

ABORTION: AN AMERICAN HOLOCAUST NOT FREEDOM OF CHOICE

BY

JESSE M. BOYD

5 MAY 1999

ABORTION: AN AMERICAN HOLOCAUST NOT FREEDOM OF CHOICE

Introduction

Abortion is a type of catastrophic genocide that has engulfed America for the past two and a half decades, resulting in the systematic butchering of approximately 30,000,000 unborn babies. It “has become the most divisive political and religious issue in the late twentieth-century America. The arguments for abortion rights are being put forth in the political arena with greater vigor and rhetorical hostility than ever before.”¹ Some have even compared this grave situation to the horrific holocaust of Nazi Germany:

The Nazi Mentality is neither dead nor is it exclusive property of the Nazis. In this nation, we long ago surpassed Hitler’s six million. Abortions occur in America at an annual rate now surpassing 1,500,000 with no end in sight. The Nazi mentality may still be correctly defined as: An acceptance of the unwarranted extermination of human beings as a national necessity.²

Abortion by its very nature certainly entails *an acceptance of the unwarranted extermination of human beings as a national necessity*. The American political arena seems to view abortion as necessary for the full realization of each and every American’s individual rights, especially the so-called “right to privacy.” However, behind the outward appeal of concern for the individual is a tangled web of depraved and wicked motives that so characterizes this country in the modern age.

The purpose of this brief excursus is to construct a clear-cut case against this national holocaust based upon the reality of the practice’s barbarity, Biblical authority, practical argumentation, and the fallacies of emotional issues. This will be done in an effort to convince the reader that abortion in America is more than a question of free choice and the right to privacy. Rather, the mentality behind the promotion of this practice is barbaric and equivocal in nature; it could quite possibly reap dire consequences for America’s future, for her sins have come into “remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath” (Revelation 16:19).

The Barbaric Reality of Abortion Methodology

Abortion, in medical terms, can be defined as the end of a pregnancy before viability; it is the termination of the process of gestation after the time when the zygote attaches itself to the

¹Francis Beckwith, Politically Correct Death (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993), 11.

uterine wall, and before the fetus is possibly capable of surviving on its own—currently 20-28 weeks from conception. In other words, it is the deliberate destruction of an unborn baby. Differentiation must be made between accidental abortion, otherwise known as a miscarriage, and therapeutic abortion which is the focus of this paper and involves the intervention of a physician as the tool of annihilation.

Currently, there are several different methods of abortion, each one being horrific and disgusting in nature. The very character of such methodology carries with it a tone of barbarism. *Suction and Curettage*, for example, is performed up to twelve weeks after conception. In this procedure, a curette is inserted through the woman's vagina into her uterus and is used to scrape the uterine wall, cutting the baby's body to pieces. Then, the mutilated body parts are sucked into a jar by way of a powerful suction hose.³

Saline Abortion, commonly referred to as "salting out," is a method used in later pregnancy when suction abortion might result in too much bleeding for the pregnant woman. Generally, it is performed between 16 and 24 weeks after conception. A long needle is inserted through the mother's abdomen directly into the uterus, and a concentrated salt solution is injected into the amniotic fluid. The baby absorbs the solution through its lungs and gastrointestinal tract, producing a change in osmotic pressure. As a result, the fetus is fried in its own fluid. The mother then delivers a dead, shriveled baby about a day later.⁴

Dilation and Evacuation is an abortion method performed 12-24 weeks after conception. Here, the child is literally cut to pieces by a sharp knife. Oftentimes, the operating nurse is required to reassemble the unborn's body parts in order to make sure that the woman's uterus has been completely emptied.⁵

Prostaglandin Abortion is performed during the second trimester of pregnancy; it involves the use of chemicals developed and sold by the Upjohn Pharmaceutical Company. The hormone-like compounds are applied to the muscle of the uterus which in turn, causes it to contract intensely. As a result, the developing baby is pushed out, oftentimes causing decapitation. Many, however, have been born alive and left to die in sinks, sewers, or trashcans.⁶

²Kent Kelly, *Abortion, The American Holocaust* (Southern Pines, NC: Calvary Press, 1981), 5.

³C. Everett Koop and Francis Schaeffer, *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?* (Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1979), 41.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Beckwith, 46.

⁶Gary Bergel, *When You Were Formed in Secret* (Elyria, OH: Intercessors for America, 1980), II- 4.

A *hysterotomy* is performed during the second and third trimesters of pregnancy and is generally the same as a Cesarean section. However, unlike the C-section, this method is undertaken with the sole purpose of killing the infant. Upon extraction, the unborn baby looks very much like other babies except that it is smaller and weighs only about two pounds. It is very much alive but allowed to die through neglect; sometimes it may even be killed by a direct act. This method is only used if a woman chooses abortion when it is too late to accomplish it by the aforementioned methods. It is rarely used today due to the increased risk to the patient's health. Nevertheless, it is a legal procedure.⁷

Perhaps the most appalling method of abortion is known as *Dilation and Extraction* (a.k.a. *Partial Birth Abortion*). It is performed anywhere between 20 and 40 weeks after conception and involves the delivery of most of the baby's body with the exception of the head, after a three-day period of cervical dilation. "At this point, the abortionist jams scissors into the base of the skull of the child, and the head is 'evacuated'—in other words, the brains are sucked out."⁸ The baby is then removed from the mother and disposed of. The interesting thing about this particular method is that the baby is still considered less than human while its body squirms outside the mother's vagina. Only a few inches of the vaginal canal differentiates between legal abortion and murder in contemporary American politics. This seeming paradox sounds strikingly familiar to the Nazis' justification for experimenting with and torturing Jews during WWII.

The horrors of the aforementioned techniques are further heightened by the fact that the unborn baby is often subjugated to intense pain. A study once published in an edition of the *Lancet*, a British medical journal, showed, based upon hormone levels, that "fetuses jabbed with needles *in utero* have a 'similar hormonal response' to human beings *ex utero*."⁹ In other words, they hurt much like adults do when encountering painful stimuli. "It is beyond a reasonable doubt that the unborn can feel pain possibly as early as eight weeks after conception and definitely by thirteen and a half weeks."¹⁰ Approximately forty-two percent of all abortions result in excruciating torture "of a sentient being that many people would find morally repugnant

⁷Koop and Schaeffer, 42.

⁸James Smith, "Brutal Abortion Procedure Protected Under FOCA," *LIGHT*, September-October, 1993, 61.

⁹"Painful Facts About the Fetus," *Washington Times*, 14 July 1994, sec. 17A.

¹⁰Beckwith 47.

if performed on animals.”¹¹ On one occasion, a sincere Pro-choice advocate by the name of Brenda Pratt Shafer was forced to witness partial-birth abortions as a nurse whose agency assigned her to work at Dr. Martin Haskell’s Dayton abortion clinic in 1993. After observing the procedure performed three times, Shafer quit. In a letter addressed to Congressman Tony Hall (D-OH) on July 9, 1995, she described the event as “the most horrifying experience of my life.”¹² She went on to say:

The baby’s body was moving. His little fingers were clasping together. He was kicking his feet. All the while his little head was still stuck inside. Dr. Haskell took a pair of scissors and inserted them into the back of the baby’s head. Then, he opened the scissors up. Then he stuck the high-powered suction tube into the hole and sucked the baby’s brains out. I almost threw up as I watched him do these things.¹³

In recent years, abortion has been taken a step further as far as repugnance is concerned. Fetal tissue research is on the rise, and companies are harvesting aborted body parts to put in cosmetic items such as make-up. Moreover, fetuses are being conceived by way of *in vitro* fertilization for the sole purpose of such lethal research.¹⁴ Such is a ghastly reminder of the bizarre Nazi medical experiments carried out during Hitler’s secret campaign of the final solution of the “Jewish problem” in Europe.

As shocking as it may seem, “the number one killer in America is not heart disease - it is abortion.”¹⁵ As noted, approximately 1.5 million abortions were being performed annually in the United States as of 1980. That rate has most probably increased drastically in the last two decades. In other words, America is killing the equivalent to all the Jews in Israel every eighteen months. Such indisputable realities immediately cast doubt upon the notion that abortion is simply a matter of free choice.

The Barbaric Reality of Abortion Politics

Having established that abortion by its very nature is barbaric, it is only appropriate to consider the political attitudes behind the cry for free choice; they too represent a paradoxical and barbaric mentality. First of all, the link between abortion and free choice is at best imaginary. Absolute freedom of choice cannot and does not exist in human society. American law does not allow the freedom of choice with regard to driving while intoxicated or robbing a

¹¹Ibid., 49.

¹²Brenda Shafer to Rep. Tony Hall, 9 July 1995, printed in *SALT* 5, no. 4 (1995): 62.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴John Feinberg and Paul Feinberg, Ethics for a Brave New World (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1993), 417-418 (n. 31).

¹⁵Kelly, 8.

bank. American citizens, in fact, do not even enjoy complete freedom of their own bodies—they cannot by law freely choose to use drugs, walk through the streets naked, or consume alcohol under the age of twenty-one. Properly understood, freedom is not barbaric anarchy as pro-choice advocates would have us believe, but the cognizance and embracing of responsibility. Thus:

The claim to the ownership of one's body is at best a feeble excuse to kill. In the U.S. and many other countries there is a right to own property, but that right does not give the owner the right to kill innocent trespassers, especially when they are present at the invitation of the owner . . . What is true of owning property in general is also true of a woman's ownership of her body. She has no right to kill "trespassers," especially when they are present at her implied or explicit consent.¹⁶

Arguments for abortion that focus upon the complete freedom of choice are faulty; they seek something that cannot be attained. The underlying motivation is none other than an initial attempt to relieve mankind of any moral responsibility. Taken to an extreme, the push for complete freedom of choice would lead to chaos and the eventual destruction of the human race. The words of the Apostle Paul in Romans 1:32 immediately come to mind—"Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

Another clear indication that the "right to choose argument" is more than a desire for freedom concerns the deliberate withholding of information that is so prevalent in American society with regard to abortion. This is perhaps best typified by the Supreme Court decision reached in *Thornburg v. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Pennsylvania* in 1986. The Court concluded that all previous information-dispensing requirements were unconstitutional, arguing that they seemed to be overt attempts to discourage abortion. In conjunction with this, the decision contained the most forceful assertion of the right to abortion.¹⁷ If it is a person's rights that are at stake, why doesn't a woman seeking an abortion have the right to know all of the available information even if it were to discourage her from going through the procedure? The truth is: it is not an issue of personal rights but a biased promotion of an anti-God, barbaric mentality. Pro-choice advocates seem to be afraid of the facts.

The barbaric mentality behind abortion politics becomes further apparent when one considers the unrestricted promotion of partial-birth abortions as implied under the *Freedom of Choice Act* (H.R. 25 / S. 25) which has come before Congress. If the issue were truly about

¹⁶Feinberg and Feinberg, 68. This conclusion assumes correctly that the fetus is a human life. Such an assumption is backed up by logic and medical facts despite the claims of pro-choice advocates and developmental theories of life. This particular topic will be discussed in more detail below.

personal freedom, there would be no problem with outlawing such an uncivilized and gruesome practice. Why would a woman want to carry a baby into the so-called “third trimester” if she did not want the child in the first place? Other techniques such as *dilation and extraction* and *saline abortion* would seem to be much more convenient and less traumatic. Perhaps other motives are involved such as the desire for fresh harvests of fetal tissue for research purposes. Such “illustrates the grisly, inhumane world of the abortion industry.”¹⁸

A Biblical Perspective¹⁹

Having analyzed the barbaric reality of abortion in both the methodological and political arenas, it is only prudent to show why abortion is wrong and why our country is heading in the wrong direction if current legislation does not change. Because the Holy Scriptures are the final authority and the source of absolute truth, they must be consulted first and foremost.

Abortion is not a “black and white” issue per se in the Scriptures, but numerous principles undergird the question; thus, it is unmitigated ignorance for a Christian to deem the issue a “gray-area.” The Word of God clearly teaches that children are valued even as they exist in the womb before birth. Furthermore, the arguments of the pro-choice camp stand in direct opposition to the righteous nature of Almighty God.

First of all, by consulting Ruth 4:13 and I Samuel 1:5, one clearly sees that God is the author of life. Therefore, claims of “procreative choice” such as those advocated by Beverly Harrison are nonsense.²⁰ It is the Almighty alone who opens up and shuts the womb. The “Absolute Monarch of all Books” even goes so far as to define life. Nowhere do the Scriptures use phrases such as “human” or “human being.” Instead, terms such as man, woman, child, son, daughter, baby etc. are utilized to refer to living human beings. Since these terms are also used to refer to unborn children, one has evidence that human life is present before birth. The Bible makes no distinction of any kind in the terms used to describe a fetus. Also, it is important to note that the body without the spirit is dead (James 2:26); and according to Deuteronomy 12:23, the blood is the life.²¹ Numerous passages in the Bible indicate that the life in the womb is a human individual. For example, according to Genesis 25:22, Jacob and Esau actively struggled with

¹⁷ *Thornburg v. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Pennsylvania* (1986).

¹⁸ Smith, 61.

¹⁹ For a more definitive outline of biblical principles surrounding the issue of abortion, one should consult Appendix A.

²⁰ Beverly Harrison, *Our Right to Choose* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1983), 32-56.

each other in their mother's womb just as two people would do. Also, in Luke 1:41,44, John the Baptist, while in Elizabeth's womb, hears Mary's salutation and leaps for joy.

Most serious discussions of biblical evidence for or against abortion have wrestled with Exodus 21:22-25. When two men fight and a pregnant woman is injured so that the fetus "departs," punishment is due for any harm that follows. Some have argued that the harm only refers to the mother, whereas if she died *lex talionis* would apply. However, this view is based on faulty interpretation and focuses more on the reading of modern English versions of Scripture which can be shown to be distorted and deficient in hundreds of places. Both "Luther and Calvin in their day and the great Jewish scholars today hold that harm to the fetus also demanded the *lex talionis*, eye-for-an-eye."²² Montgomery goes on to say, "To interpret this passage in any other way is to strain the text intolerably."²³

There are many other references in Scripture to life before birth. There is no doubt that "the preponderance of evidence is that Scripture views the unborn as having individual personhood."²⁴ Having established this fact, one must ask how an unborn child should then be treated.

Since an unborn baby is a human being, abortion is murder. In Exodus 20:13, God commands that one should not kill another man. This is one of the ten great commandments. "Thou shalt not kill" is an overreaching principle and covers all varieties of taking innocent human life. "Since every moral principle of Scripture is universally normative unless the Bible itself limits its application, what exceptions to the Sixth Commandment are indicated in Scripture? Only justifiable warfare, capital punishment, and self-defense . . . all other homicide falls under the ban"—abortion included.²⁵

With this in mind, we must be guided by exactly the same rules or principles that apply to any child or baby when dealing with the unborn. What are these rules? First of all, one is to act with stewardship, training and protecting his child. Children are a blessing and source of happiness from God to the parents (Psalm 127:3-5; 128:3-5), and God has made parents stewards of their children (Proverbs 22:6; Ephesians 6:4). If one misuses what has been entrusted to him

²¹The fetus has a separate blood supply from the mother 30 days after conception and a fully developed bloodstream at four weeks (Feinberg and Feinberg, 54).

²²Robertson McQuilkin, *An Introduction to Biblical Ethics* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1989), 320.

²³John Montgomery, *Slaughter of the Innocents* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books), 101.

²⁴McQuilkin, 320.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 319.

by God, his actions are condemned, and he will be punished (Luke 12:42-46; Matthew 25:14-30; I Corinthians 4:2). Overall, God says to love our children (Titus 2:4; I Corinthians 13:4-7).

One shows that he has respect for life when he does not allow for the murder of an unborn child. According to Psalm 106:37-38, Israel became polluted because she shed the innocent blood of her sons and daughters. America too has become polluted, for when children or infants are dashed to pieces, it is a great tragedy to any nation (Hosea 13:16; II Kings 8:12). Had Pharaoh killed the Israelite male babies before they were born, would he have been any less wicked? Certainly not! Is it any less wicked if people today do it?

In concluding the biblical argument against abortion, let it be noted that a man who takes a bribe to slay an innocent person is cursed (cf. Deuteronomy 27:25). Such is a clear description of those who operate abortion clinics. Abortion is murder, we have God's Word on it!

Practical Argumentation Against Abortion

Even though the Bible is the absolute authority on the matter of abortion, a pro-choice advocate does not want to hear what the Bible has to say because he/she is natural, and "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, for they are spiritually discerned" (I Corinthians 2:14). However, argumentative dialogue can be established with pro-choice advocates; not only does the pro-life movement have the Bible on its side, but it enjoys history, public consensus, medical/scientific facts, and logic as formidable allies.

As far as American history is concerned, the Declaration of Independence is clear on the matter, "We are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights that among these are *life*, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."²⁶ Unfortunately, the pro-choice movement would rather reword the document to read,

We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal in the third trimester. That they are endowed by the evolutionary process with certain inalienable rights depending on their viability as a human being. That among these are the right to death so long as it occurs before the deadline; liberty, if the mother and physician agree; and the pursuit of happiness should they not be one of the victims of abortion - the American Holocaust.²⁷

Aside from the claims of the founding fathers on the right to life, the actual historical development of abortion as an issue in America began almost two hundred years ago. As James Mohr promulgates:

²⁶Emphasis mine.

²⁷Kelly, 45-46.

In 1800 no jurisdiction in the United States had enacted any statutes whatsoever on the subject of abortion; most forms of abortion were not illegal and those American women who wished to practice abortion did so. Yet, by 1900 virtually every jurisdiction in the United States had laws upon its books that proscribed the practice sharply and declared most abortions to be criminal offenses.²⁸

Such anti-abortion laws permeated the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, but a major shift occurred in 1973 with the landmark case *Roe v. Wade*.

Because of the absence of any legislation whatsoever on the subject of abortion in the United States at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the general principle was to follow the traditional common law as interpreted by the local courts of the new American states. For centuries prior to 1800, the common law's attitude toward abortion did not recognize the existence of the fetus in criminal cases until it had quickened. "Quickening" was the term applied to the first perception of fetal movement by the pregnant woman herself. The expulsion and destruction of a fetus without due cause after quickening was considered a crime.²⁹

This principle was generally followed up until the earliest laws that dealt with the legal status of abortion were inserted into American criminal code-books between 1821 and 1841. During that period, ten states and one federal territory enacted legislation that "for the first time made certain kinds of abortion explicit statute offenses rather than leaving the common law to deal with them."³⁰ The first American legislation to address the question of abortion in statute form was a Connecticut "Crimes and Punishments" law that was passed in 1821. Section 14 reads:

Every person who shall, willfully and maliciously, administer to, or cause to be administered to, or taken by, any person or persons, any deadly poison, or other noxious and destructive substance, with an intention him, her, or them, thereby to murder, or thereby to cause or procure the miscarriage of any woman, then being quick with child, and shall be thereof duly convicted, shall suffer imprisonment, in newgate prison, during his natural life, or for such other term as the court having cognizance of the offense shall determine.³¹

The years 1840-1880 can be considered "The Great Upsurge of Abortion." In the 1840's, three key changes profoundly affected the evolution of abortion policy for the next forty years. First of all, abortion came out into the public view. In other words, the fact that Americans were practicing abortion was an obvious social reality, clearly visible to the population as a whole. Secondly, the overall incidence of abortion, according to contemporary

²⁸James Mohr, *Abortion in America - The Origins and Evolution of National Policy, 1800-1900*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), vii.

²⁹Mohr, 3.

³⁰Ibid., 20.

³¹*The Public Statute Laws of the State of Connecticut, 1821*.

observers, began to increase sharply. Abortion went from a marginal practice whose incidence probably approximated that of illegitimacy to a widespread social phenomenon. Finally, the types of women having abortions seemed to change; it became more and more prevalent among white, married, Protestant, native-born women of the middle and upper classes who either wished to delay their childbearing or already had all the children they desired to have. Previously, abortion was limited to cases of illegitimacy and mainly involved unmarried non-whites and immigrants.³²

Due to these changes, the state governments began to crack down on abortion by issuing a landslide of anti-abortion legislation. Let it be noted that the *Roe v. Wade* decision was partially reached by reference to the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States in which the states were forbidden to abridge the rights and privileges of American citizens residing within the respective states. As Justice Rehnquist, in dissenting, wrote, “The Court has necessarily had to find within the scope of the Fourteenth Amendment a right that was apparently completely unknown to the drafter’s of the Amendment.”³³ However, by the time of the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868, there were at least 36 laws enacted by state and territorial legislatures limiting abortion.

The period of American history from 1857-1880 is considered to be “The Physician’s Crusade Against Abortion.” As Mohr explicates,

America’s regular physicians, committed to the forward-looking tenets of what would become scientific medicine, began a concerted, self-conscious, and eventually successful drive designed to improve, professionalize, and ultimately control the practice of medicine in the United States. The founding of the American Medical Association may be taken as the beginning of this long-term effort . . . Regular physicians affiliated with the AMA launched an aggressive campaign against abortion on the eve of the Civil War. The pressure of the crusade pushed state legislatures beyond expressions of cautious concern about abortion and its possible excesses to straightforward opposition to the practice. Equally important, the doctor’s crusade began also to affect the underlying public tolerance of abortion that had remained so common in the United States through the 1850s.³⁴

In other words, the public consensus toward the issue began to shift. Before the doctor’s crusade, abortion was generally tolerated because it often involved unmarried immigrants who were pregnant out of wedlock. However, as the practice became more common among social life, the crusade of doctors sparked the public to begin to renege on their tolerance. From 1860-

³²Mohr, 46.

³³*Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), Mr. Justice Rehnquist, dissenting, II.

³⁴Mohr, 147-148.

1880, one begins to see a “significant, perceptible hardening of American public opinion against what had become a relatively common private practice.”³⁵

In response to the doctor’s crusade and the shift in public consensus, the most important burst of anti-abortion legislation in the nation’s history came onto the scene. At least forty anti-abortion statutes of various kinds were placed upon the state and territorial lawbooks during that period, over thirty in the years from 1866-1877 alone. Also, thirteen jurisdictions formally outlawed the practice for the first time, and at least twenty-one states revised their already existing statutes on the subject. “Most of the legislation passed between 1860 and 1880 explicitly accepted the regulars’ assertions that the interruption of gestation at any point in the pregnancy should be a crime and that the state itself should try actively to restrict the practice of abortion.”³⁶ These laws remained in effect for a good two-thirds of the twentieth century, although some were amended or updated. In fact, twenty-one laws on the books in 1868 remained completely intact in 1973, the year of the great shift.

As has been shown, anti-abortion laws were a large and important part of American history, and public consensus was generally to agree with such. However, with the landmark case in 1973 (*Roe v. Wade*), the perspective changed and ever since, America has attempted to limited and restrict abortions as little as possible, thus bringing about the slaughter of 30 million innocent human beings. According to American historical heritage, free choice was never an issue connected to abortion.

Public consensus also shows disfavor toward abortion because naturally, the voters do not want their tax dollars to be used to murder babies. Even if the majority of Americans were in favor of abortion, an assumption that is highly debatable, since when does majority thinking become the rule of thumb? A lynch mob is a majority rule. America was never intended to exclusively exist as a nation of majority rule. If this were the case, any right could be taken away by majority decision. Besides, as has already been presented, the general public consensus throughout American history, a history that was founded upon Judeo-Christian ethics, has been anti-abortion.

Medical and scientific facts also contradict the barbaric line of thinking promoted by the pro-choice camp. Science says there is no point after conception at which it may be said life

³⁵Ibid., 171-172.

³⁶Ibid., 200.

does not exist. “From a biological point of view there is little difference between aborting a fetus and killing an infant.”³⁷ The three trimesters of fetal development are nothing more than subjective stages forced upon the process of gestation. Erickson writes, “It is generally observed that there is a gradual and continuous development of the fetus from conception to birth; therefore, no specific moment or event can be identified as the instant of the emergence of humanity or infusion of the soul.”³⁸ The continuity of gestation implies the presence of human life. Ronald Reagan concludes, “The real question today is not when human life begins, but *What is the value of human life?* The abortionist who reassembles the arms and legs of a tiny baby to make sure all its parts have been torn from its mother’s body can hardly doubt whether it is a human being.”³⁹ Because of this, abortionists are often forced to resort to a developmental view of humanity. In other words, human life is determined by value and profitability toward society. “At best, there is a potential person [in the womb]. Value is achieved in social interaction.”⁴⁰ Such notions are purely barbaric, inevitably creating a slippery slope that can and will eventually justify all types of evil. The Feinbergs state it nicely, “The same argument would support infanticide, euthanasia, and destruction of the severely mentally handicapped, since they cannot achieve functions that are necessary for human value under this view.”⁴¹ To take it a step further, it is very conceivable that this view of humanity could one day justify that annihilation of Christians seeing as they are not “profitable” in a non-Christian society. Such is barbarism.

Outside of Scripture, perhaps the most important ally of the pro-life position is logic. Logic indicates that pro-life politics are uncivilized and barbaric. Plainly speaking, it is wrong to accept the unwarranted extermination of human beings as a national necessity. This was and is the Nazi mentality. The overriding principle of civilized society is that the strong are responsible for helping the weak and government is responsible for protecting innocent human life. “If a gathering does not expect the strong to help the weak, it is not a ‘society.’ If a society does not respect the principle of protecting innocent human life, it is not ‘civilized.’”⁴² A human fetus is undeniably human and it is undeniably innocent. Therefore, a civilized society is responsible for

³⁷McQuilkin, 318.

³⁸Millard Erickson, Christian Theology (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1983), 553.

³⁹Ronald Reagan, Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation, (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1984) 21.

⁴⁰Feinberg and Feinberg, 62.

⁴¹Ibid., 63.

⁴²Daniel Heimbach, Class Notes—Basic Christian Ethics (Wake Forest, NC: Southeastern Seminary, 1999), 66. Although this citation is not from a formally published source, the author chooses to cite it because he has found

protecting its unborn. Apart from this maxim, “life would indeed be miserable, brutish, and short.”⁴³ At best, it would be barbaric.

Emotional Issues that Tend to Divide Christians on the Issue

Before bringing this excursus to a close, it is only appropriate to briefly mention some issues that generate emotion in favor of murdering the unborn. Most of these, in fact, have been responsible for dividing Christians and/or the pro-life camp into opposing factions. One such argument holds that abortion prevents the birth and tragedy of unwanted children. However, according to a study done by Edward Leoski of the University of California, 90% of battered and neglected children were planned pregnancies. “An unwanted pregnancy in early months does not necessarily mean an unwanted baby after delivery.”⁴⁴ Two factors are often cited in this line of argument—either the family cannot afford the child or the child will be unloved. These factors may come into play, but consider the bizarre logic involved. “If extermination of such potentially troublesome children while they are still in the womb is right, why begin there? . . . surely, the reasonable course of action would be to begin with actual suffering instead of potential suffering.”⁴⁵ Why don’t doctors just go from door to door and administer lethal injections as they see fit? If it is a greater tragedy to be poor and unwanted than to be dead, this world needs a few more Jack Kervorkians to work on the present population.

The incidence of rape and/or incest also tends to stir up emotion among Christians. Some try to say that a woman should not have to suffer the burden of a child brought about by such a traumatizing crime as rape. However, should an innocent baby have to suffer for the sins of another man? Deuteronomy 24:16 says, “neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin.” Besides, pregnancies resulting from rape are so rare as to be virtually non-existent. In a study of 1,000 rape cases, there were zero pregnancies. “Medical research indicates that an extremely high percentage of women exposed to severe emotional trauma will not ovulate. The rape itself, therefore acts as a psychological ‘birth control.’”⁴⁶ As far as incest is concerned, Moses and Aaron were children of incest (cf. Exodus 6:20); yet, they grew up to become the spiritual and political liberators of an entire

no other writer that so plainly and effectively states how abortion violates the principle of civility. Dr. Heimbach’s words are some of the most profound the author has ever read with regard to the issue at hand.

⁴³Ibid., 67.

⁴⁴J.C. Wilke, Abortion: Questions and Answers (Cincinnati, OH: Hayes Publishing Company, 1988), 72.

⁴⁵Kelly, 91.

⁴⁶F.D. Mecklenburg, Indications for Induced Abortion (New York: Hawksford Publishing, 1972), 19.

nation. If a Christian were to justify abortion in cases of rape and/or incest he would not only be violating the principle of civilization but the Word of God as well. Paul writes, “for whatsoever *is* not of faith is sin” (Romans 14:23). Abortions in these instances cannot possibly be promoted or condoned with an attitude of faith.

The “health of the mother” has been an emotional issue surrounding abortion even on the political forefront. In fact, President Clinton claimed that the absence of a “health of the mother clause” in the Partial Abortion Bill is the reason he exercised his power of veto. Those suggesting abortion as a factor of any kind in this area, like President Clinton, are grasping at ancient straws. Dr. Joseph P. Donnelly was at one time the medical director of Margaret Hague Hospital in New Jersey. From 1947 to 1961, there were 115,000 deliveries in his maternity hospital with no abortions. He went on to say, “Abortion is never necessary to save the life of the mother.”⁴⁷ Furthermore, Dr. Roy S. Heffernan of Tufts University, speaking to the Congress of the American College of Surgeons said, “Anyone who performs a therapeutic abortion is either ignorant of modern methods of treating the complications of pregnancy or is unwilling to take the time to use them.”⁴⁸ Dr. John L. Grady, former Chief of Staff at Glades General Hospital in Florida, once said:

Thousands of physicians across the United States, each of whom has cared for hundreds of mothers and infants during their respective years of practice, state firmly they have never in these thousands of pregnancies seen a single instance where the life of the infant had to be sacrificed to save the mother, nor have they seen a situation where a mother has been lost for failure of the physician to perform an abortion. In fact, in more than 13 years of obstetrical practice, I never lost a mother from any cause. Moreover, during that time, at the public hospital where I was a staff member, there were thousands of babies delivered, and, to my knowledge, not a single therapeutic abortion. Thus, with today’s advanced medical knowledge and practice, a therapeutic abortion is never necessary, because competent physicians, using the latest medical and surgical techniques, can preserve the lives of both the mother and the child.⁴⁹

Unfortunately the “save the mother syndrome” is false notion merely promoted to stir up emotions. The lack of concrete evidence with regard to the matter has forced some to ridiculously accept broad definitions of health that include financial, psychological, and emotional reasons. As a result, abortion is practically justified for purposes of sheer convenience; this bespeaks a tone of barbaric depravity.

⁴⁷qtd. in Kelly, 94.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid., 95-96.

One final issue worthy of mention concerns the Christian, abortion, and civil disobedience. Groups such as Operation Rescue are often criticized for their approach. The Feinbergs, for example, argue:

Given the pro-abortion inclination of the media, those who are for life are pictured as fanatic zealots. Such actions [like those of Operation Rescue] only reinforce these stereotypes . . . Thus, we think prudence counsels against indirect civil disobedience . . . We fear that a confrontational approach like Operation Rescue's could push a goodly number of these people into the pro-choice camp.⁵⁰

All of this may be true, but so what? Jeremiah did not keep his mouth shut even though his words prodded the entire nation of Judah to side with the king. The truth must be spoken regardless of the consequences. Those who reject the truth will answer to God for it. Such a position in no way advocates the bombing of abortion clinics and the murder of abortion doctors. The end never justifies the means; but if one is bound to obey a law simply because it is constitutional, a man should then be thrown in jail for breaking a no-trespassing law to save a drowning child. Furthermore, such a premise requires a harsh criticism of the Underground Railroad and the U.S. Supreme Court Dred Scott decision because slavery was constitutional at that time, and those who promoted the abolition thereof (e.g. John Brown) were considered to be wild-eyed fanatics. Some might even say that civil disobedience is wrong when it comes to abortion because Christians are not forced to have abortions. However, abortion prevents them from exercising Jesus' command to "Love your neighbor as yourself." According to Acts 5:29, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Moreover, to hold to this position is to say that those who rescued Jews during the Nazi Holocaust were wrong in their efforts. Such is hardly even fathomable. As Christians we should not sit around dialoguing about how God hates abortion; rather, we should be out taking a stand and seeking to win lost and degenerate pro-abortionists to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. James 4:17 reads, "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

Conclusion

Having analyzed the barbaric nature of abortion, it is only proper to determine what Christians can do about this national holocaust. First of all, they can get informed. The American public has been deceived concerning the nature, reality, and motives of abortion politics—find out the facts! Secondly, Christians can get on their knees and pray, petitioning

⁵⁰Feinberg and Feinberg, 98.

God to withhold his judgment. Finally, Christians can band together to seek political action and stand up for their convictions in a society where convictions are few and far between. All in all, this excursus is by no means an exhaustive exposition but an avid attempt to present the issue of abortion in light of its barbaric reality, Scriptural teaching, and practical argumentation. America has most assuredly undertaken a holocaust, reminiscent of Nazi barbarism. If things do not change soon, divine judgment awaits this “one nation under God.” As John Montgomery ardently proclaims, “The kairoitic time has come for American Christians to bring the eschatological perspective to bear on our society. If God did not tolerate the Nazi extermination of six million Jews, what makes us think that he will continue to ignore our daily mounting toll of infanticides?”⁵¹ After all, America has resurrected the Nazi mentality—*an acceptance of the unwarranted extermination of human beings as a national necessity*. Bluntly speaking, the life America might save by doing away with abortion may very well be its own. The core of the abortionist mentality is free choice simply because everyone wants to be able to do whatever they want to do without being accountable to a moral authority. However, the right to choose really plays no part in this barbaric saga; because of abortion, 80,000 women in each of the 50 states will never even have the right to choose anything. “The truth of the matter is that if all those little ladies could be brought back to life, they would not support abortion as representing a woman’s right”⁵²

In conclusion, it is only appropriate to make mention of the warning God gave to Israel in Jeremiah 19:3-4. “Hear ye the word of the Lord, O kings of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem; Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold I will bring evil on this place, the which whosoever heareth, his ears shall tingle. Because they . . . have filled this place with the blood of innocents.”

⁵¹Montgomery, 124.

⁵²Kelly, 89.

APPENDIX A

AN OUTLINE OF SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES CONCERNING ABORTION

Abortion is not dealt with directly in Scripture, but numerous principles speak to the issue. It is ignorance that leads a person to consider this issue to be a “gray-area” in the Word of God, for one can clearly see that children are valued even as they exist in the womb before birth. What follows is an overview of Scriptural teaching on the issues.

THE BIBLE DEFINES LIFE: Nowhere uses phrases “human” or “human being”

1. Uses “man, woman, child, son, daughter, baby etc.”
2. Since these terms are used for unborn children, then we have evidence that human life is present before birth.
3. The Bible makes no distinction of any kind in the terms used to describe a fetus.
4. Body without spirit is dead (James 2:26)
5. The blood is the life (Deuteronomy 12:23) - fetus has bloodstream at 4 weeks.

THE LIFE IN THE WOMB IS A HUMAN INDIVIDUAL:

Genesis 25:22 - This verse reveals that Jacob and Esau actively struggled with each other in their mother’s womb as two people would do.

Exodus 21:22-25 - This passage presents an interesting case. If a man was to smite a pregnant woman so that her child came out of her, he was to be punished with a fine determined by the woman’s husband, *if the child did not die*. However, if the man, by attacking the woman, harms the child in her womb so that it is born dead, *lex talionis* (eye for an eye etc.) applies.

Numbers 12:12 - Here, Moses describes “one dead, of whom the flesh is half consumed when he cometh out of his mother’s womb.” If a baby dies before it is born, as in an abortion, the woman who conceived it is still a “mother.”

Job 3:16 - Babies that die before birth are called “infants” that never saw light. This is exactly like babies that are aborted. This word (Heb. OLEL) always and without exception refers to human individuals (Hosea 13:16; Psalm 8:2; Joel 2:16).

Job 10:8-12 - In this passage, Job praises God for the way in which he was created from birth. Verses 10-12 are of particular importance because they refer to God’s care of the human embryo.

Psalm 139:13-16 - In this psalm, David discusses God’s power in the formation of man. He

praises God for actively participating in his formation in the womb. In verse 15, *my substance* refers to the bones and the skeleton and *the lowest parts of the earth* is a clear allusion to the womb which was considered as mysterious as the netherworld. In verse 16, the *unperfect* substance refers to the embryo. The last part of the verse means that the days of David's life were written in God's book, affirming God's prior knowledge and plan of everything in David's life.

Isaiah 49:1,5 - In these two verses, it is promulgated that the Servant-Messiah was called and formed from the womb.

Luke 1:41,44 - These two verses detail the famous account of John the Baptist's excitement at the announcement of Jesus' birth by Mary. John was still in Elizabeth's womb, and he leaped with joy at Mary's salutation.

Further Revelation From a Detailed Word Study

ben (בן) - Hebrew word that means "son" or "child."

Genesis 25:21-44 - The word is used to refer to children in the womb prior to birth.

Genesis 17:25 - The word is used to refer to the adolescent Ishmael

Genesis 9:19 - The word is used to refer to Noah's adult sons.

brephos (βρεφος) - Greek word that means "baby" or "infant."

Luke 1:44 - The word is used to refer to the unborn John the Baptist

Luke 2:12 - The word is used to refer to the infant Christ

huios (υιος) - Greek word that means "son."

Luke 1:36 - The word is used to refer to the unborn John the Baptist

Luke 1:31 - The word is used to refer to the infant Christ.

Luke 3:22 - The word is used to refer to Christ as an adult.

HOW SHOULD WE TREAT AN UNBORN CHILD: The unborn life in the mother's womb is a human individual from conception on. How should we treat this unborn life, and may we deliberately kill it? Surely we must be guided by exactly the same rules or principles we should follow in our treatment of any other "child" or "baby." What are these rules?

1. Stewardship - Train and Protect a Child

*Children are a blessing, a source of happiness and joy to their parents (**Psalm 127:3-5; 128:3-5**)

*God has made us stewards of our children (**Proverbs 22:6; Ephesians 6:4**)

*God condemns and punishes those that misuse what have been entrusted to them by the Almighty (**Luke 12:42-46; Matthew 25:14-30; I Corinthians 4:2**)

2. God Says to Love Our Children (Titus 2:4; I Corinthians 13:4-7)

3. Respect for Life: Do Not Kill an Innocent Child

Exodus 20:13 - God commands that one should not murder another man. This law differentiated accidental killing from deliberate murder and required capital punishment for the later (cf. **21:12-14**). See also **Exodus 23:7; Proverbs 6:16-17; Revelation 21:8, 22:15; Matthew 15:19,20; Romans 13:8-10**

Psalm 106:37-38 - Israel was polluted with blood because the people shed the innocent blood of their sons and daughters.

Matthew 2:16 - Herod is considered wicked because he slew the male children in Bethlehem.

Hosea 13:16; II Kings 8:12 - When children or infants are dashed to pieces, it is a great tragedy to any nation.

Acts 7:19; Exodus 1:16-18 - Pharaoh commanded that Israelite “sons” or “men children” be killed as soon as they were born. But these terms are used for unborn babies. Would it have been acceptable for Pharaoh to have had abortions performed to kill the babies? Is it any less wicked if people today do it?

Deuteronomy 27:25 - A man that takes a bribe to slay an innocent person is cursed. What clearer description given for people who operate abortion clinics.

APPENDIX B

ABORTION AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court of the United States did not really get involved with the issue of Abortion until *Roe v. Wade* in 1973. Prior to this time, most of the court hearings and legislation were undertaken by the states.

Prior to 1973, however, two cases were decided that set the stage for *Roe v. Wade* and defined the individual's right to privacy. In *Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965), the Court appealed for the first time to the right of privacy. Although no such right was explicitly recognized by the Constitution, the Court inferred the existence of a "zone of privacy" which protected the sexual relations of married couples. Moreover, in 1972, the Court asserted in *Eisenstadt v. Baird* the "right of the individual, married or single, to be free from unwarranted government intrusion into matter so fundamentally affecting a person as the decision to bear or beget a child."⁵³ In other words, the Court said that every woman, whether married or single, had the right to decide if she wanted to have a child. In essence, this case made abortion legal. Noonan writes, "A liberty that had been based on the special position of the married was made universal in a way that repudiated the legally privileged status of marriage."⁵⁴

These two cases were stepping stones that led up to *Roe v. Wade* in 1973 which invalidated nearly all the existing laws restricting abortion. This ruling was based on the right of privacy; state intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship and into a woman's decisions concerning procreation was seen as violations of that right. In the language of the court itself,

For the stage prior to approximately the end of the first trimester, the abortion decision and its effectuation must be left to the medical judgment of the pregnant woman's attending physician. For the stage subsequent to approximately the end of the first trimester, the State, in promoting its interest in the health of the mother, may, if it chooses, regulate the abortion procedure in ways that are reasonably related to maternal health. For the stage subsequent to viability the State, in promoting its interest in the potentiality of human life, may, if it chooses, regulate, and even proscribe, abortion except where necessary, in appropriate medical judgment, for the preservation of the life or health of the mother.⁵⁵

The Court used fancy language to proscribe the slaughter of unborn children, describing the fetus as a "potential life" instead of a "human life." However, at the same time, they refused to touch the question of when life begins, but clearly approved the undeniably religious belief that life does not begin at conception. As Kelly asserts, "Such a conclusion is drawn from faith in the

⁵³*Eisenstadt v. Baird* (1972).

⁵⁴John Noonan, *A Private Choice: Abortion in America in the Seventies* (New York: Free Press, 1979), 21.

⁵⁵*Roe v. Wade* (1973).

evolutionary process, as well as a decidedly antagonistic view toward the Biblical concept of life.”⁵⁶ As mentioned earlier, the Court cited the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and claimed that it encompassed the right of a woman to have an abortion.

However, as Justice Rehnquist dissented,

There apparently was no question concerning the validity of this provision or of any of the other state statutes when the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted. The only conclusion possible from this history is that the drafters did not intend to have the Fourteenth Amendment withdraw from the States the power to legislate with respect to this matter.⁵⁷

All in all, the *Roe v. Wade* decision could not have been rooted in the traditions and conscience of the American people so as to be ranked as fundamental, for the majority sentiment in the States for a century prior to this case was to restrict abortion.

Several cases followed the *Roe v. Wade* decision in the next two decades which are of relevant importance to the issue of abortion. For example, on the same day (1973), the Court, in the *Doe v. Bolton* case, struck down other restrictive laws such as residency requirements which were seen as obstacles to women and physicians and thus as infringements on their rights. Moreover, the Court defined the health of mother as very broad in application. Psychological and emotional factors could be used to determine health and therefore warrant abortion.

In *Planned Parenthood of Central Missouri v. Danforth* in 1976, the Court overturned a law requiring a married woman to obtain her husband’s consent for an abortion. Also, the requirement that all minors had to obtain at least one parent’s consent was invalidated. Here, too, the Court stressed that minors have a right to privacy. “Such a view of the childbearing woman was now imputed to the Constitution that she became a solo entity unrelated to husband or boy friend, father or mother, deciding for herself what to do with her child.”⁵⁸

In 1977, two cases came before the Supreme Court that were of relative importance. In both *Beal v. Doe* and *Maher v. Roe*, the Court upheld the right of states to refuse to spend public money for abortions for low-income women unless they are necessary to save the life of the mother.

In *Colautti v. Franklin* (1979), the Court struck down a Pennsylvania state law requiring that a physician try to save the life of a fetus. According to Noonan, “this decision drives home how

⁵⁶Kelly, 45.

⁵⁷*Roe v. Wade*, Mr. Justice Rehnquist dissenting, II.

⁵⁸Noonan, 95.

the Court has put the abortion liberty above the life of the unborn even at a late stage of pregnancy.”⁵⁹

Later that year, in *Bellotti v. Beard* the Court re-examined the circumstances under which a minor may choose an abortion. It upheld a Massachusetts law requiring minors to notify both parents or obtain their consent for an abortion. It pointed out that such restrictions did not infringe on the rights of the minor if the minor could bypass the parents by obtaining judicial consent. In other words, if the minor could not receive consent from her parents, she could take the matter to court and receive consent from a judge instead.

In 1980, the Court upheld the right of Congress and state legislatures to refuse to pay for medically necessary abortions for poor women (*Harris v. Mcrae and Williams v. Zbaraz*). Furthermore, the decision upheld the Hyde Amendment which prohibited the use of federal Medicaid funds for abortions.

The Court took the invalidation of abortion restrictions a step further in 1983 with the *Akron Center for Reproductive Health v. City of Akron* case. It revoked state imposed waiting periods; informed consent requiring that women seeking abortions be told that a fetus is a “human life,” its precise gestational age, and that abortion is a major surgical procedure; that physicians personally give women the required information before the woman consents to the abortion; that physicians perform second-trimester abortions in hospitals; and that physicians performing abortions ensure the “humane and sanitary” disposal of the fetuses. In a companion case (*Planned Parenthood of Kansas City v. Ashcroft*), however, the Court upheld a law requiring physicians to submit fetal tissue to pathologists, who are in turn required to report their findings to the health department.

In 1986, *Thornburg v. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Pennsylvania* was an attempt to overthrow *Roe v. Wade*. Unfortunately, the decision contained the most forceful assertion of the right of abortion since the landmark case of 1973.

Later that year, another case appeared before the Supreme Court that really did not deal with the issue of abortion, but the decision clearly showed the hypocrisy of the Court and their bias in the situation. *Bowers v. Hardwick* upheld a Georgia anti-sodomy law. The Court asserted that the right to privacy did not give homosexuals a fundamental right to engage in sodomy. It distinguished the claims at issue in this case from earlier privacy decisions by saying that other

⁵⁹Ibid., 231.

private fights were related to family, marriage, or procreation. The Court also endorsed arguments about the validity of prevailing moral standards in determining fundamental rights. Now, homosexuality is one of the most perverted abominations known to man, but why weren't they protected by the "zone of privacy"? Inconsistency is definitely afoot in the Supreme Court. What in heaven's name makes issues relating to family, marriage, and procreation fundamentally private as opposed to sexual orientation? Furthermore, if prevailing moral standards were to be valid in determining fundamental rights as the Court promulgated, why was abortion considered a fundamental right, for the prevailing moral standard in America, as witnessed by history, was wholeheartedly against it? What one sees here is a problem in sanity.

Webster v. Reproductive Health Services in 1989 proved to shine a little light in the dark tunnel of iniquity surrounding the issue of abortion. Here, the Court upheld various provisions of a Missouri law restricting abortion: its preamble containing the finding that the life of each human beings begins at conception; a state may prohibit public facilities and public employees from being used to perform or assist abortions not necessary to save the life of the pregnant woman.; and a requirement that whenever a woman seeking an abortion appears to be at least twenty weeks pregnant, the physician must conduct tests to determine fetal viability. In addition, several justices indicated a willingness to reconsider *Roe v. Wade* and to contemplate further restrictions on abortion. As positive as this case may sound, the *Roe v. Wade* decision will not be reversed, for President Clinton only promises to appoint Supreme Court justices that are stridently pro-choice. He has already appointed two, and several justices soon plan to retire.

The final Supreme Court cases to deal with the issue of abortion as of yet were *Hodgson v. Minnesota* and *Ohio v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health* (1990). Once again, the Court addressed the question of parental notification. In the Minnesota case, the Justices said a state could require that a pregnant girl inform both her parents before having an abortion, so long as the law provides the alternative of a judicial hearing. This law requires notification of both parents even if they have never lived with the teen-ager or do not have legal custody. In the Ohio case, the Court upheld a state's law requiring notification of one parent while also allowing the judicial alternative. The Court did not rule on whether the Constitution compels the availability of a judicial bypass when notice to only one parent is required. The Court also upheld the constitutionality of imposing waiting periods after notification of both parents, before the abortion can be performed.

As has been clearly indicated, abortion is a hot topic that infiltrated the United States Supreme Court beginning in 1973. Since the landmark *Roe v. Wade* case, the tendency has been to loosen restrictions on abortion and make it as accessible for women as deemed possible. With the addition of pro-choice justices to the panel, it is probable that future decisions will continue the already established tendency and cause this nation to sink further into wickedness and perversion.

APPENDIX C

THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S RECORD ON ABORTION

In regard to abortion, a sharp distinction must be drawn between President Clinton's often "soft" rhetoric and his hard-line pro-abortion policies. President Clinton seeks to employ the full power of the federal government to vastly expand access to abortion on demand and to force all Americans to pay for it.

As far as Health Care Legislation is concerned, Clinton's so-called "Health Security Act" contains a broad federal "abortion mandate" that, if enacted, would result in the greatest expansion of abortion since *Roe v. Wade*. As previously mentioned, his promise to only appoint pro-choice advocates to the Supreme Court could likewise aid in the expansion of abortion.

President Clinton also seeks to nullify state limitations on abortion that are still in existence. For example, he promised to sign the "Freedom of Choice Act" (FOCA), a proposed federal law that would prohibit virtually all state limitations on abortion. "Among the most controversial provisions are those that would prohibit restrictions on third-trimester abortions, overturn several states' requirements that teenagers obtain the consent of one or both parents before having an abortion, and prohibit 24-hour waiting periods."⁶⁰

A rather frightening aspect of the Clinton administration is their ardent promotion of abortion in foreign nations. Not only did the President say that he would support policies that would make abortion rare, but he has launched a multi-pronged campaign in less developed countries to make abortion available as a method of birth-control. Furthermore, he nullified the Reagan-Bush "Mexico City Policy" which denied U.S. funding to private organizations that perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning. Funding has also been restored to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) which is extensively involved in China's coercive population-control problem, and the Clinton Administration has stopped allowing Chinese women who flee the Chinese government's compulsory abortion policy to obtain political asylum in the United States.

The federal funding of abortions has also become a major issue for the Clinton Administration. For example, the President urged Congress three months after taking office to repeal all restriction on federal funding of abortion, including the Hyde Amendment. Fortunately, both houses of Congress voted to renew the amendment. The fact that the executive

⁶⁰*Congressional Quarterly* (December 11, 1993).

administration of this nation seeks to fund abortion is rather frightening and conjures up memories of the publicly funded experimentation that went on in Nazi Germany. Dr. Francis X. Berry, an obstetrician and gynecologist from Greensboro, NC, said: “I am against the use of my taxes for abortions. This reminds me too much of Nazi Germany where the state was permitted to decide who would live and who must die. I can’t be a partner to killing innocent lives.”⁶¹ In line with this modern revival of Nazism, President Clinton also issued an executive directive lifting the Bush Administration ban on federal funding of transplantation research utilizing tissue obtained from aborted babies. Also, the federal National Institutes of Health (NIH) is laying the groundwork for conducting, with federal funds, harmful and/or lethal research on living human embryos conceived through in vitro fertilization. What a frightening thought! Our blessed country wants to harvest babies as guinea pigs.

The most recent issue involving abortion and the Clinton Administration dealt with partial-birth abortions, the absolutely disgusting procedure that was elaborated upon earlier. Congress passed a bill that would outlaw such practices, but the President vetoed it. As a result, Congress was unable to override the veto with a two-thirds majority, so it was cast out. The President claimed that he vetoed the bill because it did not have a clause dealing with the health of the mother, but based on past action, one cannot help but to suspect ulterior motives.

The Clinton Administration has also gotten itself involved with the issue of abortion on several other fronts. Examples include:

1. On January 22, 1993, the President ordered cancellation of regulations that prohibited routine counseling for abortion in federally funded family planning clinics.
2. The President appointed Dr. Joycelyn Elders as Surgeon General of the United States. Elders was given authority over the massive Title 10 family planning program and other programs that deal with adolescent pregnancy. Elders is a strident pro-abortion activist.
3. On January 22, 1993, President Clinton issued an executive directive lifting the Bush Administration ban on federal funding of transplantation research utilizing tissue obtained from aborted babies.
4. At the federal National Institutes of Health (NIH), a committee is laying the groundwork for conducting, with federal funds, harmful or lethal research on living human embryos conceived through in vitro fertilization.

⁶¹qtd. in Kelly 81.

5. On January 22, 1993, the “President abolished a Reagan-Bush ban on the performance of abortions at overseas military medical facilities.
6. President Clinton has urged Congress to repeal the 1984 law (the “Jepsen Amendment”) that prohibits the direct funding of abortion procedures by the Department of Defense (except to save the life of the mother).
7. Under the guise of “campaign reform,” the Clinton Administration is pushing legislation that would impose a “gag rule” on political advertising by advocacy groups, such as National Right to Life PAC.

APPENDIX D
THE ABORTION HOLOCAUST

War / Americans Killed

Revolutionary War - 25,324

War of 1812 - 2,260

Mexican War - 13,288

Civil War - 529,332

Spanish-American War - 2,446

WWI - 116,516

WWII - 405,399

Korea - 54,246

Vietnam - 56,480

Total American War Dead - 1,205,291

Deaths by Abortion (as of 1980) - 8,000,000

Deaths by Abortion (as of 1996) - 30,000,000

WORKS CONSULTED

- Beckwith, Francis. Politically Correct Death. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993.
- Bergel, Gary. When You Were Formed In Secret. Elyria, OH: Intercessors for America, 1980.
Congressional Quarterly (December 11, 1993).
- Eisenstadt v. Baird*, U.S. Supreme Court (1972).
- Erickson, Millard. Christian Theology. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1983.
- Feinberg, John and Feinberg, Paul. Ethics for a Brave New World. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1993.
- Harrison, Beverly. Our Right to Choose. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1983.
- Heimbach, Daniel. Class Notes—Basic Christian Ethics. Wake Forest, NC: Southeastern Seminary, 1999.
- Kelly, Kent. Abortion, The American Holocaust. Southern Pines, NC: Calvary Press, 1981.
- Koop, C. Everett and Schaeffer, Francis. Whatever Happened to the Human Race? Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1979.
- McQuilkin, Robertson. An Introduction to Biblical Ethics. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1989.
- Mecklenburg, F.D. Indications for Induced Abortion. New York: Hawksford Publishers, 1972.
- Mohr, James. Abortion in America - The Origins and Evolution of National Policy, 1800-1900. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Montgomery, John. Slaughter of the Innocents. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, n.d.
- Noonan, John. A Private Choice: Abortion in America in the Seventies. New York: Free Press, 1979.
- Reagan, Ronald. Abortion and the Conscience of a Nation. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1984.
- “Painful Facts About the Fetus.” *Washington Times*, 14 July 1994. Sec. 17A.
- The Public Statute Laws of the State of Connecticut*, Hartford, CT: 1871.
- Roe v. Wade*, U.S. Supreme Court (1973).
- Shafer, Brenda to Hall, Tony, 9 July 1995. Printed in *SALT* 5, no. 4 (1995): 62.
- Smith, James. “Brutal Abortion Procedure Under FOCA.” *LIGHT*, September-October, 1993, 61.
- Thornburg v. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Pennsylvania*, U.S.

Supreme Court (1986).

Wilke, J.C. Abortion: Questions and Answers. Cincinnati, OH: Hayes Publishing Company, 1988.

SUGGESTED READING

Brown, Harold. Death Before Birth. Nashville, TN: Nelson, 1977.

Burtchaell, James. Rachel Weeping: The Case Against Abortion. New York: Harper, 1982.

Fowler, Paul B. Abortion: Toward an Evangelical Consensus. Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1987.

Gardner, R. F. R. Abortion - The Personal Dilemma. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.

Gartan, Jean. Who Broke the Baby? Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship, 1979.

Koop, C. Everett. The Right to Live: The Right to Die. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1976.

Nathanson, Bernard N. Aborting America. New York: Doubleday, 1979.

Young, Curtis. The Least of These. Chicago, IL: Moody, 1983.