

## Inconvenient Truths

I've never seen Al Gore's slide presentation, "An Inconvenient Truth," or the documentary film spawned from it. I suspect both are much more propaganda than science. However, **there are some very *inconvenient truths* that many people today refuse to believe, such as:**

- **"Life begins at *conception*, not *birth*."** Think about some simple terms associated with this concept. If "life" does not begin at conception, exactly what is "terminated" in an abortion if not the life of the unborn child? "A pregnancy"? And what constitutes a "pregnancy"? Is it not the union of egg and sperm to produce "life" in a new organism (aka, "a baby")? Or, if "My body, my choice" is correct, why doesn't abortion end "your" *life* by destroying "your" *body*? If an unborn child is not "alive" until birth, why does it: require nutrients from its mother just like a "born" child; have a heartbeat just like a "born" child (the cessation of which universally constitutes "death" for "born" children and adults); and, kick and move and react to pain just like a "born" child? The *inconvenient truth*- at least for advocates and participants in abortion, is that **"Life begins at *conception*, not *birth*."** As the *source* of "truths" which are both *convenient* and *inconvenient*, the Bible reveals this particular truth many times in many ways- not the least of which is found in [Luke 1:41](#). The then yet unborn "*baby*" (John the Baptist; cousin of Jesus the Christ), "*leaped in her womb...*" The word translated as "*baby*" is *brephos*, the same word used in [Luke:2:12,16](#) to describe the very much born "*baby*," Jesus. It is also the same word translated as "*infants*" (again, very much both *born* and *alive*) that were "*expose(d)*" so that they "*would not survive*" in Egypt, cf. [Acts 7:19](#). Was that "murder" or "abortion" since "aborted" babies are sometimes birthed and then allowed to die outside the womb, *i.e. exposed*? The *inconvenient truth*- at least for proponents and participants in abortion, is that "life begins at conception, not birth" just as God has told us all along.
- **"There are only *two genders* in humans."** Again, I ask you to simply think logically for a moment. If evolution and its assertions regarding "perpetuation of the species" and "survival of the fittest" were true, which of the purported 23 to 200+ human genders are capable of and therefore required to carry on the human race? It may be an *inconvenient truth* to some, but "male" and "female" are required to produce human offspring(s). But please, let's carry this logical thinking a step further. If humans have "evolved" to have several other "non-binary" genders, wouldn't we be also forced to conclude that such is a non-beneficial genetic mutation since it is counter-productive to reproduction, and will thus eventually end the human species? (And wouldn't the same be true of *homosexuality* even within the binary system of genders?) The *inconvenient truth* for proponents and participants in *homosexual* and also *non-binary gender* systems is that God created humans as "*male and female*" and said to them, "*Be fruitful and multiply...*" [Gen.1:27-28](#). Everything else is misinformation, misunderstanding, or misapplication of truth, *inconvenient* as it may such be.
- **"God will *destroy the earth*, not *man*."** Throughout my life (and even before it began according to what I read), *something* has been touted as "*going to the destroy the planet*." Whether it was nuclear energy or "the bomb," fossil fuels and man-made global warming, or apparently now consumerism, capitalism, and or racism. It

may be *inconvenient*, but let's think about this a little. If a nuclear bomb could "destroy the planet," then wouldn't "evolution" eventually reassemble the pieces into a new and better one? After all, didn't everything evolve from an explosion, *i.e. the Big Bang*? "No, no, no- a nuclear bomb would just destroy all 'life' on the planet." But didn't "life" evolve from "non-living matter" as a result of an explosion and the "fortunate accident" of evolution? Of course I'm being facetious- precisely because the whole idea that the Universe/Earth and life/man and his intellect was created by a cosmic explosion and evolution of non-living matter is facetious. Who logically looks at a completed house and assumes and asserts that a forest of trees (the origin of which is unknown by the way) exploded, and over lots of time, evolved into a house? And yet the *inconvenient truth* of Heb.3:4 remains, "*For every house is built by someone, but the builder of all things is God.*" What has this to do with the "destruction" of the planet? Again, it may be an *inconvenient truth* to many, but if God "created" the world, He will be the One to "destroy" it- not man or the works of man. Man, in his arrogance, believes himself the pinnacled result of evolution. As such, he believes that it is up to him to "save the planet." Don't get me wrong, I'm for responsible "stewardship," but the planet is destined for destruction by the hand and at the discretion of God, not man, for "... *the day of the Lord will come like a thief, in which the heavens (i.e. the earth's atmosphere, PCS) will pass away with a roar and the elements will be destroyed with intense heat, and the earth and all its works will be destroyed,*" 2Pet.3:10. I don't know whether or not man actually has the ability to "destroy the planet," but I know the One who *created* and *sustains* it not only *can* but *will* do so.

Al Gore was right about one thing: The truth can be very "inconvenient" to those who apparently want so badly to believe otherwise. (Philip C. Strong; Southport Church of Christ; 7202 Madison Ave, Indianapolis, IN 46227; online at [southportcofc.org](http://southportcofc.org))