

The Sin of Abortion

In the first chapter of Romans the apostle Paul listed the sins of the Gentiles. In this heinous list of crimes we find the phrase "without natural affection" (Rom. 1:31, KJV). This refers to those who do not possess the love and attachment which nature teaches all mothers to have for their young.

"This expression denotes the want of affectionate regard towards their children. The attachment of parents to children is one of the strongest in nature, and nothing can overcome it but the most confirmed and established wickedness. And yet the apostle charges on the heathen generally the want of this affection. He doubtless refers here to the practice so common among heathens of exposing their children, or putting them to death. This crime, so abhorrent to all the feelings of humanity, was common among the heathen, and is still. The Canaanites, we are told, (Psa. cvi. 37, 38) 'sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan.' Manasseh, among the Jews, imitated their example, and introduced the horrid custom of sacrificing children to Moloch, and set the example by offering his own, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6. Among the ancient Persians it was a common custom to bury children alive. In most of the Grecian states, infanticide was not merely permitted, but actually enforced by law" (Barnes' Notes On The New Testament).

Abortion is sinful because it is the willful taking of human life. Under the Mosaic Law, God said, "If men fight, and hurt a woman with child, so that she gives birth prematurely, yet no lasting harm follows, he shall surely be punished accordingly as the woman's husband imposes on him; and he shall pay as the judges determine. But if any lasting harm follows, then you shall give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" (Exodus 21:22-25). If the accidental interruption of a pregnancy was to be punished, what about the one who deliberately murders the unborn?

- by **David Padfield** (edited)

What about Abortion in Cases of Rape or Incest?

We continue to be troubled by the fact that many who view themselves as "pro-life" advocates are willing to make exceptions, justifying abortions in cases of "rape and incest." Their position simply is not logical. Consider the following points.

If the fetus within a woman's womb is a human being, to take his or her life is murder. If the fetus is not a human person, why should anyone oppose abortion under any circumstance? The manner of conception is irrelevant. Is a child a child, regardless of "by whom" the conception was initiated? Of course it is.

Let us think about the matter from this vantage point. Suppose a woman is raped and, as a consequence, becomes pregnant (though such occurrences are extremely rare). Let us also assume, for the sake of the argument, that for some reason she carries the baby full term and gives birth. Let us take it a step further and suppose that she nurtures the baby for a couple of years. Finally, she visits a psychiatrist and confides that though she has tried to love this child, the memories of her rape have made her a mental wreck; she can no longer bear to be in the youngster's presence. Here is the key question: May she now, with impunity, kill her offspring? Universally, the cry will be, "No!" But why not? If rape is a justification for destroying the child before birth, why not after birth as well?

Does logic confuse some of our leaders? If abortion is a moral act, there should be no restrictions. If abortion is an immoral act, concessions may not be made to accommodate "circumstances."

The conception of children, by either rape or incest, is a tragedy. But one does not correct a wrong with a wrong. Somehow, though, in the abortion controversy, two wrongs are supposed to constitute a right! This ideology is utter nonsense.

- by **Wayne Jackson**

Who Gets Abortions, and Why?

The abortion debate continues to rage in our country. Various arguments are offered in support of the right of women to have "abortions on demand." Perhaps some of the people who take this position would re-think their endorsement if they studied the statistics that identify who gets abortions and why. Note:

- Less than 1% of all abortions are for victims of rape or incest
- 1% of abortions are for fetal abnormalities
- 4% of women who had abortion did so because a doctor who said their health (emotional or physical) would worsen if an abortion was not performed
- Approximately half of women who have abortions indicate that they do not want to be a single parent and/or they are experiencing problems in their relationship with the father of the child
- Two thirds of those getting abortions state that they could not afford a child
- 75% said that the child would interfere with their lives
- 81% of all abortions performed in the U.S. are on unmarried women

(Statistics from Alan Guttmacher Institute, quoted in Charles R. Swindoll, *The Sanctity Of Life*, p. 12)

Several things are clear from these statistics. First, the argument that abortions must remain legal because of pregnancies resulting from rape and incest is absolutely bogus! Can anyone seriously maintain this view and justify the killing of millions of babies every year for the sake of a handful of rape or incest victims? (See Wayne Jackson's article in today's bulletin concerning the moral implications of abortion even in cases of rape or incest.) Additionally, the health of the mother is seldom at risk in the modern age of medical technology.

It is apparent that the vast majority of abortions are performed as a "remedy" for the consequences of immoral behavior. Unmarried individuals engage in fornication. A pregnancy results. They don't want to be bothered by an unwanted child. They claim they can not afford the child. Some are honest enough to admit that having the baby would interfere with their own selfish lifestyles.

Abortion is murder. Innocent children are being sacrificed to satisfy the desires of morally bankrupt people. Think!

- by Greg Gwin