law of thermodynamics? The answer is undoubtedly "yes." The reason is because in any closed system the energy will go from order to disorder, and evolution says that everything should be going from disorder to order. Their argument on the "open sub-system" only prolongs the increase of entropy; it will not stop it from happening. As Strahler has already stated "the universe as a whole proceeds on its general course toward increasing entropy and increasing disorder."¹⁷

CONCLUSION

The laws of thermodynamics do not prove that God does not exist. As a matter of fact they prove that

there is God, a creator. Since energy cannot be created naturally, and since it cannot be destroyed naturally, it must take a supernatural being to both create and destroy it. The supernatural being is God.

END NOTES

1. Thermodynamics, An Engineering Approach, p.2.
2. Astronomy Today, Chaisson & McMillan, pp. 760, 765.
3. Thermodynamics, An Engineering Approach, p.2.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Genesis 1:1,2 KJV.

7. E-Sword (Gen. 1:1).
8. Matthew 19:4, KJV.
9. The Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament, p. 381.
10. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Edition, p.413.
11. Ibid, p.766.
12. Evolutionary Analysis, Third Edition, p. 102.
13. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Edition, p. 417.
14. Science and Earth's History, The Evolution/Creation Controversy, p. 87.
15. Ibid, pp. 88, 89.
16. Ibid, p. 89.
17. Ibid

THE AGE OF THE EARTH

Thomas H. McDonald

INTRODUCTION:

The Age of the Earth is a topic that is discussed a lot now days. Atheists believe that the Earth is billions of years old. Although to argue with them on this matter you could pin them on the choice of whether the Earth is older or younger than what they think. It forces them to either admit that they are wrong or to just not say anything at all, which is exactly the same as admitting that they are wrong, and that is something they will not do.

The Atheists do not want to admit that the Earth is too old because it doesn't fit inside of their theory and they don't want to admit that it's too young because it still doesn't fit inside their theory. Now that being said, the Atheist's would rather have someone take their word for it than try to prove it.

DISCUSSION:

Question, How long is a day? Is it 1000 years or is it 24 hours? The answer is simple really. It is 24 hours. It was stated in Genesis chapter 1 because of the way that the first chapter was written.

Gen 1:1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

3 And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.

4 And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.

5 And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the **evening and the morning were the first day.**

6 And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.

7 And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so.

8 And God called the firmament Heaven. And the **evening and the morning were the second day.**

9 And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so.

10 And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that it was good.

11 And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so.

12 And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

13 And the **evening and the morning were the third day.**

14 And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day

from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:

15 And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so.

16 And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also.

17 And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth,

18 And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good.

19 And the **evening and the morning were the fourth day.**

20 And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.

21 And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

22 And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.

23 And the **evening and the morning were the fifth day.**

24 And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.

25 And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

28 And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

29 And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.

30 And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat: and it was so.

31 And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the **evening and the morning were the sixth day.**

Each day, here, is said to have an evening and a morning which indicates that it was one literal day. Plus not to mention the fact that when God did something miraculous it happened right then. Take for example when Jesus brought back the little girl from the dead or brought back Lazarus. Did he have to wait for a year for that to happen? No! In both cases they rose just like that as if they had been awakened from sleeping. So it's pretty plain to see that when God was speaking the world into existence that everything happened in REAL TIME just exactly as He spoke it. He said let there be Light and as soon as the words left his mouth light appeared and lit the whole planet.

Point 1: The Old Earth Creationists want us to believe that the 6 days were not literally 24 hours by Figurative Language. The Old Earth Creationists have the belief that there were 6 long periods of time between the times that God made something. So they do not believe that six 24 hour days were possible. So they work to prove their beliefs on the grounds that they say that the 6 days were figurative speech. Only problem is they cannot prove that it is figurative speech. There are two rules to figurative Speech. The first rule is:

The sense of the context will indicate it---
As before said, nothing should be regarded as figurative unless such a demand is made by the meaning of the immediate context, or by the evident meaning of the passage as a whole. The second rule is: *A word or sentence is figurative when the literal meaning involves an impossibility---* Jer. i. 18 it is said: "For, behold, I have made thee this day a defenced city, and an iron pillar, and Brasen walls against the whole land." Literally we know that such was not the fact. God had made this man to resemble these things in some respects: he should be strong and immovable like them, hence the comparison" (*Hermeneutics, p.195*).

Another author by the name of Lockhart wrote:
"When a word has been appropriated by usage to one thing and is transferred to another, it is said to be used figuratively. When a word is used in its primitive or usual meaning, it is said to be used literal. A figure, therefore, is a departure or deflection from the primitive or usual meaning of a word, or the usual manner of expressing ideas" (*Principles of Interpretation, page 157*).

So therefore the Old earth Creationists cannot possibly be correct because they cannot prove that the 6 days were figurative, so they must have been actual 24 hour days.

In Exodus 20:9-11 Moses wrote:

Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is,

and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.

Moses used the creation days to set up the Jewish work week. This shows that the creation days were literal days.

Point 2: The Field of Botany shows us that the Genesis days were literal 24 hour days. Another way of showing the creation days were just 24 hours is by the Field of Botany. Otherwise known as plant life. Guy N. Woods had this to say about Botany.

"Botany, the field of plant life, came into existence on the third day. Those who allege that the days of Gen. 1, may have been long geological ages, must accept the absurd hypothesis that plant-life survived in periods of darkness through half of each geological age, running into millions of years!" (*Questions and Answers Open Forum, Freed-Hardeman College Lectures, p.16*).

So now how is it that the plants could have survived if each day was years apart. The answer is simple without sunlight the plants would not have survived the billions of years that the atheists claim that had happened. So therefore the only logical choice would be that the days were literally 24 hours. The plants could survive if the day was only 24 hours, but impossible to survive if the day was billions of years apart from the next day. Still don't believe me? Fine then my last point is this.

Point 3: Oceanography-The Real World Evidence shows us that the Genesis days were literal 24 hour days. How long does it take a reef to grow? That is the name of an article that deals in proving that the world is only a few thousand years old. How is this possible you ask? Well let's take a look at that shall we. How long does it take a Coral Reef to grow? Well one way to tell is that it was established that the thickness of Eniwetok Atoll could have been formed in less than 3,500 years. Which shows that it takes only a few years for Coral reef to grow.

CONCLUSION:

Thus by just looking at real world evidence the Earth can be no more than a few 1,000 years old.

DOES LIFE EXIST AT THE MOMENT OF CONCEPTION?

A RESPONSE TO FARRELL TILL

Jerry D. McDonald

In his online version of *The Skeptical Review*, Mr. Till has come to us with an article entitled *Does A Person Exist at the Moment of Conception?* Which he presents what he thinks is a scientific argument showing that life does not begin at conception. In this article you will find, both his article and my response.

Does A Person Exist at the Moment of Conception?

Farrell Till

For several decades, abortion has been a driving force on the American political scene, and it no doubt played a key role in voting patterns of the Christian fundamentalists who were largely responsible for returning to the White House a "president" who half of the citizenry believe has been reckless and at times downright incompetent in both domestic and foreign affairs. As a former fundamentalist preacher and foreign missionary, I can appreciate the concerns that many Bible believers have about this emotionally charged issue. Even after my personal studies of the Bible had convinced me that it was not the inspired, inerrant word of God, as I had been taught to believe in my childhood and Bible college classes, I still thought that abortion was a deliberate act of murder. Even though I had by that time spent some fifteen years in rather serious biblical studies, I had not yet disassociated myself from my fundamentalist background sufficiently to see the points that I developed in "[Abortion and the God of the Bible](#)," which points cast serious doubts on pro-life attempts to associate abortion with flagrant disregard of biblical principles.

Abortion, alone, has not been the driving force in American politics. Yes, it definitely played a key role in voting patterns of Christians in the last two elections. Homosexuality was another

driving force, along with embryonic stem cell research. However, the war on Terrorism played a key role in the last general election. People knew that John Kerry didn't have the intestinal fortitude to see things through (and I shiver every time I think where we would be right now if Al Gore had been in the White House on 9/11), and the nation knew that President Bush did have what it took. This is why he was re-elected. I don't know where Mr. Till gets his information (maybe from the polls--which are not really a reality of the peoples desire in this country), but most of the people I know, even the Democrats, are satisfied with the way the President Bush has conducted himself in office.

I don't know when he made these studies but I do know that as far back as the early 90's Mr. Till, although he thought abortion was deplorable, thought that every woman had the right to choose whether to have an abortion or not. He made this plain in our written and oral debates in 1991. He never once said anything about believing that it was a deliberate act of murder. He has always said that it was a deplorable act (which only makes one wonder why, if there is no actual murder involved), in the years since I have known him (since 1988) I have never heard him call abortion "a deliberate act of murder."

He uses this to further his attack on the President of the United States by saying that we "Christian fundamentalists... were largely responsible for returning to the White House a 'president' who half of the citizenry believe has been reckless and at times downright incompetent in both domestic and foreign affairs" solely because of our belief on abortion. Well, this did have something to do with our decision when we voted, but it certainly was not the only thing. We believed, and as far as I know still believe, that he did the right thing in going to war against the terrorists who were responsible for the destruction of thousands on September 11, 2001, as well as those who aided these terrorists (yep, that's right, I am talking about Saddam Hussein). And actually the

attack on our country on 9/11 was not the reason we went to war, but it was the straw that broke the camel's back. The Middle Eastern terrorists had been terrorizing Americans since the late 1970's. However, all of our Presidents held off sending in troops to take care of these people until President Bush was in the White House and had no other choice but to send in troops after 9/11. The terrorists had made it clear that they were going to keep it up until we came out and fought them, so after 20 something years of terror, we finally did something. Personally I am disgusted with every other President (Republican and Democrat) for not doing something sooner. Even President Bill Clinton (the liberal's choice) understood that Saddam Hussein was a threat to national security, but he didn't have the intestinal fortitude to do anything about it. So we continue to suffer attack after attack upon this country, and its interests, from Bin Laden (who was supported by Hussein) as well as other Middle Eastern terrorists until finally someone stood up and said "enough is enough." That someone was our present President. Farrell Till never misses a chance to complain about the man who presently presides in the White House as our President.

But in getting back to the point at hand, I would just like to know when Farrell Till made this marvelous discovery that abortion, although deplorable, is not "a deliberate act of murder." He further writes:

I continued to believe that abortion was immoral until a student nurse in one of my college composition classes directed me to scientific information that produced serious doubts about my hardline position and eventually led to my present belief that abortion, although deplorable, cannot logically be considered an act that kills a person. About the same time that I was discussing this subject with the nursing student, someone who called himself "Chimera" posted similar information in a website forum that I was a member of, but the nursing student gave me more specific information. By sharing the scientific facts that I learned during research prompted by

my discussion with "Chimera" and the nursing student mentioned above, maybe I can at least mitigate some of the emotionalism with which Christian fundamentalists view the abortion issue. First, I will begin with information that I already knew and will work my way down to what I learned after accepting the young lady's challenge to research the subject rather than just sticking to emotionally based religious baggage that I had carried with me after my deconversion.

If abortion cannot be considered "a deliberate act of murder" why is it deplorable? If abortion cannot logically be considered an act that kills a person why is it deplorable? This is the same song and dance that he gave in the 90's when he said that abortion was deplorable, but he felt that every woman had the right to make this choice. This is like saying that using a contraceptive is deplorable, but he feels that every woman should have the right to make the choice as to whether or not to use it. Why, if every woman has the right to choose, is it deplorable to use a contraceptive? Why, if every woman has the right to choose to have an abortion, is it deplorable? These are questions that Farrell would have a hard time answering. The word "deplorable" means: "1: LAMENTABLE <~death> 2: deserving censure or contempt: WRETCHED <~living conditions>" (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Edition*, p.334). Why is abortion so deplorable, contemptible or lamentable if it does not kill a person, or if it is not a deliberate act of murder? This would make no sense at all, except for the fact that I know this man and I know, that even though he has rejected God, His word and the church, he still can't quite get it out of his conscience that abortion is terrible act of murder; an act which takes the life of a person. He just doesn't want to admit it. As hardened an atheist as he is, he isn't that hardened. I believe the man is still struggling with his own conscience over this; what is very probably the last of the good moral values he has left. However, I also know that if he continues on his present track, he will jettison that one and will, sooner or later, say that abortion is not deplorable. When that happens, he will be so far gone that he couldn't come back if he wanted to.

The Humanist Manifesto II says "**Human life has meaning because we create and develop our futures**" (*Humanist Manifesto II under Ethics*, Third).

Thus the implication is that the unborn is not human life because the unborn does not create nor develop his/her future. This being the case, one could also take the position that a baby that is born has no meaning as far as human life is concerned because it does not create nor develop his/her future. So just when does the baby's life start to have meaning, at what age? When taken to its logical conclusion this mandate, from the Humanist Manifesto II, nullifies the meaning of much of the human life on this planet. Some people get to the age that they can no longer create nor develop their future, so according to the Humanist Manifesto II, their life has no meaning. This is the logical conclusion of the abortionist point of view. Mr. Till further says:

Before I introduce scientific information into this controversy, I must first explain a term that I will be using in reference to so-called pro-lifers. Instead of using this term that they apply to themselves, I will refer to their position as pro-birth, because I can see many reasons to believe that their main concern is to prevent abortion so that birth can occur, but otherwise they have little interest in protecting life after birth has taken place. "Pro-lifers," for example, are often opponents of public programs that would assist children born in poverty, which is often the social fate of those whose mothers chose the pro-life option over pro-choice, even though they were not financially equipped to support other additions to their families. "Pro-lifers" are often proponents of the death penalty, and they generally oppose gun control laws like those in Canada, England, Japan, and other countries where death from gunshot wounds is rare compared to the number who are killed in the United States. "Pro-lifers" generally favor the unprovoked war against Iraq, which, as I write this, has resulted in the deaths of some 1500 American soldiers and over 100,000 Iraqis. Such positions as these show a disdain for life after it has been born, so I consider pro-birth to be a more accurate description of these people than pro-life. That, then, is the term that I will use throughout this article.

Mr. Till says he is going to refer to those of us who disagree with abortion as "pro-birth" because he says that we are not "pro-life."

1. He says that we are often opponents of public programs that would assist children born in poverty. I don't know what programs he is talking about unless it is the welfare program which no one who holds to the "pro-life" position is against when it comes to children. What we are against is the idea of dead-beat parents who live off of welfare when they could be working. I sold insurance (from house to house) in the Kansas City, MO area and many of the families I had insurance with had parents who could work, but wouldn't work because it is easier to draw welfare than it is to work.

In 2000 my mother moved to Missouri to live in the same town that I was living in. I took her to the Social Services office to get her signed up for Medicaid so that her prescription bill wouldn't be so high (she was paying around \$400.00 per month for her medications). They made her jump through hoops while I saw young people that I knew could work (they lived in the same town), but chose to live off of welfare and they had no problem at all getting it. It took six months for my mother to get into a program where after she paid so much then Medicaid would pay the rest.

These adults often use their children to get welfare so they won't have to work. The more children they have, the more money they get. I say if the parents are able to work, but won't then take the children from them and let the parents fend for themselves, but there are too many liberals involved in these programs to allow that to happen.

2. He says that we are often proponents of the death penalty. Yes, we are! When a person has committed a crime worthy of death, then that is exactly what should happen to him. If you take a mass-murderer and just give him life in prison, he has the opportunity to go to college, get a degree and have the best health care in the state. He gets three hot's a day and a place to sleep. He often has color TV and cable. Society flips the bill for him, and if he is ever set free, he (many times) goes out and does it again. We don't believe in the death penalty for every crime, but for those crimes where the crime warrants such a penalty then yes we do. Jeffrey Dahmer, after he was

convicted of his crimes, became a Christian, but even he said that he deserved the death penalty. He tried to get them to put him to death for what he had done, but the liberals wouldn't allow that.

3. He says that we generally oppose Gun control laws like those in Canada, England, and Japan where deaths from gunshots are rare compared to those in the U.S. Yes, we have more deaths from gunshots, but it isn't because we don't have gun control laws such as is found in those countries. For years we had no gun control laws, but we still had guns. In the home that I was raised in, we had several guns. All were used for hunting and all of us knew that they were not toys to be played with. We knew that when you killed something that it was dead and was going to stay that way. Back when parents cared enough to teach their children not to play with guns we didn't have all the problems we have today. I had a loaded weapon for 11 years in my home every day. My son knew where it was and that it was loaded. He never touched it because he knew that it was not a toy. He didn't allow any of his friends to get near it; he never told them where it was. He knew that it would kill and that he couldn't play with it. He has a 12 ga. shot gun and it stays in its bag until it is needed. The problem isn't that we have guns in our country; the problem is that we don't have parents who care enough to instruct their children not to play with them.

As far as the criminal activities go, if you take guns out of the hands of the citizens the only people who will have guns will be the police and the criminals. The criminals outgun the police 1000 to 1. The police carry glock 40's at the best, while the criminals carry Uzis. As far as the conceal carry issue is concerned most of the people I know were against that law and voted it down in Missouri. Had it not been for National Rifle Association pushing money into our state congress it would have stayed down. Most Missourians don't want the law, and most don't carry weapons. It has nothing to do with whether or not we are pro-life, it has to do with money and business. But I do believe that the Constitution of the United States guarantees us the right to bear arms. If you take that freedom

away from us, what other freedoms will you take?

4. He says "Pro-lifers' generally favor the unprovoked war against Iraq, which, as I write this, has resulted in the deaths of some 1500 American soldiers and over 100,000 Iraqis." UNPROVOKED? What planet has he been living on the last several years? Let's set aside the fact that Hussein aided and abetted the terrorists for years before the final attack came on this country in 2001. Let's set aside the fact that even Bill Clinton and John Kerry, both, admitted that Hussein was a threat to this country. Let's set aside the fact that Hussein was guilty of mass-murder on the grounds that certain people of the Middle East disagreed with him either religiously or politically. Hussein also refused to cooperate with the U.N.'s efforts of inspections for Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) time and again. Diplomacy only goes so far and when it runs its course, as it did with Hussein, harsher methods have to be taken. It wasn't as if Hussein knew nothing about what was going to happen. If memory serves, he was given a deadline to allow the U.N. inspectors back in for a complete inspection. He refused to meet the deadline. He could have stopped this war before it ever started, but he didn't want to. George Bush Sr. should have finished him off when he had the chance during his term, if he had he might have been re-elected. Hussein went looking for a fight. Now while he didn't have any assembled "WMD's," that we have found, he had all the ingredients for "WMD's" in close proximity so that the weapons themselves could have been quickly assembled when needed. I wonder what Mr. Till thinks all that "saran gas," was for, that they found in Iraq? I wonder that Mr. Till thinks all of those barrels of chemicals, that were found, were for? Fertilizer?

Yes, we have lost over 1500 soldiers in this war, and I lament every man and woman who has given his or her life for this cause. I lament every man and woman who has been injured in this war. I pray for every man and woman who serves in our military. But just remember one thing; they are over there as volunteers. We have no draft, which is exactly what would have happened if Kerry had been elected. Yes, there have been over 100,000 Iraqi deaths (innocent and guilty) because of this war. However, these numbers don't even begin to come close to the number of deaths that have taken place each year since 1973 (at least one and one half million), in this

country alone, as a result of abortion. I don't see Mr. Till shedding any tears for them. I don't see him lamenting for these innocents. All I see him doing is saying, "Well, it's a woman's choice." Now he can say that these aren't deaths all he wants, but the fact remains that "**life begins at conception!**" So he can call us whatever he pleases, but the fact is we are pro-life and pro-birth. He is "pro-death" except where it comes to confessed convicted murderers (or terrorists), then he thinks they shouldn't have to die. Kill an innocent baby, but don't kill a guilty murderer, and don't kill a terrorist! That's Till's motto!

Till continues...

Life begins at conception: This has almost been a mantra that is chanted by those who oppose abortion, but it is a scientifically incorrect belief. Life really begins before an actual pregnancy occurs. An ovum, for example, is alive in the ovary before it is expelled into a fallopian tube to wait for a possible rendezvous with the sperm cell that will fertilize it. That sperm cells are alive is obvious to anyone who has ever watched them "swimming" under a microscope. This is all true, anti-abortionists will say, but gametes or reproductive cells are only "potential persons" but do not become actual persons until the two come together. I will ask readers to keep this thought in mind, because I will return to it later after we have looked at some rather intriguing scientific information about these "actual persons" that exist in the womb after the two gametes have united.

A mantra is defined as "[Skit, sacred counsel, formula, fro. *mandate* he thinks; akin to *L means mind--more at mind*] (1795): a mystical formula of invocation or incantation (as in Hinduism); also; WATCHWORD2" (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Edition, p. 757*). When people like Farrell Till say that "life begins at conception: This has almost been a mantra that is chanted by those who oppose abortion" they are in fact saying that it is nothing more than an incantation of a mystical formula such the Hindus chant in their worship and prayer

services. They have to make the phrase sound as absurd and ridiculous as they can in order to propagate their cause. The word "mantra" must be the new atheistic buzz word. I keep hearing it a lot. The phrase is nothing close to being a mantra, but it is the truth. Mr. Till tries to make an argument showing that the ovum and sperm cell is alive, and by this trying to show that first stages of the human is alive, but is not life. There is a difference and even Farrell Till knows this. All cells, of the body are alive, my hair follicles are alive, my skin cells are alive, but none of them are a LIFE. When the sperm enters the egg and is nucleated life begins, it is not just alive, but it is a life. This is not a potential life, it is life. Now whether it will be one person or two will be determined by whether the zygote separates and stays separated or if it reunites. If it reunites it will be one person, but if it stays separated there will be more than one. Now what follows is Mr. Till wanting to show us how life is not there until certain things have happened.

Mr. Till continues...

The problems of identical twins and embryonic amalgamations: The nursing student mentioned pointed out in our first conversation that she had an identical twin sister. I wondered about the relevance of this until she asked me to divide myself into two identical persons. Her point, I soon realized, was that a blastula or zygote, the hollow sphere that forms with the union of the female and male gametes, will sometimes (for reasons not yet known) divide to form two identical zygotes, which will usually pass through the different stages of pregnancy to be born as identical twins. Sometimes one or both of the identical zygotes will divide again to form triplets or quadruplets, and in even rarer instances, a third division of one of the zygotes will occur to form identical quintuplets. A year after I was born, the Dionne quintuplets, the only known case of identical quints who survived childhood, were born in Canada. I remember seeing them in newsreels shown at the movies when I was growing up, but I really didn't know what was meant when they were referred to as identical quints. By the time, I met the nursing student who eventually changed my position on abortion, I had completed a required college course in general biology in which a unit in human

reproduction was explicitly presented, so I knew about the scientific principles that produced multiple identical births, but I didn't know that sometimes after a zygote divides to form potential twins, they will fuse, for some reason also not known, to form a single zygote again, which will later be born as one person. That came as a surprise to me, but what was even more surprising to me was the phenomenon known as "chimerism." The definition below from TheFreeDictionary.com explains what chimerism is.

The problem with student nurses is the same problem we have with students in every field. A preacher student, for example, gets a little knowledge and automatically he assumes that he has all the answers. One of the biggest let downs I ever had was right after I came out of two years of intensive training at Brown Trail. I came out with the idea that I was going to go out and win the world to Christ in just a little while. I soon found out that I didn't know near enough to do what I needed to do to even begin winning the world for Christ. After 27 years I am still finding that I don't have all the knowledge that I need to complete the work that God has given me to do.

A doctor student thinks he has enough knowledge to diagnose (really what he does is misdiagnose) a person's illness. I had a resident doctor (one who had graduated medical school, and was serving his internship) try to tell me that I did not have any sign of a stroke on the left side of my brain and that I had never had a stroke. However, my regular neurologist (who had been practicing and teaching for 30 years) said that I did and even showed it to me on my MRI. Now I am not running this student nurse down, but the fact is she does not know everything. Student nurses, doctors, preachers, police officers, et. al., should not be involved in giving absolute information because they don't know absolutely if they are correct or not. Now I am sure that this person thought she had enough knowledge of what moment life began with her and her sister. The issue is not whether the zygote divides and then refuses itself, the

issue is; when does life begin. Life begins at the moment of conception.

Till continues...

In zoology a chimera is an animal which has (at least) two different populations of cells, which are genetically distinct and which originated in different zygotes. In biology, a zygote is the result of fertilization. That is, two haploid cells--usually (but not always) a male sperm cell and a female ovum or ovule--merge into a single diploid cell called the zygote. The zygote then undergoes multiple cell divisions in gametic and sporic meioses (see biological life cycles) to become an embryo.

Chimerism may occur naturally during pregnancy, when two non-identical twins combine in the womb, at a very early stage of development, to form a single organism. Such an organism is called a *tetragametic chimera* as it is formed from four gametes--two eggs and two sperm. As the organism develops, the resulting chimera can come to possess organs that have different sets of chromosomes. For example, the chimera may have a liver composed of cells with a second set of chromosomes. This has occurred in humans, though it is considered extremely rare, but since it can only be detected through DNA testing, which in itself is rare, it may be more common than currently believed. As of 2003, there were about 30 human cases in the literature, according to New Scientist.

This website has links imbedded that give definitions of scientific terms such as *zoology*, *zygotes*, and *gametes*. Most readers will probably be familiar with these terms, so I will focus on the meaning of *chimera*, which is partly clarified by its origin. In Greek mythology, Chimera was a fire-breathing monster, who was the offspring of Typhon and Echidna. Descriptions of it varied. Some said that the Chimera had the head of a lion, the body of a goat, and the hindquarters of a dragon or serpent. Others say that it had two heads, one of a lion, the other of a goat, and the body of a serpent. The fact that this mythological creature was thought to be a composite of different biological creatures is the reason why its name was used to describe the fusion of

nonidentical zygotes in pregnancies that would ordinarily result in the birth of fraternal (nonidentical) twins but instead produce single births that are composites of two genotypes. George W. and Laura Bush, for example, have well known nonidentical or fraternal twin daughters, who are therefore as genetically different as if they had been born from separate pregnancies, as most sisters and brothers are. If, however, chimerism had occurred in the early stages of their mother's pregnancy, the separate zygotes would have fused to form a single embryo, and when the pregnancy had run its course, the child born would have been neither Jenna nor Barbara but a genetic composite of the two.

Mr. Till thinks that "chimerism" is proof that there is no life in the womb at conception. Just because the zygote divides and then sometimes refuses does not mean that there is no life in the womb. All it means is at this point the number has not yet been determined. I don't know how this determination is made, and I don't know if anyone else does either, but the fact that the zygote splits and sometimes refuse does not mean that life is not present. All this means is that the number of people hasn't been determined as of yet, that will be determined down the road. The example that this student nurse used about Till cutting himself in half and then reforming himself is absurd and has no bearing (as far as an example is concerned) on this case. If Mr. Till was to cut himself in half, he would die. There would be no putting him back together again, he would just be dead. The zygote can divide itself and on occasion refuse itself without death occurring, but a fully formed being cannot do that because of the level of development it happens to be in.

Till continues...

The conclusion that this leads to is not at all compatible with the pro-birth view that a "person" exists at the moment of conception, because if chimerism had occurred in the example just mentioned, neither Jenna nor Barbara Bush would have been born but a single individual who would have been a

genetic composite of the two originally separate zygotes; therefore, it follows that neither Jenna nor Barbara Bush existed in the early stages of their mother's pregnancy. What existed was simply the genetic materials that had the potential to develop into two persons. In their case, that potential was realized, and they were eventually born as two separate persons, but when chimerism occurs, that potential is lost through fusion of the two zygotes. [An actual documented example of chimerism](#) will illustrate how chimerism in early pregnancy will merge two potential individuals into just one. In the case just linked to, "Jane," the woman discovered at the age of 52 to be a tetragametic chimera, had been born after her mother had conceived nonidentical or fraternal female zygotes that merged to form just one person (the "Jane" who later became the subject of the study reported in *The New England Journal of Medicine*.) As this article reported, however, hermaphroditic chimerism sometimes results from the fusion of male and female zygotes. [A case of this](#) reported in *The New England Journal of Medicine* [338 (3):166-169] told of a child who had been born with an ovary on one side and a testis on the other. Genetic studies showed that the child had two lines of cells, one 46XX (female) and one 46XY (male). The conclusion of these studies was that the child had resulted from the fusion or amalgamation of two separate zygotes. Had the amalgamation of the zygotes not occurred, two children, one male and the other female, would have been born, but the amalgamation resulted in a single hermaphroditic birth.

The conclusion of all of this does not mean that "life begins at conception" is incompatible with true science or is in error. When we say that "it is a child, not a choice" we are saying nothing more than there is life there. Whether it is one child or two or more, will be determined later on in the pregnancy, but the fact remains that at least one child does exist at conception. At least one person does exist at conception. There is no need to say "it is either a child or children, not a choice." That would be like my filling out a job application and coming to the question "How many children do you have living at home" and me putting "I don't have children, I have one child." If I answered this way, the employer would most likely decide that if I was that idiotic

there would be no chance of me ever being able to do the job for which I was applying. Many people, in the church of Christ, have mistakenly argued that an elder must have a multiplicity of children because of the statement "*having his children in subjection with all gravity*" (1 Tim. 3:4), and that if all he has is one child he cannot serve as an elder. The problem is that the word children can be used to mean either one child or many children, but at least one child is essential. This is all that we are saying when we say "it is a child, not a choice." We are simply stating that it is at least one child, and it is not a woman's choice.

Till continues...

This case had resulted from *in vitro* fertilization, where several zygotes were implanted in the mother, but hermaphroditic chimerism in humans has been known to occur in otherwise normal impregnations. Dr. Mehrdad Rahmaniyan has documented [a case of "a true hermaphroditic chimera"](#) that had the same 46XX and 46XY karyotypes as in the *in vitro* case documented above. The XX cell line was in 80% of the body and the XY in the other 20%. Instead of having an ovary on one side and a testis on the other, Rahmaniyan's case had "ambiguous genitalia," a small phallus and a "pseudo-vaginal perineal hypospadias" and "a bifid scrotum containing gonads." The results of an analysis of the chromosomes showed that the child was a chimera, with the cell lines described above, that had resulted from the fusion of two embryos.

We will not deny what chimerism is or that it does happen. This may well end up as a birth defect when fully formed. Is it a possibility that this may be a cause of multiple personality disorders? However, this "chimerism" was done at such an early development that it was possible to do this. However, it is not possible to do this with a fully grown person. This, in any case, does not negate the fact that at least one life is involved in this case. It does not negate that at least one person is involved. This person may have a birth defect (an ovary on one side and a testis on the other), but that does not

mean that at least one person was involved. That does not mean that at least one life was involved. All this means is that, in such a case, a person may be born with a severe birth defect or even multiple personalities (you understand that I am not a psychiatrist or psychologist so I don't know). This might also explain "bi-polar" disorders in many people. However, no one would say that at least one person was not involved in the pregnancy.

In some cases, in some animals, this is a natural built in defense mechanism. Certain animals are born with both male and female organs. Such is the case with female hyenas. They have both, the female part is functional the male part is not, but it is there as a defense mechanism so that other animals will think that they have come across a male. In humans, this would be a birth defect, but that in no way argues that life does not happen at conception.

Till continues...

If anything can make the pro-birth movement reassess its position that abortion in even the early stages of pregnancy is murder, the scientific information summarized above should certainly give them pause to reconsider. No single human being can divide him-/herself into identical twin persons, and no two human beings can fuse their bodies into a single person. It must follow, then, that what is in the womb at the time of conception and even shortly thereafter is not a person but only a potential person or persons.

This will not make "pro-life" people see that abortion is not murder. All it does is shore up our belief that abortion is murder. In such cases it may be the murder of two persons, not just one. This, in no way, gives us pause to reconsider our position. It should, however, give the pro-abortionist pause to reconsider.

No fully formed person can divide himself/herself into twins and no fully formed person can refuse their bodies into a single person. As has already been stated, at the point of conception life is present. However, we don't know how many lives are present until the formation that will determine this is complete. This does not mean that there was no life. All it means is that the number of lives has not yet been determined. This isn't a potential life, it is life.

It isn't a potential person; it is a person (at least one). It isn't a fully formed body; it is a potential body or bodies. That won't be determined until later. The fact that a fully formed body is not present has nothing to do with whether or not a person (life) is present. If so, then it would logically follow that the more fully formed the body is, the more of a person it is. What about Terri Schiavo? She had a fully formed body, but she wasn't treated as a person, she was treated as a vegetable and finally murdered.

This does not mean, however, that life does not exist. Mr. Till wants to use the word "person" from the reference point of you and me. We are fully formed persons. We have our own personality, and we have our own body. However, that does not mean that our life didn't come into existence until after all of the processes that would make us one person happened. Life was present at conception. However, it wasn't until all the processes were completed that it was determined whether there would be one, two or more of us.

Till continues...

This brings us back to a point that was introduced earlier: at the time of conception, only a potential person exists but not an actual person in the sense that I am a person and those of you reading this are persons. If, for example, the mother of "Jane," referenced above, had had an abortion while nonidentical (fraternal) zygotes were in her womb, this would not have killed "Jane," in the sense that the person "Jane" existed at that time. Instead, the abortion would have terminated two zygotes, which at the time had had the potential to become two persons. "Jane" as a person, however, never existed until the two zygotes had amalgamated to form a tetragametic chimera, which was later born as the one person "Jane."

If Jane's mother had received an abortion before the zygote went through all the processes, then the woman would have been guilty of murdering at least one person; who was later named "Jane." Jane was not Jane until she was

born, but she was still a person and was still a life. Her being born and being named did not make her a person because she was a person long before that.

Had the woman had the abortion before the zygotes divided then Jane still would have been murdered. From conception the only difference between the born and the unborn is one of development. Jane's body had not been formed until all the determining factors were complete, but Jane's life was present. That is what would have been taken. After the life is taken, the personality means precious little.

Till continues...

"Twinning" presents a similar problem for the pro-birth movement. At the time of fertilization, one zygote exists, so if it is true that a "person" exists at the "moment of conception," abortion would "kill" only one "person," but if the aborted zygote happened to be one that would divide later to become twin zygotes that would eventually be born as two persons, did the abortion somehow kill two "persons"? If so, what rationale is used to reach that conclusion?

Yes, if a woman has an abortion and the zygote would have become two people, then she would be guilty of murdering two people. Why? Simply because she stopped the pregnancy that would have resulted in two different lives. However many lives, though, would have been born is not the issue. The issue is that she took at least one life when she received her abortion because there was at least one life at that point. The issue also is not whether or not the life is conscious. The issue is that life is present and in an abortion at least one life is taken.

Here is something that I would like to see Mr. Till answer. If a woman becomes pregnant, she knows she is pregnant and she wants to keep the baby. One day, as she goes to get into her car, a man comes out of nowhere and takes her and throws her to the ground and in grabbing for her car keys he kicks her in the stomach killing her child, is the man guilty of murder? Can he be brought up on charges of 2nd degree murder or 1st degree manslaughter? If so, why? In a recent episode of "Without A Trace" Mary Elizabeth Mastrantonio (who plays the girl friend of FBI special agent Jack Malone – Anthony LaPaigla) is, on the show, pregnant with Jack's baby. She is

kidnapped and as the kidnapper goes to kill her she says "Wait...it isn't just me that you will be killing. I am pregnant." Because of this fact, the kidnapper decides to allow her to live. Why? Because she has a life inside of her. Now at this point, because she has just found out that she is pregnant, there is no way of determining whether or not it is going to be one child or two. The kidnapper knows this, but it is understood that at least one life is involved. Realizing that this is just a T.V. show, it does show that when a woman decides that she wants to keep the child, it is a baby. However, in this episode the woman hadn't even decided that she wanted to keep the child.

There have been actual cases where a people have been tried for murder for killing an unborn child while killing the mother. The person has been tried and convicted of murdering not only one person, but two.

Also, there have been cases where a woman, or a girl, was brought up on charges for aborting her baby with whatever tools she had. The problem was that she didn't have the money to go to an abortion clinic. So, she was brought up on charges and convicted.

Why is it that if a woman decides to keep the child it is a baby, but if she doesn't want it and she can afford an abortion it is not a baby, it is not a child? Why is it that if a woman does not have the money for an abortion and does not go to a clinic where she can get it done for nothing, and does it herself that she is guilty of murder, but if he does go to a free clinic or does have the money and goes to a regular clinic, she is not guilty? Why is that?

Till continues...

When confronted with scientific information like this, I suspect that many in the pro-birth movement would claim that even though abortion in the early stages of pregnancy doesn't kill an actual person, it is still immoral, because it kills a potential person, but that is a position fraught with so many problems that no reasonable person would try to defend it. As I pointed out earlier, there

is "potential life" in the gametes (ovum and sperm) before actual fertilization occurs. All that is necessary for a person to be born is the union of the two gametes, followed by a pregnancy carried to term. If, then, the destruction of "potential life" by abortion is immoral, why wouldn't birth control methods that prevent fertilization from occurring also be immoral? Both prevent the development of "potential life" into an actual person. Catholics, of course, will argue that birth control *is* immoral because it prevents potential life from developing, but even they are not consistent, because they allow abstinence as a morally acceptable method of birth control. If, however, there is immorality in preventing "potential life" from developing into actual persons, even birth control by abstinence would be immoral, because it too prevents "potential life" from developing into actual persons. To be consistent, then, those who argue that birth-control methods that prevent "potential life" from developing into actual persons is immoral would have to take this position to its logical end and argue that women who realize that they are ovulating have a moral obligation to seek out males to help them make the "potential life" within them into actual persons. If not, why not?

Mr. Till can give us all the information in the world about chimerism and twins and so forth, but none of that will come close to proving that life does not begin at conception. Whether there will be one, two or six persons that are born, the fact is that however many there will be, their lives began at the moment of conception, and no student nurse is going to be able to change that fact.

The issue has nothing to do with "potential persons." The issue has to do with "life" itself. Before two people come together and have sexual relations they cannot have a pregnancy. If there is no pregnancy there is no life. My wife lost our first child due to complications of the pregnancy (we still don't know what happened). She almost lost Thomas. She was never able to get pregnant again. The first pregnancy involved a life. It died! The second pregnancy involved a life. It lived, and became our son. There has been no third pregnancy, thus there has been no life. This is so elementary that I am amazed that I would have to explain it to someone who is obviously as educated as Farrell Till. My wife and I

continued to have relations, but there was no pregnancy, so there was no life. There was potential life, but no life. That is the issue, not whether or not one or more people are involved, but whether at least one life is involved.

Till continues...

I hope that the scientific information presented in this article will cause those in the pro-birth movement, who tend to see life as either black or white or right or wrong, to reexamine their views and recognize that the abortion issue is far more complex than they have previously thought. In national and state elections, many will vote against their interests in other issues just to elect those who are opposed to abortion. History, however, is not on their side, because the unfortunate reality of abortion has existed for centuries and will continue to exist no matter what the pro-birth movement may be able to accomplish legislatively. Regrettably, the problem of abortion is not going to go away, so those who vote as if it is the only important issue in elections do themselves a disservice if they put the one issue of abortion above all other problems like education, health insurance, employment opportunities, outsourcing, and various other social problems that an obsession with abortion is causing many to deemphasize.

Mr. Till can hope for many things, but the fact is all this scientific information he has presented does not come close to proving that life does not begin at conception. Whether it is one life, or more than one, at least one life is present. It is a "black and white" issue! There is no middle ground, and the law of excluded middle states that either life is present at conception or life is not present at conception. You can't have it to where life is and life isn't present at conception. Chimerism does not prove that life is not present at conception. All it proves is that there may be more than one life involved, but the fact is life (itself) is present at the moment of conception.

I believe that education, health insurance, employment opportunities, etc., are all

important issues when selecting a president, senator, representative or a governor. However, abortion, homosexuality, embryonic stem cell research are also important issues. I did not go to the election polls with my mind made up that whoever took my position on abortion was going to be the one that I voted for. I would not vote for a pro-abortionist, but there were other issues that I felt needed to be addressed. The war against terrorism was a big issue for me. Employment, health insurance, etc., were all important issues. I did not want the democrat nominee in the White House because I knew that if John Kerry got into the White House, the job situation would be far worse than what it is. I watched Bill and Hillary Clinton promise health insurance to all, right at election time, but they never did anything about it after the elections were over. We have social problems, but I am 53 years old and I have served (in the military) under both Democrat and Republican Presidents, and neither one was able to resolve these social problems. I believe that when we go to the polls again, we should consider abortion, homosexuality, embryonic stem cell research, the war effort, as well as all the other things that need to be considered. In Matthew chapter 23 Jesus was condemning the Pharisees for overlooking important issues such as caring for their parents in their old age while making sure that they were exactly right on the amount of money that they gave the temple, and he said: *"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone"* (Matthew 23:23). Yes, finances are important! Foreign policy is important! However, there are more weighty matters that need to be dealt with such as the issue of the sacredness of human life and the sacredness of marriage between a man and a woman. These are the weightier matters that Mr. Till (and those like him) would have us ignore on Election Day.

Mr. Till wants us to believe that abortion was the only issue we considered, but he is just as wrong about that as he can be. Abortion might have been the only issue he considered (if he voted for Kerry) when he voted during the last election, because Kerry stood in favor of abortion and Mr. Till wants abortion so bad that he would vote for cowardly traitors like Clinton (who took off and went to school in England so he wouldn't have to go to Viet-Nam, under the guise that he didn't believe in killing—funny thing

about that is how hard he tried to get us into war when he was President, when it didn't involve the possibility of him getting killed. I wonder where his sensibility to killing was then?), and Kerry because they took his position on abortion. It seems that he just can't get enough of the slaughter of innocent lives. Don't kill a guilty person who has committed murder, but kill an innocent baby (or innocent babies) so that a woman can live her lascivious lifestyle and not have to put up with the baby that come

as a result of it. I don't understand why Mr. Till says that abortion is regrettable because if there is no life at conception, if no person is involved, then what is so regrettable about it?

I pray that Mr. Till will take the time to respond to this. We will gladly print his response.

In Christ Jesus

Jerry D. McDonald

Challenge is a quarterly apologetic journal that is used mainly to debate the evangelical atheistic/skeptical movement that permeates our country today. There is no charge for the electronic journal and you can either view it on the challenge website or request it and it will be sent to you free of charge. If you want the paper version of Challenge please let me know. We won't be making that many, but we will make them up for those who don't use computers. There will be no charge for the paper version. For the electronic version please send an email to jerry@challenge2.org. If you want the paper version you can send a request to that address or the following regular address: Challenge, P.O. 237, Belle, MO 65013. Phone is (573) 578-5931) Jerry McDonald is the editor and owner of Challenge. Thomas Hardeman McDonald is the co-editor.

Challenge

P.O. Box 237

Belle, MO 65013