

Abortion, the Sanctity of Life, and the Judgment of God

By Jay Wegter

God's righteous character demands He avenge the shedding of innocent blood.

The fundamental biblical issue in abortion is that it constitutes *the shedding of innocent blood*. The real question today is not when people's lives begin, but what is the value and sanctity of human life? The blood of millions of aborted children cries to God for vengeance. Their silent screams are heard loudly by Almighty God. America's hands, and most of the nations of the world are covered with the guilt and stain of innocent blood. "That innocent blood cries to God for vengeance. Those cries are reaching a thunderous crescendo, and God will answer in judgment just as he did with Israel and Judah" (John O. Anderson).ⁱ

In Holy Scripture the penalties were very clear for those who gave their children up to be sacrificed to Molech. The people were to stone that person to death. "You shall not give any of your offspring to offer them to Molech, nor shall you profane the name of your God; I am the Lord" (**Lev 18:21**). "Any man from the sons of Israel or from the aliens sojourning in Israel who gives any of his offspring to Molech, shall surely be put to death; the people of the land shall stone him with stones" (**Lev 20:2**). "I will also set My face against that man and will cut him off from among his people, because he has given some of his offspring to Molech, so as to defile My sanctuary and to profane My holy name. If the people of the land, however, should ever disregard that man when he gives any of his offspring to Molech, so as not to put him to death, then I Myself will set My face against that man and against his family, and I will cut off from among their people both him and all those who play the harlot after him, by playing the harlot after Molech" (**Lev 20:3-5**).

God's holy, just and righteous character demands that He avenge the blood of innocent victims. "And I will avenge their blood which I have not avenged, for the Lord dwells in Zion" (**Joel 3:21**). "He said, "What have you done? The voice of your brother's blood is crying to Me from the ground" (crying to be avenged) (**Gen 4:10**). "For behold, the Lord is about to come out from His place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity; and the earth will reveal her bloodshed and will no longer cover her slain" (**Is 26:21**).ⁱⁱ

Our society has lost its conscience

Consider that it requires an incredible state of mind to regard human life so casually as to kill it. Abortion on demand is killing, but our culture does not speak of it as killing. The ceaseless drumbeat of feminism's propaganda has imbued us with the idea that women are to find satisfaction outside the home—they have been conditioned to think that they are trapped by their children. This deplorable mindset feeds the justification of killing the unborn because every child should be a 'wanted child'. At first blush, 'being wanted' sounds like a caring statement, but it is a subtly demonic concept. For, to designate a child in the womb as 'unwanted' has proven a death warrant for millions of innocent babies.ⁱⁱⁱ

‘Women’s rights’ now demand the willingness to kill. The following quote by British journalist and feminist Antonia Senior has breathtaking moral implications, “Yes, abortion is killing but it is the lesser evil. You cannot separate women’s rights from their right to fertility control. The single factor in woman’s liberation was our newly founded ability to impose our will on biology. The nearly 200,000 aborted babies in the UK each year are the lesser evil no matter how you define life. To defend women’s rights you must be prepared to kill.”^{iv}

Women are being encouraged to kill their offspring in the interest of guarding personal autonomy. What world view explains such a drastic devaluation of life? A godless concept known as *personhood theory* is in part to blame. That theory radically devalues the human body by suggesting that being biologically human does not alone qualify the individual as a person—true ‘personhood’ requires that a number of traits be present (i.e. intelligence, self-awareness, self-control, a sense of time, curiosity, concern for others, communication, etc.). In commenting on the devastation caused by *personhood theory*, pro-life apologist Scott Klusendorf says that the idea of basing legal protection on traits that vary among the population “relegates the proposition that all men are created equal to the ash heap of history.”^v The implications of *personhood theory* is that the body is not an aspect of the true self; instead the body is a mechanism that serves the needs and desires of the mind. This dualistic worldview taught that a human was a free subject connected to a deterministic machine (one’s body). So, if nature is but a ‘biological machine’ then mind or person could manipulate the body as a mechanism. Thus, in *personhood theory* the promise is that the mind would become independent of the body and its limitations. This dualism dates back to Rene Descartes. We can see how the history of this philosophy explains the arguments for abortion. The mind is regarded as the authentic self—the body has been reduced to the sub-personal, functioning solely on the level of biology and chemistry. If the fetus is just a clump of cells as Planned Parenthood states, then fetal eyes, lungs and brains may be harvested as impersonal tissue. “Yet, virtually no professional bioethicist denies that life begins at conception.”^{vi}

Regarding our humanness, Christian author Nancy Pearcey states what ought to be obvious, “most scientifically informed people know that life begins at conception. From that moment on, the organism merely unfolds the capacities that belong intrinsically the kind of being that it is. No outside force or substance enters the embryo at any point to transform it from some other creature into a human.” The evil ideas such as *personhood theory* emerge from the love of darkness, and they can have incredibly inhumane consequences. For, according to *personhood theory*, even though the fetus is fully human, it may be killed without any moral consequence!^{vii} Thus, when *personhood theory* is allowed to construct its own ethics, there is no moral obligation to protect the fetus until it attains personhood.

This dichotomy, or split between *body* and *person* prevails today among secular bioethicists. What is critically central to *personhood theory* is that personal status eclipses, or upstages human status. For, according to that view, genetically defective fetuses and newborns do not attain the status of personhood. They are sub-personal organisms and therefore fail to qualify to the right to life. The human organism is a life but not a person because their level of awareness does not qualify them as a person. If a fetus were regarded as a person, abortion would be illegal. Laws permitting abortion are not religiously neutral, they express *personhood*

theory. Justice Harry Blackmun (Roe V. Wade) asserted unapologetically that the unborn baby is not a person: [though] the word *person* as used in the 14th amendment does not include the unborn. Blackmun goes on to state that if the fetus were recognized as a person, then that abortion would necessarily be illegal. Thus, if the suggestion of personhood is established, the fetus' right to life would then be guaranteed. The logical conclusion of Blackmun's godless worldview was turned into law. What we must not miss is that by legalizing abortion, the Supreme Court did not remain neutral, it established *personhood theory*, with its two story body-dualism, as the law of the land.^{viii} The heresy of *personhood theory* has become a 'political religion', a state-sponsored worldview and theology leading to the bloodshed of millions of babies.

“We are not really killing if we are aborting ‘non-persons’”

In holocausts throughout history, victims were designated as less than human before being slaughtered. The same is true of the unborn, they have been 'de-humanized' as a class. Thus, the cruel logic of *personhood theory* follows: the fetus is just a disposable piece of matter, it is a mindless machine which may be exploited. “This explains why being biologically human is no longer thought to confer any moral status or to warrant legal protection. Human life in the womb has been reduced to raw material with no intrinsic purpose or dignity. In view of this rank dualism, the key question in abortion is as follows: is the human body an integral part of the person sharing in its dignity? The very practice of abortion implies a dogmatic commitment to *personhood theory*. That is the hidden premise and argument for abortion” (Nancy Pearcey).^{ix}

So, who qualifies as a person? Since personhood is not equated with being biologically human, then it must have something to do with a kind of 'personhood score' such as level of intelligence, self-awareness, or self-control. This means that to score low on any measure or trait, would reduce one to merely being biological life and not fully a person. This is arbitrary and subjective and very dangerous because it suggests that the person with the most traits has the most personhood.^x This present author has found that in discussions with students in public universities, nearly every unbelieving student could give only a functional, utilitarian definition of humanness (traits and abilities). Not one of these students was able to define humanness and dignity as innate, finding its source in our being created in the image and likeness of God. The Christian concept of personhood depends not on what I can do, but on who I am, that I am created in the image of God, and that God knows me, loves me and called me into existence. “Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I have appointed you a prophet to the nations” (Jer 1:5). I do not have to earn the right to be treated as a creature of great value.^{xi}

When ethicists decree that someone is a non-person, the protection of that individual evaporates—doctors and judges may then deny them the legal right to life. As a result, human life is no longer inviolable. Arguments defending abortion demean the body to the sub-personal level. If the unborn are not persons, then killing them for any reason requires no more justification than having a tooth pulled (Klusendorf). One would have thought that ultrasound

images would have settled once and for all that the baby that is kicking and sucking its thumb is actually a person. But, no! Even after ultrasound imaging, they still said it is not a person. How was that wicked conclusion possible? The answer is that it came from the heart commitments of a godless worldview. Leon Kass who served as chairman of the President's Council on Bioethics, says that the two-story view dualistically sets up the concept of personhood in opposition to nature and the body, and thus, it fails to do justice to the concrete reality of our embodied lives. The Christian ethic rejects dualism and recognizes our dignity as embodied beings.^{xii} The reality of our body-soul binary is captured beautifully in the creation account in **Genesis 2:7**. "Then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being."

A key philosophical question is where do you draw the line? When is a human being 'not a person'? Or, when does a human being 'become a person'? The Supreme Court's decision of *Roe v. Wade* in 1973 separated personhood from humanity. In other words, the judges argued that a developing fetus was a human (i.e., a member of the species *Homo sapiens*) but not a person. Since only persons are given 14th Amendment protection under the Constitution, the Court argued that abortion could be legal at certain times. This left to doctors, parents, or even other judges the responsibility of arbitrarily deciding when personhood should be awarded to human beings. That is shocking to an informed conscience, for the Supreme Court's cleavage of personhood and humanity made the ethical slide down society's slippery slope inevitable. The Court chose the idea of viability, and allowed for the possibility that states could outlaw abortions performed after a child was viable. But viability was an arbitrary criterion, and there was no biological reason why the line had to be drawn near the early stages of development. The line, for example, could be drawn much later. This effectively opened the door for the possibility of infanticide and euthanasia.^{xiii}

To lack sufficient traits of personhood is to be considered a 'non-person'

Ethicist Paul Ramsey frequently warned that any argument for abortion is slippery slope, for it could logically be also used as an argument for infanticide (killing a baby after it is born). As if to illustrate this, Dr. Francis Crick (one of the discoverers of DNA), demonstrated that he was less concerned about the ethics of such logical extensions, and proposed a more radical definition of personhood. He suggested in the British journal *Nature* that if "a child were considered to be legally born when two days old, it could be examined to see whether it was an 'acceptable member of human society.'" Obviously this is not only an argument for abortion; it's an argument for infanticide. Kerby Anderson notes, "Other line-drawers have suggested a cultural criterion for personhood. Ashley Montagu, for example, stated, 'A newborn baby is not truly human until he or she is molded by cultural influences later.'" "Again, this is more than just an argument for abortion. It is also an argument for infanticide."

Some pro-abortion proponents of personhood theory have focused on a mental criterion for personhood. Dr. Joseph Fletcher argues in his book *Humanhood* that "Humans without some minimum of intelligence or mental capacity are not persons, no matter how many of these organs are active, no matter how spontaneous their living processes are." This

statement represents not only an argument for abortion and infanticide; it also is a justification for euthanasia and the potential elimination of those who do not possess a certain IQ. In other writings, Joseph Fletcher suggested that an “individual” was not truly a “person” unless he has an IQ of at least 40.^{xiv}

The postmodern concept of personhood is a fact-value split in which the upper story is cut off from any objective criteria. Because God’s infallible Word has been rejected, deeming what a person is, and what person is to be protected has become completely arbitrary. In 2016, an international group of bioethicists recommended that governments set up tribunals to coerce doctors to perform abortion, infanticide and euthanasia, even if they believe those practices are morally wrong! Ultimately whoever has the most power will define who a person is, and that power is the state. This murderous tyranny is not new, it took place in ancient Egypt. “Then the king of Egypt spoke to the Hebrew midwives, one of whom was named Shiphrah and the other was named Puah; and he said, ‘When you are helping the Hebrew women to give birth and see *them* upon the birthstool, if it is a son, then you shall put him to death; but if it is a daughter, then she shall live.’ But the midwives feared God, and did not do as the king of Egypt had commanded them, but let the boys live” (Ex. 1:15-17).^{xv}

Schaeffer warned 50 years ago that those who decide which babies live or die will someday decide which elderly should live or die, and ultimately who should live in between infancy and old age.

When the state decides who qualifies as a person, the doors open to tyranny and oppression. A secular view of personhood denies that the fetus is biologically fully human. Pro-life thinkers have warned that America is headed in the same direction as Nazi Germany. For, the Third Reich did not begin by killing Jews, but by killing the handicapped and disabled, as ‘not worth living’. The movement was led by the medical profession!^{xvi} Adolf Hitler declared Jews to be non-human. ‘Non-human’ is what pro-abortion people are saying when they declare that it is not a baby or human life until 3 months. But, that is a very subjective conclusion. Because of God’s commandment not to kill, we should be dogmatic against killing children in the womb. Imagine for a moment that you were there in Nazi Germany, they are about to kill all of the children with Down’s Syndrome (which they did). The argument the Nazis employed was that the quality of life of the disabled does not merit permitting those children to live. Ray Comfort notes that pro-abortion people rely on a similar argument: “why give birth and raise the child if its quality of life will be low?” But, how can one make that judgment before the child is born? The womb has become a place of holocaust in America, and it is sanctioned by the government. Abortion is the number one cause of death in our country.^{xvii}

Those who support abortion do not rely on science to defend their position. Christians are accused of imposing their views on the subject or issue of fetal life. Yet, the secular view is far from philosophically neutral. It rests upon a two-level view of nature that is crassly utilitarian (what a person can do) in its view of the body. Our state’s *political religion* needs to be identified as anything but neutral. So, learn how to identify the false dichotomy between science and religion. For, the state’s position is absolutely dogmatic about its two-level view of

human nature. As Christians, we must learn to shed the caricature with which we have been labeled, namely that our sole pro-life argument rests upon the existence of the supernatural. But, is the pro-life position held only because we believe that we (as well as the unborn) have an eternal soul? No, physicians were the first opponents of abortion. They saw that the genetic die was cast at conception. Science supports our pro-life position. Every conceived child is genetically unique, there will never be another you genetically. *Personhood theory* is egregious; it dismisses scientific facts so that the decision of who lives and dies in the womb turns upon which baby is wanted—even though the babies are the same biologically. Thus, the criterion for who lives and dies is a matter of the woman’s autonomy. She is the boss. The life of the fetus is worth sacrificing for her sense of independence. Notice that this decision is not arrived at biologically or scientifically; that matters infinitely less than the feelings of the parents. The ‘rights’ of the autonomous woman automatically eliminate or supplant the rights of the non-autonomous entity inside of her. The fetus is indeed a life, but, it is a life worth sacrificing for autonomy.^{xviii}

The Darwinist ‘creation myth’ feeds the lie of *personhood theory*. Why? Because in the materialistic worldview of philosophic naturalism, there is no Creator to endow humans with rights. This worldview makes our inalienable rights into nothing more than a myth borne of human aspirations and wishful thinking. If a baby is only a biological mass of cells, an organism, then it has no inherent rights or moral worth. Thus, the state has a fragmented view of the body. It treats the body as extrinsic to the person. It splits apart the body-mind binary and opposes a holistic value of the body which has intrinsic value and worth. That is state-sponsored dualism; and it radically devalues life. By contrast, Biblical theism demands a holistic view of the person. One of our strategies in defending pro-life is to use some of the left’s terminology. We can accurately say that the biblical worldview is *inclusive*. No innocent life should be killed—every baby is *included* in the right to life. It is the secular worldview which is *exclusive* and discriminatory deciding which babies are to live and to die.^{xix}

Does abortion on demand mean that America is practicing ‘child sacrifice’?

Is it an exaggeration to suggest that the wicked practice of abortion today is a form of child sacrifice? One of the purposes of this paper is to persuade the reader that abortion on demand is a form of child sacrifice. Child sacrifice has not stopped—we just don’t hear the screams today. In our 21st Century form of idol worship, infants are sacrificed to our idols of: *freedom, autonomy, convenience*; sacrificed in order to pursue *fame, money, career*, etc. Our culture’s babies are sacrificed on the altar of *free sex* (no consequence sex). And, unlike the practice in antiquity, child sacrifice is not a public even today, it is ‘sanitized’ and concealed behind closed doors. Yet, the cruelty is unabated: burning (with saline), stabbing, and dismembering. It has become a clinical event. Child sacrifice is a barbaric evil that has continued from antiquity. “That which has been is that which will be, and that which has been done is that which will be done. So there is nothing new under the sun. Is there anything of which one might say, ‘See this, it is new’? Already it has existed for ages which were before us” (**Eccle 1:9**).^{xx}

Throughout history, children have been sacrificed to a variety of deities. This was

carried out in an attempt to gain blessing and favor, (and in an effort to appease offended deities). The Mayans sacrificed humans to the gods of rain and war. The Incas in order to placate the sun god so that their crops would flourish. The Canaanites sacrificed infants to Molech in order to secure prosperity (they did so to the blare of musical instruments and drumbeats intended to drown out the baby's screams). In the Roman world, infants were killed by exposure, left to die by freezing, thirst, and hunger, by wild beasts, or by drowning in the sewers. We are aghast at that heartless cruelty, and we pride ourselves in being so much more civil and compassionate. Yet, consider that in America, the world's freest nation, unborn babies are starved, poisoned, burned with saline, have arms and legs ripped off, and skulls crushed. We call it 'choice' or 'empowerment', but make no mistake, it is child sacrifice. Our culture condones it and celebrates it. We murder the unborn and consider it vital to our prosperity, flourishing, and existence. It has become a 'right'. Nothing is new under the sun. Innocent humans are still being sacrificed for the selfish gains of those more powerful. Modern child sacrifice is thriving. We must put an end to the practice of abortion.^{xxi}

What do the Scriptures say about the preciousness of life in the womb?

Advocates of abortion like to remind Christians that the Bible doesn't say anything about abortion directly. "Why the silence of the Bible on abortion, they ask?" The answer is simple. Abortion was so unthinkable to an Israelite woman that there was no need to even mention it in the criminal code. Abortion was an unthinkable act because children were viewed as a gift or heritage from the Lord. "Behold, children are a gift of the Lord" (**Ps 127:3a**). Jews believed what Scripture claimed, namely that God opens and closes the womb and is sovereign over conception. "Now the Lord saw that Leah was unloved, and He opened her womb, but Rachel was barren" (**Gen 29:31; 30:22; Ruth 4:13**). In addition, childlessness was seen as a curse.^{xxii}

One of the most important Scripture passages to understand, in developing a biblical view of the sanctity of human life is Psalm 139. This psalm is the inspired record of David's praise for God's sovereignty in his life. He begins by acknowledging that God possesses omniscient knowledge and therefore knows what David is doing every single second of his life. David adds that wherever he might go, he cannot escape from God, for the Lord is in the remotest part of the sea and even in the darkness. And, God knows David's thoughts even before he forms the words to express them. Finally David contemplates the origin of his life and confesses that God was there forming him in the womb. "For You formed my inward parts; You wove me in my mother's womb. I will give thanks to You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; wonderful are Your works, and my soul knows it very well. My frame was not hidden from You, when I was made in secret, *and* skillfully wrought in the depths of the earth; Your eyes have seen my unformed substance; and in Your book were all written the days that were ordained *for me*, when as yet there was not one of them" (**Ps 139:13-16**).^{xxiii}

We ought to observe that in Psalm 139 the Bible doesn't speak of fetal life as mere biochemistry. The description here is not of a piece of protoplasm that becomes David: this is David already being cared for by God while in the womb. In **verse 13**, we see that God is the Master Craftsman fashioning David into a living person. In **verses 14 and 15**, David reflects on

the fact that he is a product of God's creative work within his mother's womb, and he praises God for how wonderfully God has woven him together. This is crucial to our understanding of the sanctity of life in the womb. David utilizes figurative language in **verse 15**, he refers to his growth during gestation, "I was made in secret, and skillfully wrought in the depths of the earth." This poetic allusion harkens back to **Genesis 2:7** which indicates that Adam was formed from the dust of the earth. David also notes that, "Thine eyes have seen my unformed substance."^{xxiv} Henry Morris notes that the dust of the ground (dust being our *unformed substance*) conveys the thought of the smallest particles of the earth composed of the basic elements of oxygen, nitrogen, calcium, etc. And, that these basic chemical elements were to become the building blocks of the human body.^{xxv} Even when David was in the embryonic and fetal stages of development, God's care and compassion were already present. What a powerful statement of the preciousness of life. The book of Job also alludes to God's infinite wisdom in constructing the baby in the womb. "Your hands fashioned and made me altogether, and would You destroy me? Remember now, that you have made me as clay; and would You turn me into dust again? Did You not pour me out like milk and curdle me like cheese; clothe me with skin and flesh, and knit me together with bones and sinews?" (**Job 10:8-11**).

Another significant passage underscoring the sanctity of life is Psalm 51. This psalm was written by David after his sin of adultery and murder. David confesses his sin, repenting of his sinful actions. His comments on original sin are illuminating, "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me" (**Ps 51:5**). David is stating that from his time of conception, he had a sin nature—and possessing a sin nature is only possible if he is fully human. Therefore, this would imply that he carried the image of God from the moment of conception, including the marred image of God scarred from sin. Bearing the image of God is the essence of humanness (**Gen 1:26-27; 5:1; 9:6**). And though God's image in man was marred at the Fall, it was not erased (**cf. 1 Cor. 11:7; Jas 3:9**). Thus, the unborn baby is made in the image of God and therefore fully human in God's sight.

Another Biblical argument against abortion can be found in the Old Testament legal code. "If men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child so that she gives birth prematurely, yet there is no injury, he shall surely be fined as the woman's husband may demand of him, and he shall pay as the judges *decide*. But if there is *any further* injury, then you shall appoint *as a penalty* life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise" (**Ex 21:22-25**). Kerby Anderson comments, "If men who are fighting hit a pregnant woman and she gives birth prematurely but there is no serious injury, the offender must be fined whatever the woman's husband demands and the court allows. But if there is serious injury, you are to take life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise. The verses appear to teach that if a woman gives birth prematurely, but the baby is not injured, then only a fine is appropriate. However, if the child dies [of its injuries], then the law of retaliation (*lex talionis*) should be applied. In other words, killing an unborn baby would carry the same penalty as killing a born baby. A baby inside the womb has the same legal status as a baby outside the womb."^{xxvi}

How deeply does state-sanctioned abortion plunge a nation into evil?

Is abortion a more heinous sin than other transgressions? Child sacrifice is an historic atrocity. Israel's judgment and downfall came because of their ultimate sin, the killing of innocent victims by official sanction. The apostate Israelites *shed innocent blood* according to **Ps 106:38**. They sacrificed the blood of their sons and daughters to the idols of Canaan. And the land became polluted with blood. Like the advance of a progressive disease the collective conscience of the nation became increasingly callused. The prophet Hosea states, "Bloodshed follows bloodshed" (**Hos 4:2**). "Murder begets murder, and murder of innocent life begets more murder of innocent life. Abortion is the shedding of innocent blood. Today millions of innocent babies are sacrificed by official sanction"^{xxvii} (John O. Anderson).

In terms of the depths of wickedness, there are three levels of murder. One is the common kind of murder you would see in the news (the homicides associated with violent crimes), the second kind of murder, in terms of degree of evil-doing, would be the murder of the helpless or innocent people, that would include the targeting of the helpless, the poor, the aged, the infirm, children, widows, and babies; those too weak to defend themselves. This is a vicious damning form of murder, but there is a third level of murder that represents an even greater index of evil. This third level is the murder of innocents by official sanction. It is calculated, premeditated, planned murder. It is societal first-degree murder. This is the kind of murder which occurred in the form of the sacrifice of infants to pagan gods in ancient Canaan.^{xxviii}

The firstborn child was placed on a fiery altar and cruelly burned to death in the service of the pagan deities. And now, nearly three millennia later, innocent blood is being shed even now by official sanction. A culture that publicly approves of abortion is the culture of death. Can we not say that the spirit of Molech is with us now? Here we are about to enter the year 2021, and leftist American politicians are promising to enact legislation to collect tax dollars from American citizens in order to support the abortion industry. That is the sanctioning of murder at a deeper level; for it will mandate the collection of revenue from U.S. citizens in order to pay for the murder of unborn.^{xxix}

Horrific practices are inevitable when self is worshipped in place of God. Without God, man is the measure of all things, and man's laws are his only moral determinants, but man is not truly the measure of all things. God is, and God's laws are absolutes which cannot be legislated away. Countless American Christians are passive in the face of this holocaust in the womb. They will not raise their voices in defense of their unborn neighbors. Their reigning sentiment is, "well if it's legal, it means America is treating it as permissible and moral." "We guard 'liberty' by protecting choice." But pro-choice is pro-abortion. R.C. Sproul says, "the fence-sitting of countless Christians, by their deadly neutrality, consigns to death millions of unborn citizens each year."^{xxx}

Today, society's legalization and sanction of abortion parallels Israel's ritualized child sacrifices in a number of frightening ways. Whether an Israelite offering her baby up to her idol Molech or, 28 centuries later a 21st century mother offering up her baby as a sacrifice to contemporary idols, there are undeniable commonalities. The worship of Molech was a

product of her society's depraved imagination and pagan ideals. Whereas, when a modern mother sacrifices her infant, it is a product of our society's twisted view of life and its self-centered values. In both cases the sacrificed lives were innocent, and in both instances the cultures had deteriorated morally to a level in which sexual immorality had become the accepted norm. The government's sanctioning of abortion is a rush towards divine judgment; it is a high velocity race toward a nation's destruction and doom. The outcome of this mass killing of the innocent can only produce catastrophe.^{xxx}

Historically, the evils of immorality and murder have always occurred together

Why does a culture that worships sex inevitably become a culture of death? What is the answer? The record of history demonstrates that sexual immorality and murder occur together. Both are fueled by conscience-destroying, runaway sinful passion. The twin sins which sink cultures into depravity are immorality and murder. Both would strike at mankind's beautiful, God-bestowed capacity of procreation. Sexual immorality rears its filthy head as fornication, adultery, homosexuality, incest, rape, bestiality, and prostitution. When sexuality is trivialized, reduced to base impulses, and allowed to travel in the gutter, it becomes a weapon in the hands of the evil one. Thus, immorality by demonic design is intended to demean God's created gift of bringing new life into the world. Immorality's overarching purpose is to mangle the image of God by striking at mankind's noble calling as the crown of God's creation. And, in so doing, deface the truth that we were created in God's image in order to reflect Him. "So also, the twin sin of murder is wrapped in selfishness and pride. The Canaanites killed their children by fire in sacrificing them to Molech. America and the world sacrifice infants by providing abortion on demand. Immorality and murder often function independently from one another, but they are twin sins that demonically attack the creation of life. One at conception, and the other after conception."^{xxxii}

Idolatry offers the false promise of elevating man, allowing him to reach his full potential to enjoy pleasure, to forgo inconvenience and thus, to 'liberate' him. Idolatry makes man into God, makes Satan our default god (**2 Cor 4:3**), and rejects God's holy and loving authority over us. The Old Testament record of Israel's apostasy describes the Jewish nation as wandering down the tragic path of these two sins sexual immorality and murder. There is a major lesson for us today. In every age, culture, nation, and society including ours, there has been a crisis in the matter of ultimate authority: who will rule? Will life be God-centered or man-centered?^{xxxiii}

When a society becomes man-centered, the worship of God is replaced with idolatry. As a consequence, the twin sins of immorality and murder will ultimately rear their heads. "How the faithful city has become a harlot, she *who* was full of justice! Righteousness once lodged in her, but now murderers" (**Is 1:21**). "Listen to the word of the Lord, O sons of Israel, for the Lord has a case against the inhabitants of the land, because there is no faithfulness or kindness or knowledge of God in the land. *There is* swearing, deception, murder, stealing and adultery. They employ violence, so that bloodshed follows bloodshed" (**Hos 4:1-2**). "Harlotry, wine and new wine take away the understanding. My people consult their wooden idol, and

their *diviner's* wand informs them; for a spirit of harlotry has led *them* astray, and they have played the harlot, *departing* from their God. They offer sacrifices on the tops of the mountains and burn incense on the hills, under oak, poplar and terebinth, because their shade is pleasant. Therefore your daughters play the harlot, and your brides commit adultery” (**Hos 4:11-13**).^{xxxiv}

In Biblical times, the Canaanites made a religion out of sex. In their pagan worship system, they had a *father god* and *mother god* who created the world with their sexual union. Various sexual rites were performed in the worship of these gods. “Sacred” prostitution was common. Our current culture has made a religion out of illicit sex. As far as today’s Canaanite values are concerned, Hollywood has taught us: *you are your sexuality*. When Israel began worshipping the Canaanite gods, it was only a matter of time before the nation began shedding innocent blood. Here is how the downgrade operates. As Biblical faith wains, people may still maintain ethical habits of thought and self-restraint. The ethic can remain for a while even after the truth which supported it departs. But, eventually a Biblically illiterate generation arises that no longer has the ethical habit, and that is when the behavior changes radically.

Jeremiah calls attention to Judah’s idolatry and to its twin sin of shedding innocent blood. “Because they have forsaken Me and have made this an alien place and have burned sacrifices in it to other gods, that neither they nor their forefathers nor the kings of Judah had *ever* known, and *because* they have filled this place with the blood of the innocent and have built the high places of Baal to burn their sons in the fire as burnt offerings to Baal, a thing which I never commanded or spoke of, nor did it *ever* enter My mind; therefore, behold, days are coming,” declares the Lord, “when this place will no longer be called Topheth or the valley of Ben-hinnom, but rather the valley of Slaughter” (**Jer 19:4-6**). “Thus says the Lord, ‘Do justice and righteousness, and deliver the one who has been robbed from the power of *his* oppressor. Also do not mistreat *or* do violence to the stranger, the orphan, or the widow; and do not shed innocent blood in this place.’” “But your eyes and your heart are *intent* only upon your own dishonest gain, and on shedding innocent blood and on practicing oppression and extortion” (**Jer 22:3, 17**). (Note the devastation God’s judgment will bring: **Jeremiah 19:7; 7:30-34**).^{xxxv}

Apostate nations are societies which had the knowledge of God at one time, but departed from that knowledge

An apostate nation, ripe for judgment, abandons the infallible truth of God’s authoritative self-revelation. In our culture, our epistemology (or method of knowing reality) is no longer founded upon God’s self-revelation, the Holy Scriptures, but has become self-referential, reductionistic, and pragmatic. ‘Their law originates with themselves’ rather than from God’s plenary verbal propositional truth. “Yes, destruction and violence are before me; strife exists and contention arises. Therefore the law is ignored and justice is never upheld. For the wicked surround the righteous; therefore justice comes out perverted” (**Hab 1:3b-4**). The Old Testament prophets’ warning has a note of irony. For, God will judge the apostate Jews by a nation that in rejecting God, devises its own pagan law and authority—much like Israel! “They are dreaded and feared; their justice and authority originate with themselves” (**Hab 1:7**).^{xxxvi}

A nation's collective compromise of conscience precedes judgment. The issue is this, society's conscience is corporately compromised when immorality is mainstreamed and advocated as 'freedom'. In the Old Testament books of Hosea and Jeremiah, the ultimate crime is the shedding of innocent blood. It symbolizes high-handed rebellion against God in the destruction of human beings made in his image (**Hos 4:1, see also 2 Ki 24:3-4**). We should learn from the warnings of the Old Testament prophets. The twin sins of murder and immorality are expressions of the satanic depths of idolatry. In Israel and Judah, these sins were committed by people who claimed to know God. They entered God's temple on the same days they sacrificed their children. "Moreover, the Lord said to me, 'Son of man, will you judge Oholah and Oholibah? Then declare to them their abominations. For they have committed adultery, and blood is on their hands. Thus they have committed adultery with their idols and even caused their sons, whom they bore to Me, to pass through *the fire* to them as food. Again, they have done this to Me: they have defiled My sanctuary on the same day and have profaned My sabbaths. For when they had slaughtered their children for their idols, they entered My sanctuary on the same day to profane it; and lo, thus they did within My house" (**Ezek 23:36-39**). Theologian Carl Henry warns that the West (even in claiming to have a majority 'Christian' population) is reverting to a pagan and pre-Christian readiness to murder the innocents and the defenseless.^{xxxvii}

How is a *culture of death* 'marketed' to an educated populace such as our own?

We live in an age in which a massive redefinition campaign is taking place—the murder of the unborn is renamed *women's health care, or reproductive rights*. The sanctity of life has been discarded and replaced with the 'quality of life'. Morality has been sold to the highest bidder; it has become a matter of situational ethics. Man himself becomes the self-centered basis for morality and law. In historic Israel, if the people of the community close their eyes when a man gives one of his children to Molech and fail to put him to death, God will bring judgment on the entire community as well as the man who sacrificed his child. In our society's materialistic idolatry and spiritual apostasy, the shed blood of the innocent is on our hands. It is shed by official sanction of a society that we citizens control. Therefore, our passivity in the face of this slaughter is culpable; for that blood is shed by our complacency. It cries to God for vengeance and vindication. We too much resemble the people of Noah's day in which before the flood came, went on as usual with only a few people alarmed. That culture's apathy made them utterly ill-prepared for catastrophe. The peoples of Noah's day were not expecting judgment but it came suddenly and decisively—it trapped them and destroyed them while they were amid their normal routines of life.^{xxxviii}

The death of the innocent has been 'sold' to our culture as a necessary condition of personal 'freedom'. Our responsibilities to God have been replaced with our "rights"—but these are 'rights' which God never bestowed. These pseudo-rights are: the "right" for a woman to control her body by killing her baby; the "right" of sexual license; the "right" of homosexuality as an alternative lifestyle. And now, the "right" to die is gaining fresh momentum. We are seeing a modern pursuit of a pagan worldview. The darkened and futile

‘Gentile cosmology’ of which Paul warns in **Ephesians 4:17-19** is now advocated in every educational-political center in the Western world. The church has become too timid in the face of this defiance of God. We do not see churches crying out over the sins that are crying out to God for vengeance. How can we preach repentance to our society if we don’t preach about that society’s specific sins and idols? If we are passive in the face of those sins and apostasy, then we have become co-conspirators with idolatry and the sins of our nation.^{xxxix}

When abortion on demand first became available in America, social theorists lauded its potential effects. It was thought that abortion on demand would reduce, or even resolve the problems of illegitimacy, suicide, juvenile delinquency, and child abuse. But these tragic problems increased when liberal abortion laws were passed. Abortion does not solve a single social problem, for our hunger and thirst for happiness and satisfaction will not be met by greater selfishness. The blessedness Christ promised can only come through righteousness. “Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied” (**Mt 5:6**).^{xl}

A pro-abortion bumper sticker reads, “Stop the long war against choice.” In that slogan, the word, ‘choice’ is associated with the freedoms that belong to a democratic society. But, does the word ‘choice’ somehow absolve one of moral culpability? Does the use of that word automatically clear away ethical obstacles? Of course not, yet, this kind of foolish reasoning is endemic to the state of moral madness we have entered. For, personal autonomy is now deemed more important than protecting the lives of the innocent. So idolatrous has the dream of absolute personal autonomy become that those who oppose abortion are portrayed as a group of inflexible hard-liners who may even have leanings toward fascism. This sentiment has been relentlessly pushed by the media, and so much so that most public university students believe they are defending ‘women’s rights’ when they advocate abortion on demand. The political left has so effectively framed this issue within their worldview that pro-abortionists are regarded as sensitive, open-minded, humane people who are articulate and intelligent, and in touch with the needs and demands of modern life.^{xli} How subtle and pervasive this lie concerning ‘rights’ has become. The horror of murdering a toddler by dismemberment would be an unspeakable crime. Yet, pro-abortionists defend slaying a baby in the womb by that method.

A clever ‘re-definition campaign’ is being waged against the lives of the innocent

The slaughter carried out by Hitler was a ‘choice’, and it was sanctioned by the citizens of Germany. Did ‘choice’ make the horror of the holocaust any less evil? Not for a moment. Ray Comfort, in his gospel outreach ministry, uses the following scenario: “picture yourself in WWII Germany, you are horrified to see Jews rounded up and killed, yet what the Nazi’s did was done ‘legally’ in terms of national support. In light of that, again, fill in this sentence: killing a baby in the womb is ok when _____. Wouldn’t you rather give it up for adoption than kill it? You felt strongly about the life of Jews in Germany. Is it morally rational to say, it is never right to kill Jews—BUT, a government should ‘have the right to do it because it is a choice’—no, that would be an absurd statement. Yet, the pro-abortion position advocates that killing a baby in the

womb is justifiable for a number of reasons.”^{xliii} Lest we forget, Hitler hated the 10 Commandments. He wanted to free people from them, not because he cared about his countrymen, but because the Ten Commandments are the safeguard of love to God and neighbor—they are a safeguard of the sacredness of life. What will happen to Hitler on judgment day? What is common among unbelievers is that the thought of being morally responsible to God is abhorrent, so people choose to deny His existence. They hate the light; their heart commitments shape the worldviews to which they adhere (**Jn 3:19-21**). When the allies liberated Europe, they required the citizens of Germany to tour the Nazi concentration camps. The citizens were horrified, reduced to weeping and grief that their government which they sanctioned had committed such unspeakable cruelty. This WWII history of the holocaust is incredibly relevant today, for America has put a government in power by their collective votes which advocates murdering children in the womb. A present day holocaust is raging—sanctioned by political leaders who have been put into power by the American people. Determine that you will never give your vote to any politician who advocates murdering a child in the womb.^{xliii}

Today’s Godless creation myth, Darwinism, in exalting chance, has stripped life of meaning, purpose, and value. Thus, the same worldview used to justify sexual immorality also justifies the murder of the unborn. For, Darwinism leaves us only with a mechanistic impersonal universe to contend with. As a consequence, life has no value except as determined by self-interest. This has birthed the culture of selfishness: what do I want? What is good for me? The social ethic has degenerated to where, “I am valuable to me, but you are not except that I can use you to achieve my goals.” The crass pragmatism born of atheistic determinism makes sexual immorality, and the murder of the unborn perfectly acceptable. In ancient Israel, as the nation fell ever deeper into pagan worship (8th century B.C.) cruelty abounded. Murder and the absence of compassion were common, as the prophet Hosea records (**Hos 4:1-2**).^{xliiv} In our culture (though driven by secular humanism, and not pagan spiritism), we are manifesting the same lack of respect for innocent life.

In our own nation, the murder of the unborn has been cloaked in terminology associated with women’s rights, as if those who wish to protect the unborn are ‘anti-woman’ and ‘anti-reproductive rights’. This represents a breathtaking exhibit of ethical self-deception. Why do women have abortions? Even though half of women having abortions believe it is morally wrong, they yield to the pressure to have an abortion. If more people advocated for them, including the man in their life, many babies could be saved. Almost 80% who have an abortion feel guilt afterwards, and over half report feeling sadness and loss.^{xlv}

Many women choose to have an abortion because of societal pressure. In the feminist perspective, pregnancy is viewed as tragic; as a devastating interruption to the woman’s career path. Nancy Pearcey observes, sadly, women have been bullying their bodies with chemicals in order to comply with the secular, feminist expectations of the university and the marketplace. Thus, it is vitally important in our pro-life message to communicate that the church of Christ Jesus is a place that values women. For, respect for women is inseparable from respect for the life of her baby. Healthy, happy child-rearing should not be treated as a disease. Pregnant women need support.^{xlvi}

The pro-abortion propagandists are willfully ignorant of the liberty which Christianity won for women and for children

The early church changed the face of Western Civilization in its opposition to abortion and infanticide. In the ancient pagan world, Christianity was distinctive in its humanitarian efforts—this was persistently expressed in its high view of life. Modern critics portray Christianity's opposition to abortion as hostile to women's rights. But, the early church's opposition to abortion and infanticide made it attractive to women. Here's why: a culture that practices abortion and infanticide demeans women and disrespects their unique contribution to the task of reproduction. It does not treat women's ability to conceive, gestate, and bear children as a wondrous and awesome capacity, but as a liability, a disadvantage, and a disability. Pro-choice does not value and protect women in their child-bearing capacity, but seeks to suppress women's bodily functions using toxic chemicals and deadly devices to violently destroy the life inside her. In ancient Rome, infanticide was the major method of birth control. Civic leaders supported it fully. Sewers were clogged with the bodies of babies, especially girls. The discarding of female infants certainly would fit the title "gendercide." Only Christianity stood against these cruel traditions of the day.^{xlvii} But, how many in our nation today have ever read or heard of the historical contributions of Christianity?

In ancient Rome infanticide was considered a practical way to remove the consequences of sexual slavery which was ubiquitous. Women and underaged persons could be violated sexually. They had no rights of protection. Christian leaders finally began to wield enough influence to pass laws against sexual slavery. It was solely through the influence of Christianity that sexual slavery was eventually outlawed. What Christianity did for women is amazing. It made male and female equal in marriage. A conjugal, mutual authority over one another's bodies within holy matrimony was absolutely new. "The husband must fulfill his duty to his wife, and likewise also the wife to her husband. The wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband *does*; and likewise also the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife *does*" (1 Cor 7:3-4). This mutuality in marriage was accompanied by the Biblical command for sexual fidelity of both husbands and wives. Christianity demanded that sexual activity be contained solely in the marriage covenant. Prior to this in the ancient world women's bodies were property, chattels.^{xlviii}

Christianity liberated women—Christian sexuality is a testimony to the world. Historically, culture was characterized by infanticide, abortion, sexual slavery, and sexual license. These sins accompanied disrespect for women. The feminist lie is that women will not be equal with men until they accomplish as much or more than men in the workplace. But, in order to achieve this false goal, they 'neuter' themselves with chemicals at the height of their child-bearing years, and are even encouraged to be sexually profligate.^{xlix} An important part of our argument in defending life ought to involve a recitation of the true liberty that Christianity provided for women. We must learn how to make a case for this—how to 'connect the dots' between the following: *respect for the woman, for her body, for her marital fidelity, and for her baby*—they all belong together. Christianity is the only worldview which presents these virtues as God-ordained, and thus, indispensably linked together.

It is not too late if Christians will step forward and speak, opening their mouths for the dumb (the mute, those in the womb who cannot speak) (Prov 31:8)

Believers must earnestly call our society to repentance. Our timid plea for truth and repentance is so weak and harmless to the kingdom of darkness, it could be compared to a sorority pillow fight. Are we to ignore this country's slide into judgment? Consider the message of the Word of God through the prophet Ezekiel as he proclaimed disaster upon impenitent Judah: "Make the chain, for the land is full of bloody crimes and the city is full of violence" (**Ezek 7:23**). "Then He said to me, 'The iniquity of the house of Israel and Judah is very, very great, and the land is filled with blood and the city is full of perversion; for they say, 'The Lord has forsaken the land, and the LORD does not see!'" (**Ezek 9:9**). "Moreover, you took your sons and daughters whom you had borne to Me and sacrificed them to idols to be devoured. Were your harlotries so small a matter? You slaughtered My children and offered them up to idols by causing them to pass through *the fire*" (**Ezek 16:20-21**). "Therefore, O harlot, hear the word of the Lord. Thus says the Lord GOD, 'Because your lewdness was poured out and your nakedness uncovered through your harlotries with your lovers and with all your detestable idols, and because of the blood of your sons which you gave to idols'" (**Ezek 16:35-36**). Repentance will involve the recapturing of the privilege of procreation. For, human reproduction is a part of our uniqueness as God's image. For, God planted a human nature and character in us which includes a moral, intellectual, and spiritual likeness.¹

Abortion reveals the moral bankruptcy and prominent worldview of a God-denying culture. No man or woman has the 'right' to shed innocent blood. God's purpose for us as His image and likeness involves the powerful and wonderful capacity to procreate life in His image by an act of the will in cooperation with Him. But the twin sins of immorality and murder continue to attack this beautiful gift and privilege of bringing new persons into the world. Our culture of murder today is filled with idolatrous humanistic reasonings such as pro-choice, the non-viability of the fetus, the alleged right of the woman to her body, and the sanctioning of the shedding of innocent blood. Lest we forget for even a moment, those whom God was about to judge were described as *swift to shed innocent blood* (**Is 59:7; 1:21; 26:21**).^{li}

The womb ought to be the safest place in the world, yet it has become the site of a silent holocaust. John Calvin's comments on the preciousness of human life in the womb are noteworthy. "The fetus, though enclosed in the womb of its mother, is already a human being." Hence, Calvin concluded that the Exodus 21 passage referred to the possible death of either the mother or the child. He therefore protested vigorously against the murder of the unborn: "If it seems more horrible to kill a man in his own house than in a field, because a man's house is his place of most secure refuge, it ought surely to be deemed more atrocious to destroy a fetus in the womb before it has come to light."^{lii}

During World War II, Dietrich Bonhoeffer was a Christian leader in Germany. He was captured by Hitler's forces and sent to the scaffold. Bonhoeffer had publicly condemned abortion as vehemently as he had spoken out against Nazi-ism. His views are worthy of quotation: "Destruction of the embryo in the mother's womb is a violation of the right to live which God has bestowed upon this nascent life. To raise the question whether we are here

concerned already with a human being or not is merely to confuse the issue. The simple fact is that God certainly intended to create a human being and that this nascent human being has been deliberately deprived of his life. And that is nothing but murder.”^{liii}

Proclaiming repentance involves the courage to voice disturbing truths. When a nation is impenitent, divine judgment is inevitable. Like a bulging wall ready to burst, God’s judgment could be unleashed at any time upon a wicked nation. Believers must not be timid about saying, ‘God will judge’. Jeremiah rebuked the false prophets in Judah for saying ‘peace’ when it was God’s judgment that was about to come. “They have healed the brokenness of My people superficially, saying, ‘Peace, peace,’ but there is no peace” (**Jer 6:14, 8:9-10**).^{liv}

Believers need to equip themselves to stand up for the sanctity of life

As committed Christians we must equip our fellow-believers to defend the sanctity of life.

What makes us equal as persons is that we each possess the same human nature, and are created in God’s image and likeness. Every individual had this human nature from the same moment he or she began to exist. In terms of our genetic code, the normal baby has all forty-six chromosomes at conception. His or her heart is beating at twenty days, and at forty-five days, brain waves can be detected. He or she has all the organs by eight weeks old, and by thirteen weeks, the baby recoils from pain and sucks his thumb.^{lv} How absurd to suggest that late-term abortion is not killing. At Summit Worldview Ministry camp, only 12 students out of 180 Christian students had ever heard a sermon about how to defend the pro-life position against abortion. The vast majority of students who attended had never heard a message about the link between abortion and the gospel. God is life and the Author of life: “It is wrong to intentionally kill a human being—abortion is intentionally killing of an innocent human being. That is why abortion is wrong” (Scott Klusendorf)^{lvi} In regard to man’s sanctity, dignity, and worth, God in speaking through the Psalmist tells us what man is for, twice in Psalm 8 the question is asked, ‘what is man. . .?’ The answer comes that man has profound dignity—he is created a little lower than the angels, and is crowned with glory and majesty (Ps 8:5). Man’s dignity derives from his being created in the image and likeness of God.^{lvii} Murder is high-handed crime for it strikes down a person formed in our Creator’s image: “Whoever sheds man’s blood, by man his blood shall be shed, for in the image of God He made man” (**Gen 9:6**).

Believers need to learn a strategy that will enable them to defend the unborn.

Christians ought to be equipped to persuasively answer the following three questions: **1) What is the unborn?** Many assume that the unborn are not fully human. And, then from that assumption, they reason that a woman’s choice is about her body, her reproductive freedom, and her health. A poisonous toxic ‘cocktail’ of humanism and feminism has convinced us that everyone deserves the right to fulfill his or her dreams at any cost. Thus, it is permissible to set aside one’s responsibility before God in order to pursue one’s passion. Therefore, out of expedience, the assumption about the fetus is that it is not fully human, thus not a part of the population, not one of us. Ultimately the issue is not about choice. The foundational question is: **what is the unborn?** After all, why not let a woman make her own choice? That sounds reasonable to our ears because we have been soaked and steeped in decades of moral

relativism. But, consider that pro-choice people agree that one cannot justly abusing a two-year old child in the privacy of your home. No, of course not, the reason why is because they are human persons and therefore possess dignity and moral worth. We must learn to make the case that the unborn are fully human like the toddler.^{lviii} Embryology states that as a fetus, you are a distinct, a whole human being, with each of your cells containing the genetic coding that makes you uniquely you—there will never be another you, possessing the same DNA. We once were embryonic human beings. Is that hard to believe that the little cluster of embryonic cells was once you? Even in the earliest stages of development, you were already there.

2) What makes a human valuable? Answer: not our functions, or our I.Q, or our physical ability, or our self-awareness. These are not the basis for equality and dignity. When one attempts to ground human identity in one's capacity, there is a huge problem. For, even though our capacities differ, we all have the same human nature from the moment we began to exist. Learn to press the issue: why is it permissible to be killed in the womb, but not after one is born?^{lix}

The S.L.E.D. acrostic is a useful memory device to show why it is morally irrational to kill an innocent human being. **S. – Size**, is a smaller body size an adequate reason to kill the unborn? No, of course not. **L. – Level of development**. Is a lesser level of development a just reason to kill an unborn human. No! **E. – Environment**. Can an infant inside the womb be justifiably killed a minute before it is born in late-term abortion—even though it will be outside the womb a minute later, and then protected? No! Learn to press the issue: how does where you are determine what you are? Consider that advances in fetal surgery commonly operate on the baby within the fetal sac' even partially placed outside the woman's body—once the surgery is completed, the baby is then placed back in the womb. **D. – Degree of dependency**. A toddler (who is of course dependent) is regarded as fully human, and is thus, fully protected by the state. In summary, the S.L.E.D. acrostic is useful to show that the reasons that an individual could be killed then (while inside its mother), but not now, do not add up. If you are asked, why are you pro-life, your answer will not only be that every person is created in God's image and bears a fully human nature. But, you also can answer that the science of embryology says that from the beginning of a baby's formation, that child is a distinct human being. In terms of a person's uniqueness and genetic identity, there is no essential difference between the embryo you once were, and what you are today that would justify killing you. **S.L.E.D.** (*Size, Level of Development, Environment, Degree of Dependency*) is not a good reason for a child to be killed then, but not now. Pro-choice assumes the unborn are not fully human persons, but the pro-choice position does not even attempt to prove the 'non-human' assumption. Why not grant the 'right' to kill an unwanted two year old toddler? Should an unborn be killed for lack of social services? How about a two-year old facing similar challenges. Utilizing the **S.L.E.D.** acrostic helps cut to the chase by demonstrating that even when all four of the excuses for killing the unborn (S.L.E.D.) are cobbled together, they cannot justify murder.^{lx}

The medical arguments against abortion are compelling. For example, at conception the embryo is genetically distinct from the mother. To say that the developing baby is no different from the mother's appendix is scientifically inaccurate. A developing embryo is genetically different from the mother. A developing embryo is also genetically different from

the sperm and egg that created it. A human being has 46 chromosomes (sometimes 47 chromosomes). Sperm and egg each have 23 chromosomes. In the womb, the fetus even develops finger prints unique from its mother. A trained geneticist can distinguish between the DNA of an embryo and that of a sperm and egg. But, that same geneticist could not distinguish between the DNA of a developing embryo and a full-grown human being!^{lxi}

Another set of medical arguments against abortion surround the definition of life and death. If one set of criteria have been used to define death, could they also be used to define life? Death used to be defined by the cessation of heartbeat. A stopped heart was a clear sign of death. If the cessation of heartbeat could define death, does it not make sense that the onset of a heartbeat would certainly indicate life? The heart is formed by the 18th day in the womb and begins beating by the 21st day. If heartbeat were used to define life, then nearly all abortions would be outlawed. Physicians now use a more rigorous criterion for determining death: brain wave activity. A flat EEG (electroencephalograph) is one of the most important indicators used to determine death. If the cessation of brain wave activity can define death, could not the onset of brain wave activity define life? Individual brain waves are detected in the fetus in about 40-45 days. Using brain wave activity to define life would outlaw at least a majority of abortions.^{lxii}

Opponents to abortion also raise the crucial issue of fetal pain. Does the fetus feel pain during an abortion? The evidence seems fairly clear and consistent that it does feel pain. Consider this statement made in a British medical journal: "Try sticking an infant with a pin and you know what happens. She opens her mouth to cry and also pulls away. Try sticking an 8-week-old human fetus in the palm of his hand. He opens his mouth and pulls his hand away. A more technical description would add that changes in heart rate and fetal movement also suggest that intrauterine manipulations are painful to the fetus." The development of sonography has provided us with a "window to the womb" showing us that a person is growing and developing in the mother's womb. We can discern eyes, ears, fingers, a nose, and a mouth. Our visual senses tell us this is a baby rapidly growing and maturing. The point is simple: *medical science leads to a pro-life perspective rather than a pro-choice perspective.*^{lxiii}

There are sound legal arguments against abortion as well. The best legal argument against abortion can be seen in the disastrous decision in the case of *Roe v. Wade*. It violated the standard of legal reasoning. The Supreme Court decided not to decide when life begins and then turned around and overturned the laws of 50 different states. Most of the Supreme Court's verdict rested upon two sentences. "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 an answer." Although the sentences sounded both innocuous and unpretentious, they were neither.

The Supreme Court's non-decision overturned state laws that protected the unborn and has resulted in approximately 60 million abortions (roughly the population of Canada) in the United States. The decision also seems unpretentious by acknowledging that *it did not know when life begins*. But if the Court did not know, then it should have acted "as if" life were in the womb. A pivotal role of government is to protect life. Government cannot remove a

segment of the human population from its protection without adequate justification. The burden of proof should lie with the life-taker, and the benefit of the doubt should be with the life-saver. Put another way: “when in doubt, don't.” A hunter who hears rustling in the bushes shouldn't fire until he knows what is in the bushes. Likewise, a Court which doesn't know when life begins, should not declare open season on the unborn. The burden of proof in law rests upon the prosecution; the benefit of doubt is with the defense. This is also known as a presumption of innocence. The defendant is assumed to be innocent unless proven guilty. The Supreme Court clearly stated that it does not know when life begins, and then it violated the very spirit of this legal principle by acting as if it just proved that no life existed in the womb.^{lxiv}

In Christ eternal hope is offered to those who repent, to those who have had abortions, and to those who have performed abortions

The blood of the innocent defiles those who shed it as well as those who sanction its shedding. The only hope of mankind is the gospel of Jesus Christ. Women and men who were persuaded by the abortion script, that the fetus is a mere thing with no moral worth, need the mercy and grace that is found only in Christ Jesus.^{lxv} Several years ago, this present author had a unique opportunity to repeatedly meet privately with a medical doctor who had assisted in the most live births within his state, but also had performed countless abortions. This physician had terminal lung cancer, and his son convinced him he ought to discuss his eternal welfare with a Christian pastor. As we talked within the privacy of his home, he would ask, “tell me again what will happen to me when I die, according to the Bible.” I shared the passages on judgment as well as pleading with him to repent of his sin and entrust himself to Christ. At times he seemed deeply sobered. But, at the end of each visit, he would give a concluding statement suggesting that he saw life much differently than I. During one appeal, I implored him to consider again the infinite value of the blood of God’s Son. For, according to Scripture, the blood of Christ speaks infinitely ‘louder’ than the shed blood of the victims. And, this has a profound application for those who have received abortions as well as those who have performed abortions. This marvelous truth had the physician’s attention for a moment, but he was not ready to repent of his crimes. Think of it, I pleaded with him, the blood of Abel cried out for justice, but the blood of Christ cries out for mercy upon the repenting sinner! “. . .and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood, which speaks better than *the blood of Abel*” (**Heb 12:24**).

It's difficult to think of a more bloody Jewish king than Manasseh who sacrificed his infant sons to the idol, Molech. “He made his sons pass through the fire in the valley of Ben-hinnom; and he practiced witchcraft, used divination, practiced sorcery and dealt with mediums and spiritists. He did much evil in the sight of the Lord, provoking Him *to anger*.” Yet, when Manasseh was afflicted, we read: “When he prayed to Him, He was moved by his entreaty and heard his supplication, and brought him again to Jerusalem to his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the Lord *was God*” (**2 Chron 33:13**). How marvelous this is! When we as believers advocate for the lives of the unborn, we ought also proclaim the gospel—that to those who repent, the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanses from all sin.^{lxvi} “If we say that we

have fellowship with Him and yet walk in the darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth; but if we walk in the Light as He Himself is in the Light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin” (1 Jn 1:6-7).

End Notes:

-
- ⁱ John O. Anderson, *The Cry of the Innocents* (Bridge Publishing: South Plainfield, NJ, 1984), pp. 72-76
- ⁱⁱ *Ibid*, pp. 79-82
- ⁱⁱⁱ *Ibid*, p. 100
- ^{iv} Nancy Pearcey, *Love thy Body*, (Baker Books: Grand Rapids, MI, 2018), p. 47
- ^v Scott Klusendorf in Pearcey, p. 53
- ^{vi} Pearcey, pp. 50-51
- ^{vii} Pearcey, p. 48
- ^{viii} *Ibid*, p. 49
- ^{ix} Pearcey, p. 52
- ^x *Ibid*, p. 53
- ^{xi} *Ibid*, p. 55
- ^{xii} *Ibid*, p. 56
- ^{xiii} Kerby Anderson, “Arguments against Abortion,” Probe Ministries International
- ^{xiv} *Ibid*.
- ^{xv} *Ibid*, p. 59
- ^{xvi} *Ibid*, pp. 57, 60
- ^{xvii} Ray Comfort, “180” video, LW Productions, 2011
- ^{xviii} Pearcey, 56-58, 60-62
- ^{xix} *Ibid*, pp. 64-65
- ^{xx} “Child Sacrifice,” YouTube
- ^{xxi} *Ibid*.
- ^{xxii} Kerby Anderson, “Arguments against Abortion”
- ^{xxiii} *Ibid*.
- ^{xxiv} *Ibid*.
- ^{xxv} Henry Morris, *The Genesis Record*, (Creation-Life Publishers: San Diego, CA, 1976), p. 85
- ^{xxvi} Kerby Anderson, “Arguments against Abortion”
- ^{xxvii} John O. Anderson, pp. 4-5
- ^{xxviii} *Ibid*, pp. 51-52
- ^{xxix} *Ibid*.
- ^{xxx} *Ibid*, pp. 62-63
- ^{xxxi} *Ibid*, pp. 6, 18
- ^{xxxii} *Ibid*, pp. 31-32
- ^{xxxiii} *Ibid*, pp. 34-35
- ^{xxxiv} *Ibid*, pp. 48-49
- ^{xxxv} *Ibid*, pp. 107-111
- ^{xxxvi} Francis Schaeffer, *Death in the City*, (Intervarsity Press: Downers Grove, IL, 1969), p. 59
- ^{xxxvii} John O. Anderson, pp. 114-117, 120-121
- ^{xxxviii} *Ibid*, pp. 130-131, 136-139
- ^{xxxix} *Ibid*, pp. 149-151
- ^{xl} Peter Barnes, *Open your Mouth for the Dumb, Abortion and the Christian*, (Banner of Truth Trust: Carlisle, PA, 1984), p. 27
- ^{xli} *Ibid*, p. 4
- ^{xlii} Ray Comfort, “180”
- ^{xliiii} *Ibid*.
- ^{xliv} John O. Anderson, pp. 48-49
- ^{xlv} Pearcey, p. 66

xlvi Ibid, pp. 75-79

xlvii Ibid, pp. 75, 81

xlviii Ibid, pp. 71-73

xlix Ibid, p. 74

¹ John O. Anderson, pp. 20-21

li Ibid.

lii J. Calvin, *Calvin's Commentaries on the Last Four Books of Moses Vol. 3* (Baker: MI, r. p. 1979) pp. 41-42 in Peter Barnes, p. 17

liii D. Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, (SCM: London, 1963) pp. 149-150, in Peter Barnes, *Open your Mouth for the Dumb, Abortion and the Christian*, (Banner of Truth Trust: Carlisle, PA, 1984), p. 3

liv Francis Schaeffer, *Death in the City*, p. 57

lv Peter Barnes, *Open your Mouth for the Dumb*, p. 6

lvi Scott Klusendorf, Focus on the Family, 1.12.17

lvii Peter Barnes, *Open your Mouth for the Dumb*, p. 26

lviii Scott Klusendorf

lix Ibid.

lx Ibid.

lxi Kerby Anderson, Probe Ministries International

lxii Ibid.

lxiii Ibid.

lxiv Ibid.

lxv Pearcey, p. 48

lxvi Peter Barnes, pp. 27-28