

The Case for Pro-Life

By Dr. J.P. Moreland

[Starts in the middle of a song]

[Song ends and another starts]

[Worship leader prays while strumming guitar]

Worship leader:

God we proclaim that today. That we were made by a wonderful maker, and that we belong to You, God. We belong to a God who is above all, who is through all, who is in all, who is from everlasting to everlasting. So God, we pray Lord that You would speak to us today. That we would remember that we are Yours, that we are in Your hands God. You'd remember how You are so present in every danger. How You love us so much. So God speak to us today. Pray this in Jesus' name, amen. You guys can have a seat.

Speaker 1:

Thank you, guys. Michael, Chris, Emily. Michael actually uh graduated, um but he has agreed to come back and help us with worship music. And Emily is going to be our worship coordinator for AS chapel board next year, taking over from Andy Toye. So.

[Audience applauds and cheers]

Speaker 1:

Very excited about that. And Chris will continue to ka-play the keyboards in his life. Yes. Right. Couple announcements. You know, we are in a series of uh the value of human life. Priceless.

Question mark? The value of human life. And so uh, in a minute, we'll be introducing today's speaker. But let me uh tell you about what's happening next week in chapel. On Monday and Wednesday, um Dr. David Dockery, who is the president of Union University back in Tennessee, uh will be coming to speak with us as part of the Contemporary Issues lecture series that that Talbot helps us sponsor. So he'll be here on Monday and Wednesday, by the way, union was that university--and I don't know if you've heard about in the news a couple of years ago, a tornado went through their town, their area, and just tore up the campus. Um, uh, buildings were destroyed, damaged, and unbelievably no one was killed.

And I don't know if Do-David Dockery we talking about that at all, um but that was an amazing um mercy from God. So he comes from an interesting place. So next week he'll be speaking. On Thursday, Chad Miller from um Woody Area Church will be speaking on Thursday, in Calvary chapel. And then on Friday, May 1st, a week from today, um, have any of you seen that Jesus mural out there? Okay I didn't--yeah I don't know if you've seen it or not. Um, we're going to be having a panel discussion because you know what? What happened there recently about about a year ago or maybe more than a year ago, it's become time to refurbish it. It's-it's-it's been getting um faded, whiter.

[Speaker 1 laughs]

Speaker 1:

And um, and uh, and-but that whole process of beginning to even think about that again has raised a lot of issues and these issues come up perennially. Issues like should we even be

representing Jesus, uh, from a Protestant--you know, attempting to do that in art. Um, theological issues of, you know, how should we represent Him if we're going to resent Him--

[Speaker 1 laughs]

Speaker 1:

Represent Him. Uh, racia-rac-racial issues, social issues. Um, wow, there's just a whole host of issues. And by the way, these discussions have been going on. Uh we've had some academic discussions uh lately among theologians and other scholars on this campus, urban student discussions, for about quite some time now as we've thought about um the process of refurbishing it and it has drawn tension back to it. There's been some very interesting discussions. And through it all, we-we would try to model how do we discuss things in love, even amid some of our deepest differences, if those differences arrive. So Friday, a week from [unintelligible] Chapel, we're going to try and model that by bringing some of these folks in who have had some practice discussing this from various angles to talk about the Jesus mural. So that'll be next Friday, May 1st, here in chapel.

Let me remind you, um, that sa-the Sabbath-ing time, which is tomorrow from 9:00 to noon, will be in the Giumarra courtyard. So we've had about one hundred plus students sign up to spend three hours with God. Uh, there'll be an hour and a half where you'll actually be with, um, on your own with the Lord. But there'll be some introduction to what does one do with time alone with God. And some debriefing as well as afterwards. If you still want to sign up for that time. You can go to Spiritual Life Department, which is up by A-S in the upper sub. But we do need you to sign up if you're going to come tomorrow morning. But for those, of you who are going to

come, get a good night's sleep tonight. We'll see you at 9:00 in the Giumarra courtyard, which is that courtyard next to the library there, next to Rose Chapel. That's where it will be at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Finally, let me just let you know that the journey, which is the men's discipleship group, is still looking for two um leadership positions. And today is the last day to apply for those. So um, go to the spiritual life department and take a look at that. Let me now introduce to you someone who's been helping us with our apologetics ministry called Apologia. Um, last week, they had about 45 people show up for lunch to discuss um some apologetic issues, and he'll introduce our speaker, this is Mira Tuguta.

[Audience applauds]

Mira Tuguta:

It's a privilege for me this morning to introduce our speaker, a distinguished uh professor of philosophy at Harvard School of Theology, Dr. J.P. Moreland. With degrees in philosophy, and theology, and chemistry, Dr. Moreland has taught theology and philosophy at several schools throughout the United States. He has authored or co-authored books including Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview, Love God with All Your Mind, Christianity and the Nature of Science, Scaling the Secular City, Does God Exist, Immortality: the Other Side of Death, and The Life and Death of Death Debate. Moral issues of our times. He is co-editor of Christian Perspectives on Being Human, and Jesus Under Fire: Modern Scholarship Reinvents the Historical Jesus. His work appears in journals such as Christianity Today, Journal of the

Moreland: The Case for Pro-Life

Evangelical Theological Society, Philosoph-Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, and the American Philosophical Quarterly.

Dr. Moreland served with Campus Crusade for 10 years, planted to a church, and has spoken on over 200 college campuses. Dr. Moreland's intellectual works have been inspirational for me personally. As a result, I was able to write three books in the area of apologetics in the Ethiopian national language, Amharic, or [unintelligible]. For nearly three years now, I have been benefiting immensely from the classes I've been taking with Dr. Moreland. It's a great honor for me to present our speaker this morning for whom I have the highest regard. Please welcome Dr. J.P. Moreland, a distinguished professor of philosophy.

[Audience applauds]

J.P. Moreland:

Given the color of my beard and my hair, it's nice to know I have something in common with Jesus. I get whiter the older I get, too.

[J.P. Moreland and audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

Think about it, ladies and gentlemen. Think about it.

[Audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

It's good to be with you this morning. I've really looked forward to this time. Uh I count it a real privilege to be on the faculty here at Biola University. And I just love the school. And I'm grateful for the opportunity to share with you this morning. I actually became a Christian in 1968. That was 41 years ago. And for the longest time, I would meet people that thought that believing in Christianity was superstitious or silly or irrational. But they still believed that following the ethical teachings of Jesus was a good idea. So that while they didn't believe Christianity was true, they did treasure the moral teachings of Christianity. However, today we live in the very first time that I can ever remember, where not only is the Christian religion considered to be irrational and superstitious by many people, but now the ethics of Jesus is considered to be bigoted and deeply immoral.

Thus, if you follow Jesus, you're not only ignorant, you are a bigot. Now, I don't believe this for a minute. And I believe that folks who think that way, well I wish they would come here and interact with what we've got going on at Biola and other places around the country. But you need to know that there is a growing number of people in the culture that believe that those of us who follow Jesus are ignorant and bigoted. To give you an example, not long ago, novelist Jane Smalley made the following statement about us. Quote, "Here is how their ignorant bigotry works. First, they put the fear of God into you. If you don't believe in the literal word of the Bible, you'll burn in hell. Of course, the literal word of the Bible is tremendously contradictory. And so you have to abdicate all critical thinking and accept a simple but logical system of belief that is dangerous to question. A corollary to this point is that they make sure you understand that Satan resides in the toils and snares of complex thought. So it's best not to try to think at all."

Along the same lines, Robert Reisch, who is secretary of uh labor under the Clinton administration and a professor, I believe, at Harvard not long ago made the following statement. Listen carefully to what he's saying. He says, "The great conflict of the 21st century will not be between the West and terrorism. Now, that's news. No, terrorism is a tactic, not a belief. The true battle will be between modern civilization and anti-modernists, between those who believe in the primacy of the individual and those who believe that human beings owe their allegiance and identity to a higher power. Between those who give priority to life in this world and those who believe that human life is mere preparation for an existence beyond the grave. Between those who believe in science, and reason, and logic, and those who believe that truth is revealed through scripture and religious dogma. Terrorism will disrupt and destroy our lives, but terrorism is not the greatest danger we face. Religious conservatives is."

Now, again, I don't believe this for a moment. But what this tells us is that it is incredibly important for us as Christians to not only know what we believe, but to know why we believe it. And in my heart for you, as an aside, is that while you're here at this university, you do not leave this campus when you graduate without having gotten answers to your questions. And if you have questions about the Christian religion, or doubts, or things you don't get, or don't agree with, or don't understand, by all means, please approach a faculty member and don't let it rest. Do not let it rest. Find an answer to your questions and get them answered before you leave, because there are answers available. I just want you to be sure that you get in touch with those answers.

Now, one area of controversy where it's important for us to know why we believe what we believe is in the area of the sanctity of human life, and abortion in particular. And what I want to do in the brief, very brief, time I have this morning is to give you a few preliminary considerations to think about. And then I want to say a word about what the fundamental issue on abortion is so that I can give you at least a little bit of equipping on this topic in a very brief time this morning. Two preliminaries before I say a word about abortion. Preliminary number one, what exactly is a moral absolute? Well, here's what a moral absolute is. A moral absolute is a moral principle that's true, whether anyone believes it or not. Let me say that again, a moral absolute is a moral principle that's true, whether anyone believes it or not.

Thus, just as we discovered that two and two is four, or that electrons have negative charge, rather than inventing those ideas. Similarly, we discover the truths of morality. We don't invent them, according to the absolutist. So just as there are truths in chemistry, and physics, and history, and mathematics, so the absolutist says there are truths in the moral realm such that it is actually possible to be wrong in your moral ideas or moral beliefs. Now, I would never, if I were interacting with somebody at a secular university, I would never put myself in a position of having to prove that there are moral absolutes. I would simply assert their existence and place the burden of proof on the individual denying moral absolutes. Or to put the point a little bit differently, I would not try to prove there are such things, I would make other people prove there aren't moral absolutes. Now, why would I approach this issue in light of that strategy?

The answer is very simply because everybody knows there are moral absolutes. Everybody. There really are no relativists, brothers and sisters. And you have to have the strength of your

convictions to know that there are people who claim to be relativists, but they're really not. They're really absolutist. And here's how you can find out. If you meet someone who claims that they think that everything's relative, "Hey, whatever is true for you is true for you. And whatever is true for me is true for me. And I think that we should not judge other people and say their views are wrong." If somebody espouses that kind of a view to you, find out what they care deeply about. Relativize it, and see what happens. And you will find a closet absolutist every time. Let me illustrate it.

Several years ago, I met a fellow that told me he was a relativist in morality. "Everything's relative," he said. Well, I found out that he loved the environment. And so I said to him, I said, "Look, I don't know what you're going to think about this, but I have four buddies and the five of us get together about once a month. We can usually only do it about nine or 10 times a year. We try to do it every month, but you know how it is. And we get together about once a month, we each kick 50 bucks a piece into a kitty of 250 dollars. We buy a 100-gallon drum of sulfuric acid, and we take it out to Lake Paris and we dump it in the lake.

[Audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

And what we do, is we have taken bets as to how many fish are gonna-we're gonna kill that'll float to the surface. And whoever gets the closest to the number of fish that are actually killed wins the whole kitty." And I said, "It is unbelievably exciting as we're watching those fish float to the surface."

[J.P. Moreland and audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

So know, this guy's blood vessels were just popping out of his neck. And I said to him, I said, "You know, I'm I'm not an expert in body language, but the sense I'm getting from looking at you is that you think that what my friends and I are doing is, wrong." Now, the truth of the matter is people are only relativists in the areas of their life where it is convenient to their lifestyle. In the areas they care deeply about, they're absolutists and everyone knows that there are moral absolutes. And this is why I would never put myself in a position of having to prove that moral absolutes exist, because the-the existence of moral absolutes is what is called a self-evident truth. It is obvious to people and everyone knows it. That's the first preliminary. Now, my second preliminary remark is to remind you that if God did not exist, it would be almost impossible to explain why human beings have high and equal value.

You see, there is today, in the public eye, a constant concern about human rights. And most people want to assert that there should be equal human rights for all human beings worldwide. Now I agree with that claim. The problem is making sense as to why we ought to believe it. And the question that we ought to raise is why should we believe in equal human rights? How on the earth--how in the world can you justify that kind of a belief and make sense out of it? Now, let me illustrate the problem by sharing with you something I did with my daughter when she was back in sixth grade. She was going to a public school, and she brought home a Martin Luther King flyer that said that Martin Luther King believed that all people ought to be treated equally and that all pe-human beings should have equal rights. Now, I said to my daughter, "Do you uh, do you believe this?" And she said, "Well, yeah." And I said, "Well, why in the world do you

believe it?" And she thought she could get rid of me by using the G word. So she said, "Well, God." You know, and like I-okay Dad's happy I can go play, you know.

[Audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

Well parents aren't as dumb as you all think we are. But uh, so I said to her, "No, no, no," I said, "Let's pretend that God isn't real. Let's pretend that God is a fairy tale for just a minute." I said, "You see over behind the couch there on the wall where we have a lovely, lovely painting that cost a fair amount of money," and I said, "Look on the coffee table, there's a piece of paper that I wadded up and forgot to throw away yesterday." Now, I said, "Honey, if the house was on fire and you could only save one of those two objects, do you think you would have a duty to save one and leave the other one? Or do you think it would be 50/50, wouldn't matter, so you could flip a coin and you would choose which object to save based on heads or tails?" So she said, "No, Dad, I shouldn't do that." I said, "Why not?" She said, "Well I ought to save the painting." I said, "I think you're right. But why?" She said, "Well, it's worth a lot more than that piece of paper." And I said, "Well, what if it was a choice between saving our little dog Casey and that piece of paper?"

Well she rolled her eyes and said, "Dad, I'm going to save Casey." "Why?" "Well, he's precious. And that piece of paper is just trash." And I said, "Okay, we-we learn a lesson then, and here's the lesson that we learn. Equals ought to be treated equally, and un-equals ought to be treated unequally." She said, "Well, what do you mean?" And I said, "Well, look, it would be immoral for you to treat our dog and that piece of paper as though they were equal and just flip a coin to

decide which one to save. The reason that would be wrong is you would be treating unequal things as though they were equal. And that's wrong. We ought to treat equal things the way they are, equally, and we ought to treat unequal things the way they are, unequal. It would be wrong to treat a human being with the same value as a-as a tomato plant, for example." Now, I said "There's a problem here, honey," and I said, "Here it is. There's nothing that human beings have in common that's equal. There are smart, there are dumb, there are good looking, there are ugly, there are athletic, non-athletic. There are musical, nonmusical. There are socially useful, socially useless human beings."

[J.P. Moreland and audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

I said, I said there's nothing in common that's equal that we have in common." She said, "Oh yes, there is." "What is it?" "Bellybuttons."

[Audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

She really did. Now, you know what? My kids had to go to therapy.

[J.P. Moreland and audience laugh]

J.P. Moreland:

But that's a whole 'nother story. But um, so I said, "Well," I said, "there are people with large and people with small belly buttons, do the people with the large ones have more value than the ones with the small ones?" I said, "By the way, if having a belly button is where we get our

value, if we had-took your sister to the doctor and had her belly button removed, could we use her as a doorstep?"

[Audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

"Because she would lose her value? Now," I said, "here's the point. If it's going to make sense to treat human beings with high equal value, two things have to be true. Number one, there has to be something that we all have in common that's equal. There's got to be something that all human beings have in common that's equal. Number two, whatever that thing is, it's got to be deep, and important, and weighty instead of shallow and trivial like a belly button. Now," I said, "the reason Martin Luther King believed that all human beings should be given equal rights and treated equally is because he believed that there was something in common that all human beings had that was of great importance, namely the image of God." And I said, "Honey, if there is a God and if He made us in His image, then we have a very, very reasonable explanation for why we ought to treat all human beings with high equal value, because all human beings have something in common that's equal, namely--and-and what that is they have in common is weighty and important, namely the image of God."

"But if there is no God, then there is, of course, no image of God. And it's very difficult to see what we all have in common that matters." And so what I want to say to you folks is that we in the Christian religion have an unbelievably powerful explanation for the moral intuition that human rights and equal human rights ought to be protected. Yea, verily, and amen. But it's hard to give a justification for that within a secular worldview, whereas a Christian worldview has a

powerful justification for the idea of equal human rights. Two preliminaries then. Number one, there are moral absolutes. What are they? They're simply moral principles that are true, whether anyone believes them or not, we discover morality we don't invented. Don't try to prove there are moral absolutes. Make the deniers of moral absolutes prove their position because everybody deep down knows their real.

Second preliminary, the concern for human life is rooted in the idea that human beings have high and equal value. That makes sense if there is a God who made us in His image, why? Because on that account, we all do have something equally in common that matters. The Imago Dei. But if there is no God, then there is no image of God, and it becomes very difficult to explain what it is that we all have in common that would ground the high equal human value that we all intuitively wish to be true. Now, what about the abortion controversy? I don't have a lot of time this morning and this is a brief message, but I do want to make a couple of points that I hope will be useful to you. The fundamental issue in the topic of abortion is the nature of the fetus. It is not a woman's right to choose, it is not what would happen if abortion isn't legal, there would be a lot of back alley abortions and it could cause a lot of women to be harmed. These are not the fundamental issue in abortion.

The fundamental issue in the abortion debate is what is a fetus? And let me explain why that's true. The basic pro-life argument goes like this. Here's-here's the fundamental argument for pro-life. Premise number one, it is wrong intentionally to take an innocent human person's life. It's wrong to take an innocent human person's life on purpose. That's premise number one. Premise number two, the fetus is a human person. And from this, it follows that it is wrong to take,

intentionally, the life of a fetus. So the first premise says it's wrong intentionally to take an innocent human person's life. The second premise is the fetus is a human person. From these two premises, it follows that it's wrong to take the life of a fetus intentionally. Now, let's consider the first premise very briefly. It is wrong intentionally to take innocent human la-a human person's life.

This principle is virtually self-evident. It is hard to see how anyone could real intelligently deny it. I want you to notice that the way the statement is formulated, namely that it's wrong to take, intentionally, an innocent human person's life, note carefully the way it's formulated leaves open the possibility that it is morally permissible to take life in war and capital punishment. And so uh there are people I've seen some uh Ed Asner and other Hollywood uh uh stars protest the pro-life belief that capital punishment is morally justifiable. I myself am an advocate both of capital punishment and just war. And the argument against me and others would be that it's inconsistent to be pro-life with regard to abortion, but not be pro-life in regards to capital punishment and war. And that's just a bad argument, because the pro-life position does not rest on this premise. It doesn't rest on the premise that it's wrong intentionally to take human life. It rests on the premise it's wrong intentionally to take an innocent-an innocent human person's life.

That would leave open the possibility that when it comes to those who are guilty of capital offenses and who are fighting in a just war against you, that it would be morally permissible to take life in war and capital punishment. Now, whether it is morally permissible to take life and warrant capital punishment is a matter of a different discussion that I-I'm not going to get into this morning. I am simply making one very simple point. And the simple point that I wish to

make is from the fact that I believe that it is wrong intentionally to take an innocent human person's life, it doesn't follow that I'm being inconsistent by believing in war, just war, and capital punishment. Further argumentation has to be made for those points. Now, let's return to the abortion argument. Premise one, it's wrong intentionally to take an innocent human person's life. As I submit to you again, this is virtually self-evident. I mean, no one is going to walk over to their next door neighbor and see their five year old boy playing out in the front yard and say, "I, you know, I think I'm going to just cut this little boy to pieces because I'm bored today."

I mean, that would be wrong because it's the taking of an innocent human person's life. The premise of controversy is going to be the premises of whether the fetus is a human person. And let me just say very simply that I think it is obvious that the fetus is a human person, and one piece of evidence for that is that the fetus has its own DNA. The fetus cannot be a part of the mother's body because the mother's body, every part of the mother's body, has its own DNA, but the fetus has unique-its own unique DNA, which is not the same as the DNA of all the parts of a mother's body. And so based on the uniqueness of the fetus's DNA, it seems reasonable for me to believe that the fetus is a human person and not, say, a part of the mother's body. The fundamental issue then is over the nature of the fetus. Now, some pro- uh pro-choice advocates will argue that the fetus is a human but not a person. And so they'll claim that you don't get value until you become a person, and that the fetus is a human but not a person.

There are many problems with this. Michael Tooley at the University of Colorado has raised this argument. And if you were to ask him, when does someone become a person, I think it's around a year of age. So now you can just think about the moral implications of that. But um, what do we

make of this claim that the fetus is a human being all right, but the fetus isn't a person. And you don't get value from being human, you get value from being a person. Well, now this is going to be a little hard to follow, but-but let let's try this on for size and see how we do. Basically, the idea is this. There could be persons that aren't humans, but there couldn't be humans that aren't persons. Now, let me say that again, there could be persons that aren't humans. But there couldn't be humans that aren't persons.

Now, the way to make sense out of this is that person is to human as color is to red, or mammal is to dog. Now, let's think about it. Could something be colored without being red? Yeah, by being blue. But could something be red that isn't color? No. So from the fact that something could be colored that wasn't red, it doesn't follow that something could be red that isn't colored, does it? Now, let's think about the same thing with mammal and dog. Could something be a mammal but not be a dog? But it doesn't follow from that that something that's a dog isn't a mammal, does it? Now could something be a person and not a human? Why, of course, angels are persons, but they're not humans. God is a person, but he's not a human. If God created Vulcan's, if He wanted to, He hasn't but if He wanted to create Vulcan's, He would create persons, but they wouldn't be humans, would they? So there could be persons that aren't humans, but it doesn't follow from that that there could be a human that isn't a person.

And my view is that if something is red, that is enough for it to be colored. And if something is a human being, that is enough for it to be a person, even if there could be persons that aren't humans. So now what am I saying? You know, I'm not sure I got lost in that process. What I'm saying is that the fundamental issue in the abortion controversy is the nature of the fetus and

whether it is a human person. And I am-I am arguing that from the fact that there could be persons that aren't humans, it doesn't follow that, that something could be a human and not a person. Now, what about this issue of a woman's right to choose? Now, think carefully about that assertion, a woman's right to choose. That statement is an incomplete sentence. It's like saying the apple is to the left of. Now, if I were to say the apples to the left of, you would immediately recognize to the left of. Hello, to the left of whatever, uh, to the left of what? Absolutely. And if I were say we're just say the apples to the left of the lamp, you might say, well, that's true. But if I were to say the apples to the left of the orange, you'd say, no, that's not true.

So whether the apples to the left of or not, depends on the what? That we specify. Is that right? Now, a woman's right to choose is like the apple is to the left of. We don't know whether a woman has a right to choose until we specify what is being chosen. Now, if-if-if-if the what is: drive your car through the living room window of your neighbor's house, a woman doesn't have a right to choose that.

[Audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

Um, if it's to wear a certain pair of shoes in the morning, you know, I suppose there's a right to choose that. Except for social ostracization, I don't know. But um I'll leave that up to the ladies.

[Audience laughs]

J.P. Moreland:

But uh, you get the point that there is a right to choose certain things, but there isn't a right to choose other things. And what's-what-on what does it depend as to whether a woman has a right to choose something or not? It depends on the what, doesn't it? Now, this brings us back to the question of what is the fetus? Because the question of whether a woman has a right to choose or not depends on the prior question of what an act of abortion is. And if a fetus is a human person, an active abortion is the intentional taking of an innocent human person's life. If the fetus is a part of the woman's body, then who cares? Who am I to tell a woman she can't have a body part removed? I mean, I'm not going to be in that business. But if the fetus is a human person, that's a horse of a different color. So is there a woman's right to choose? No. Any more than there is an-it makes sense to say the apple is to the left of. There is only a woman's right to choose X, and whether she ought to have a right to choose X or not depends on what X itself is.

Now, in some ways, this morning has been like trying to take a drink out of a fire hydrant. Um, it's-it's kind of come at us a little bit quickly. And I want to close-I want to close our time together by saying something personal. It occurs to me that there may very well be some sisters in this room who've had abortions. This is entirely within the realm of possibility. And I want to say to my dear sisters that if you, if you have had an abortion, you need to forgive yourself for what you've done. God forgives you if you've asked Him for it. And we in the Christian community can do no less. You will do yourself and the church no good if you keep beating yourself up, if you keep saying that you're unclean, and if you continue to deny uh that God loves and forgives you.

My mother told me when I was an older man that she had had an abortion before I was-before she had me with her first pregnancy. And it was a thing that she carried with her through her life and was never able to forgive herself. And so I want to close in prayer and I want to just pray a prayer of forgiveness, if we might close in prayer. Lord Jesus, we thank You for precious human life. And yet we know that there may very well be a sister in this room who's had an abortion. And for that sister, we-we express love and tenderness, and we embrace her and forgive her in the name of Jesus. And we thank You that Your forgiveness extends to every single one of us, because there's not a person in this room that doesn't desperately need it. We thank You for this time in Jesus' name, amen. You're dismissed. Thank you.

[Audience applauds]