



Media Spotlight

A BIBLICAL ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS & SECULAR MEDIA

SPECIAL REPORT

ABORTION SOME COGENT ARGUMENTS

by Albert James Dager

What's wrong with abortion? After all, a consensus of American opinion shows that a significant percentage of people believe that a woman should have the right to choose whether or not to carry her baby to term. Especially in extreme cases where pregnancy is the result of rape or incest, or if the child is determined to be at risk of being born with severe disabilities. And who's to say when a child in the womb is really a live human being?

The fact is that, of the millions of abortions performed each year in the United States alone, only a small fraction approaching one percent are the result of the above concerns. The vast majority of abortions are performed for the sake of convenience.¹ But this fact aside, there is an argument against abortion and for the recognition of the fetus as human life that has been supported by virtually every culture since man's appearance on earth. And from the start, American jurisprudence has recognized that the unborn child is a living human being.

Virtually every state in the union has statutes that treat the unborn child as a human being worthy of the right to life. For example, if a person murders a pregnant woman and her child dies in the process, that person can be charged with double homicide. If a person accidentally kills an unborn child, that person can be charged with manslaughter, even if the mother is unharmed. Even if, in the line of duty, a medical professional through negligence, causes the death of an unborn child, that medical professional can be sued by the parents for malpractice based on the loss of their son or daughter.

Recent news reports have confirmed that United States jurisprudence recognizes the unborn child as a human being worthy of protection under the law. In one instance, a woman was charged with mur-

der for self-aborting her 14-week-old fetus. And in San Francisco a woman was charged with murder on grounds she recklessly ingested illegal drugs that led to her unborn child's death. She was acquitted on the judge's interpretation of a 1970 California law against fetal murder on the basis that the judge felt there was insufficient evidence that the Legislature intended the law to be used in such a circumstance.

Regardless of the outcome from that particular case, the fact remains that these laws are still on the books and in force.

These are just two of many such cases. History shows that American jurisprudence has always recognized that human life exists in the womb. And there are no time limits from conception to birth to determine whether or not a child is protected by laws against destruction of a fetus. Only recently have some states begun to apply these laws only to those cases where the child has passed into the second trimester. This itself infers that, until recently—and only after strong lobbying by pro-abortion forces, all U.S. law has been predicated upon the belief that life begins at conception.

Now a child can be aborted at any time up to birth. All that is needed is a doctor's certification that the abortion is for the mother's physical or mental health.²

In view of these facts, is it not hypocritical of the medical profession, the legal profession, the feminist lobbies and government in general to grant exemption from these laws for doctors who perform abortions? And what of those mothers who consent to the destruction of their babies? Why does the law exempt them from prosecution for fetal murder when a woman who attempts self-abortion, or even through negligence kills her unborn child, faces prosecution for murder?

Thanks to more liberal legislation, medical doctors and the women whose children they abort are exempt from these laws. Yet if a woman self-aborts or otherwise causes the death of her unborn child she is liable for prosecution. The medical profession, which recognizes the multi-billion dollar benefit to abortion practitioners, has successfully lobbied government officials to enact laws that, in view of all prior existing laws, legalize murder if done at the hands of a medical doctor.

How can almost every law of the land dealing with unborn children call the killing of an unborn child murder or manslaughter if that child isn't recognized as a living human being—if, as the feminists and abortionists insist, it is only tissue matter that has no life on the simple reasoning that it is not viable outside the womb? Well, many people are not viable without artificial support systems. Does that nullify *their* humanity?

If the government wishes to grant exemption for abortionists and say that the unborn child is not a human being, then it must strike down all the hundreds of other statutes that declare that it is a human being. And once that happens, then it remains only for the social engineers to determine any other factors that would disqualify a person as a human being.

Suppose it is determined that those with diminished mental faculties are no longer considered human—even those who suffer from brain injuries. Will the state revise its laws to allow for their destruction at the hands of the medical profession?

This isn't as far-fetched as some may think. Writers of futurist fiction have envisioned such a world for many years. And in many countries genocide has been the norm against certain ethnic groups for the simple reason that they were not considered human.

At one time, blacks were not recognized as human beings. This was the rationale behind the slave trade that brought black Africans to the United States. They were transported in slave ships that held them confined in the same manner that livestock is confined when shipped to the slaughter houses. In Nazi Germany, only the Aryan race was considered human, and we know the consequences of that thinking. The treatment of Jews and other non-Aryans was similar to that of animals. And the Nazi genetic experiments remain a source for horror stories even today.

Once government begins to define life and humanity there is no end to the possibilities for subjective and selective determination as to who will be allowed to live.

Therefore, the argument that the pro-abortionists raise—that government has no business telling a woman what she can do with her body—is fallacious. By allowing abortion at all, the government has overstepped its bounds in determining when human life becomes worthy of defense against assault and death.

Governments have, since time immemorial, told people what they can and can't do with their bodies. And, except for abortion, all those laws against suicide and self-mutilation are meant to preserve life, not destroy it. The fact is that anyone who contributes to the death of a fetus can be tried for murder, manslaughter, wrongful death, and any number of crimes and misdemeanors that apply only to human life.

And the media have perpetuated the myth that abortion is a moral issue subject to one's personal discretion—the government has no business interfering. But by its enacting laws to allow for abortion, it is interfering. It is interfering with the very process of life. It is intruding into a moral area in a manner just the opposite of what it has done for centuries.

Moral issues cannot arbitrarily be separated from government legislation, especially if they affect others. Murder is a moral as well as a legal issue. So are prostitution, drug abuse, pornography, theft, and even the running of a traffic light. Every law, no matter how mundane it appears, raises a moral issue simply on the basis of its being a law. Because every law is based on the presupposition that there is a standard of right and wrong.

The root question is whether or not the law itself is predicated upon a subjective or an objective standard. Laws based upon objective standards—obvious evidence of what is right and wrong according to nature, science and God's Word—are righteous laws. Laws based upon subjective standards—human reasoning, special interest objectives or the prevailing political climate—are unrighteous laws.

When subjective laws do not conflict with nature or God's Word they must be obeyed. When subjective laws do conflict with nature or God's Word they must be disobeyed. This assumes, of course, that there are objective standards upon which all law must be based.

IS THERE AN OBJECTIVE STANDARD?

Actually, there are three objective standards: nature, true science and God's Word. Nature is objective in that, unless God intervenes (through what we call miracles), there are definite consequences for certain actions. The laws of nature cannot be violated. Attempts to violate those laws result in natural calamities.

For example, the law of gravity dictates that what goes up must come down (or at least be held in orbit). Man has devised ways to overcome the law of gravity by using other natural laws to offset its effect. But he has not been able to *nullify* the law or to disobey it capriciously. To attempt to fly by jumping off a cliff will bring dire results.

There are also objective natural laws that pertain to genetics and to human life. To attempt to abrogate those laws will also bring dire results: disease, pain, suffering.

Man has learned about the natural laws through observation and testing. This is called scientific inquiry. True science is based on objective facts, not theory. Theory is the foundation of pseudoscience. What man doesn't know for certain he has been

Once government begins to define life and humanity there is no end to the possibilities for subjective and selective determination as to who will be allowed to live.

able in some cases to deduce based on certain evidence. And it is on the basis of that evidence that he makes his judgments. The problem is that man's sin nature gets in the way and he tends to want to fly in the face of reason and the evidence that natural law and true science provide. In the same manner, man tends to fly in the face of the reason and evidence presented in the other objective standard, the Bible.

How do we know that the Bible is an objective standard upon which men's morals must be based? By the evidence it presents for the existence of God as the law-giver. That evidence is three-fold:

The Evidence of History

The Bible is the oldest written historical record that man has. And it has proven itself historically accurate. No historical revelations disprove the Bible's account of history. New historical findings continue to verify the accuracy of the Bible's historical basis.

The Evidence of Archaeology

The Bible has proven to be archaeologically accurate. No archaeological evidence has ever been unearthed that disproves the Bible's account of civilizations and cultures that have existed since the beginning of man's life on earth.

The Evidence of Prophecy

The Bible has proven itself prophetically accurate. Every single prophecy relating to future events has come to pass with one exception: those pertaining to the return of Jesus Christ to establish His reign on earth, and the subsequent establishing of the new heavens and the new earth.

The odds of all three of these accurate revelations taking place from the figment of various men's imaginations (men who lived at different times over a period of some two thousand years) is infinite—especially the prophetic revelations. They are, in fact, similar to the odds of the universe coming into existence by pure chance—of matter evolving from nothing. The difference is that the Bible has met the odds, while the theory of evolution is just that—a theory that has never been proven.

So where does the truly wise person place his faith? In the subjective, theorizing of human wisdom, or in the objective, proven wisdom of God's Word, the Bible?

Unless we recognize the objective nature of God's Word and the natural laws He has established, humanity will reap the whirlwind for its actions.

WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

God's Word says that to kill an innocent life is sin:

Thou shalt not kill (Hebrew. *ratsach*, murder). (Deuteronomy 5:17)

Thou shalt do no murder. (Matthew 19:18)

Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him. (I John 3:15)

No one will deny that murder is wrong. Even nature confirms God's Word within the human heart. For even nations where God's Word has not been preached have laws against murder. But the question for the skeptic is, "is abortion murder?" To answer that, we have to see what God's Word says about life in the womb.

Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations. (Jeremiah 1:5)

For thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb.

I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well. (Psalms 139:13-14)

And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb...

For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. (Luke 1:41-44)

Scripture confirms that God recognizes the reality of human life in the womb by virtue of His Law given to Moses:

If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follows; he shall be surely punished, according as the woman's husband will lay upon him: and he shall pay as the judges determine.

And if any mischief follows, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe. (Exodus 21:22-25)

So Scripture is clear that life resides in the unborn child. The blessings of a child are reiterated time and again, suggesting that it is a precious life. And if murder is evil, then to kill a child, whether inside or outside the womb is evil.

The only question remaining is, when does the object in the womb actually begin to be human? Let's see what science says.

WHAT DOES SCIENCE SAY?

The terms "embryo" and "fetus" are merely scientific terms to describe the developmental stages of human life. They were never meant to suggest that they are anything other than human life.

From the moment of conception a child is a human being. Consciousness has nothing to do with the person's nature. A person can be totally unconscious and still be a human being. When a person falls into a dreamless sleep does he cease to be a human life? And the physical makeup of the person—whether in the form of one cell or billions of cells—is inconsequential simply because the element of life is in the spirit, not in the body. The body merely offers a place of residence for the spirit. And the human being, even while in the embryonic stage, is nevertheless a human being simply on the basis of the life of the spirit within. Who can play God and determine that at a certain point in development a child in the womb is not a human being?

Within a matter of days, the embryo has begun to exhibit growth. *And where growth is, there is life.* The reality of miscarriages proves that life goes beyond the physical. It is possible for the child to die within the womb at any stage of its life, from conception to birth; then the mother's body naturally rejects the physical element and expells it. The mother's ability to carry the developing child in the womb proves that the child is alive from conception.

The mere fact of developing life, even from the moment of conception, is scientific evidence that human life exists from that point on—that the spirit necessary to sustain that life is present. And to say that a fetus can "die" implies that there had to be life in the first place. To say otherwise is to ignore reality.

WHAT DOES NATURE SAY?

In the case of abortion, nature tells a woman that the child she carries in her womb is a human life worth protecting. It is the selfless love of a mother that has kept the human race functioning. It is only when others convince a woman that her personal

The physical makeup of a person is inconsequential because the element of life is in the spirit, not in the body. The body only offers a place of residence for the spirit.

desires should supercede the life of her child that she can will decide to kill it. It is not a natural, inherent tendency for a woman to kill her unborn child. And the propaganda mill of the pro-abortionists has done its job with millions of unsuspecting women who now believe that it is lawful to kill their child simply because the government says that it's lawful.

What is truly sad to contemplate is the number of women who abrogate their role of life givers and life nurturers, and kill what even nature says is something a mother should die to protect.

How sad that a large percentage of American womanhood has bought into the killing of innocent, unprotected children. Many women who would not themselves have an abortion, have believed the lie that the fetus is not really a human life, and that a woman should have the right to choose whether or not to allow it to be born.

Even some professing Christians—admitting that abortion is murder—say that, while they would never have an abortion themselves, they believe that others should have the choice to do so.

We've often heard the argument that, if women ran the world, there would be no wars—the world would be a place of peace and safety. The media play up this theme by touting the benefits of more women running for governmental office. But don't you believe it. All that women have needed to demonstrate that the evil in the female breast is equal to the evil in the male breast is the opportunity to give vent to that evil. The demand of millions of women for the right to kill the innocent life within them is testimony to that fact. And try to tell that unborn child about to be torn to pieces that his world is one of peace and safety.

Yet while God's Word and natural law affirm right and wrong, each person will be allowed to make his own choices. Until Jesus returns, mankind will be given every opportunity to vent his evil so there will be no arguments that His judgment is not just.

Only faith in Jesus Christ and repentance from sin will cause men and women to give up the wholesale destruction of life within the womb. The problem is, most of these people have already heard the Gospel and have rejected it. They stand entrenched in the filth of their bloodthirst for the simple reason that they love their sins too much to turn from them. They are, as the Apostle Paul said, brute beasts, whose god is their belly. In truth, they are worse than brute beasts. For even brute beasts protect their young.

WHAT'S REALLY BEHIND ABORTION?

One factor behind the abortion-rights movement is the world planners' implementation of means to control population growth. Populations must be reduced if the New World Order is to realize its objective of population control.

Another factor behind abortion rights is the hope to improve the genetics of the human race. Among other proponents of race purity, Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood, stated that her goal was to reduce the proliferation of non-white races and the poor. Her reason for founding Planned Parenthood was to provide information on contraception to these elements of society. Interestingly, Sanger was opposed to abortion, seeing it as an evil consequence of withholding from women information on contraception:

There is no doubt that women are apt to look upon abortion as of little consequence and to treat it accordingly. An abortion is as important a matter as a confinement and requires as much attention as the birth of a child at its full term.

"The immediate dangers of abortion," says Dr. J. Clifton Edgar, in his book, "The Practice of Obstetrics," "are hemorrhage, retention of an adherent placenta, sepsis, tetanus, perforation of the uterus. They also cause sterility, anemia, malignant diseases, displacements, neurosis, and endometritis."

In plain, everyday language, in an abortion there is always a very serious risk to the health and often to the life of the patient.

It is only the women of wealth who can afford the best medical skill, care and treatment both at the time of the operation and afterwards. In this way they escape the usual serious consequences.

The women whose incomes are limited and who must continue at work before they have recovered from the effects of an abortion are the great army of sufferers. It is among such that the deaths due to abortion usually ensue. It is these, too, who are most often forced to resort to such operations.

If death does not result, the woman who has undergone an abortion is not altogether safe from harm. The womb may not return to its natural size, but remain large and heavy, tending to fall away from its natural position. Abortion often leaves the uterus in a condition to conceive easily again and unless prevention is strictly followed another pregnancy will surely occur. Frequent abortions tend to cause barrenness and serious, painful pelvic ailments. These and other conditions arising from such operations are very likely to ruin a woman's general health.

While there are cases where even the law recognizes an abortion as justifiable if recommended by a physician, I assert that the hundreds of thousands of abortions performed in America each year are a disgrace to civilization.³

Today's operators of Planned Parenthood abortion clinics have perverted Sanger's intentions of providing only information on contraception. By counseling for and providing the means to abortion, they are acting contrary to the designs of their organization's founder. The reason for this brings us to yet another factor behind the cry for abortion rights. That factor is the money made by doctors and owners of abortion clinics. This equates in the billions of dollars annually. And that money and power is not lost on those in the media.

There are philosophical as well as monetary reasons why the media do not publicize the medical complications and psychological distress that result from abortion even under the most carefully monitored conditions. All we hear is that, unless abortion on demand is honored by the law, millions of innocent women and girls will suffer at the hands of amateur abortionists in back alleys and sleazy hotel rooms. But they neglect to tell of the many who suffer physically and emotionally at the hands of medical professionals bent on extracting as much money as possible from women who don't want to face the responsibility of motherhood because it's inconvenient. And those who ask for at least informed decision-making by insisting on full disclosure of what is involved in pregnancy, birth and abortion, are derided.

KILLING THE FUTURE

Because of the millions of babies killed annually in abortions there will not be enough young people to support the older generation that increases annually.

Advances in health care, medicine, nutrition and leisure technology have helped increase average life expectancy to 78 years. With the low birth rate between 1965 and 1978, there are now more senior citizens in America than there are teens.

What does this portend for the United States? A Social Security System already in shambles will be called upon to support an increasing number of senior citizens at the expense of a diminishing number of workers. In 1950 there was one Social Security recipient for every 16 workers. By 1970 the ratio had shrunk to one recipient for every three workers. By 2030 there will be one recipient for every two workers, and by 2050 the ratio will be one-to-one.⁴

This means that taxes will have to be raised to astronomical proportions to carry the weight. In turn, this will mean less productivity, which means a shrinking tax base, which means even higher taxes for each individual. The cycle will continue until everyone is a slave to the state and poverty is the norm.

Hospitals will become increasingly burdened with feeble, but long-lived citizens, requiring government subsidies for hospital care, and further increasing the tax burden on the few young. This will result in laws to relieve the burden of caring for the elderly. Euthanasia, already being touted in the media, is just around the corner.

Civilization has traditionally expected the younger generation to care for the older. That is the biblical model. Because society has adopted abortion as a means to self-gratification, the blessings reserved for those who obey God's Word are forfeited. Unless things change, all we have to look forward to as a society are the curses that come from willful disobedience.

Because he has rejected God's Word, man has been given over to a reprobate mind. And we are seeing the results of that reprobate mind with the increase in homosexuality, lesbianism, abortion, drugs, crime, rebelliousness in youth, and every evil imagined by the heart of man. Abortion and euthanasia are both evidence of the reprobate mind that seeks self-gratification over responsibility to others.

How can the elderly expect to rely for care on a younger generation raised on the ridicule of parental authority in the media and in the classroom? As the support base for the elderly diminishes even further, the young will find it expedient to add to abortion the sin of genocide against the elderly and the feeble of all ages who cannot produce enough for themselves. They will be looked upon as non-human—as "eaters" who impose upon the good life of those brought up on believing in self-esteem and self-love. Perhaps we're not far from sustaining the human race on "Soylent Green."

In the long run, abortion is not only murder of innocent children. It is murder of civilization. Those women who kill their babies today will pay the price tomorrow. For they are really killing their own means of future support.

Think about it, you who believe in abortion. One day *you* may be on the meat rack. ■

NOTES

1. Status Report, Family Planning Perspectives, July/August 1988, reported in *Ms.* magazine, April 1989, p. 93.
2. *U.S. News & World Report*, March 4, 1974, p. 44.
3. Margaret Sanger, *Woman and the New Race* (New York: Brentano's Publishers, 1920), pp. 124-126.
4. O. Casey Corr, "Social Insecurity," *Seattle Times*, September 28, 1992, p. A1.



Media Spotlight

A BIBLICAL ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS & SECULAR MEDIA

Copyright © Sept. 1992 Media Spotlight
P.O. Box 290 • Redmond, Wa 98073-0290
Additional copies available on request.