

Editor, Commonwealth:

I'm glad you ran the letter Sunday from opponents of the Personhood Amendment ("Amendment 26 could endanger lives"), because it really lays bare a very stark fact: that legal and human rights for everybody is always a burden against the desires and practices of some.

That is why, historically, full legal and human rights have been opposed — because there is always somebody whose options will be limited if we extend human rights to all persons.

The Personhood Amendment is very simple: It proposes to extend legal and human rights to all human beings from the moment of creation. Right now, there is a class of human beings — unborn children — who are denied full human and legal rights. This amendment will restore those rights.

The fact that people object to treating all human beings with equal legal rights (especially their right to not be murdered in their sleep) ought to astound us. There ought to be a shame attached to those who object to full legal protection.

When I read those names at the end of that letter, I thought about the people who objected to "full personhood" for African-Americans. Can't you hear their list of "reasons" why slavery ought to be maintained? "If we grant full personhood to slaves, who's going to do my laundry? My children will go hungry because nobody will be there to cook the meals. Who will take care of the former slaves?"

Some of the reasons given to oppose personhood (the ectopic pregnancy and miscarriage examples) are just plain falsehoods. But the rest all boil down to this: that this amendment will completely stop us from killing unborn babies, but we want to keep killing babies, because we have all these good reasons to do so.

The writers of the letter, really, are saying this: We're pro-life, but we need to keep killing babies for these noble reasons, and full legal human rights for unborn babies are going to stop us from doing so.

Two Sundays ago, I preached a sermon entitled "May We Keep Killing Babies to Do Good? The Evils of Innocent Bloodshedding." It can be listened to at <http://tinysa.com/maywekeepkillingbabies>.

I described how the American way of morality is to first decide all the "good things" we want to do, and then craft a morality to fit what we want to do anyway.

But God's Word demands that human life be respected FIRST, and that all our other actions be conformed to that moral law.

It is always wrong to take an innocent life, no matter what “good thing” you hope to accomplish by doing so. It is wrong to kill an innocent human being even in self-defense.

This amendment causes us to search our own souls: Are we personally willing to die before we will take an innocent life?

Am I?

Are you?

A person who has that moral decision clear in his or her mind will have no problem voting “yes” on Proposition 26.

John Pittman Hey

Grace Bible Church
Greenwood

Published as a Letter to the Editor
in the Greenwood Commonwealth on Sunday, November 6, 2011