

THE CHURCH AND THE AMERICAN HOLOCAUST—ABORTION

Hear C. Everett Koop, Surgeon General of the United States:

Abortion: the whole issue has been foisted upon us through deception. Its advocates have convinced much of the American public and the courts that concerns a woman's right of privacy, and that the issue is political and social rather than personal or moral.

The Supreme court has championed these views. The secular public has split down the middle. Pro-life groups flex muscle in major cities. But the evangelical church, which should be seething with outrage and storming the nation in protest, still waits in the wings, trying to make up its mind.

In 1973, after hearing the abortion issue debated twice, the Supreme Court came to a landmark decision. In Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton, the Court, in two 7-2 decisions, overturned virtually all existing abortion laws. The Court has said that a woman's constitutional right to an abortion is not absolute. In fact, the unborn can be killed even while the mother is in natural labor. The only requirements: (1) the baby still lives inside the mother, (2) the mother wants the baby killed, and (3) her doctor is willing to do it.

In 1976 the Court ruled (on behalf of Planned Parenthood), that a state may not require the written permission of a spouse, or, in the case of a minor, the consent of a parent in order for an abortion to be performed.

As the new freedom to abort went into effect, Pro-choice advocates piously insisted that no one, least of all themselves, was for wide-open abortion. Instead of seven who could be counted on to abuse the eighth, were it allowed to see day-light. Next came the defective baby and the argument that abortion is, naturally, the "best thing for it." Last we saw the almost-mythical woman who must have an abortion or die.

Pro-lifers warned that the legal door was now open to an American Holocaust; for their trouble they were jeered as hysterical neurotics and shameless violators of the sacred Separation of Church and State. It's ten years later, and what do we have? We have over twelve millions dead babies, murdered at almost every state of development—from a few weeks to seven, eight, and even nine months. Of these only 3% were cases of rape, incest, or the expectation of a defective child; 97% were for convenience and economy. Planned Parenthood will arrange the abortion, and the girls don't even have to tell their parents.

Abortion is the most common medical procedure performed on adults; doctors take out more fetuses than tonsils. We have abortion-on-demand. One in three pregnancies is terminated by abortion. Abortion is the new chic; it is the sure-fire backup for contraceptive failure. In fact, it has become the only method of birth-control for many. In one study of 500 women who had received abortions only 6% had been regularly using birth control when they conceived. Over 30% of those having abortions have had abortions before; many have had three or four. For sheer numbers, America owes Hitler an apology.

Of course no one admits to slaughtering the innocents. Abortion, we hear, is not killing; it is the "removal of the products of conception"; life is being "prevented"; that being destroyed is "fetal material," not unlike a woman's appendix. In the California Medical Journal (Sep. 1970) an essay admits "the very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life."

Who can deny that abortion is the American Holocaust? Is the Church silent because it cannot admit a reality that must disturb its moral slumber? Or does the Church not understand what an abortion is? If not, learn this: Abortion is a twelve-week fetus with all organ systems functional. This unborn person breathes, swallows, digests, and urinates. He is very sensitive to pain, recoiling from a pin-prick. His psychosomatic self is well underway. He has been caught sucking his thumb. One day a curette, a tiny hoe-life tool, comes at him through his mother's dilated cervix; the instrument gouges his writhing body into bloody chunks and drags him in pieces

from the uterus. The operating nurse stands by to reassemble the parts to be sure the uterus is empty, otherwise the mother will bleed or become infected.

Abortion is a nineteen-week fetus that is a baby with facial expressions; fine hair has begun to grow and the eyebrows and eyelashes are evident. The heart can be plainly heard and its mother is just beginning to “show.” The baby seeks comfortable positions when it is ready to sleep. Suddenly a long needle injects salt into the amniotic fluid in which the child is floating. The baby breathes in and swallows the salt and is gradually poisoned. The outer layer of skin is burned off. It takes an excruciating hour for the baby to die. About a day later the mother goes into labor and delivers the wretched, tortured corpse. Many physicians prefer this method because they don’t have to see the baby. They inject the salt and leave; remains for the nurse to dispose of the body.

Abortion is a twenty-four week baby that could very well survive if the mother delivered prematurely. But she undergoes a hysterotomy. This procedure is exactly like a Caesarean Section until after the cord is cut. In a C-Section, the baby’s phlegm is sucked out and it is taken to the intensive-care nursery. In a hysterotomy the victim is dropped into a pan or a sink and left to die. It struggles to breathe; some cry. If the infant is too vigorous, the physician might have to smother or strangle it.

Then there is the Upjohn Special. This new abortion procedure uses chemicals developed, promoted, and sold by the Upjohn Pharmaceutical Company. In this abortion a hormone-like substance is injected into the muscle of the uterus, causing it to contract intensely, pushing the fetus out. Babies have been decapitated during these abnormal contractions. Many are born alive. Mothers have died from cardiac arrest when the prostaglandin compounds were injected.

This year two bills were introduced in the Florida legislature that would require fetuses from thirteen weeks on to be anesthetized during an abortion. A feminist representative of the Women’s Health Association opposed anesthetics for fetuses on the basis that only 2% of abortions are performed after the first trimester. Even if this were true, 2% of 1.7 millions is 34,000 tortured, agonizing babies a year. The American Civil Liberties Union (who else?) warned that the bill might be unconstitutional.

Exactly what are the benefits derived from this program of legalized murder? Points of fact: Back-alley abortions have not been appreciably reduced. It is hard, of course, to get data on illegal activities, but it is known that in Germany, Great Britain, and Yugoslavia, illegal abortions increased after pro-abortion legislation. Rape pregnancies? Pregnancy resulting from criminal rape (not to be confused with statutory rape) is extremely rare. A ten-year study in Minnesota showed no pregnancies from 3,500 rapes. More children are born retarded or handicapped because of their mother’s previous abortion than are destroyed for potential defectiveness. There is little connection between the unwanted pregnancy and the unwanted child. A 1976 study in New York found that, of 2,000 children, 44% were unplanned or unwanted pregnancies; yet nine of ten of those parents said they would have another child because of their joy in the “unwanted” baby. Very many unwanted pregnancies, after the initial shock, become wanted pregnancies. If the early judgment were the final one, few pro-abortion people (or any other kind) would be around. In 1977 the Supreme Court allowed 210,000 Medicaid abortions on teenagers without their parents’ consent; only 2% of these were medically indicated—for the mental or physical health of the mother.

There is almost no connection between unwanted babies and child abuse. A University of Southern California study revealed that 91% of battered children were planned pregnancies. Child abuses have that problem because they were themselves mistreated as children. Not because they do not want their own children. And it is beyond imagining that a Pro-choicer, who holds for the legality of salt poisoning abortion, could be giving a serious hearing when he puts into the air his regretful concern about child abuse.

Medical complications of abortion for the mother make it unwise for her to choose it over childbirth; abortion is not safer than childbirth. Depending on the method of abortion used, the woman increases (sometimes dramatically) her chances for prematurity in subsequent pregnancies, sterility, Rh factor sensitization, and other difficulties.

Abortion and the Constitution

Abortion was pleaded for as an expression of informed humanitarianism; it has become a juggernaut bathed in the blood of millions of the earth’s most innocent creatures. Will this dreadful development call a halt to the

Humanist death machine? Hardly. This slaughterhouse medicine must go on unhindered, it seems, because to deny the legal right to abortion-on-demand is to destroy freedom of choice under the Constitution.

So here it is—the issue: Life vs. freedom. The Supreme Court has determined that the Constitution places the right of the mother to choose over the right of her baby to live. It's that simple. Whence this lethal interpretation of the foundational document of our republic? In preliminary summary: (1) The U.S. is no longer a republic, it is a five-man (the majority vote in the Supreme Court) oligarchy. (2) Life has been given a novel, arbitrary, nonconstitutional definition by the Court. (3) The doctrine of freedom has been twisted by the unconstitutional constructions placed on the language of the Constitution by the Court.

First, the loss of the Republic. Story is that Benjamin Franklin, on emerging from the Constitutional Convention, was asked, "What have you given us, Mr. Franklin?" His answer: "A republic, if you can keep it." Well we lost it. It happened when Chief Justice of the Supreme Court John Marshall (1803) declared the nonconstitutional principle of Judicial Review. It opposed the rival Jeffersonian theory that reserved constitutional interpretation to the states. Ultimate authority passed from the hands of the state legislators, from the hands of elected U.S. congressmen, into the exclusive domain of the appointed-for-life Supreme Court. This means that, elected body can reject a Court interpretation. (Court justices are appointed by elected presidents and confirmed by Congress, but this is a useless technicality—witness the anti-administration stance of the present Court.)

Abortion became legal because it embraces the secular Humanist concept of human rights and human life. It is this philosophy that dictated Court decisions on abortion (and other matters), not the original, intended meanings behind the language of the Constitution. The present Court regularly and publicly acknowledges its philosophic debt to Chief Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes (1841-1835). Holmes is the godfather of the judicial oligarchy; it is his social view that guides, not that of Jefferson and Adams. Chief Justice Holmes was the consummate social Darwinist. He rejected as naïve the fundamental assumptions of the Constitutional fathers: a created universe that answered to an absolute moral standard—a world in which man has, by nature, rights that cannot be taken away by government.

For Holmes, human law derived neither from God nor from nature. He liked to say, "the Cosmos does not wear a beard." He denied the significance of man. "Man," said Holmes, "is a cosmic ganglion. All my life," he declared, "I have sneered at the natural rights of man." Inalienable rights? Holmes: "Man has no more rights than a rattlesnake!" To evolutionists Holmes, Life was action, passion, struggle. Sovereignty was dominance. He confessed to Harold Laski: "All society rests on the death of men. If you don't kill 'em one way you kill 'em another—or prevent their being born" (emphasis mine). Holmesian law is sociological law—the codification of human experience, not the expression of moral absolutes. Human rights do not exist ultimately. Death must be considered a dynamic of social progress, since that's the way it is and the function of law is to legitimize what is. Individual rights, according to this new, unwritten constitution, must be preserved only insofar as their preservation promotes the evolution of the State. Human rights must be alienated if those rights hinder social progress. This is the de facto law of the land.

Human babies are dying by the millions because man, in our legal system, is no longer what the Constitutional fathers thought of as man. How can we be surprised that the Court does not view the human fetus as a person when we understand that an adult is no longer a person—not really? Man-created-by-God has been replaced by man-the-higher-animal. B.F. Skinner said it: "to man qua man we readily say good riddance."

Roe v Wade is not an interpretation of the Constitution; it is the application of Holmesian secular Humanism. And the Humanist agenda will be followed, no matter what. The meaning of the Constitution (based on the concept of moral absolutes and inalienable rights) must surrender to the agenda. So we understand what's going on: The Court has arrogantly and illegally misinterpreted the word "establish" in the religious thought from public institutions (while the Congress has been busy converting private institutions into public ones). The august judges know—a high school sophomore knows—that the Constitution means that no particular church could be installed as the state church. No competent historian denies that the creators of the Republic intended for religious concepts to be in the very warp and woof of the brave new experiment in freedom. The First Amendment was designed to protect religion from the State, not to exclude religion from the State. Again, the Court knows this very well. But the Humanist Court brazenly uses its new Establishment clause to systematically trample the legitimate First Amendment right to the free expression of religion and speech. Have

you not noticed, for example, that the Humanist religion has been established in the public schools while Christianity has become illegal in the classroom?

The Court denies the unborn's right to life; it does so by playing the semantic trick of declaring the helpless victim a nonperson. Is the Court interpreting the Constitution? Don't be silly. Exactly where in the Constitution does it imply that the fetus is ineligible for the protection of the State before the second trimester? Does anything in the Constitution suggest that a woman and her physician can decide one day before the natural birth of a child that the baby might be "distressful" (Roe v Wade) to the mother so she can have a C-Section and dump the kid in the toilet? It is the law, but it's not Constitutional law. It is purely arbitrary sociological law; it is the Humanist agenda.

Ought it not give the Church pause to remember that the ethic that makes a baby a nonperson because it might be socially regressive if allowed to live, can make a Christian into a criminal when the Court decides that Christianity hinders the proper evolution of the State? Witness the recent decision in favor of the IRS over Bob Jones University. We are embarrassed that the Bible is used to support a tired, old racism, but this should not keep us from being alarmed that the Court allowed the IRS to deny privilege to the BJU on the basis that its otherwise legitimately held religious views violate "public policy." There it is. BJU didn't offend the Constitution, it violated social evolution. A legal system that can kill a baby can put a Christian in prison—or worse. If you think that statement is a piece of hysterical nonsense, I invite you to take a peek behind the Iron Curtain.

The Court's determination to establish a world view by raw judicial power has plunged it into a morass of legal confusion and contradiction. It is a replay of the 1857 Dred Scott Decision, which excluded black Americans from legal personhood. Mr. Justice Blackman spoke for the Court:

We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins. When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy, and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary, at this point in the development of man's knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer.

Since the Court doubts that the fetus is human life, the unborn cannot be protected by the Constitution. Every day in American courtrooms men unquestionably guilty walk free because of legal doubt—the guilty get the benefit of the doubt. In America's abortion mills unquestionably innocent babies are executed because the Court has doubts about when life begins—the Humanist agenda gets the benefit of the doubt, i.e., "Since we can't be sure it's human life, kill it!"

In most states the unborn has the right to inheritance, to damages received while yet in the womb, to have a blood transfusion over its mother's objections, to have a guardian appointed, and to other legal protection. (But only as long as its mother does not exercise her right to do it in.)

Pro-choicers scream at the top of their lungs about the mother's right to privacy over her body. In no other area would they stand for a legal ethic in which one person's right to privacy overcomes another's right to life. They push for spouse abuse laws, which allow the policeman into the bedroom to protect life. The lawman who hears a murder underway behind a locked door has the legal obligation to break in, the killer's normal right to privacy notwithstanding.

The Court says the word person has application only postnatally. But every year hundreds of the aborted have the audacity to emerge alive. Is this postnatal life preserved? Almost never. Postnatal Constitutional guarantees are generally ignored. From the Philadelphia Inquirer (on a hysterotomy):

As the infant is lifted from the womb, said one obstetrician, "he is only sleeping, like his mother. She is under anesthesia, so is he. You want to know how they kill him? They put a towel over his face so he can't breathe. And by the time they get him to the lab, he is dead."

More than once a day in America a living, viable baby, completely separated from its mother, is actively murdered by doctors and nurses. Is the American Civil Liberties Union up in arms over this clear violation of the rights of the infant? The silence of the ACLU thunders over the land. Herod the Great is the patron saint of the ACLU.

Abortion and Society

The sociological implications of abortion are staggering. Theology aside, the sanctity of life serves as a secular concept (one which should be perfectly acceptable to an atheist), the denial of which leads to cultural suicide. When killing becomes a useful social tool, men are reduced to the level of expendable things. In eighteenth-century France the Comte de Charolais once shot a tiler who was working on his roof, for no other reason than for the pleasure of seeing him fall. King Louis XV summoned the man to court and promptly pardoned him. The royal court was astonished at the verdict. When the king overheard their criticism, he said, "Understand me well. I have pardoned the Comte. I will likewise pardon anyone who shoots Comte."

Not only does abortion create a careless attitude toward sex, especially among men, it destroys that which makes life safe for anyone. Hear the anguished word of the condemned Nazi judge after the Nuremberg trials: "I never knew it would come to this." The American judge answered, "It came to this the first time you condemned innocent life."

So we do away with the unwanted child. What comes next? The unwanted wife? Aging parents? Will they go the way of Hitler's unwanted Jews? "Ridiculous!" shouts the Pro-choicer, "abortion has become socially acceptable, but it will stop there." Well, it won't stop—simply because it cannot stop. The law of cause-and-effect applies in the world of ideas just as it does in the physical world. Abortion, infanticide, euthanasia, stand before us like dominoes, they are falling. Remember Baby Doe in Bloomington, Indiana. Not an abortion—a birth. The Down's syndrome child was sentenced to court-ordered death by exposure for the capital crime of unpremeditated inconvenience. Death with Dignity legislation has been introduced in many states. A DD sponsor in Florida—Dr. James D. Watson—suggested withholding rights from newborn babies until they are three days old. He reasons that hitherto undetected defects could be identified and the parents offered the choice over life and death. Given the abortion ethic, who can deny the good doctor's logic? It provides the benefits of abortion without the medical risk-taking. Indiana courts, of course, have already sanctioned this procedure. A seventy-nine-year-old man in Fort Lauderdale shot his wife; the woman was suffering from Alzheimer's disease. It was mercy. The grand jury refused to indict. Choosing to be merciful to the poor man. But he should have been indicted and tried. Grace could have been extended by the judge at the sentencing. We are on what C. Everett Koop calls "The Slide to Auschwitz."

Bernard N. Nathanson, a physician and formerly a pro-abortionist, points out that even the Pro-choice people recoil at some choices, although there is no logic in their reluctance. Nathanson asks about the hypothetical woman who has her fifth-month fetus aborted purely out of curiosity as to what it looks like; she then has it bronzed. Or suppose a wealthy woman, a Wagner addict, got an abortion in her fourth-month because she realized she would come due during the Bayreuth Festival. Nathanson points out, as a matter of fact, a woman came to him for an abortion because of a trip to Europe.

Sex-selection abortions are performed every day; they are not illegal. Ancient pagans killed their girl babies; why can't modern pagans? The Christian despises it. The Pro-choicer might not like it either, but he has no grounds for rejecting sex-selection abortion, or the bronzing of a fetus for that matter, other than an appeal to taste. Once life is trivialized, it's trivialized. There's no going back. Once left for us to do but make sure that we do not become social problems ourselves.

After World War II students from all over Europe crowded in to hear lectures of Helmut Thielicke. They wanted to know how the Holocaust could have happened. He told them:

Once a man ceases to recognize the infinite value of the human soul... then all he can recognize is that man is something to be used. But then he will also have to go further and recognize that some men can no longer be utilized and he arrives at the concept that there are some lives that have no value at all. Nobody can be preserved from this ultimate conclusion by a peaceable character or because he can't stand to see blood.

Abortion and Theology

The Bible assumes the personhood of the fetus. Man is in the image of God, who is Spirit; man is spirit as well as body. He is not an animal. Man has potential for relationship with his Creator. There is no sliding scale, i.e., both the unborn and the sixty-year-old have potential for capacity for fellowship with God. Theological debates about "ensoulment" or "quickenings" are not to the point. Human life is a continuum, so a new life

begins at conception. We are not surprised to read in the Bible that to kill a man is neither the slaughter of livestock nor the hunting of game; it is murder (Ex. 20:13). God gives the impersonal State permission to find a man guilty and put him to death. In principle, capital punishment is execution by God (Ro. 13:4). A policeman, acting for the State, may take guilty life to protect innocent life. God permits no one, however, to act personally and take innocent life.

God is directly aware of the unborn as persons. Read Psalm 139:

For Thou didst form my inward parts;

Thou didst weave me in my mother's womb.

I will give thanks to Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.

The Bible attributes personhood and identity to the unborn: Jer. 1:5; Gal. 1:15; Luke 1:15, 36, 41-44. Note that Elizabeth speaks of Jesus as "my Lord," although he has just been conceived in the womb of Mary. In the New Testament the word brephos = baby refers to the born and the unborn.

Exodus 21:22-25, in mistranslation, has been used to justify abortion. Most versions have the text saying that if brawling men accidentally strike a pregnant woman causing a miscarriage, but no further harm, they must pay a fine. This has it that damage to the fetus is categorically different from hurt to the woman. But the word further is added. The text actually reads: "If her child (lit. "fruit") comes out, yet there is no injury..." If there is harm, then the "life for life" rule applies. Both mother and premature child are protected by the Law.

Abortion and the Early Church

Abortion is an ancient problem. Many early pagan societies prohibited it. For example, Provision 53 of the Assyrian Code ordered that a woman who aborted herself be impaled on stakes without the dignity of burial. The Hippocratic Oath included the promise not to perform an abortion. The prevailing Greek view, however, favored abortion and exposure in the belief that it would insure the best possible offspring. Under the Roman patria potestas, the father could, and often did, command abortion. In Roman law the fetus was a part of the maternal viscera, not a human being. Roman fathers often practiced infanticide and exposure.

Abortion was common in the ancient world, and the reasons for it were the same reasons given today, e.g., to conceal illicit sexual activity, control family size, keep prostitutes in business, make sex-selections, keep the mother looking young, etc. Moderns are surprised at the variety of methods used for abortion in antiquity. Various pessaries (substances introduced directly into the womb) and oral drugs were used (cf. Gal. 5:20 pharmakeia), such as wine mixed with wallflower seed, myrrh, or cabbage blossoms. Some would bind the body and pound to womb to expel the fetus. Ancient abortionists used a version of the D&C: an instrument that held the uterus open while another was used to dissect the fetus or pull it out whole.

There is no mention of nontherapeutic abortion in Jewish literature through A.D. 500. The Talmud makes only one definite reference to unnecessary abortion, and that is directed to nonJews.

The apostolic Church stood in violent opposition to the widespread practice of abortion in the first-century Graeco-Roman world. After discussing child sacrifice and exposure, Tertullian summarized the Christian view:

In our case, murder being once for all forbidden, we may not destroy even the fetus in the womb, while as yet the human being derives blood from other parts of the body for its sustenance. To hinder a birth is merely a speedier man-killing; nor does it matter whether you take away a life that is born or destroy one that is coming to birth. That is a man which is going to be one; you have the fruit already in the seed.

The Christian case against abortion was based on the personhood of the fetus and the binding law of love, especially toward the helpless. Early Christians discussed abortion in the context of murder and violence. In his recent book Abortion and the Early Church, Michael Gorman summarizes:

The earliest Christian ethic, from Jesus to Constantine, can be described as a consistent pro-life ethic. It was in favor of human life regardless of age, nationality or social standing. It pleaded for the poor, the weak, women, children, and the unborn. This pro-life ethic discarded hate in favor of love, war in favor of peace, oppression in favor of justice, bloodshed in favor of life. The Christian's response to

abortion was one important aspect of this consistent pro-life ethic. Rooted in Jewish love for life and hatred of bloodshed, it developed a specific Christian character as part of early Christian holistic discipleship. To follow Jesus was to forsake bloodshed.

Abortion and the Church Today

Who is making the Christian case today? Post-Hitler Americans asked the self-righteous questions: Where were all the good people in Germany in the 30's? How could civilized men allow their government to declare a class of Germans "Untermenchen" (submen) and send them to the ovens? And where was the Church? I submit that the Church in America—too much of it—is exactly where the German church was when the Nazi death machine began its roll.

I give minimum attention to the liberal churches—those with their vaulting humanitarianism. In this fight we find them in their usual place, i.e., in the camp of the enemy. The fifteen or so denominations that have gone on record for a just war against the unborn include the United Methodist Church, the Lutheran Church, in American, the United Presbyterian Church, the United Church of Christ, and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

If the Church does not become the visible champion for the cause of life, she will lose her soul. To stand on the sidelines and hope for the best (our usual place) is to be an accomplice to murder. I propose the following agenda:

1: The public excommunication of pro-death church members (I Cor. 5). I include (a) Church members who have undergone abortion or who have sanctioned it for a wife or girlfriend, (b) members of Planned Parenthood, the ACLU, or other pro-choice organizations, and (c) medical personnel who have participated in abortions. This, of course, after instruction and exhortation. If pro-death church members refuse to repent, they must be put out of the fellowship. All must be done with a view to restoration.

2. Individual Christians penetrating the socio-political processes. Christians must inform themselves. They can join pro-life groups, write to senators, and congressmen asking for a Human Life Amendment to overturn the Court decision of 1973, send letters to newspapers, and vote for Pro-life candidates to public office.

3. An annual memorial service for the slaughtered innocents. Babies by the millions have been consigned to the garbage dump, burned in the incinerator, or simply flushed down the toilet. God knows each by the name it would have had. It's time for the Church to mark their passing, to shout that here was a person who was murdered. The least we can do is give them a funeral service. Drape the Church in black. Carry in a child's coffin. Announce to the community that anyone who wants to make a statement can purchase a single rose for the auditorium; send the money to Right to Life. Have a funeral procession through town. Preach on the Bible view of human life. Advertise. Invite the mayor. Send a special invitation to Planned Parenthood, and one to the ACLU and to NOW. Invite the Supreme Court by telegram. Let them know we are blowing the whistle on murder. The Pro-choicers will get mad; it's about time the Church made the world angry about something. Beat the drums of faith; beat the drums for the little ones. Perhaps it's time to rework the Nativity scene at Christmas to include Herod.

4. Minister to the living victims of abortion. Pro-death people argue for abortion on the basis of the mental health of the mother. The fact is that abortion destroys the psychological well-being of those who are in on it. It has always been the task of the Church to pick up after the world, to care for the wounded. Fetuses are not the only victims.

Here is an incomplete list of those who need to hear of the redemptive love that is in Christ: Teenagers who have been stampeded into abortion by Planned Parenthood, and who later mature and realize what they have done. The physician who had to suffocate a baby because he could not breach the unwritten contract with the mother and hand her a salt-scalded little girl who did not have the decency to die on schedule. The woman doctor in the Midwest who walked out of the operating room after doing six abortions, showed her blood-covered hand to a young nurse, and said, "That's the hand that did that."

A moral backlash is setting in. Doctors, nurses, even hospitals are refusing to perform any more abortions. As the Humanist's Moloch continues its march through the land, many are seeing what a horror it is to throw in the little ones. It's going to get ugly. America is being polarized. Those for abortion will try to use the law to silence all opposition; they have already gone to court to prevent the physician from telling women what a fetus really is and how dangerous the procedure is for the mother. Many are recoiling—repenting. The Church must be ready to minister to the thousands who will find that secular paganism is not what they want after all.

5. Christian sex education. The pro-death position is that abortion must be free to all because men and women are going to be irresponsible and promiscuous no matter what. The Church has a higher view of man. Young people will follow the Biblical discipline regarding sex if they are taught it. We cannot simply say, "No abortion!" and leave our people in the dark concerning sex.

6. Offer realistic alternatives to abortion. Make it known that the Church is ready to help women face the problems that come with having the baby whose presence is a threatening one. This might include adoption and placement counseling. Christians should be willing to take children into their homes, just as our brethren in the early centuries visited the exposure dumps each morning and took home the unwanted infants. If the Church can encourage the parents of newborn, thousands of unwanted babies will become wanted and loved.

7. Honestly face the social problems that are used to justify abortion. I invite your attention to the May 20, 1983 issue of Christianity Today with its feature "If Not Abortion, What Then?" It is a challenge to Christians to no longer ignore the staggering social evils that push women toward the abortion clinic.

8. Come to grips with the tougher ethical problems connected with abortion.

The thorniest question is this: Is abortion ever justified? Should the fetus be killed to save the mother's life? (Medical technology has made this an extremely rare dilemma). Traditional Christian ethics has made this the one circumstance permitting abortion. Is this good ethics? If a Christian chose to leave the matter in the hands of God Who gives life, should he be condemned by his brothers? A Christian might reluctantly allow an abortion to avoid the certain death of the mother, but even then it is not right; it is simply best—perhaps. It is not clear that abortion is right, even to preserve the life of the mother, but we must be very slow to sit in judgment of a Christian who chooses that path. The choice is easier if the alternatives are the death of the fetus or the death of both mother and child.

Is abortion ethical in the (rare) case of impregnation by rape? No. How about incest? No. The violated woman can surrender the baby to adoption. And it makes neither moral nor logical sense to execute the baby for the sins of the father, especially since the State has demonstrated its unwillingness to execute the rapist. This problem is compounded for black women. There is a waiting list to adopt white babies; not so for black children.

What about the prenatal discovery of defects (usually by amniocentesis)? Abortion is usually performed "for the good of the child." Really? I suggest that it is almost always for the good of the parent, who is unwilling to rear the child. Most children who are aborted after amniocentesis have treatable maladies—many are correctable. The Down's syndrome child, whose condition is used most often to justify abortion, is the most affectionate of children. Parents of these children testify to the delight of having them in the home. Their IQ's range up to 70—the mental capacity of a twelve-year-old. Many families adopt DS babies, some more than one. Great progress is being made in the treatment of birth defects. But after all is said and done, the rock-hard reality is that the defective baby is a human child; it is still pagan to kill those that are not born perfect enough.

A final ethical problem is the post-conception contraceptive. Consistency calls into question the IUD and the "morning-after pill," or any other device or chemical that destroys the fertilized ovum. A Christian who chooses this method will find it hard to take a firm stand against abortion.

Conclusion. On the Pro-choice side: Constitutional illegality, medical malpractice, cultural disintegration, hysterical irrationality, sin, and death. On the Pro-life side: Constitutional law, cultural survival, reason, God, and the children.

FOOTNOTES

1 C. Everett Koop, "Deception on Demand," Debate (1982) :46.

2 The Court divided pregnancy into three-month stages: During approximately the first three months, the decision to abort is left up to the woman and her physician. In the second trimester, the State may regulate abortion to protect the health of the mother. In the final three months, the State may regulate or forbid abortion except where necessary in the judgment of physicians to preserve the life or health of the mother. The Court defines (Roe v Wade) "health" in such a way that permits an abortion with a pregnancy would "force upon a woman a distressful life and future," will bring the distress "associated with the unwanted child," will "bring a child into a family already unable psychologically or otherwise to care for it," or will bring the "continuing difficulties and stigma of unwed motherhood."

3 M. Siegel and Nancy Jacobs, eds., Abortion, an Eternal Social and Moral Issue (Plano, Texas: Instructional Aids, 1982), p. 52.

4 Koop: "In my thirty-six years in pediatric surgery, I have never known of one instance where the child had to be aborted to save the mother" ("Deception," p. 46).

5 Gary Bergel, Abortion in America (Intercessors for American, 1982), p. 6.

6 Franky Schaeffer, A Time for Anger (Westchester: Crossway, 1982), p. 82.

7 quoted in John Lippis, the Challenge to be Pro Life (Washington: National Right to Life Educational Trust Fun, n.d.), p. 14.

8"Bill to Anesthetize Fetuses in Abortions Clears the Senate Panel," The Orlando Sentinel, 19 May 1983, sec. C, p. 3.

9 Lippis, The Challenge, p. 9.

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid., p. 10.

12 Ibid.

13 Ibid., pp. 10-11.

14 Ibid., p. 11.

15., p. 8.

16 Stow Persons, American Minds: A History of Ideas (New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1958), p. 446

17 Ibid., p. 267

18 Ibid., p. 268

19 See B. F. Skinner, Beyond Freedom and Dignity (New York: Bantam, 1971).

20 Roe v Wade, 93 S. Ct 705 (1973) at 730.

21 See the important unpublished study by John Warwick Montgomery, Abortion and the Law: Three Clarifications

22 Liz Jeffries and Rick Edmonds, "Abortion, the Dreaded Complication," The Philadelphia Inquirer, 2 August 1981

23 J. C. Wilkie, "Speak Up for Life," Christian Standard (July 4, 1971) :15.

24 American Medical Association Prism (May 1973).

25 C. Everett Koop, "The Slide to Auschwitz," The Human Life Review 3, no. 2 (Spring 1977).

26 Bernard N. Nathanson, "Abortion: A Just War on the Womb?" Charisma (January 1981) :31-32.

27 Helmut Thelicke, Nihilism (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 84.

28 Hippocrates Works 1:291-292 (LCL).

29 Justinian Digest 35. 2. 9. 1;25. 4. 1. 1.

30 Suetonius Domitian 22; Juvenal Satire 6. 592-601; Clement of Alexandria Paedagogus 2. 10. 96. 1; Origen Against Heresies 9; Chrysostom Hoily 24 on Romans; Plato Republic 5. 9; Aristotle Politics 7. 14. 10; Ambrose Hexameron 5. 18. 58; Hippolytus Refutation of All Heresies 9. 7; Justinian Digest 48. 19. 39; Epiphanius Panarion; Soranos Gynecology 19.

31 Michael J. Gorman, Abortion and the Early Church (Downers Grove: Intervarsity press, 1982), pp. 15-18.

32 Ibid., p. 33.

- 33 Ibid.
 34 Apology 9. 6.
 35 Gorman, Abortion, p. 89.
 36 Ibid., p. 90.
 37 Jeffries and Edmonds, "Abortion the Dreaded Complication."
 38 Lippis, The Challenge, p. 15.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Harold, O. J. Death Before Birth. Thomas Nelson, 1977.
 _____ "What the Supreme Court Didn't Know." Human Life Review 1, no.2
 (Spring 1975) :5-21.
 Cameron, A. "The Exposure of Children and Greek Ethics." The Classical Review 46,
 No. 3, (July 1932) :105-114.
 Connery, John R., S.J. Abortion: The Development of the Catholic Perspective. Loyola
 University, 1982.
 Bajema, Clifford E. Abortion and the Meaning of Personhood. Baker, 1974.
 Ganz, Richard L. Thou Shalt Not Kill. Arlington House, 1978.
 Garton, Jean Staker. Who Broke the Baby? Bethany Fellowship, 1979.
 Gorman, Michael J. Abortion and the Early Church. Intervarsity Press, 1982
 Granberg, Donald. "What Does it mean to be Pro-Life?" Christian Century, (May 12, 1982): 562-566
 Grisez, Germain G. Abortion: The Myths, the Realities, and the Arguments. Corpus Books, 1970.
 Hilgers, Horn, and Mall. New Perspectives on Human Abortion. Frederick, Maryland: University Publications,
 1981.
 Huser, Roger John. Crime of Abortion in Canon Law: An Historical Synopsis and Commentary. Catholic
 University Press, 1942.
 Koop, C. Everett. Right to Live; Right to Die. Tyndale, 1977
 _____, and Schaeffer, Francis A. Whatever Happened to the Human Race? Fleming H. Revell, 1979.
 Mall, David and Watts, Walter, F. The Psychological Aspect of Abortion. Washington, D.C.: University
 Publications, 1979.
 Mohr, James. Abortion in America: The Origins and Evolution of National Policy. Oxford University, 1981.
 Nathanson, Bernard N. Aborting American. Doubleday, 1979.
 Noonan, John T., Jr. A Private Choice. Macmillan, 1979.
 _____, Ed. The Morality of Abortion: Legal and Historical Perspectives. Cambridge: Belknap Press,
 1970.
 Powell, John. Abortion: The Silent Holocaust. Alcen, Texas: Argus Communications, 1981.
 Schaeffer, Franky. A Time for Anger. Westchester: Crossway, 1982.
 Siegel, Mark A. and Jacobs, Nancy R., eds. Abortion, an Eternal Social and Moral Issue. Plano, Texas:
 Instructional Aides, 1982.
 Willke, J.C. Handbook on Abortion. Cincinnati: Hiltz, 1971.

OTHER SOURCES OF INFORMATION

- Christian Action Council, 788 National Press Building, Washington, DC 20045. Free bi-monthly newsletter.
Human Life Review, published quarterly by the Human Life Foundation, 150 East 35th St., New York, NY
 10016.
The Life Advocate, 4901 Richmond #101, Houston, TX 77027
National Right to Life News, 1299 Arcade St., St. Paul, MN 55106
 American United for Life, 230 N. Michigan Ave. #915, Chicago, IL 60601
 Ad Hoc Committee in Defense of Life, Inc., 605 14th St. NW Suite 302, Washington, DC 20005
 Christian Action Council, 422 C. St. NE, Washington, DC 20002
 National committee for a Human Life Amendment, 1707 L. St. NW Room 400, Washington, DC 20036
 American Life Lobby, Inc., P.O. Box 490, Stafford, VA 22554