

A Response to Hillary Clinton on Abortion

Summary Narrative: Hillary Clinton uses common euphemisms such as “family planning”, “reproductive rights”, “reproductive health care”, “the right to choose”, “private choice”, and “personal decision” when referring to abortion. The central logical fallacy she commits, as with other philosophically unsophisticated pro-abortion choice advocates, is begging the question. She assumes the unborn is not an intrinsically valuable human being who possesses natural rights, the most important of which is the right to life. She never attempts to answer the question, “What is the unborn?” but instead consistently refers to abortion as a “personal, private choice.” She assumes throughout that abortion is a moral good, that women ought to have access to it, and therefore that denying access is a moral evil. Rather than make arguments, Hillary prefers to tell stories and rely on rhetoric. This allows her to make the most of emotional appeals and exploit the hard cases of rape and incest in an attempt to justify abortion on demand. While she claims she wants to make abortion safe, legal, and rare, she also does not support legal limits on abortion at any stage of pregnancy. She defines “health of the mother” so broadly (consistent with *Doe v. Bolton*, i.e., physical, emotional, psychological, familial, woman’s age) it makes any of her references to abortion restrictions meaningless.

1. Sec. Hillary Clinton Defends Reproductive Rights and Family Planning

- a. Author: RH Reality Check RHRC
- b. Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UH9rC0MaBJc>
- c. Synopsis: Hillary states, “Family planning is an important part of women’s health” and “Reproductive health includes access to abortion that I believe should be safe, legal, and rare. I have spent a lot of my time trying to bring down the rate of abortions.” She also appeals to the existence of botched abortions, teenage pregnancies, and lack of access to abortion (“family planning”) consigning women to “lives of oppression and hardship”. She goes on to speak about her campaign against teen pregnancy.
- d. Response:
 - i. Hillary begs the question by assuming the unborn is not a human being.
 1. The question is, “What is the unborn?” If the unborn is a human being then they are already part of your family, and “family planning” shouldn’t include the legal ability to kill these innocent and vulnerable family members simply because they are in the way and can’t defend themselves.
 2. “Safe, legal, and rare.” The question is, “Safe for whom?” It certainly isn’t safe for the unborn. It’s lethal. And if the unborn are human beings, we shouldn’t make it safe or legal for one class of human beings (women) to kill another class of human beings (the unborn).
 - ii. Hillary places herself on the horns of a dilemma:
 1. On her view, why should elective abortion be rare? If abortion is essentially no different than having your tonsils or appendix removed, what’s the big deal? Simply have the abortion. No one is championing that a tonsillectomy should be safe, legal, and rare.

2. On the other hand, if elective abortion kills an innocent human being, again, why should it be rare? Are we allowed to kill human beings so long as we do it infrequently?
 3. Either elective abortion kills an innocent human being or it does not (law of excluded middle). If elective abortion kills an innocent human being, no justification is adequate, and therefore it should not only be rare but impermissible.
 4. If elective abortion does not kill an innocent human being, no justification is necessary, and therefore no restrictions should be placed on the practice, including its frequency. By advocating that abortion should be rare and claiming she has spent her time trying to bring down the rate of abortions, Hillary ends up undermining the very women's rights she seeks to defend since if abortion does not kill an innocent human being, women should have unrestricted access without question and there is no reason in principle to bring down the rate of abortion.
 5. Either way, there is no justification for arguing that abortion should be rare.
- iii. In response to the lack of abortion access ("family planning") leading to hardship and oppression for women:
 1. How does it follow that because a certain class of human beings (the unborn) may cause hardship and oppression we are therefore allowed to kill them? Hardship does not justify homicide.
 2. Trot out the toddler: Newborns and infants are extremely demanding and require constant care and attention. They can be financially burdensome and emotionally taxing, which may lead to certain hardships and "oppression". Can we kill them?
 3. Hillary confuses "finding a solution" with "eliminating a problem" and so again begs the question. If the unborn are full-fledged members of the human community, then killing them is not a humane, moral solution but rather an inhumane, immoral action disguised as the euphemism "family planning".
 - e. Candidate Sound Bite:
 - i. "I agree with Hillary. Family planning is important. But family planning shouldn't include having the ability to kill the weakest and most defenseless members of your family. The science of embryology tells us that the unborn are distinct, living, and whole human beings from the earliest stages of development. It is these small and vulnerable family members that deserve our protection most. We need to come alongside women who find themselves in crisis pregnancies and provide them with the care and support they need, finding humane solutions, rather than encouraging them to simply eliminate the problem through the intentional death of their unborn children."
2. Hillary Clinton defends Planned Parenthood: Videos "an attack" against abortion rights
 - a. Author: CBS News

- b. Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RXAhFNWQ66I>
 - c. Synopsis: Hillary speaks of the public goods and services provided by Planned Parenthood and then goes on to state, “I think it is unfortunate that Planned Parenthood has been the object of such a concerted attack for so many years and it’s really an attack against a woman’s right to choose, to make the most personal, difficult decisions that any woman would face based on her faith and the medical advice that she is given.” Planned Parenthood provides very important services and the Affordable Care Act helps make these services more readily available “particularly but not exclusively for poor women.”
 - d. Response:
 - i. Hillary begs the question by assuming the unborn is not a human being and that abortion is a moral good which poor women will be denied if abortion is made illegal.
 - 1. But if abortion kills an innocent human being then it is prima facie morally wrong regardless of economic status.
 - 2. “For it is not true that the vices of the wealthy are virtues simply because the poor are denied them” (Beckwith, *Defending Life*, 96).
 - ii. The phrase “woman’s right to choose” is an incomplete thought. The question is, “Choose what?” Answer: abortion. But then we must ask, “What is abortion?” Before we can determine whether or not a woman has the right to choose abortion, we must know what abortion is. And if elective abortion kills an innocent human being, no one should have that choice, man or woman.
 - iii. Why is the decision to have an abortion “the most difficult decision that any woman would face”? Is it a “difficult” decision to have an appendectomy or tonsillectomy? Hillary’s language betrays her position; she is implicitly admitting that abortion is more than just routine surgery to remove an unwanted tissue mass. She intuitively knows that abortion takes the life of an innocent human being.
 - e. Candidate Sound Bite:
 - i. “Hillary is right. Women should have the right to choose. Women should have access to abortion on demand. *If. If what?* If the unborn are not human. But the science of embryology establishes that from the earliest stages of development, each one of us was a distinct, living, and whole human being. The question we must then ask is, “Does every human being have an equal right to life or do only some have it in virtue of some characteristic which may come and go within the course of their lifetimes?” Hillary’s view is elitist because it entails that strong and independent humans have basic human rights while small and dependent ones do not. My view is the true liberal position because it is inclusive and wide-open to all, especially to those human beings who are small, defenseless, and vulnerable.”
3. Hillary Clinton says Religious Beliefs about Abortion Have to be Changed
- a. Author: The Joe Walsh Show
 - b. Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7f8of3NAX-c>

- c. Synopsis: Hillary states, “Far too many women are still denied critical access to reproductive health care and safe childbirth. All the laws we pass don’t count for much if they’re not enforced. Rights have to exist in practice, not just on paper. Laws have to be backed up with resources and political will. And deep-seated cultural codes, religious beliefs and structural biases have to be changed. As I have said, and as I believe, the advancement of the full participation of women and girls in every aspect of their societies is the great unfinished business of the 21st century.”
- d. Response:
 - i. Hillary begs the question by assuming the unborn is not a human being, e.g., if the unborn are human beings, what she is saying is, “Far too many women are still denied critical access to be able to intentionally kill their unborn children.”
 - ii. Who exactly is denied critical access to safe childbirth?
 - 1. No one in the pro-life movement argues that women should not have access to safe childbirth. This is a straw-man.
 - 2. Even if this is the case, ensuring safe childbirth does not entail the right to an abortion. The former seeks to save life, the latter seeks to destroy it.
 - iii. Hillary implies that deep-seated *pro-life* religious beliefs have to change.
 - 1. Why is it that only the deep-seated *pro-life* religious beliefs have to be changed? Why not the deep-seated *pro-choice* religious beliefs?
 - 2. After all, some churches and denominations support abortion-choice and are just as “religious” as pro-life churches.
 - 3. Hillary herself claims to be a Methodist Christian. Why doesn’t she take her own advice, change her own deep-seated religious beliefs, cultural codes, and structural bias, and become an advocate for the pro-life movement?
 - iv. Hillary wants to portray the pro-life position as merely a “cultural code”, “religious belief”, and “structural bias.”
 - 1. This is reductionistic: it seeks to reduce the pro-life movement to merely a cultural code, religious belief, or structural bias, ignoring the scientific evidence and philosophical arguments that pro-life advocates put forward.
 - 2. It is also a straw-man: it misrepresents the pro-life position so that it can be dismissed and ignored (“that’s just a religious view”) rather than engaged.
 - a. Secular pro-life groups use the exact same evidence and arguments to support the pro-life position, and this from a position of non-religious belief.
 - 3. Pro-lifers make arguments. Those arguments are either valid or invalid, sound or unsound. There is no such thing as a “religious” argument. This is a category mistake.
 - a. The fact that a moral position is consistent with a religious position does not mean that the moral is purely based on and motivated by the religious.

1. *How* you are conceived has no bearing on your value, nor does it change the kind of thing you are: a human being.
- ii. The science of embryology establishes that a new human being begins to exist at conception. How should a civil society treat innocent human beings who remind us of a painful event? May we kill them?
- iii. Trot out the toddler: May we kill two-year-olds who were conceived in rape? “No, but that’s different. A two-year-old is a human being.” That’s the issue then, isn’t it? Whether or not the unborn is a human being. If the unborn is a human being, you are no more justified in killing her because she was conceived in rape than you are the two-year-old. So the question is, “What is the unborn?”
 1. Question: Can we kill two-year-olds or even adults who were conceived through rape because they are less valuable as human beings or because they do not possess a right to life?
 2. If she answers “Yes” her position is morally abhorrent.
 3. If she answers “No” and justifies that by saying “the two-year-old or adult is a human being” then that shows it is not the circumstances of their conception that is the issue but rather their human nature, the same human nature which the unborn possesses from conception.
- iv. The science of embryology tells us the unborn from conception is a human being. Therefore, there is not just one victim of rape but two, the woman and the unborn
 1. Questions: Why should the unborn be killed because her father was a rapist? Does a child lose its right to life because its father was a sexual predator? Is a human being somehow less human because of how it was conceived? Should the mother be allowed to kill the child for the crime of the father?
- v. Do pro-lifers lack compassion?
 1. “Nothing could be further from the truth. It is the rapist who has already *forced* this woman to carry her child, not the pro-lifer. The pro-life advocate merely wants to prevent another innocent human being (the unborn entity) from being a victim of another violent and morally reprehensible act, abortion, for two wrongs do not make a right. What makes abortion evil is the same thing that makes rape evil: an innocent human person is brutally violated and dehumanized. Unwillingness to endorse unjustified homicide is no lack of compassion.” (Beckwith, *Defending Life*, 106)
- vi. Hillary boasts of the women she has fought for, worked for, stood up for, and advocated for, those women who may not have an opportunity to defend themselves and who may be forgotten.
 1. Yet roughly fifty percent of those killed in abortion are female.
 2. Ironically, Hillary has forgotten the weakest and most defenseless class of female human beings who need her protection and advocacy most: the unborn.

- vii. Hillary exploits the tragedy and horror of rape for her own political agenda of abortion on demand.
 - 1. Even according to the Guttmacher Institute, abortions due to rape and incest are about 1.5%.
 - 2. “To argue for abortion on demand from the hard cases of rape and incest is like trying to argue for the elimination of traffic laws from the fact that one might have to violate some of them in rare circumstances, such as when one’s spouse or child needs to be rushed to the hospital” (Beckwith, *Defending Life*, 105).
 - e. Candidate Sound Bite:
 - i. “Everyone in this debate agrees that rape is a horrendous evil which no woman should ever have to suffer. In these difficult situations we need to show compassion for both the mother and the child who in this instance are both victims of the same crime. In fact, what makes abortion wrong is the same thing that makes rape wrong: an innocent human person is brutally violated and dehumanized. So the question we need to ask is, ‘How should we treat innocent human beings who remind us of a painful event?’ Hillary thinks we should be able to kill these innocent human beings for the crime of the father. I want to provide the support and care these women and children need and help make available pro-life alternatives such as adoption. The pro-life movement is both pro-child *and* pro-woman, which is why pregnancy centers in this country outnumber abortion clinics 2 to 1, providing support, shelter, pre-natal and post-natal care, as well as adoption services for pregnant women. Adoption is always a better alternative than abortion.”
5. Hillary Clinton on Abortion
- a. Author: GLASSBOOTHdotORG
 - b. Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IESIFzGAxVI>
 - c. Synopsis: Hillary states, “I believe abortion should be safe, legal, and rare.” She speaks of her campaign against teen pregnancy to help young men and women make more responsible decisions to help reduce teen pregnancies. Prevention is the best strategy.
 - d. Response:
 - i. Regarding “safe, legal, and rare”, see number one above.
6. Support and Stand with Planned Parenthood
- a. Author: Hillary Clinton and Hillary for America
 - b. Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xq1_WjeNOCM
 - c. Synopsis: Message by Clinton campaign. Hillary states that attempts to defund Planned Parenthood are a full on assault on women’s health. This will block millions of women, men, and young people from life-saving preventive care, including cancer screening, breast exams, and birth control. This is an attack on women’s health and America’s health. “It’s wrong and we’re not going to let them get away with it. We’re not going back, we’re going to fight back. I’m proud to stand by Planned Parenthood. I’ll never stop fighting to protect the ability and

right of every woman in this country to make her own health decisions.” Video focuses on Scott Walker, Jeb Bush, and Rick Perry, though other Republicans are in view as well.

- d. Response:
 - i. Hillary claims this is a “full assault on women’s health” and “an attack on women’s health and America’s health”, yet she is the one supporting an organization which kills unborn women in the womb.
 - 1. In other words, Hillary fails to define who can be counted in the category of “women”.
 - a. Do unborn women count? They should if they are human beings. And if that’s the case, what about their health?
 - b. Hillary not only supports taking away unborn women’s health care but taking away their life as well.
 - c. She begs the question in assuming that unborn women are not human beings and part of the community of women.
 - ii. Hillary’s appeal to fear (argumentum in terrorem) is fallacious.
 - 1. Hillary resorts to scare tactics: “this will block millions of women, men, and young people from life-saving preventative care.”
 - 2. This assumes Planned Parenthood somehow has the market on preventative care for Americans and that this care cannot be received elsewhere.
 - iii. Hillary ignores the counterevidence.
 - 1. Even if it is true that Planned Parenthood performs many moral goods, this doesn’t justify its moral evils.
 - 2. Providing preventative health care doesn’t justify killing 300,000 unborn human beings every year.
 - e. Candidate Sound Bite:
 - i. “The only one here tonight who is leading an assault on women’s health is Hillary Clinton. Hillary says she favors “women’s rights” yet she champions abortion which kills an unborn female roughly 50 percent of the time. What about their rights? I want to protect the rights of all women, including those who are the most vulnerable and defenseless. And I’m not against preventative health care. That’s ridiculous. I just don’t think an organization which intentionally kills unborn human beings should be the entity providing that health care.”
- 7. Hillary Clinton Talks About Reducing Abortions in America
 - a. Author: andrescik
 - b. Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4kVpT-tHs5A>
 - c. Synopsis: Hillary is asked, “Could you see yourself, with millions of voters in a pro-life camp, creating a common ground, with the goal ultimately in mind of reducing the decisions for abortion to zero?” She answers, “Yes. And that is what I have tried to both talk about and reach out about over the last many years...in talking about abortion being safe, legal, and rare.” She goes on to say that both pro-life and pro-choice communities have been unwilling to find common ground. This is a failing on all of our parts. She says, “We have left too many children to

fend for themselves morally.” Finding common ground “would require sort of leaving at the sides the suspicions and the baggage that comes with people who have very strong heartfelt feelings.” Regarding abortion she says, “it’s a moral issue and it should not be in any way diminished as a moral issue no matter which side you are on because I have seen cases where I honestly believed that the moral choice was very complicated and not so straightforward.”

- d. Response:
- i. Regarding “safe, legal, and rare”, see number one above.
 - ii. Why would Hillary want to reduce the number of abortions to zero?
 1. This assumes there is something morally wrong with abortion.
 2. The only reason abortion would be morally wrong is if it unjustly takes the life of an innocent human being.
 3. But if abortion takes the life of an innocent human being, why should it be lawfully permissible?
 4. One cannot claim to have a right to do a moral wrong, otherwise the impermissible has become permissible.
 - iii. It is hard to take seriously Hillary’s claim that she could work together with pro-lifers and has tried to “reach out” when she won’t even vote against partial-birth abortion but rather asserts even *that* procedure is a “woman’s right.” Perhaps her suggestion that “pro-choice communities have been unwilling to find common ground” was self-referential.
 - iv. Hillary begs the question assuming the unborn are not human beings
 1. “We have left too many children to fend for themselves morally.”
 - a. Are the unborn children? They are if they are human.
 - b. How can she talk about our collective failing in allowing born children to fend for themselves morally when she believes it’s morally permissible to kill those same children as long as they are in a different location at an earlier stage of development?
 2. “Leaving at the sides the suspicions and the baggage that comes with people who have very strong heartfelt feelings.”
 - a. Facts don’t care about your feelings: either the unborn is a human being or it is not. Again she begs the question.
 - b. If the unborn is a human being, your personal “feelings” on how they should be treated are irrelevant. This is a matter of objective morality, not subjective preference. The question is, “How should we as a civil society treat the smallest, most vulnerable, and defenseless members of the human community?”
 - c. If I have “strong heartfelt feelings” about killing infants, may I?
 - v. Hillary confuses psychological complexity with moral complexity.
 1. She says “the moral choice was very complicated and not so straightforward.”
 2. It does not follow that because abortion may be a psychologically complex issue it is therefore morally complex: it is wrong to

- intentionally kill innocent human beings simply because they are in the way and can't defend themselves.
- 3. Women may undergo emotional, psychological, familial, even physical stress. None of this justifies killing another human being. Hardship doesn't justify homicide.
- 4. Infants and toddlers may cause emotional, psychological, familial, and physical stress. May we kill them?
- 5. "It is better to suffer evil than to inflict it." - Socrates
- vi. Hillary concedes that abortion is a moral issue.
 - 1. A moral issue has a moral answer: right or wrong.
 - 2. The moral answer must take into account the morally relevant questions: in this case, "What is the unborn?"
 - 3. If the unborn is human, abortion is a moral wrong since it intentionally kills an innocent human being.
- vii. Hillary chooses the wrong side of the moral conflict.
 - 1. She says "the moral choice was very complicated and not so straightforward."
 - 2. Moral conflicts arise when you have objective moral principles in competition with one another, e.g., if a Nazi asks if I'm hiding Jews do I lie or answer truthfully so they are killed?
 - 3. In this case the conflict/choice is between (1) Killing an unborn human being and (2) Requiring a mother to carry her unborn child to term.
 - 4. Hillary believes it is better to allow mothers to kill their unborn children rather than require mothers to carry these children to term.
 - a. The problem should be obvious: nine months of hardship is in no way morally comparable to a death sentence.
 - b. "It is better to suffer evil than to inflict it." - Socrates
- e. Candidate Sound Bite:
 - i. "Let's be honest. Hillary isn't interested in finding common ground or in making a concerted effort to reduce the number of abortions. If she were she would support at least *some* restrictions on the practice. As her voting record shows she is more interested in defending an ideology without compromise. However she does get one thing right: abortion is a moral issue. And it's a morally bankrupt position that says the weakest and most vulnerable members of our human community can be killed simply because they are in the way and can't defend themselves."

8. Hillary Clinton on Abortion

- a. Author: Chuck Ross
- b. Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-CPbojiXphw>
- c. Synopsis: In response to a question on supporting reasonable restrictions on abortion, Hillary states, "I've said that there were and that's under Roe v. Wade that there can be restrictions in the very end of the third trimester but they have to take into account the life and health of the mother."
- d. Response:

- i. There are no meaningful restrictions under *Roe v. Wade*.
- ii. *Roe v. Wade* must be interpreted in light of its companion case *Doe v. Bolton* which essentially allows for abortion on demand, ruling that health must be defined “in light of all factors—physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman’s age—relevant to the well being of the patient. All these factors relate to health.” (*Doe v. Bolton*, 410, U.S. 179, 192 [1973])
- iii. Why would Hillary support *any* restrictions on abortion?
 1. If abortion is a woman’s right and a private choice, there should be no restrictions whatsoever, end of story.
 2. If she *does* support restrictions then she undermines her own position and reveals an inconsistency.
- iv. Hillary constantly hides behind the “health of the mother” exception which makes her support of any “restrictions” meaningless.
 1. “Health of the mother” is defined so broadly in *Doe v. Bolton* that no matter what restrictions on abortion are proposed, Hillary can always say those restrictions violate the health criterion.
 2. This allows Hillary to talk out of both sides of her mouth.
 - a. Out of one side she says she can support abortion restrictions so long as they are reasonable and take into account life and health exceptions. This gives the appearance she is making an effort to find “common ground.”
 - b. Out of the other side she defines “health” so broadly that there really are no reasonable restrictions on abortion that can be put in place which she would support.
- e. Candidate Sound Bite:
 - i. “I’m confused. Why would Hillary support any restrictions at all on abortion? Isn’t it her position that abortion is a woman’s right and a private choice? She can’t even remain consistent with her own position. She wants to make it *seem* like she is willing to find common ground but in reality, as her voting record shows, she supports abortion on demand whenever and for whatever reason. My position is that there *should* be exceptions for the life of the mother, such as in ectopic pregnancies, but these situations are rare, and the intent is not to kill the unborn but to save the life of the mother. To be pro-life means not to be just pro-child but pro-woman as well. This is why pregnancy centers outnumber abortion clinics in this country 2 to 1.”

9. Hillary Clinton defends gruesome Partial Birth Abortion

- a. Author: rapnsum
- b. Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ItafBMuuy70>
- c. Synopsis: In 2003, Hillary spoke in defense of partial birth abortion before the U.S. Senate, which begins at about 4:55:17 on this video and lasts about 25 minutes. She then interacts with Rick Santorum on the topic for a little over 15 minutes. Santorum does a good job of exposing some of the problems with

Hillary’s position and language. Due to the length of her speech and numerous comments, I have put what I believe are the most important and relevant quotes below in parenthesis with a quick response underneath. Even though this is a bit outdated considering the Supreme Court upheld the 2003 federal Partial-Birth Abortion Ban in *Gonzales v. Carhart* (2007), her comments still give insight to her position and can be applied to her view of abortion more broadly. It is also relevant considering that if it were up to Hillary, federal and state bans on this practice would be overturned.

- d. Response:
- i. Abortion should be “legal, safe, and rare.”
 1. For response see number one above.
 - ii. Republican leadership wants to “work together to criminalize a private medical decision made by women and their physicians” which is an “unusual and in my view a misguided choice.”
 1. Can parents abuse their toddlers, so long as they do it in the privacy of their own home? Of course not, because they are human beings. So the question is, “What is the unborn?”
 2. If the unborn are human beings like toddlers, a woman’s private medical choice to kill her unborn should not be legal. Hillary begs the question.
 3. Hillary calls the effort to stop doctors from cutting open the back of a baby’s head, sucking the brain outs, and delivering the baby dead, a “misguided choice.” Enough said.
 - iii. “Today, 300,000 men and women wearing the uniforms of our military stand in harm’s way in the Persian Gulf...With so many American lives on the line, the Republican leadership has decided to spend it’s time working to criminalize a medical procedure that is used in very few cases and only when the health and safety of women are at stake.”
 1. While 300,000 troops stood in harm’s way serving our country, Planned Parenthood kills 300,000 unborn human beings each year (over 1,000,000 abortions occur in this country each year).
 2. If Hillary is truly concerned with “American lives” she should be concerned with the entire spectrum of life which begins in the womb. She begs the question in assuming those unborn lives should not be considered “American lives”.
 3. She assumes that partial-birth abortions are medically necessary for the health of the mother. Congress found in their research that it is *never* medically necessary. Santorum in his response states the following: “I refer the Senator to the State of Kansas where they have to report the reason for a partial-birth abortion; 182 were done last year, or the year before, and of those 182, none--zero--were done because of a problem with the child or a physical problem with the mother. They were classified as mental health.”
 - iv. “I find it deeply ironic that it is taking place in the month of March, women’s history month. Apparently some people believe that the purpose of women’s history month is to literally bring us back to a time in history

when women had no choices. Instead of celebrating our accomplishments and improving the health and safety of women in the United States and internationally there are those who would put women's health at risk."

1. Do unborn females count as women? They should if they are human. So why is attempting to save defenseless and vulnerable women inside the womb anti-woman? Au contraire, that's pro-woman.
 2. If any position is "anti-woman" it is Hillary's since she supports the killing of women inside the womb. Not only does she want to "bring us back to a time in history when women had no choices" but she supports taking the very life of those women before they can make any choices.
 3. Why would a woman's legal ability to put her unborn to death be a reason for "celebrating our accomplishments"?
 4. She again assumes that bans on partial-birth abortion put women's health at risk.
- v. "But if we are to debate this emotional issue then we must do so with great care, care about the words we use and the laws we right. Every time we use inflammatory language in this chamber it limits our ability to talk about this very private, personal decision between a woman, her loved ones, and her doctor."
1. Hillary as already conceded this is a "moral issue" (see number seven above, 7.d.vi.).
 2. No one denies abortion can be an emotional issue. What follows from that? Not much. There are a lot of issues which are emotional, that doesn't mean they are any less clear morally. Psychological complexity does not entail moral complexity (see number seven above, 7.d.v.).
 3. For Hillary to lecture on the use of language is ironic considering the amount of euphemisms she employs for abortion: "private choice", "woman's right", "personal decision", "reproductive rights", "family planning", etc.
- vi. "And I'm also concerned about some of the visual aids that have been used by some of my colleagues. They are as deceptive as they are heartbreaking. Because what do they show? They show a perfectly formed fetus and that is misleading because if we're really going to have this debate then we should have a chart that demonstrates the tragic abnormalities that confront women forced with this excruciatingly difficult decision..."
1. The pictures are not at all deceptive considering that the majority of partial-birth abortions are elective in nature.
 - a. Dr. Martin Haskell testified in 1993 concerning this procedure to American Medical News: "And I'll be quite frank: most of my abortions are elective in that 20-24 week range... In my particular case, probably 20% are for genetic reasons. And the other 80% are purely elective."

not live long in utero or for no more than seconds or minutes outside her womb...Her choice was not easy and it was a choice she made with professional, medical advice...Each of these women would have been forced to carry their babies to term only to see a child with such severe abnormalities die upon or shortly after birth.”

1. Hillary must resort to story-telling because the facts are not on her side. These stories truly are tragic, but hardship doesn't justify homicide.
 2. Hillary confuses natural causation with agent causation. One does not follow from the other.
 - a. The fact that these unborn children will not live long and die of natural causes does not justify personal agents intentionally killing them.
 - b. Of course, most human beings will eventually die of natural causes. Since most human beings will die this way, can we kill them at will? Hillary begs the question and the logical implications of her rationale reduce her position to absurdity.
 3. She is essentially saying, “Because these children were inflicted with a genetic disease that will soon result in their death, it is morally permissible for us to kill them now.”
- ix. “I have to respectfully disagree with my colleagues about mental health. If we've learned anything in the last several decades, there is no artificial divide between mental and physical health. The mind and the body are a totally integrated system, one affects the other. I believe that mental health is health. And I believe that forcing a woman to carry a child who she knows will die is an assault, not only on her health, her mental health, but on our values as a nation and a free people.”
1. Here Hillary makes it clear that when she speaks of “health” she includes mental health and other forms of “health”. This is in agreement with the definition used in *Doe v. Bolton*.
 2. Is mental anguish really a sufficient condition for homicide? Women may experience mental health problems and post-partum depression after birth, may she kill her children because of that? Hillary begs the question in assuming the unborn are not human.
 3. Hillary assumes there are no adverse mental and physical health problems associated with abortion, i.e., she assumes abortion will somehow alleviate the mental anguish experienced by a woman in this situation rather than compounding it.
 4. Hillary exploits tragedy for her own benefit. She believes “health” is all-inclusive and that partial-birth abortions can be procured for any of these “health” reasons, yet she only puts forward emotionally compelling, tragic stories in order to gain sympathy and appeal to pity.
- x. “Whether it was Romania saying you've got to have children for the good of the State or China saying you can only have one child for the good of

the State, the government was telling us what we were supposed to do with our bodies...I don't think we can dismiss these examples...I have seen that where government gets this type of power it can be quickly misused...I can guarantee you standing here as a United States Senator, if we go down this path you're going to have the same kind of overzealous, interfering, prosecutors and police officials, doing the very same kinds of things in this country.”

1. More scare tactics and slippery slope fallacies. Apparently banning partial-birth abortion will bring about the end of the world.
 2. Also a false analogy: the U.S. government telling you not to kill your unborn human children is not the same as a government which tells you how many children you can have.
 3. The government tells us what we can and cannot do with our own bodies all the time, and with good reason.
 - a. For example, we can't use our bodies to steal, murder, drive drunk, or take illegal drugs.
 - b. In this case, the government is telling women they can't use their bodies to kill another human being within them.
 - c. So, government can make reasonable laws that help prevent individuals from using their bodies to hurt themselves or harm another. In the case of abortion, it is killing another.
 4. Hillary assumes there is only one body involved.
 - a. But it should be obvious there are two: the mother's and the unborn. While the mother's body is certainly involved, it is not the mother's body that is being aborted. After all, the woman survives the abortion while the unborn doesn't.
 - b. This fact is confirmed by science. The unborn from conception has a totally unique, individual, and separate genetic code. The unborn has a separate central nervous system, may have a different blood type and, in the case of a boy, a different gender. In other words, a pregnant woman does not have four arms, four legs, two heads, or a penis when she is pregnant with a boy. There are two bodies involved, not one.
 - c. Therefore, the question is not what a woman can do with her own body but rather what she should be permitted to do with the body and life of her unborn. She should not be legally protected in killing him or her.
 5. Hillary's guarantee didn't come true. The federal ban on partial-birth abortion enacted in 2003, upheld by the Supreme Court in 2007, and 32 states have enacted their own bans on the procedure. So far, our country hasn't degenerated into Romania or China.
- xi. “Why did we ever have to do Roe v. Wade to begin with?...We had to have it because in many parts of the country these kinds of decisions were not permitted to be made by individual women.”

1. Yes, all 50 states had at least some restrictions on abortion prior to Roe v. Wade because abortion intentionally kills an innocent human being and “these kinds of decisions” should not be legal.
2. Just because something is legal, that doesn’t make it moral.
- xii. “And look at the progress we have made?...the U.S. Abortion rate is now at the lowest level it has been since 1974.”
 1. Why should lower abortion rates be considered progress? Is there something morally wrong with abortion? Only if abortion is a moral wrong could a lower rate be considered moral progress.
 2. I thought Hillary was in favor of women’s rights? Isn’t abortion a woman’s right? If so, couldn’t a higher abortion rate *also* be considered “progress” since this would indicate that more women were exercising their constitutional right to abortion?
- xiii. “We’re talking about those few rare cases when a doctor has to look across a desk at a woman and say, ‘I hate to tell you this but the baby you’ve wanted, the baby you care so much about that you’re carrying has a terrible abnormality.’”
 1. Hillary’s solution? Kill him or her.
 2. Hillary is once again being dishonest and deceptive, for it is not only in these rare cases that she believes partial-birth abortion should be an option. Rather it should be available on demand.
- xiv. “Who are we really leaving out?...We are leaving out the vast majority of American women. Middle income women. Working women who can’t get on an airplane and go to Sweden or some other place.”
 1. See number one above (1.d.iii) and number two above (2.d.i.) regarding the appeal to poor women. “For it is not true that the vices of the wealthy are virtues simply because the poor are denied them” (Beckwith, *Defending Life*, 96).
 2. Hillary is right; the vast majority of American women *are* being left out. But it isn’t poor women; it is the women inside the womb. Over 500,000 of those women are put to death every year.
- xv. “I have also seen the results of that...problems they had encountered, mostly because of botched back-alley, illegal abortions. Some of them lost their fertility forever; some of them lost their lives...That is one of the other reasons we had to do Roe v. Wade, because is it fair that we have that kind of distinction made on the basis of class or income instead of the basis of law?”
 1. Botched illegal back-alley abortions are tragic and sad, but it doesn’t follow that abortions should therefore be made legal.
 2. The government shouldn’t make it safer, easier, and legal for one class of human beings (women) to kill another class of human beings (the unborn). Hillary begs the question and appeals to pity.
 - a. Abortion-choice advocate Mary Anne Warren agrees: “The fact that restricting access to abortion has tragic side effects does not, in itself, show that the restrictions are unjustified, since murder is wrong regardless of the consequences of

- prohibiting it” (“On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion” in *The Problem of Abortion*, 2nd ed., 103).
3. No one is forcing women to get illegal back-alley abortions. They *choose* to have them.
 - a. “A woman is no more forced into the back-alley when abortion is outlawed than a young man is forced to rob banks because the state won’t put him on welfare. Both have other options” (Greg Koukl, “I’m Pro-Choice,” <http://www.str.org/articles/i-m-pro-choice#.Vp7OMk9uKSo>)
 4. Stephen Schwartz: “...the true response to back-alley abortions is to be outraged at all abortions, to condemn all abortions—not to propose one kind (legal) in place of another (illegal)” (*The Moral Question of Abortion*, 205).
- xvi. “I value every single life and every single person, but if you can explain to me how the U.S. Government, through the criminal law process, will be making these decisions without infringing upon fundamental rights, without imposing onerous burdens on women and their families, I would be more than happy to listen.”
1. If Hillary truly valued every single life and every single person she wouldn’t think it morally permissible to kill unborn human beings (most of whom are killed for socioeconomic reasons) simply because they are in the way and can’t defend themselves.
 2. Hillary confuses natural rights with legal rights and wrongly assumes legal rights trump natural rights.
 - a. Natural rights are those rights that you have simply because you are human (e.g., the right not to be killed).
 - b. Legal rights are those rights you can only acquire through accomplishment or maturity (e.g., right to vote, drink, drive, etc.).
 - c. Natural rights always trump legal rights, for without natural rights (the most basic of which is the right to life), legal rights would never be attainable.
 - d. Therefore, the natural right to life of the unborn trumps any so-called legal right to abortion a woman may have, since the former is a natural right and the latter a legal one.
 - e. “Where did that right to abortion come from? In other words, is it a *natural* right that springs from our nature as human beings, or is it a positive (legal) right granted by the government? If the latter, the abortion-choice advocate cannot really complain that she is wronged if the state does not permit her to abort... On the other hand, if the right to an abortion is a natural right—a right one has in virtue of being human—then the abortion-choice advocate had that right from the moment she came to be, that is, from conception! Thus, we are left with this amusing paradox:

According to the logic of many abortion-choice advocates, unborn women do not have a right to life but they do have a right to an abortion! Absurd!” (Klusendorf, *The Case for Life*, 63).

- e. Candidate Sound Bite:
 - i. “In 2003 Hillary Clinton defended the gruesome procedure of partial-birth abortion before the U.S. Senate and still supports it today, a practice which is never medically necessary according to Congressional findings. If it were up to her, there would be no federal or state restrictions on abortion at any time during pregnancy, which is why she has the endorsement of Planned Parenthood. Hillary says this is pro-woman, but there is nothing more anti-woman than supporting the killing of women at their weakest and most defenseless time of existence. I believe every woman has an equal right to life and should be treated equally from the beginning of their existence. Hillary wants to pick on the little women. That won’t happen on my watch.”
10. Hillary Clinton Opposes Legal Limits on Abortion “At Any Stage of Pregnancy”
- a. Author: John McCormack
 - b. Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=41AjUt9qpw4>
 - c. Synopsis: Hillary is asked, “Do you support a federal limit on abortion at any stage of pregnancy?” Essentially her answer is, “No.” She states, “This is one of those really painful questions that people raise and obviously it’s really emotional. I think that the kind of late term abortions that take place are because of medical necessity and therefore I would hate to see the government interfering with that decision. I think that again this gets back to whether you respect a women’s right to choose or not and I think that’s what this whole argument once again is about.”
 - d. Response:
 - i. This video is more of the same, see the following points above:
 - ii. Hillary confuses psychological complexity with moral complexity (see response to number seven above, 7.d.5.)
 - iii. The majority of late term abortions are elective in nature. They are not done out of medical necessity and a small percentage are done for “health” reasons (see number nine above, 9.d.6.).
 - iv. Regarding a “woman’s right to choose” see number two above (2.d.ii.).
11. Hillary’s Abortion Stance is Extremeist; Fringe: Restrictions in the Very End of the Third Trimester
- a. Author: Tea Party
 - b. Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k6UWCpoIPwc>
 - c. Synopsis: In response to a question on supporting reasonable restrictions on abortion, Hillary states, “I’ve said that there were and that’s under Roe v. Wade that there can be restrictions in the very end of the third trimester but they have to take into account the life and health of the mother.” Hillary goes on to mention a bill on partial birth abortion which her husband vetoed in 1996 and the stories of women who influenced her, saying the difficult decision “ought to be made based

on their own conscious, their family, their faith, in consultation with doctors. Those stories left a searing impression on me. Women who think their pregnancy is going well and then wake up and find some really terrible problem. Women whose lives are threatened themselves if they carry their child to term. And women who are told by doctors that the child they're carrying will not survive...If there is a way to structure some kind of constitutional restrictions that take into account the life of the mother and her health then I'm open to that but I have yet to see the Republicans willing to actually do that and that would be an area where if they included health you could see constitutional action."

- d. Response:
 - i. This video is more of the same and the material has been covered pretty thoroughly above already. See the following points:
 - ii. See number eight above which covers some of this same video clip.
 - iii. See number nine above regarding story-telling, medical necessity of late-term abortions, and 9.d.ix. for more health of the mother.