

LIFE HAS NO COMPROMISE

by Jonathan Gaspard, President of NE Tarrant County Young Republicans, Policy Director Texas YR Federation, Precinct Chairman, Small Business Owner and Entrepreneur in North Texas

We are told that to stand on any principle not in-line with the progressive agenda is to be an extremist, that unless you are willing to give ground on every issue you are “unreasonable” and possibly even “dangerous.” The struggle between Evil and Good has been, and will continue to be, a constant in human history. The devaluation of human Life has always been central to this struggle. This Evil has born many definitions and characteristics: child sacrifice in early cultures, racial supremacy, slavery, anti-Semitism and abortion. All of these things carry with them the fingerprints of one common goal- the devaluation of one human Life over another; whether for convenience or some other advantage be it societal, political or merely the offspring of fear and ignorance.

The fundamental question is: where is the value of human Life derived from?

If it is from God, as I believe it to be, what authority do we assume to possess to place a varying value on Life?

If you do not believe in God, the question still remains, where is the value of Life derived? Upon what authority, or parameters, does one human presume to have the right to establish the value of another? Does an individual, or group of individuals, even possess such an authority?

I think that even most progressives would agree that no such authority exists, and I emphasize the word “most.”

If we can agree that there is no

mandate, right, or authority one human may have over another to dictate value and the right to exist, then that is where we must start.

This brings us to our next question: what is Life?

I like to find areas of agreement with those on the opposite side of issues from myself. Agreeing on common principles can provide an opportunity to not only win an argument but potentially win a heart and mind, which is by far the greater goal. Where can an avid pro-Life supporter and an abortion advocate find common ground?

Let’s start by agreeing on Death. This is a subject I think is fairly universally agreed upon by all sides as to its definition, reality, and existence.

The medical definition of Death:

- The “absence of spontaneous respiratory and cardiac functions.” *These functions begin on week 5 of fetal development.*
- And “irreversible cessation of all functions of the entire brain, including the brain stem . . .” *Brain function begins on week 8 of fetal development.*

I think all sides can agree that without the presence of these necessary functions the end result is what we all agree upon as “Death.”

Since we are in universal agreement on what Death is, and we must certainly agree on the fact that the opposite of Death is Life, we must then agree, if intellectually honest, that the presence of these functions would be defined as Life, or “Alive.” If we can agree that brainwave, cardiac and re-



spiratory functions are indicative of Life, then I think that even the most avid, honest abortion supporter must concede that to possess these attributes would be defined as “Alive,” or one possessing this thing we call Life. If one is therefore deprived of these attributes, it would be removing the definition of Life from that individual. **It would redefine** them as one who had previously possessed those attributes and defining them as one who is dead, or has “died.”

“What about the government telling a woman what she can and can’t do with her body?” This false argument should be rejected. Pro-Life legislation is not about telling a woman what she can or cannot do with her body, it is about telling one living person what they can or cannot do to another living person.

So, where is the compromise with Life? In order for there to be compromise there must be mutually agreeable middle ground. Is there a middle area between Life and Death?

There is not.

It is not extremism to defend Life, especially defending the vulnerable and innocent Life is a duty.

It is not unreasonable to hold the line and refuse to pretend that there is room for compromise when there is no middle area; that is common sense.

It is not dangerous to remain immovable in the resolve that all Life has value and should be protected; it is dangerous to advocate taking the lives of children while still in the womb.

Life has no compromise.