

ABORTION : THE SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENT : PART 1

Last Updated : March 19, 2009

History Of This Series, 1973 Roe v. Wade Ruling, War Against Life Begins, The Perpetrators, 46,000,000+ Unseen Victims In USA Since 1973, 1.3 Million Annual US Abortions, Legality Of Late-Term Abortions, Fetal Viability, Shocking Comparisons, Fetuses Do Feel Pain, The Hippocratic Oath Condemns Abortion, Roe v. Wade Not Overturned In 36 Years, Abortion & Politics, Barack Obama's Position On Abortion, Freedom Of Choice Act, G. Bush's Efforts To Contain Abortion, Bill Clinton's Record, Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, Supreme Court & Appeals Court Appointments, Child Custody Protection Act & Its Exceptions, Parental Consent & Parental Notification, South Dakota Bills, Defining An Abortionist, Right To Privacy Deception & Cover, Due Process Clause, Fourteenth Amendment, Fundamental Rights

Introduction:

The following series is the result of a writing project that spans a period of approximately fourteen years. It began as a series of online conversations that I had with members of our BBS, (Bulletin Board Service), during the early to mid 1990's. These various conversations were eventually combined into a lengthy article entitled "Abortion, Birth Control And Promiscuity", and published on our Endtime Prophecy Net web site in 1997. From that time until now, I have occasionally held other online conversations regarding abortion, via our Endtime Discuss Group Exchange, (EDGE), Mailing List, our Endtime Prophecy Org Messageboard, our Armageddon FreeShare server, and via other online avenues which I've frequented. At the same time, over the past twelve years since I first published "Abortion, Birth Control And Promiscuity", I have also continued to expand my personal understanding of the abortion issue, and have solidified my position regarding it.

In light of the new information that I have acquired, since several years ago, I have been wanting to update my original article, but just contemplating the sheer magnitude of the job before me made it difficult to begin. Thankfully, as a result of recent online conversations which centered on this same issue, I was finally motivated to put my hands to the plough, (or more accurately, to the keyboard), and to tackle this project once and for all.

This series is basically divided into two sections. Without becoming overly burdensome or filled with weighty, confusing legalese which perhaps only a legal scholar would be able to understand, the first part of the series examines the legal and political aspects of the abortion issue in recent years. It also briefly and simply explains how the right to obtain an abortion became the law of the land in 1973. The latter half of the series changes gears, and addresses some of the arguments and questions which have been posed by some of the individuals with whom I've communicated over the years, and offers Biblical responses to their inquiries and challenges.

Please understand that due to the very depth and complexity of this issue, this series does not claim to examine every single facet of the abortion debate. You won't find every single state law discussed in these pages. You may not find

every single argument, either in favor of abortion, or else against abortion, examined herein. However, it is my opinion that sufficient information has been provided here, to assist you in making an informed and knowledgeable choice regarding the issue of abortion.

It is my hope and prayer that you will find the following series enlightening and informative, and that it will have a positive effect on your life. In addition to reading this series, I encourage you to avail yourself of the additional information and files which are to be found in the abortion section of the Endtime Prophecy Net website. Finally, if you are blessed by what you are about to read, please consider sharing the URL to the series with your friends far and wide. Thank you so much! You may just save an unborn child!

It was thirty-six years ago, in January of 1973, that the United States Supreme Court made a ruling which is legally known as 410 U.S. 113. Today, most people know this historic ruling as Roe v. Wade. With the stroke of a pen, a terrible war was initiated; the execution of which doesn't rely upon bombs, or jets, or guns, or tanks, but rather upon a group of men and women, who when they entered their profession, took a vow to protect, to preserve, and to save life. In an utterly bizarre twist of their pledge, and their duties as the guardians of life, over the past thirty-six years, they have made a mockery of their chosen profession, and have in fact been directly responsible for taking the lives of an estimated forty-six million innocents in the United States alone; and this is only the figure for acknowledged legal abortions.

Rarely, if ever, will you see their victims, and much less hear them; because their lives are snuffed out before they have even had a chance to come to term, and take their first small breath. Such is the cruelty and barbarity of legalized abortion. The tragedy of this war against life, is that it is relentlessly waged in a nation which claims to be founded upon Christian principles, which teach us that all life is sacred in the eyes of our Creator. To this day, this ungodly war continues to be carried out under a cloak of deception by its perpetrators, and feigned ignorance by their willing accomplices, the would-be mothers and fathers.

According to figures that were released in 2001 by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control, and also by the Alan Guttmacher Institute, the aforementioned figure means that an estimated 1.3 million legal abortions have been performed in the United States every year for the past thirty-six years. Based upon that annual average, the prolifeaction.org website provides the following breakdown regarding at what stage of gestation these abortions have occurred:

Gestational Age	Percentage	Yearly Total
Less than 9 weeks	57.9%	752,700
9-10 weeks	20.3%	263,900
11-12 weeks	10.2%	132,600
13-15 weeks	6.2%	80,600
16-20 weeks	4.3%	55,900
21+ weeks	1.5%	19,500

As you can see, this means that just over eighty-eight per cent of all abortions occur during the first twelve weeks of

a woman's pregnancy. The "Center for Bio-Ethical Reform" web site provides slightly different percentages. Consider the following:

Gestational Age	Percentage
Less than 9 weeks	52%
9-10 weeks	25%
11-12 weeks	12%
13-15 weeks	6%
16-20 weeks	4%
21+ weeks	1%

While I find all of the above figures troubling, the last one is the most alarming of all. It tells us that 1% to 1.5%, or 16,450 to 19,500 annual abortions in the United States, occur after the twentieth week of pregnancy. Folks, we are talking about a fetus that is five months old, or possibly older. If nothing else in this series motivates you to strongly oppose abortion, then it's my sincere hope that this one figure will give you sufficient reason to want to oppose it. As you can plainly see, when we discuss the issue of abortion, we aren't always talking about "just a clump of cells", as many people ignorantly claim. If you are wondering why it is even legally possible for a woman or minor teen to obtain an abortion at such a late stage of fetal development, it is because Roe v. Wade ruled that a woman can abort her baby for any reason, up until, in the words of the court document, "the interim point at which the fetus becomes viable." The Supreme Court defined the word "viable" as being:

----- Begin Quote -----

"potentially able to live outside the mother's womb, albeit with artificial aid. Viability is usually placed at about seven months (28 weeks) but may occur earlier, even at 24 weeks"

----- End Quote -----

The US Supreme Court also held that even after the point of viability has been reached, abortion must still be available to a woman, when it is needed to protect her health. That is why late-term abortions are legally possible within the USA.

I'd like to ask you to stop and think about that total figure for a moment:

46,000,000 legal abortions in the USA since 1973

46,000,000 unborn children slaughtered since 1973

Consider where you currently live. Consider what percentage of people living in your area would have to die, in order to reach such an astounding number. It's really shocking, isn't it? Why? Because there are not enough people living in your area, or even in your entire state, to reach that horrific number. Exactly how large is 46,000,000? Well, let's make a few quick and easy comparisons. The 2007 population of the state of California, which happens to be the most populated state in the USA, was 36.5 million people. That means that for the purposes of this comparison, the entire population of that huge state has been slaughtered through abortion, in addition to about another 25% of the population beyond that, since abortion became legal in 1973. In other words, roughly 125% of the entire population of California would have to be

slaughtered, in order to equal the number of abortions which have been performed in the USA, since Roe v. Wade became the law of the land in 1973.

Here is an equally astounding comparison. According to 2007 population figures, the huge state of Texas comes in second with over 23.9 million inhabitants. That means that double the entire population of Texas has been slaughtered through the act of abortion, since 1973. Let us not forget that this state is where the Roe v. Wade battle began. Let us also not forget that the 46 million figure only represents the known number of legal abortions. How many illegal ones have there been?

Now can you better comprehend the full scope of this problem? No one ever heard those 46 million voices. No one ever felt, or saw, their pain. They were just gone. They were horribly burned by a salt solution; sliced up like a worthless hunk of meat; shredded and sucked up before the evidence could be seen; and discarded. And America, and the world, continue in this grotesque, detestable practice year after year, without blinking an eye. Oh, how God must weep! Speaking of the pain which fetuses are now scientifically known to feel, you won't believe what one person wrote to me a few years ago regarding this sensitive issue. After referring to an embryo as a "ball of cells", they said:

----- Begin Quote -----

"Well, perhaps the cells do have the ability to feel, but at that stage of development, it wouldn't have a brain to interpret such signals. I think the issue of the one-month old fetus feeling pain is irrelevant."

----- End Quote -----

Either this person was purposely being downright deceptive, or else they are ignorant of the fact that at least 42% of all abortions performed in the United States occur after the first month of gestation; and the longer that a woman waits to have her abortion, the more likely that the fetus is able to feel pain as it is being ripped apart by the abortionist.

When U.S. Government figures take public office, they often place their hand upon a Bible, and swear to uphold the laws and ideals of the United States, as are set forth in the US Constitution, and other legal documents. In similar fashion, most members of the medical profession, upon entering their chosen field of practice, take a similar oath which is known as the "Hippocratic Oath". This oath, which is believed to have been written by Hippocrates, the father of medicine, in 4th century BC Greece, sets down in writing the ethics of all medical practitioners. Translated from Greek, it states the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

"I swear by Apollo, Asclepius, Hygieia, and Panacea, and I take to witness all the gods, all the goddesses, to keep according to my ability and my judgment, the following Oath.

To consider dear to me, as my parents, him who taught me this art; to live in common with him and, if necessary, to share my goods with him; To look upon his children as my own brothers, to teach them this art.

I will prescribe regimens for the good of my patients according to my ability and my judgment and never do harm to anyone.

I will not give a lethal drug to anyone if I am asked, nor will I advise such a plan; and similarly I will not give a woman a pessary to cause an abortion.

But I will preserve the purity of my life and my arts.

I will not cut for stone, even for patients in whom the disease is manifest; I will leave this operation to be performed by practitioners, specialists in this art.

In every house where I come I will enter only for the good of my patients, keeping myself far from all intentional ill-doing and all seduction and especially from the pleasures of love with women or with men, be they free or slaves.

All that may come to my knowledge in the exercise of my profession or in daily commerce with men, which ought not to be spread abroad, I will keep secret and will never reveal.

If I keep this oath faithfully, may I enjoy my life and practice my art, respected by all men and in all times; but if I swerve from it or violate it, may the reverse be my lot."

----- End Quote -----

Please notice the line that clearly states ". . . I will not give a woman a pessary to cause an abortion." Clearly then, as I stated earlier, medical professionals who perform, or assist in, an abortion, are in direct violation of their own creed. Could this possibly be one of the reasons why some of them now even refuse to recognize the oath; that is, because they know that they have no intentions of fully keeping it?

Every four years, as mandated by the U.S. Constitution and the laws of the United States, the people of America elect a new president. At the time that Roe v. Wade became the law of the land, Richard M. Nixon was the president of the USA. He was forced to resign in August of 1974, due to the Watergate scandal, at which time Gerald Ford, then the vice president, became the new president. From that time until today, there have been nine four-year presidential cycles; yet in spite of the fact that thirty-six years have passed, Roe v. Wade has never been overturned, and we should wonder why this is so.

As is common knowledge within the United States, the issue of abortion has repeatedly played a central role, and has had a very direct effect, on who becomes the next president of the United States. Would-be presidents know that if they want to assume the office of the president, they must win the support of their constituents, whether they are pro-lifers, or else pro-abortionists. Concerning the more conservative Republican Party, this has usually meant taking a strong stand against abortion. As recent American history reveals, it was because George W. Bush catered to the Christian Right, and came out against abortion, embryonic stem cell research and same-sex "marriages", that he won the presidential race in 2000, and then again in 2004, in spite of the fact that he dragged the United States into the illegal Iraq War, based on deception and lies.

However, as I explain in the four-part series "Obama, McCain And The Bush Legacy", despite their high expectations, even after eight years of the Bush Administration, Christians in America are saddened to see that abortions still occur on a daily basis throughout the country. Furthermore, soon a much more liberal president, who has tried to straddle the fence regarding abortion, and who has in fact done nothing which opposes abortion, will be moving into the White House. I am of course referring to President-elect Barack Hussein Obama. To clarify what I mean, please consider the following data regarding Mr. Obama:

1. He supports Roe v. Wade.
2. He voted against prohibiting minors from crossing state lines in order to obtain an abortion.
3. He voted against notifying parents of minor children who obtain out-of-state abortions.
4. He is undecided on whether or not life begins at conception.
5. He voted against banning partial-birth abortions.
6. He stated that we should trust women to make their own decisions regarding partial-birth abortion.

Equally alarming is the fact that President-Elect Obama has made it quite clear that one of his very first acts as the new president of the United States, in addition to dealing with the current economic crisis, will be to sign into law the so-called "Freedom Of Choice Act", or FOCA, once the US Congress has presented it to him for his signature. In fact, in July of 2007, while speaking to the Planned Parenthood Action Fund, Barack Obama, then a U.S. senator, stated the following; and you can be certain that Planned Parenthood is going to hold Obama to his promise:

----- Begin Quote -----

"The first thing I'd do as president is sign the Freedom of Choice Act. That's the first thing that I'd do."

----- End Quote -----

While the US Supreme Court has long recognized abortion as a fundamental right, even though it is not specifically written as such in the U.S. Constitution, the Freedom Of Choice Act will make abortion a legally-recognized fundamental right. As a result, once this horrible piece of legislation is signed into law by Obama, it will basically invalidate and reverse any "statute, ordinance, regulation, administrative order, decision, policy, practice, or other action" of any federal, state, or local government that would "deny or interfere with a woman's right to choose" to have an abortion. As I explain in "Obama, McCain And The Bush Legacy", currently, hospitals, clinics and medical professionals can refuse to participate in, or to facilitate, an abortion, based upon an act of their conscience. The Freedom Of Choice Act will reverse this right and will make anti-abortion professionals vulnerable to law suits, etc., if they fail to perform an abortion upon demand.

Based on the previous points, it seems obvious that no true Bible-believing, God-fearing Christian can possibly support the agenda of the incoming president; and his record on gay

and lesbian rights is just as bad, and equally troubling.

But let's return to the efforts of the Bush Administration. In all fairness, it should be noted that failure to overturn Roe v. Wade was not due to President Bush's lack of trying to accomplish this goal. During his eight years in office, Bush in fact appointed a number of conservative judges to the U.S. Supreme Court. In one of its more recent rulings in April of 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the highly controversial Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act by a vote of 5 to 4. As you may recall, this bill was passed by the U.S. Congress, and signed into law by President Bush in November of 2003. This important piece of legislation makes it a crime for doctors to perform any "overt act" to "kill the partially delivered living fetus". Those who violate this law may face criminal prosecution, fines and up to two years in prison. While in office, President Bill Clinton vetoed this bill two times.

And that is not all that George Bush managed to accomplish. In addition to his controversial Supreme Court appointments, during his presidency, he appointed sixty-one judges to the federal appeals courts, the majority of which lean towards a conservative viewpoint. The appeals court system consists of thirteen circuits, of which ten are controlled by Republican appointed judges, according to an October 2008 article in the New York Times.

During his term in office, President Bill Clinton appointed sixty-five judges to the federal appeals courts. It has been estimated that the number of federal judges appointed by the Republican Party, most of them conservative, will have risen about twelve per cent; from fifty per cent, to sixty-two per cent, since George W. Bush first took office. The movement to advance a "conservative legal revolution" actually began during the Reagan Administration.

These aren't the only developments which occurred during the Bush years in the hope of eventually overturning Roe v. Wade. In 2006, the Child Custody Protection Act, (also known as the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act), was amended to title 18 of the Federal Criminal Code; or the United States Code, as it is also known. This bill makes it a crime for any doctor to perform or to induce an abortion on an out-of-state minor in violation of parental notification requirements. The act also mandates that physicians provide a twenty-four hour actual or constructive notice to a parent of the minor child who is seeking an abortion. Violators of this act are subject to a fine, and could spend up to a year behind bars as well. However, as passed, this bill does allow for an exception if:

1. the physician complies with parental notification requirements in the physician's state;
2. the physician is given documentation that a court in the minor's state of residence has waived parental notification or otherwise authorized the minor's abortion;
3. the minor provides a written statement that she is the victim of sexual abuse, neglect, or physical abuse by a parent and the physician notifies appropriate state officials of such abuse;
4. the abortion is necessary to save the life of the minor (written notice must be given to the minor's parent within 24 hours after the lifesaving abortion is performed): or

5. a person accompanying the minor provides documentation to the physician that such person is the parent of the minor.

As tough as it sounds, this act is not bullet-proof, and does have legal loopholes. But there is more. While these two acts do make it more difficult for a minor to obtain an abortion, they don't make it entirely impossible for them to do so. The reason for this is simple; and that is because abortion laws differ from state to state. At this current time, there are forty-four states that have abortion laws which require that a minor's parents be involved in the decision-making process. However, the level of parental involvement varies. The level of parental involvement can be broken down as follows:

a. In twelve states, a minor can obtain an abortion without parental consent; however, she is required to notify at least one of her parents ahead of time regarding her decision. The one exception is the state of Minnesota, where both parents are required to be notified of the girl's decision to have an abortion.

b. In twenty-three states, a minor cannot obtain an abortion unless she first acquires parental consent from one parent. The exception to this are, I believe, Mississippi, North Dakota and Texas, where the consent of both parents is required before an abortion can be granted to a minor.

c. In two states, Oklahoma and Utah, parental consent and parental notification must both be provided before an abortion can be performed on a minor.

d. In nine states, the situation is rather nebulous, as parental involvement laws have either been blocked by a particular court order, or else they are simply not being properly enforced.

e. Tragically, there are six states where there are no laws concerning parental involvement. These are Vermont, Connecticut, New York, Washington, Oregon, and Hawaii. Also included in this group is the District of Columbia.

As if the situation isn't already loose enough, as we saw a moment ago, in some situations, the Child Custody Protection Act does allow judges to issue court orders which permit a girl to obtain an abortion even without her parents' consent. For example, in the state of West Virginia, a physician who can demonstrate that he/she has no financial attachments to the abortion provider, can perform an abortion on a minor. There are likewise some states where it is acceptable for grandparents, or other family members, to be involved in a minor's choice to have an abortion, instead of the parents.

While the state of Mississippi has very strict anti-abortion laws, so that only one abortion clinic has managed to survive there, (at least legally), it is obviously not the only state where the abortion war is being waged. In March of 2006, two-term Governor Michael Rounds of South Dakota signed into law a bill which made it a felony to perform an abortion, unless it could be proved that it was absolutely necessary in order to save a woman's life. The general consensus in both camps was that the purpose of the South Dakota law was to challenge Roe v. Wade head-on. As was expected, abortion advocates went on the attack, and the law was ultimately repealed by a voter referendum in November of that same year.

On November 4, 2008, voters in South Dakota were again given an opportunity to accept, or to reject, a new amendment which would ban abortion except in the case of rape, incest or when there is a serious health threat to the mother. Sadly, this initiative also failed. The Pro-Life camp has vowed to carry on the battle another year. Another initiative in Colorado, which was also on the November 4 ballot, and which would have defined a fertilized egg as a legal human being, also failed to acquire a majority vote.

Before continuing, let me mention here that one term that you will see me using a lot in this series is "abortionists". To avoid any kind of confusion, when you see this word used, I am referring to anyone, whether they are a physician, or any other kind of medical professional, or an organization, or a woman, or a young girl, or anyone else, who practices, fights for, supports, promotes or defends the practice of abortion. If you refer to yourself as pro-choice, then in my view, you are still an abortionist, because you want to have the right to choose whether or not to have an abortion; which signifies that you favor abortion. In short, unless a person is clearly opposed to abortion, then in my view, they're an abortionist; because there is simply no sitting on the fence when it comes to this important issue. Having said that, let's continue.

One tactic which is frequently used by abortionists in order to try to justify their hideous crime, is to emphasize the right to privacy issue. It worked quite well for them in the past, and they are obviously hoping that it will continue to work for them for years to come. In case you weren't aware of it, it was precisely the right to privacy issue that resulted in the Roe v. Wade ruling prevailing thirty-six years ago in 1973. Roe v. Wade determined that at that time, most laws that banned abortion in the U.S. were in violation of the right to privacy under the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

The Due Process Clause, which is also referred to as the Due Process of Law, is the principle whereby the U.S. Government is obligated to respect all of the legal rights to which a person is entitled according to the law of the land, instead of respecting just some or most of their legal rights. To put it another way, the Due Process Clause provides a person with the means to enforce their rights against alleged violations by the government. The Fourteenth Amendment states:

----- Begin Quote -----

"No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

----- End Quote -----

By a vote of 7 to 2, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down Texas abortion laws, and ruled that abortion is a fundamental right under the Constitution. A fundamental right is simply a right that finds its origin in the Constitution, or that is implied by the Constitution. We'll take a quick look at some of these fundamental rights as we continue our discussion in part two.

Please go to part two for the continuation of this series.

This file was written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net

<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

End Of File

ABORTION : THE SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENT : PART 2

Last Updated : March 19, 2009

Abortion Not Listed As Fundamental Right In US Constitution,
US Bill of Rights, Supreme Court Adds Abortion To Recognized
Fundamental Rights Via Roe v. Wade, Justice Harry Blackmun
Rules That Abortion Is Encompassed By The Right To Privacy,
Only Justices Byron R. White & William H. Rehnquist Dissent,
Roe v. Wade A Very Poor Ruling Which Defied States' Wishes,
Public School System - Sex Education Condoms And Counseling,
Not Old Enough To Vote But Old Enough To Decide On Abortion,
Partial List Of Pro-Abortion Advocates, Dr. Vanessa Cullins,
Parental Support And Endeavors To Break The Parental Bond,
Abortion Clinics Are Money-Making Businesses Bent On Profit,
Rosa Acuna, Dr. Sheldon Turkish & "Nothing But Some Tissue",
Big Deception - Just A Clump Of Cells And Not A Real Person,
Abortionists' Subtle Attempts To Relieve Women Of The Guilt,
We Are Recognized By God As Humans Even Before Conception,
Psalm 139:13-16 And The Earth Of The Womb, When Life Begins,
God Called Prophet Jeremiah Prior To His Actual Conception,
God Stated "Before I Formed Thee In The Belly I Knew Thee",
Jews Sacrifice Children To Molech In The Valley of Hinnom

As I concluded in part one, a fundamental right is simply a
right that finds its origin in the US Constitution, or that's
implied by the Constitution, according to the interpretation
of the U.S. Supreme Court. Some of the rights which the court
views as being fundamental rights are the following:

The right to life.

The right to freedom of movement.

The right to own property.

The right to marry.

The right to procreate.

The right to raise children free from unnecessary
governmental interference.

The right to freedom of association.

The right to freedom of expression.

The right to equal treatment or equal protection before
the law (fair legal procedures).

The right to freedom of thought.

The right to religious belief.

The right to choose when and where to acquire formal
education.

The right to pursue happiness.

The right to vote.

The right to freedom of contract.

Now, let me ask you something. Abortion is obviously not a right which finds its origin in the U.S. Constitution as per the previous definition. In other words, going by the first condition, abortion is not a fundamental right. That being the case, how did the Supreme Court arrive at the conclusion that abortion is implied in the Constitution? In the United States, most fundamental rights can be found in the Bill of Rights. The U.S. Bill of Rights is comprised of the first Ten Amendments to the Constitution, which are the following:

1st Amendment : Includes the Establishment Clause, Free Exercise Clause; freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly; right to petition.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

2nd Amendment : Protects the right to keep and bear arms.

"A well regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

3rd Amendment : Protects citizens from the quartering of troops.

"No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

4th Amendment : Offers protection from unreasonable search and seizure.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

5th Amendment : due process, double jeopardy, self-incrimination, and eminent domain.

"No person shall be held to answer for any capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

6th Amendment : Covers trial by jury and the rights of the accused; Confrontation Clause, speedy trial, public trial, right to counsel

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial

jury of the State and district where in the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense."

7th Amendment : Protects civil trial by jury.

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

8th Amendment : Covers the prohibition of excessive bail, and cruel and unusual punishment.

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

9th Amendment : Covers the protection of rights not specifically enumerated in the U.S. Bill of Rights.

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

10th Amendment : Regarding powers of states and people.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people."

Okay, it is quiz time again. Did you happen to notice that ugly word "abortion" listed in any of those Ten Amendments? Well, you are not alone, because I didn't either; and that is where the problem lies. There are also some fundamental rights which the U.S. Supreme Court has legally recognized, that are not actually enumerated in the U.S. Constitution, or more specifically, in the Bill of Rights. These include the following:

- The right to interstate travel.
- The right to marriage.
- The right to privacy.
- The right to procreation.

Sadly, on January 22, 1973, the supposedly wise justices who sit on the U.S. Supreme Court, added the right to obtain an abortion to the above short list of recognized fundamental rights. What in the world were they thinking, and how could they possibly arrive at such a terrible conclusion? The way that it happened is simply this: Justice Harry Blackmun and six other justices, embracing a very liberal interpretation of the Bill of Rights, determined that the "right of privacy . . . is broad enough to encompass a woman's decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy"; and that, tragically, is how the Roe v Wade ruling became the deadly instrument for legalizing abortion throughout the United States of America.

Ever since that historic determination was made, many legal experts have argued that it was a poor ruling that was based on an extremely weak interpretation of the US Constitution.

While I myself am no legal expert and have never studied law, I must concur with their opinion. Yet despite their protests, the right to obtain an abortion has endured for thirty-six years now, and millions of innocent unborn children have been slaughtered, to the shame of the American people.

The two judges who dissented and did not go along with the majority ruling were Associate Justices Byron R. White and William H. Rehnquist. In his dissent, Justice White stated quite emphatically:

----- Begin Quote -----

"I find nothing in the language or history of the Constitution to support the Court's judgment. The Court simply fashions and announces a new constitutional right for pregnant mothers and, with scarcely any reason or authority for its action, invests that right with sufficient substance to override most existing state abortion statutes."

----- End Quote -----

For his part, Justice William H. Rehnquist basically said that the majority had fabricated the right to an abortion out of thin air, because not only did it not exist in the Bill of Rights, but prior to the Roe v. Wade ruling, the precedent was that the majority of the states wanted to limit abortions. In other words, the Blackmun court even went against the precedent, and overruled what the States clearly wanted. Rehnquist wrote in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

"To reach its result, the Court necessarily has had to find within the scope of the Fourteenth Amendment a right that was apparently completely unknown to the drafters of the Amendment. As early as 1821, the first state law dealing directly with abortion was enacted by the Connecticut Legislature. By the time of the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868, there were at least 36 laws enacted by state or territorial legislatures limiting abortion. While many States have amended or updated their laws, 21 of the laws on the books in 1868 remain in effect today."

----- End Quote -----

Thus we see that, despite President Bush's personal position regarding abortion, and despite the fact that he succeeded in appointing conservative-leaning judges to the Supreme Court, as well as to many courts of appeal, legalized abortion still remains the law of the land; and surely, this is to our shame. Furthermore, due to the fundamental right to privacy, to this day, a woman retains full control over her body when it comes to the issue of abortion. Under normal conditions, neither a spouse, boyfriend, or anyone else, can override her personal decision to obtain an abortion. Thankfully, at least there are restrictions, although by no means bullet-proof, when it comes to a minor girl attempting to do the same.

What aggravates the abortion problem even more, is the fact that we now have sex education being taught in the American public school system. Furthermore, to add insult to injury, it has also become common practice for some schools to make condoms available to their students. In my view, doing this only contributes to the problem of sexual promiscuity, which will obviously increase the opportunity for abortions to be

sought out. It's also my belief that sex education is a very private matter, and is something that children should really be taught in the privacy of their own home, by their parents.

I also find it quite disturbing, and in fact alarming, that due to the right to privacy, and the current status of some abortion laws in some states, a teenaged pregnant girl can now receive counseling at school, without her parents even being notified about it. The fact that the girl is still a minor, under the care of her parents, and the fact that her parents are legally responsible for her, should nullify the minor's right to privacy, when it comes to abortion. As we saw earlier, in some states, a pregnant minor can not only get counseling regarding her pregnancy, but she can proceed to have an abortion without her parents' consent, or without their being notified, or without both. I find it rather odd that this same minor is not old enough to vote, and yet she is deemed wise enough to make a decision regarding abortion, which will slaughter and terminate the life of another human being. Surely, this is the epitome of hypocrisy and madness.

While we have been discussing the legal and political aspects of the long fight to overturn Roe v. Wade, there is another aspect which we have yet to examine, and that is the various arguments which have been put forth by those people who are intent on keeping abortion legal throughout the United States of America. In addition to common everyday American citizens, I'm referring to the big names and the national organizations which have waged a relentless fight to keep the evil practice of abortion alive. These people and organizations who condone the slaughter of the innocent include, but are not limited to the following:

American Civil Liberties Union
Center for Reproductive Rights
Former President William Jefferson Clinton
Former Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor
Former Vice President Al Gore
Guttmacher Institute (former division of Planned Parenthood)
Nancy Pelosi, Speaker of the House, Democrat of California
Naral Pro-Choice America
National Organization for Women
Planned Parenthood Federation of America
President-elect Barack Hussein Obama
Senator Barbara Boxer, Democrat of California
Senator Dianne Feinstein, Democrat of California
Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, Democrat of New York
Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy
Supreme Court Justice David Souter
Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens
Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg
Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer
Vice President-elect Joseph Biden

One has to wonder what goes through the minds of people who so adamantly resist outlawing abortion. Well, perhaps I can shed a little light on this issue with the following remarks. One comment I came across while conducting research for this series, which I found rather disturbing, was made by Doctor Vanessa Cullins, who currently serves as vice president for medical affairs for Planned Parenthood Federation of America. In a statement, this woman made a remark regarding how, in her opinion, "draconian parental notification laws endanger the health of young women".

What Dr. Cullins is basically saying, is that we should just

trust that young teenaged girls, who are obviously already under a lot of stress due to their situation, and who are by law still minors, possess the wisdom and the maturity to make such an important decision by themselves, without any input whatsoever from their much wiser parents. As a parent myself, I cannot possibly agree with Doctor Cullins' position, and I must strenuously object to her misguided, biased mentality.

Now obviously, some of these minors are probably fearful that their mistake will be discovered; and then not only will they suffer embarrassment, but they'll have to face their parents' disappointment and anger as well. However, I would posit that in many cases, while the parents may not approve of what the child has done by getting pregnant, and may even scold them, they will also offer their child the comfort, understanding, and support that she will need at such a time. If we are only there for our children during the good times, and not for the bad times, what kind of parents are we? Furthermore, a wise parent will encourage their child to give birth to the baby, even if she still chooses to offer it up for adoption at some later date. Isn't this a lot better than murderous abortion which will mercilessly slaughter an unborn, innocent child?

It seems to me that one of the problems is that some of these abortionists don't want to allow this parent/child encounter to occur. These unscrupulous baby killers obviously know how vulnerable a young pregnant girl can be. Likewise, they know that the minor may not go through with the abortion, if the child has any opportunity to consult with her parents first. Thus, they endeavor to break the parental bond when it comes to the all important issue of abortion. They want to isolate the child, and in fact replace the parents, and substitute their opinion, for the parents' opinion. They want to usurp the parents' position. Of course, the abortionists will try to comfort the girl prior to the abortion; but once the deed has been done, it is done, and it most certainly cannot be reversed; and the child will have the rest of her life to regret her decision, while the abortion clinic goes on its merry way, and continues to turn a handsome profit.

Folks, let's not forget that this is precisely what abortion clinics are really all about. Don't be deceived by the false notion that they are just there to help young teenaged girls and women in distress. That is a bunch of nonsense. The fact of the matter remains that abortion clinics are businesses, and no person goes into business for any other reason than to turn a profit. Yes, all businesses may provide some kind of beneficial service or product to the community; nevertheless, they are in business to make money, and not just enough to barely get by, but enough to make a handsome profit and live comfortably. These abortion clinics are no different. If they can't make it as easy as possible to obtain an abortion, then they won't be in business for very long. They will go broke. It is for this reason, and this reason only, that these evil abortionists fight tooth and nail, and use every means, and every argument at their disposal, to keep abortions legal.

I am reminded of another cold-hearted statement from a case which made the news towards the end of 2002. It involved one gynecologist/abortionist in the state of New Jersey by the name of Sheldon Turkish, and a woman named Rosa Acuna. News reports state that Ms. Acuna sued the abortionist, because at the time of her abortion in 1996, he failed to inform her that aborting a baby in the first trimester was in reality terminating the life of a human being. According to Acuna, when she asked Turkish whether or not a baby was already in

her womb, he responded that it was "nothing but some blood". This deceptive abortionist in fact admitted in depositions, that he informs pregnant women that there is "nothing but some tissue". Sadly, this is the attitude of many of these cold-blooded, licensed killers, and it has to be one of the biggest, most evil deceptions that surrounds the abortion issue.

In other words, many abortionists intentionally attempt to dehumanize the human embryo, and to desensitize people to the reality of what actually occurs during an abortion, by promoting the false notion that there is "nothing but some tissue". "It's not really a living human being, it's just a clump of cells", they claim; and on and on the argument goes.

Tragically, I even had one individual tell me recently that, in his view, until the baby takes its first breath, and the umbilical cord is cut, it is not even a real person. So what is it then; a breathing, humanoid non-human? So by promoting the utterly false impression that what is in their womb is not really human yet, or a person yet, these abortionists in fact help to relieve pregnant women and minor girls of the guilt which they would surely feel, if they realized that they were in fact murdering an unborn child, who is created in the image of God, in the most horrific of ways, and it is indeed very horrific. If you doubt my word, then you really need to examine the various abortion images which you will find in the abortion section of our Endtime Prophecy Net web site. Abortion is nothing short of wholesale slaughter of innocent unborn human beings, as the images make very clear.

Thankfully, God, the Creator and Giver of life, doesn't view a fetus or an embryo as just a clump of unrecognizable cells. As I have mentioned a number of times before, God sees us as real, living human beings, long before we are ever conceived or born. This is clearly revealed in the Book of Psalms where we are plainly told that God knew us, and designed us, even before He created us in our mother's womb. In the powerful set of verses below, this is what it means when it uses the word "earth". After all, does not Genesis tell us that Adam was made from the dust of the ground; and did not God cause life to spring forth from the earth? So too, life springs forth from the womb in the same way:

"For thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."

Psalms 139:13-16, KJV

Once we open our hearts and accept the above verses as being true, the argument of when human life begins falls apart. It simply vanishes, and becomes a moot point. By accepting the previous verses as being true, we place the final nail in the coffin of the abortionists, because then they can no longer argue the point that a days-old embryo, or a months-old fetus is not human, or a real person. God has spoken, and His Word is the Final Authority, when it comes to our Christian faith. By accepting these verses, the abortionists' heinous sin of mass murder is fully exposed; and that is why they work so hard to try to conceal this truth from pregnant women, and

minors. It is their evil lie, ("nothing but some tissue"), versus God's truth. Which are you going to believe?

The previous verses are not the only Biblical evidence which points to the fact that God knew us, and viewed us as human, long before He ever formed us in our mother's womb. In the Old Testament, there are many books which were written by the Prophets. These were men who were called and ordained by God to be messengers to the nation of Israel. One such Prophet, who heard his prophetic calling at a very early age, was the young child Jeremiah. Similar to the Prophet Samuel, we know that Jeremiah was called by God at a very young age, because he even complained to the Lord about it in the book that is named after him.

The Bible informs us that the Prophet Jeremiah warned the people of Jerusalem and Judah for forty years to repent of their rebellion against the Lord, right up until the very day that the armies of the Babylonian king, Nebuchadnezzar, utterly destroyed Jerusalem and Solomon's Temple. However, many years before these dark days arrived, the Lord gave the following message to this young boy Jeremiah, when He first called him to be one of His messengers to the rebellious Jerusalemites. Please notice the very first words of the very first verse:

"Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations. Then said I, Ah, Lord GOD! behold, I cannot speak: for I am a child. But the LORD said unto me, Say not, I am a child: for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces: for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the LORD."
Jeremiah 1:5-8, KJV

"Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee", the Lord tells Jeremiah. So just as we saw in the set of verses from Psalm 139, God reveals that He knows us even before He ever physically forms us in our mother's womb. So taken together, these two sets of verses tell us that God personally knows us; that He has designed our organs and physical appearance, and thus knows exactly what we will look like, and that He has even planned and predestinated our lives, long before the moment of our actual conception in our mother's womb. In light of these facts, again I ask, how can abortionists dare claim that we are nothing but an unidentifiable clump of cells, "nothing but some tissue", and not a person or a real human being? Someone is obviously lying here, and it most certainly is not God.

What the previous verses also tell us, is that by condoning and engaging in abortion, people are trying to destroy what God has already chosen to create. They are defying His Will. They are interfering with His plans. How dare anyone do that! Just who do you people think you are, to so haughtily place yourselves, and your will, and your foolish medical opinions, above the Almighty God, El Shaddai, the Creator of life, and the Creator of the Universe? Shame on you all!

Returning to the ministry of the Prophet Jeremiah for just a moment, as I explain in some of my other articles, such as in the in-depth series "The Fruits Of Disobedience", the Bible plainly tells us that one of the primary reasons why the Lord allowed Jerusalem and the temple to be destroyed by the army of King Nebuchadnezzar, was because they were worshipping the

false gods of the heathen nations around them. This worship included regular child sacrifices to the god Molech, in the Valley of Hinnom. This valley, known as "geenna" or "Gehenna of fire" in Greek, was located to the south, just beyond the walls of Jerusalem. It was where the Israelites burned their trash, as well as the bodies of dead livestock and criminals. How fitting, albeit tragically so, that this is also where they chose to slaughter their children on the fiery altars of Molech. Consider the following revealing verses:

"And say, 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 upon this place, the which whosoever heareth, his ears shall tingle. Because they have forsaken me, and have estranged this place, and have burned incense in it unto other gods, whom neither they nor their fathers have known, nor the kings of Judah, and have filled this place with the blood of innocents; They have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind: Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that this place shall no more be called Tophet, nor The valley of the son of Hinnom, but The valley of slaughter. And I will make void the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place; and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hands of them that seek their lives: and their carcasses will I give to be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth. And I will make this city desolate, and an hissing; every one that passeth thereby shall be astonished and hiss because of all the plagues thereof. And I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his friend in the siege and straitness, wherewith their enemies, and they that seek their lives, shall straiten them."

Jeremiah 19:3-9, KJV

"Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon."

1 Kings 11:7, KJV

"And he defiled Topheth, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech."

2 Kings 23:10, KJV

"And they built the high places of Baal, which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire unto Molech; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind, that they should do this abomination, to cause Judah to sin."

Jeremiah 32:35, KJV

To some modern readers, the above verses must sound rather horrific. Yet ironically, some of these same people seem to find absolutely nothing wrong with slaughtering millions of unborn children through the murderous act of abortion. If God punished the ancient Israelites for their wickedness and evil infanticide, how can He not some day soon also punish wicked America for the death of millions of unborn babies at the hands of heartless abortionists? Is America not asking for severe judgment by the Almighty? The ancient Israelites certainly did not escape His wrath, and it is a safe bet to conclude that neither will America.

Please go to part three for the continuation of this series.

This file was written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

End Of File

ABORTION : THE SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENT : PART 3

Last Updated : March 19, 2009

Just A Ball Of Cells?, Protecting Women's Health And Saving Their Lives A Huge Abortionist Deception, 42 Million Babies Are Slaughtered Every Year Worldwide, Double State Of Texas, Cloaking Abortion In Aura Of Humanitarianism, 93% Of Women Obtain An Abortion As A Selfish Act Of Personal Convenience, Potential Health Problems, Genetic Screening, Fetal Defects, Modern Science Playing "God", Elevating Ourselves Above God, Lucifer's Biblical Rebellion In Isaiah, Genetic Engineering, Cloning And Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World", Adolf Hitler, Racial Purity, Aryan Super Race, Thule Society, (Nazis), And Lebensborn Organization, Designer Babies And Eugenic Society, Improving God's Creation?, Is Abortion Small-Scale Eugenics?, Is Abortion Government Sanctioned Population Growth Control?, God Creates Life, Heals, Kills & Creates People With Defects, The Foolishness Of Questioning God's Ways, Fear Of The Lord, Abortionists Don't Fear God, Keep Our Mouth Shut Before God, God's Ways Are Above Our Ways, Trust The Lord No Matter What, Children With Mental Or Physical Limitations, Reading List, Our Struggle With Diabetes, Excuses For Having An Abortion, A Woman's Right Over Her Body - How Far Does It Actually Go?, Children Are God's Blessing, Christian Marriage Relationship

Several years ago, in one of the online conversations that I was having at the time, one individual tried to fall back on the "nothing more than a ball of cells" argument. Those were in fact his actual words. I was totally appalled by the weak justifications that he provided for condoning abortion; and they were some of the very same arguments that we continue to see being promoted today. As we saw earlier, the "nothing but some tissue" argument is one of the biggest deceptions that is promoted by abortionists. The second deception which is believed by a considerable number of people, and which was even used by Dr. Vanessa Cullins in the quote that I shared earlier, is that delaying or preventing an abortion endangers the health of young women. Some of these crafty abortionists would like us to believe that every time that an abortion is performed, a woman's health is protected, or perhaps her very life is even saved.

In my view, just the sheer magnitude of that deception defies belief, yet we hear it all the time. Are we to believe, that based on the average number of annual abortions, that some 1.37 million women's and minors' lives are wrenched from the claws of death every single year? Are we to believe that ever since abortion was legalized in 1973, the lives of forty-six million women and teenage girls have been saved? I don't know about you, but I have a very difficult time accepting that. I honestly don't know how many women's lives are actually saved each year as a result of having had an abortion. I doubt that anyone really knows; and if they do know, I would guess that they certainly don't want the general public to know; because the number is probably so low in comparison to the number of abortions that are performed, that it would undoubtedly be a major embarrassment to abortionists to even reveal it, and it would expose this deception for what it is -- a subtle device they use to garner support for abortion.

We need to ask ourselves an important question. Regardless of the actual number of lives which have truly been saved, does

this unknown figure warrant the mass murder and slaughter of forty-six million unborn children during the past thirty-six years? Mind you, this is just the number of legal abortions which have been performed in the U.S.A. While that figure may astound you, consider the fact that approximately forty-two million abortions are performed around the world every single year. This staggering number is about equivalent to twice the entire population of the US state of Texas being put to death every year. Imagine that you live in Texas, and one morning you wake up to discover that the streets in your town or city are totally devoid of life. Every single person has vanished without a trace. Absolute silence reigns. How would you feel? Now, double that number, and that is exactly what happens to unborn, innocent children every single year all around the world. They are slaughtered, and not a whimper is ever heard.

The daily worldwide rate of abortion has been approximated at 115,000 abortions, while the daily US abortion rate has been estimated at 3,700 innocent lives slaughtered on the bloody altars of the abortionists. I obtained some of these figures from the "The Center for Bio-Ethical Reform" website.

The point I am trying to make here, is that for the sake of profit, abortionists intentionally try to cloak abortion in this aura of humanitarianism. "We must protect the health of the mother. We must save the life of this dear young girl". That is their mantra, and we all know that while this may be true in some cases, it is most certainly not true for the roughly 1.37 million women and girls who obtain an abortion every single year within the USA. As I said, I cannot offer an actual figure for how many lives have truly been saved, simply because I was unable to find one, but I can provide some additional information which I found on the "The Center for Bio-Ethical Reform" website. At the top of their page, they state the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

"All abortion numbers are derived from pro-abortion sources courtesy of The Alan Guttmacher Institute and Planned Parenthood's Family Planning Perspectives."

----- End Quote -----

In short, the figures that I'm sharing below were provided by the abortionists themselves. Exactly how accurate and honest they are is anyone's guess. These numbers are a breakdown of why women and minors choose to have an abortion:

- 1% - rape or incest.
- 6% - potential health problems regarding either the mother or child.
- 93% - social reasons (i.e. the child is unwanted or inconvenient).

The above numbers are extremely revealing; and they totally expose the deceptions which are constantly being promoted by the abortionist camp. As you can see, a full ninety-three per cent of all abortions obtained in the United States are by no means medical emergencies which are performed in order to save a woman's life. More often than not, they're selfish acts of personal convenience, and nothing more.

Now let's have a look at that last six per cent figure. The

way that they have worded it seems a bit deceptive to me. It is not saying that six per cent of all women and minors who obtain an abortion do so in order to save their lives. I am not disputing that some abortions do save some undetermined number of lives; however, what it says there is "potential health problems". Six per cent of women and minors seek out an abortion due to "potential health problems". My point is, the number of lives which have actually been saved is under six per cent. Exactly what percentage of that six per cent can actually be assigned to lives saved, I honestly do not know, because, as I said, I was unable to find a figure for it.

But let's explore this idea of a "potential health problem". A "potential health problem" can mean many different things, and not necessarily death, or even the threat of death. Let me give you a clear example. Medical professionals have now devised methods to perform what they refer to as "genetic screening", as well as other tests, whereby they are able to determine if an unborn fetus possesses any kind of defects. Obviously, it is a given that all parents desire to have a healthy baby; but suppose that genetic screening reveals a problem? Does that fact give the parents the right to obtain an abortion?

In my conversations over the years, this is precisely one of the justifications which have been presented for obtaining an abortion. A few years ago, I was exchanging email with a young high school girl who asked me about this very issue. Let me share with you some of the things that I told her.

The first point that we need to establish is that contrary to modern, ungodly, medical and scientific opinion, mankind does not have the right to play "God". It is not for man to decide who is to live, and who is to die. Neither is it man's place to determine what constitutes human life, and what does not. Furthermore, it is not for man to determine when human life technically begins, or when human life technically ends. As I explained earlier, as far as God is concerned, our existence was known to Him even before we were ever conceived in the womb. Thus, by making any of these determinations, man has in fact elevated himself above God. He has usurped the authority of the Almighty. If you're a Christian, this kind of attitude should alarm you, because this isn't the first time that this has occurred. Lucifer had similar thoughts. Consider this:

"How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit."
Isaiah 14:12-15, KJV

This unhealthy attitude is illustrated quite well by modern attempts at cloning and genetic engineering. While there are medical professionals who truly do have our best interests at heart, and who sincerely want to alleviate, and even cure, some of the many ailments which afflict our modern society, nevertheless, the practice of creating and design life in the laboratory is truly an ethical minefield, and the temptation to play "God" exists.

I don't know how many of you have read Aldous Huxley's novel

"Brave New World", but it is a very interesting book which centers around society's attempt to supposedly "improve" the human race through genetic engineering and controlled gene selection. This seems to be what Adolf Hitler had in mind as well with his ideas of "racial purity", and his intentions to create an Aryan "super race" through the Thule Society, (a.k.a. National Socialist German Workers Party - Nazis), a massive sterilization program, the Lebensborn organization, and the murder of millions of "imperfect" Europeans.

The minute that we pass that threshold, and decide that we have the right to terminate human life due to some perceived genetic deficiency, or to manipulate and genetically sculpt life so that it meets our definition of perfection, such as with so-called "designer babies", we are actually on our way to fulfilling Aldous Huxley's vision of a futuristic eugenic society, in which the creation of a new human life has been reduced from being a miracle of God, to merely a scientific process performed in the laboratory. Sadly, I suspect that within a few short years, the first cloned human being will be introduced to the world. In fact, as you may have heard, the controversial Raelian UFO cult has supposedly already passed this scientific hurdle. If this turns out to be the case, or if someone else eventually does it, then what? Who will close the flood gates to this madness?

What I also find alarming regarding the current progress that is being made in the areas of genetics and cloning, is that in an indirect way, those who engage in these activities are suggesting that the Lord didn't do a good enough job when He fashioned and created us; so we humans need to correct His "errors" and "deficiencies" in our design, through genetic manipulation.

Here is something else that you should consider. When people are given the right to decide whether or not a forming baby should be born or else aborted, in essence, they are already practicing a small-scale form of selective breeding; they're already practicing a subtle form of eugenics that is in fact sanctioned by their government. They don't need to let some Big Brother government do it for them, because Big Brother has already given them the freedom to practice small-scale eugenics, every time that they choose to use birth control, or to abort a baby. So in reality, the government engages in full-scale population growth control by letting its citizens think that it is their, (meaning the people's), idea. Now that is being crafty!

As we saw earlier, the Bible makes it rather clear that God is the Author, Creator and Giver of life. The Scriptures tell us that not only does He create life, but that He also heals, and even kills according to His Divine Purposes. Furthermore, (and this may surprise some of you), the Bible even tells us that the Lord allows people to be born with certain physical defects for whatever His reasons. Consider these verses:

"See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand."
Deuteronomy 32:39, KJV

"And the LORD said unto him, Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh the dumb, or deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? have not I the LORD?"
Exodus 4:11, KJV

One common argument which is sometimes made by atheists and other ungodly persons, is to say "Well, if God is real, and if He is as powerful as you Christians claim that He is, why then does He allow wars to occur; and people to suffer from oppression and hunger; and children to be born deformed; and all of the other evil things that occur in the world?" While we may be tempted to adopt this complaining attitude, it is important for us to remember that it is not for us humans to question why God does the things that He does, or allows the things that He does; because to do so, is essentially to say that we could run things better, and in effect, to put ourselves in the place of God.

The Scriptures repeatedly tell us that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. It is because many people today no longer fear or reverence the Lord and His Word, that they have become fools, and have adopted such a haughty, negative and critical attitude towards God. Furthermore, they believe that they can be their own little gods, and the masters of their own fate. As we saw earlier, in their pride and vanity, they even think that they have the right to decide who is to live, and who is to die; even for those who don't have a say in the matter, like an unborn child. These people who speak against the Lord and criticize Him would do well to consider the wisdom of the following verses:

"And unto man he said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding."
Job 28:28, KJV

"The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom: a good understanding have all they that do his commandments: his praise endureth for ever."
Psalm 111:10, KJV

"The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction."
Proverbs 1:7

"The fear of the LORD is to hate evil: pride, and arrogancy, and the evil way, and the froward mouth, do I hate."
Proverbs 8:13, KJV

"The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom: and the knowledge of the holy is understanding."
Proverbs 9:10, KJV

"The fear of the LORD prolongeth days: but the years of the wicked shall be shortened."
Proverbs 10:27, KJV

"The fear of the LORD is a fountain of life, to depart from the snares of death."
Proverbs 14:27, KJV

"The fear of the LORD is the instruction of wisdom; and before honour is humility."
Proverbs 15:33, KJV

"By mercy and truth iniquity is purged: and by the fear of the LORD men depart from evil."
Proverbs 16:6, KJV

"The fear of the LORD tendeth to life: and he that hath it shall abide satisfied; he shall not be visited with evil."
Proverbs 19:23, KJV

"By humility and the fear of the LORD are riches, and honour, and life."
Proverbs 22:4, KJV

Please notice how many positive things we are told regarding the fear of the Lord:

1. It is wisdom and knowledge.
2. It prolongs our lives.
3. It protects us from evil.
4. It enriches our lives.
5. It brings honor to our lives.

These are things which many people in the world desire; and they can indeed have them, if they will only fear the Lord, and obey His Commandments; one of which very clearly warns us "Thou shalt not kill". In the previous Scriptures, notice how often we are told that the fear of the Lord is to depart from evil. No true God-fearing, Bible-believing Christian can deny that to obtain an abortion, simply for the sake of personal convenience is a very evil thing; and yet every single day in the U.S.A., an average of 3,700 innocent, unborn children are slaughtered, and their remains thrown in the trash, or burned in an incinerator. To you people who would dare to open your mouths in defiance against God, I urge you to also consider what the Lord once said to the Patriarch Job:

"Moreover the LORD answered Job, and said, Shall he that contendeth with the Almighty instruct him? he that reproveth God, let him answer it. Then Job answered the LORD, and said, Behold, I am vile; what shall I answer thee? I will lay mine hand upon my mouth. Once have I spoken; but I will not answer: yea, twice; but I will proceed no further. Then answered the LORD unto Job out of the whirlwind, and said, Gird up thy loins now like a man: I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me. Wilt thou also disannul my judgment? wilt thou condemn me, that thou mayest be righteous?"
Job 40:1-8, KJV

In the Book of Ecclesiastes, we can also find the following words of wisdom:

"Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God: for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few."
Ecclesiastes 5:2, KJV

In his Epistle to the brethren at Rome, the Apostle Paul was likewise inspired to write:

"Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?"
Romans 9:20, KJV

So as you can see, we must simply accept that God's ways are above our ways, and His thoughts are above our thoughts; and that whatever He does, or even allows, is for our own good. We must never doubt His love for us; and we must continue to trust in Him no matter what. Consider the following verses:

"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

Isaiah 55:8-9, KJV

"And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose."

Romans 8:28, KJV

"Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee."

Isaiah 26:3, KJV

"Trust in the LORD with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths."

Proverbs 3:5-6, KJV

This same attitude must be applied to our children who may be born with certain mental or physical limitations. We must not allow our emotions to overcome us, and become angry with, or even bitter against, God. This issue is in fact something to which I personally have given considerable attention. If you are interested in reading my current thoughts on this and related subjects, please consider reading the following list of articles:

1. Why Doesn't God Heal Me?
2. Are Personal Tragedies Due To Sin?
3. Free Will And Personal Choice
4. Love And Light Or Rod And Wrath?
5. Beholding The Evil And The Good
6. The Fruits Of Disobedience

One thing I would like to mention here is that I write from personal experience. I have a daughter, who is now a young adult, who was diagnosed with Type 1 Diabetes a little over seven years ago. At the time of her diagnosis, she had just turned eleven years old two months prior, and it was a very traumatic experience for her, and a very heartbreaking one for me. From that day until now, and unless a cure is found, for the rest of her life, she will be forced to perform an average of three blood tests each day, as well as inject herself with insulin about three times a day, in order to maintain a safe blood glucose level.

Similar to many diabetics, we have endured our share of ups and downs over the past seven years; including many bouts of hyperglycemia, hypoglycemia, neuroglycopenia, ataxia, faulty judgment, disorientation, seizures, incoherency, mood swings, vomiting, headaches, etc. If we are not careful, my daughter could eventually go blind, or have one or more of her limbs amputated, or possibly lose her kidneys, which would result in her being forced to go to dialysis for a number of years, until eventually, her body grows so weak that she just dies. Lapsing into a coma is also an ever-present danger.

For many people, this would be a very heavy burden to bear; particularly for a young child. And believe me; when we at first became aware of her condition, and had to spend over two weeks in the hospital, it was difficult; particularly for my daughter, who was constantly poked with needles, had to be woken up every four hours, had an I.V. in her little arm, etc. It was very hard on her; and as I already said, it broke my heart as well to watch my young daughter suffer so much.

In spite of this development in our lives, we still hold on

to our faith, and love and trust in the Lord for everything. We haven't allowed the experience to embitter us against the Lord. We don't know why He has allowed this to happen in our lives, but we accept it as coming from His Hand. Maybe some day we will better understand; but in the mean time, we will just keep on trusting Him, and praising Him, no matter what.

Now, in case you still don't understand why I have chosen to share this personal part of my life with you, let me explain. Imagine if eighteen years ago, before my daughter was born, the technology existed which would have allowed the doctors to determine that she was going to develop Juvenile Diabetes later on in her life. That would have presented me with a big choice. Should I even allow this child to be born, realizing that she is going to suffer later? Do I really have the right to terminate her existence even before she is born through a cruel act of abortion? Do I really have the right to destroy what God has obviously created for whatever His reasons?

As we've already seen, in my particular case, as a Christian, who believes that life comes from God, even if it happens to be born defective, I must resolutely answer in the negative. I don't have that right; and I would have never consented to an abortion eighteen years ago, just as I would do so even less today; because I understand even better now, how ugly, horrible, violent and disgusting an abortion really is; and this is even more so when we are dealing with the so-called Partial-Birth Abortion. Over the years, I've educated myself even further concerning the various forms of abortion, as is evident by the eye-opening information that is found in the abortion section of our web site.

I thank God for my daughter. She's brought so much laughter, joy and inspiration into my life. She is one of the primary reasons for my existence. I both love her and admire her. She has been a shining example to me of inner spiritual strength and positiveness, which I don't know that I would have had, if I had found myself in a similar situation at such a tender age. My daughter is a blessing to me; and to think that she would have never entered my life, had I selfishly chosen to accept abortion.

Sadly, as we all know, many pregnant women and minors do not, and would not, make the same choice. As we saw earlier, 93% of abortions are motivated by personal convenience of one kind or another. Some of the reasons given for obtaining an abortion include, but are not limited to, still being young and wanting to enjoy life, financial difficulties, viewing a pregnancy and/or newborn as an obstacle in one's career path, repudiation due to rape or incest, a fear of being socially ostracized, etc. To try to justify an abortion in such cases, many women and pro-abortion organizations claim that a woman has the right to do with her body as she pleases. This type of attitude is reflected in the words of someone who wrote to me several years ago. They stated in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

"Whether God has planned for this baby to be born or not, it is the mother's choice of whether to have the baby or not."

----- End Quote -----

This person seems to recognize, or at the very least, seems to have considered, that God may have planned for a woman's pregnancy to occur; yet in spite of that fact, still insists

that a woman has the right to choose to reject what God has willed. I find it rather astounding that a woman would even think of trying to override God's Will in this manner. The grave error of those people who think this way is to assume that this "right-to-my-own-body" extends to murdering the new life that grows within. To those of you who embrace this ungodly deception, allow me to simply say this:

Yes, you may have the right over your own body, (although it does have limitations according to God's Word), but you most certainly do not have the right to cold-heartedly snuff out the life of the young, developing body that's forming within your womb. Why do I say this? Quite simply, because while you may think that the embryo is just the result of human sexual intercourse, as we have already seen, this is clearly not the case. It may have been your egg and your partner's sperm, but their union was a direct result of God's Divine Will. It was the Lord who saw fit to join them together; and it was He who breathed a spark of His Spirit into that young being, giving it life. To reiterate a point I made earlier, God is the only Author of life, and not we ourselves. Furthermore, as I point out in the series "The Fruit Of The Womb", the Bible plainly tells us that conception, and thus children, are a blessing from the Lord, as we see here:

"Lo, children are an heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward."

Psalm 127:3, KJV

That being the case, and as we have already seen, a woman has no right to interfere with what God has apparently ordained to be. Her responsibility as His creation is to humbly accept His Will for her life whether she likes it or not. This is in fact one instance where a woman doesn't have a right over her own body. In the case where a woman is married, this is even more true. Consider the following verses which clearly define a woman's role in a Christian marriage relationship:

"The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife."

1 Corinthians 7:4, KJV

"Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body."

Ephesians 5:22-23, 33 KJV

"Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband."

Ephesians 5:33, KJV

"Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them."

Colossians 3:18-19, KJV

"In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works. Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."

1 Timothy 2:9-14, KJV

"Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; While they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands:"

1 Peter 3:1-5, KJV

"Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

Genesis 3:16, KJV

Please go to part four for the continuation of this series.

This file was written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

End Of File

Last Updated : March 19, 2009

Respecting The Christian Husband's Will Regarding Abortion, 70% Of Abortions Are Obtained By Women Of Religious Faiths, Influence Of Women's Lib And Equality Of The Sexes Nonsense, Traditional Stay-At-Home Mom Is A Shameless God-Given Role, Denying God's Existence Does Not Free Us From Obeying His Laws, God Tolerates Our Willful Ignorance Only For A Time, Voice Of Conscience - God's Laws Are Written On Our Hearts, Our Sins Are Not Hidden, Before The Judgment Seat Of Christ, Right To Privacy Does Not Conceal The Awful Sin Of Abortion, Shock & Dismay But Not When It Comes To The Abortion Issue, Roe v. Wade Took 13 Months To Decide, We've Had 36 Years To Change It, Norma L. McCorvey, (Jane Roe), Lied To The Court, Norma McCorvey Says She Was Manipulated By Sarah Weddington And Linda Coffee, Norma L. McCorvey Never Had Her Abortion, McCorvey Aligns Herself With Operation Rescue And Reverses Her Position Regarding Abortion, Excerpt From "Won By Love", McCorvey v. Hill - Jane Doe Fights To Overturn Roe v. Wade, Texas District Court, Appeals Court And Supreme Court Refuse To Hear McCorvey's 2004 Case, Obama Will Undo Good Done By Bush Administration Regarding Abortion, Freedom Of Choice Act Will Enforce Abortionists' Will On All Medical Professionals, Slaughtering Unborn Innocent Children In Order To Spare Them From Potential Suffering In Future Isn't Doing Them A Favor, Only God Knows Future Of Unborn Children, Negative Childhood Environment Isn't God's Fault, Abraham Sarah & Birth Of Isaac

Based on the previous verses, it becomes quite clear that if a husband is opposed to his wife obtaining an abortion, her responsibility, as mandated by God's Word, is to submit to her husband's will; for in so doing, she is submitting unto the Lord. So as you can see, this ridiculous notion, and in fact, lie, that a woman has a right to do with her body as she pleases, is totally contrary to the Scriptures, and is in reality an evil invention of modern, ungodly abortionists. It should also be noted that even if the husband does not oppose the abortion, it is still wrong to obtain one for the reasons which I have already stated. Furthermore, if the husband does agree to the abortion, then he makes himself an accomplice to her crime against God, as well as against the unborn child which they have agreed to slaughter.

But surely no true, Bible-believing, God-fearing Christian woman would ever consent to having an abortion, would she? While I was conducting some web research for this series, I discovered some shocking information which should alarm all Christians. According to "The Center Of Bio-Ethical Reform" website, a full seventy per cent of all abortions that are performed in the United States, are requested by women of faith of one form or another. Consider the following tragic statistics:

- 37.4% - Protestant women
- 31.3% - Catholic women
- 23.7% - women with no religious affiliation
- 18.0% - Born-again/Evangelical women
- 1.30% - Jewish woman

One would think that most abortions are obtained by women who do not profess belief in God, but to our shame, this is

clearly not the case. Protestants and Catholics appear to be the guiltiest parties of all. Also, please note that the 18.0% figure is actually a part of the Protestant group as well; at least that is how I interpret the data.

I suspect that part of the problem is that many women today have been poisoned by the philosophy of the "women's lib" movement. As a result, rather than just humbly accept their traditional role in society, as is ordained by God's Word, they have chosen to engage in such things as the so-called fight for the equality of the sexes. So many women now feel that they have to prove to the world that they are just as "good" as men. No you don't! Simply be a good wife to your husband, as well as a good mother to your children. That is what God expects and demands of you most, and nothing more. In fact, I would dare say that in fulfilling these Biblical obligations, He will bless you the most, and you will also reap the reward of being the happiest, and feeling the most fulfilled in life. As Jesus said:

"If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."
John 13:17, KJV

Another great verse from the Book of Proverbs states:

"Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing, and obtaineth favour of the LORD."
Proverbs 18:22, KJV

Thus, contrary to modern opinion which contradicts the Bible, the truth of the matter is that being a stay-at-home wife and mother is definitely not something of which a woman should feel the least bit ashamed. For more information regarding the topic of marriage relationships, please consider reading other articles such as "Women Shepherds: The Family Sex Cult Exposed Again", and "Churchianity Or Christianity: Which Do You Practice?".

Of course, the way that some people try to circumvent the Biblical truths that I just presented, is by claiming that they don't believe in God; and therefore, His Laws, and His Word, don't apply to them. They know that they'll never win against God's Word, so they have no other recourse than to continue to try to defend their wayward position with what appear to be logical arguments. On the surface, saying that they don't believe in God, and therefore are not bound by His Word, may sound quite logical to some people, but in reality it isn't.

As I recently pointed out to some of my online friends, to feign ignorance to God and His Word, is like attempting to speed down a roadway at sixty miles an hour, when all along your route there are signs which clearly tell you that the speed limit is thirty-five miles per hour. Eventually, you are going to be pulled over by a police officer, (hopefully an honest one who doesn't accept bribes), who is more than likely going to present you with a speeding ticket.

If you go to traffic court, and try to plead your innocence by explaining to the judge that you just don't recognize the legality of speed limit signs, or worse yet, that you don't recognize his authority as the judge, he is going to laugh in your face and probably lay a heavy fine on you. If you're foolish enough to act belligerently and argue with him, you might even end up spending a few days in jail. So it is with God. You may deny His existence, or refuse to recognize the

Authority of His Word as Divine Law, but it does not make a bit of difference. If you violate His Laws, (which is what sin is -- 1 John 3:4), you will be found guilty as charged. As the Apostle Paul once boldly declared to the Greeks on Mars' Hill in the city of Athens:

"And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent: Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."
Acts 17:30-31, KJV

Paul is of course referring to Jesus, who will righteously judge the world one of these days. As Paul states, God may put up with our foolish rebellion and feigned ignorance for a while, but sooner or later, He is going to be forced to put His foot down; and trust me; if you are on the wrong side of the fence at that time, you are not going to like what happens next. So to reiterate my point, attempting to find some way around God's Laws is an exercise in futility, because the Bible plainly tells us that our God is the God of the Universe; He is the God of all flesh. Furthermore, we are told that God's Laws are written upon the tables of our hearts, whether we have ever read the Bible or not. As a result, we are all without excuse. We know the difference between right and wrong; and abortion is definitely wrong. Consider these verses:

"Behold, I am the LORD, the God of all flesh: is there any thing too hard for me?"
Jeremiah 32:27, KJV

"This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;"
Hebrews 10:16, KJV

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;)"
Romans 2:14-15, KJV

This issue of feigning ignorance, and trying to find a way around God's Laws, (as if that is really possible), ties in to an issue that we discussed earlier. As we have seen, one tactic that abortion advocates frequently use in their vain attempts to try to justify the violent, murderous acts that are daily perpetrated upon the unborn, is to try to conceal their evil deeds behind the "legal fence" that is now known as the "right to privacy" issue. The mentality seems to be "out-of-sight, out-of-mind". While the world at large may be foolish enough to accept this flimsy excuse, God is most certainly not. In fact, the Bible clearly tells us that it is utterly useless for us to try to hide our sins from the Almighty. As the old saying goes, "Be sure that your sins will find you out"; and that most certainly applies to the ugly, ungodly sin of abortion. Concerning the hypocritical religious leaders of His own day, Jesus Christ Himself stated:

"For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed;

neither hid, that shall not be known."

Luke 12:2, KJV

"If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloke for their sin."

John 15:22, KJV

In his Epistles, the Apostle Paul also makes it clear that we all have a future appointment with the Lord, and that we will be judged according to our actions in this life:

"But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ . . . So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

Romans 14:10, 12, KJV

"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

2 Corinthians 5:10, KJV

"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment:"

Hebrews 9:27, KJV

In the Old Testament, we are also told that some people will be raised to Everlasting Life, while others will be raised to shame and everlasting contempt, as we see here:

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Daniel 12:2, KJV

So as you can plainly see, we may be able to fool others at times, and we can try to hide our sins behind the legality of the law, such as with the right to privacy and abortion, but no matter how hard we try, we simply cannot fool God. He knows the score; and the Day of Reckoning is coming for each and every one of us. That includes for the people who engage in the violent act of abortion, whether we choose to believe it or not. We will all have to acknowledge our sins. Knowing then that we will each have to answer for ourselves, should go a long way in motivating us to always make certain that we are doing the right thing in the Lord's eyes to the best of our knowledge and ability; particularly in such issues as abortion, where another person's life is involved.

One question which I posed earlier in this series, is why, after so many years, and after having so many conservative judges appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court, as well as to the Federal Appeals Courts, has abortion remained the law of the land? While some people might point to legal issues as the root problem, from some of the research that I've done, I have formed the impression that some justices on the U.S. Supreme Court are hesitant to overturn Roe v. Wade because, in their view, the current social environment within the USA is not yet conducive to doing so. In other words, they feel that the American public is not quite ready yet for such a monumental change in the legal status of abortion. Obviously, while the Conservative Right and Bible-believing Christians would rejoice at such a gesture by the Supreme Court, there would also be a public outcry against such a move, by the individuals and organizations that we discussed earlier in this series, as well as by many other women.

As I lay in bed this morning, still waking up from a good night's rest, my mind turned to this current series, being as it was the last thing that I worked on last night before retiring. As I lay there pondering this issue, I thought of a simple way to illustrate in a powerful way, the distorted social attitude which seems to currently prevail in the USA, when it comes to the contentious issue of abortion. I must assume that this same attitude also prevails in other parts of the world as well, due to the fact that approximately 42 million legal abortions are performed worldwide annually. I want you to consider the following incidents and the general public's reaction to them. These incidents are listed in no particular order, except for the last one:

1. Sept. 11, 2001, 3,000+ people dead- shock, dismay, anger
2. Columbine High School shootings - shock, dismay, anger
3. John F. Kennedy's assassination - shock, dismay, anger
4. Martin Luther King's assassination- shock, dismay, anger
5. Jeffrey Dahmer, 17 gory murders - shock, dismay, anger
6. John Lennon's murder - shock, dismay, anger
7. Bali Bombings, 202 dead - shock, dismay, anger
8. Oklahoma City Bombing, 168 dead - shock, dismay, anger
9. Branch Davidians Siege, 82 dead - shock, dismay, anger
10. Jonestown Mass Suicide, 909 dead - shock, dismay, anger
11. Heaven's Gate Suicides, 39 dead - shock, dismay, anger
12. 1.3 million annual US abortions - it's a woman's right
to do with her body
as she pleases.

Clearly, there is something wrong with our society, when the vast majority of people express shock, dismay, anger, disgust and repulsion upon hearing of the above-noted events, and yet so many of those same people adopt such indifference when it comes to the ugly issue of abortion, and the pre-meditated, cold-blooded slaughter of over 1.37 million unborn, innocent children annually in the United States of America alone.

It just seems to me that if the Supreme Court justices truly wanted to correct the serious legal mistake that was made so long ago, surely they would have done it already. Think about the following. The Roe v. Wade case was first argued before the Supreme Court on December 9, 1971. It was then reargued ten months later on October 11, 1972. The Supreme Court then ruled in favor of "Jane Roe", on January 22, 1973. In short, Roe v. Wade was decided by the Supreme Court in a matter of just over thirteen months. Thirty-six years have now passed since then; so why is it that the Supreme Court is finding it so difficult to reverse its decision? It just amazes me that three women in their mid-twenties -- Sarah Weddington, Linda Coffee and Norma L. McCorvey -- were able to convince the supposedly wise sages of the U.S. Supreme Court, who should have known better than to have made the Roe v. Wade ruling.

While there exists a variety of reasons, both legal, as well as Bible-based, regarding why the Roe v. Wade ruling should be overturned, one which I find particularly compelling is the fact that the determination was made in part, based upon what we now know was an intentional deception. In the case, Norma L. McCorvey, (who adopted the pseudonym of "Jane Roe"), claimed that her pregnancy was the result of being raped. She has since admitted that this was not true. Furthermore, she has since stated that she was a pawn who was manipulated by two rather ambitious Texas attorneys by the names of Sarah Weddington and Linda Coffee, who were looking for a plaintiff

with whom they could challenge Texas law which made abortion illegal, except in the case when it is necessary to save a woman's life. I am obviously no legal scholar, but unless I am mistaken, isn't perjury sufficient reason to throw out a case? Isn't this a valid reason to revisit the Roe v. Wade ruling, even though thirty-six years have passed?

What I find ironic is the fact that while this famous case revolved around McCorvey's right to obtain an abortion, she never actually had the abortion, and gave birth to a girl, which she gave up for adoption. It might also interest you to know that in 1995, McCorvey made a full reversal, and allied herself with "Operation Rescue", which is dedicated to making abortion illegal again. In her 1998 book entitled "Won By Love", McCorvey described the defining moment when she reversed her position regarding abortion. She wrote:

----- Begin Quote -----

"I was sitting in O.R.'s offices when I noticed a fetal development poster. The progression was so obvious, the eyes were so sweet. It hurt my heart, just looking at them. I ran outside and finally, it dawned on me. "Norma," I said to myself, "They're right." I had worked with pregnant women for years. I had been through three pregnancies and deliveries myself. I should have known. Yet something in that poster made me lose my breath. I kept seeing the picture of that tiny, 10-week-old embryo, and I said to myself, that's a baby! It's as if blinders just fell off my eyes and I suddenly understood the truth -- that's a baby!"

"I felt crushed under the truth of this realization. I had to face up to the awful reality. Abortion wasn't about "products of conception." It wasn't about "missed periods." It was about children being killed in their mother's wombs. All those years I was wrong. Signing that affidavit, I was wrong. Working in an abortion clinic, I was wrong. No more of this first trimester, second trimester, third trimester stuff. Abortion - at any point - was wrong. It was so clear. Painfully clear."

----- End Quote -----

Realizing how much damage she had caused to unborn children, in 2004, in the case McCorvey v. Hill, the former "Jane Doe" petitioned to have the 1973 ruling overturned. In the case, she argued that Roe v. Wade should be heard again in light of evidence that abortion does harm to women. However, due to a legal time limitation, the US District Court for the Northern District of Texas ruled that it was too late for McCorvey to file her case. The district court's ruling was upheld by the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit; and on February 22, 2005, the U.S. Supreme Court denied Judicial Review, known in legalese as "Certiorari", thus rendering the Fifth Circuit's ruling final; and that is where the case currently stands. Furthermore, I have read certain legal opinions which seem to indicate that due to the specific language that was used in the ruling, it is possible that Roe v. Wade may never be overturned.

What the above information tells me personally, is that the U.S. Supreme Court apparently has no desire or interest in overturning Roe v. Wade. Think about this for a moment. Ms. Norma L. McCorvey petitioned at a time when a conservative administration was in office, and the U.S. Supreme Court is filled with conservative-minded justices. In spite of these

facts, by resorting to Certiorari, the court was basically saying "We have no interest in reviewing the case". If this is the best that we can anticipate from a conservative court during a conservative administration, can you imagine what's going to happen when President-elect Obama takes office in less than two weeks?

The handwriting is obviously already written on the wall, and has been for some time. As we discussed before in this series, the Freedom of Choice Act will become law just as soon as the US Congress passes the final version of the bill to incoming president, Barack Obama. As I recently explained to some of my online friends, I was reading a news article which again confirms that Obama won't hesitate to undo some of the good that President Bush has managed to accomplish in the fight to overturn the Roe v. Wade ruling during the eight years of his presidency.

The article deals with the Bush Administration's attempt to push through a proposed rule which would prohibit recipients of federal money from discriminating against doctors, nurses, pharmacy workers, and other health care workers, who, due to their "religious beliefs or moral convictions", refuse to be involved in abortion procedures, or sterilization procedures. Halfway through the article in question, Obama's intentions regarding this rule, (should it become effective), are made perfectly clear. Consider these excerpts from the article:

----- Begin Quote -----

The protest from the commission comes on the heels of other objections to the rule by doctors, pharmacists, hospitals, state attorneys general and political leaders, including President-elect Barack Obama.

Mr. Obama has said the proposal will raise new hurdles to women seeking reproductive health services, like abortion and some contraceptives.

Officials at the Health and Human Services Department said they intended to issue a final version of the rule within days. Aides and advisers to Mr. Obama said he would try to rescind it, a process that could take three to six months.

----- End Quote -----

The way that Obama will probably rescind this rule, will be by signing the all-encompassing Freedom of Choice Act just soon as it lands on his desk. As we saw earlier, FOCA will make abortion on demand the unquestionable law of the land; and medical professionals won't be able to refuse to perform an abortion, without facing serious legal repercussions. If this is truly an act dealing with the freedom of choice, why will these medical professionals be forced to do something which is against their conscience? FOCA will in fact legally enforce the will of the abortionists upon everyone. The name of this bill is nothing short of deceptive.

So as I've been warning for the past several months, in spite of the wild jubilation that millions of Americans experienced following Obama's November 4th victory, the real truth of the matter is that the United States has turned another dark page in its moral decline by electing Obama. The general consensus is that during his term in office, he will have opportunity to appoint several liberal justices to the US Supreme Court, and probably even more to the Federal Appeals Courts as well.

If Obama's first term in office goes well with not too many bumps, and he is re-elected in 2012, he will have opportunity to do even more damage. If we consider that US Supreme Court justices usually serve for life, the depth of the damage that Obama can and probably will do becomes even more apparent.

Therefore, while many people in America watch as the waning days of the Bush Administration are slowly counted down, and anticipate the inauguration of their new president, there is really no reason for us Christians to rejoice. Please refer to the four-part series "Obama, McCain And The Bush Legacy" for more information regarding this issue.

As I noted earlier, as a result of their rejection of God's Word, many people aimlessly walk in spiritual darkness. One of the consequences of their belligerence against the Lord is that they are forced to create their own set of rules by which to live, based upon their flawed moral standard. This of course affects their personal perspective regarding the issue of abortion. While I've mentioned a number of flawed excuses that are sometimes used in order to try to justify slaughtering an unborn innocent child, perhaps some of the saddest, most twisted, and truly bizarre reasons come from two people with whom I communicated online several years ago. The first person stated as follows:

----- Begin Quote -----

"It sounds like you enjoy your life. It's not so easy for some people. The children born to parents who would want to abort them are children who will not have a happy life. Be glad they do not have a chance at God's gift . . . You are doing them a favor in many cases. If the parents don't want them, what do they have to look forward to? They certainly won't belong to any family . . . Is life so grand where you live? People around here who grow up without a family turn into criminals and drug dealers."

----- End Quote -----

A second person, who also engaged in this same conversation with us, made the following similar astounding remarks:

----- Begin Quote -----

"Then I look at the other side. Would you rather have 15 year old mothers aborting their babies or stuffing them in trash cans? Flushing them down the toilet? Throwing them off bridges? At least once a week in this country, (the United States), we hear of a new baby thrown in a dumpster, had in the bathroom during a school dance, and left in the bathroom to die, dropped into a river, or tied in a plastic bag. The babies won't even be given the option of a painless death. They will die cruelly, or they will be neglected, beaten, and otherwise not taken care of their whole lives. Perhaps they will be put into foster care, bouncing from home to home to home all their life, or another teenager on welfare payroll. Can you actually say that God would want these babies to be born into such conditions? I don't think it's murder. I think that it's a good thing to allow mothers the choice of abortion, or bringing yet another welfare baby into the world."

----- End Quote -----

When I read the previous comments by these two individuals, I

was absolutely appalled. As I stated earlier, the people who make such shocking comments have fully convinced themselves that their positions are not only very logical, but in fact, very humanitarian as well. As you can see, in their sick and perverted frame of mind, these people have actually convinced themselves that slaughtering an unborn innocent child in cold blood is doing them a big favor. Their sense of morality is so completely warped, that they even insist that we should be glad that these unborn children are killed, and won't have to suffer. May God help them by enlightening them to the truth!

The fact of the matter remains that the idea of committing one horrendous act of violence, (in this case, abortion), in order to potentially prevent another horrible act from being committed, (dumping aborted fetuses in garbage cans, etc.), is totally unjustifiable. It is downright sick!

As we have already seen, in addition to the fact that no one has the right to play "God", none of us knows the future of any of these unborn children, other than God Himself; and if He willed them into existence, as I believe He did, then it must be for a very good reason, whether we understand it or know it or not. Concerning the question regarding whether or not God wants children to grow up in a negative environment, allow me to say this: Of course He doesn't; however, neither is it God's fault that they do. The Lord expects that mother, or those two parents, to forsake their selfish, foolish ways, and to raise that child properly in a loving environment. If they fail to do so, you can bet that He will hold them very accountable.

We saw earlier from the verses in Psalm 139 that God not only knew us long before we were conceived in our mother's womb, but He even designed our exact physical appearance as well. Having now looked at Psalm 139, as well as the story of the young Prophet Jeremiah, allow me to share yet another interesting example that is found in the pages of the Old Testament.

In this case, God foresaw and planned the birth of the son of Abraham; that is, the Patriarch Isaac, who would become the father of Jacob. Jacob, of course, would later be known as Israel, and would become the father of the Twelve Tribes of Israel. If you are familiar with the story, then perhaps you already know that Abraham and Sarah were well stricken in years, far beyond Sarah's ability to conceive or bare any children for Abraham. Naturally, Abraham was very concerned, because other than Eliezer, who was a Damascene, and also the steward of Abraham's house, he had no flesh heir. Here is a part of the story:

"And Abram said, Lord GOD, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus? And Abram said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in my house is mine heir. And, behold, the word of the LORD came unto him, saying, This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be."

Genesis 15:2-5, KJV

Well, several chapters later, we find both Abraham and Sarah laughing in disbelief at the words of the Lord, because dear Abraham is already one hundred years old, and his wife Sarah

is ninety years old. But Abraham and Sarah soon realize that this is no laughing matter, and that the Lord is being quite serious about this whole issue. We'll find out exactly what the Lord told them as we continue this story in part five.

Please go to part five for the continuation of this series.

This file was written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

End Of File

ABORTION : THE SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENT : PART 5

Last Updated : March 19, 2009

Abraham And Sarah Laugh, God Keeps His Promise, Isaac Is Born, God Is In The Business Of Doing Miracles, We Are Planned And Made In Heaven, God Alone Is The Author Creator And Designer Of Life, God's Will Be Done, Abortion Is Cold-Blooded Murder And Not Mercy Killing, The Apple Of God's Eye, Only God Knows The Future Of Unborn Children, We Have The Power To Improve Our Lives, Responsible For Our Actions And Choices, Driven To The Lord, God Hears Our Cries Of Distress, Faith And Trust In The Lord For Your Future, Aid Of Government Social Services, 1.37 Million Annual Unborn Victims Of Personal Convenience, Exodus 20:13 Thou Shalt Not Kill, Acuna & Turkish Deception, Women Are Personally Responsible For Understanding Abortion, Robbing Unborn Children Of Life And Their Freedom To Choose, Hormones, Teenage Pregnancy And The System's Two Solutions, Teenage Parents Must Accept Responsibility For Their Actions, Adoption & Childless Couples, Young Mothers In Other Cultures, Children Hold A Special Place In God's Heart, Prohibition Of Abortion Is Implied In The Bible, Involuntary Abortion In The Book Of Exodus, No Biblical Support For Intentional Abortion, Is Practicing Birth Control Better Than Having An Abortion?, Birth Control And Abortion Are Often Motivated By Selfishness

So exactly what did the Lord tell Abraham and Sarah, who were laughing in disbelief? Consider the following:

"And God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be. And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her: yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her. Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear? . . . And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him . . . But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year."
Genesis 17:15-17, 19, 21 KJV

"And they said unto him, Where is Sarah thy wife? And he said, Behold, in the tent. And he said, I will certainly return unto thee according to the time of life; and, lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son. And Sarah heard it in the tent door, which was behind him. Now Abraham and Sarah were old and well stricken in age; and it ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women. Therefore Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also? And the LORD said unto Abraham, Wherefore did Sarah laugh, saying, Shall I of a surety bear a child, which am old? Is any thing too hard for the LORD? At the time appointed I will return unto thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah shall have a son. Then Sarah denied, saying, I laughed not; for she was afraid. And he said, Nay; but thou didst laugh."
Genesis 18:9-15, KJV

"And the LORD visited Sarah as he had said, and the LORD did unto Sarah as he had spoken. For Sarah conceived, and bare

Abraham a son in his old age, at the set time of which God had spoken to him. And Abraham called the name of his son that was born unto him, whom Sarah bare to him, Isaac. And Abraham circumcised his son Isaac being eight days old, as God had commanded him. And Abraham was an hundred years old, when his son Isaac was born unto him. And Sarah said, God hath made me to laugh, so that all that hear will laugh with me."

Genesis 21:1-6, KJV

So as you can see, God did the impossible. He both planned and placed a little life in that womb; which according to modern medical opinion, would be totally impossible. God is clearly in the business of doing miracles; and one of those miracles is the miracle of new life. In the Lord's eyes, our life doesn't begin after we pass through the birth canal and take our first gulp of air; it doesn't begin after so many weeks or months of gestation; it doesn't even begin at the moment of conception. God recognizes each of us as a person long before then. We were both planned and made by the Lord, in Heaven, and that should settle the issue of abortion for God-fearing Bible-believing Christians. To believe otherwise is to call God a liar.

No matter what kind of logical or politically-correct reason a person presents in their effort to justify the wholesale slaughter of millions of unborn, innocent children, it just is not going to stand up to the scrutiny of the Scriptures; because God alone is the Author, the Creator and the Designer of life; and if He wills it to happen, it will happen; and if it is not His Will, then of course it won't happen. If by His design, conception does occur, you had better not dare touch that developing being, no matter how young it is, or else one of these days, you may find yourself facing a very angry God.

To reiterate a point that I made earlier, they can resort to using every medical opinion in the book to try to convince us that an embryo is just "nothing but some tissue", and not a real person, but they are absolutely wrong, because God's Word says differently; and I personally will trust His Word any day, before I will trust profiteering abortionists. How about you? I hope that you are wise enough to see through the subtle lies and deceptions of those cold-hearted killers who slyly say:

"Oh, don't be alarmed. We are simply being merciful to this "clump of cells" by preventing it from ever being born. That way this "product of conception" won't have to suffer in the future at the hands of abusive parents. Let me just use this vacuum tube to suck the little life right out of you, and spare you the pain, which I know you will end up suffering if you were ever to be born. It will all be over in a few minutes. Don't worry ma'am; it's "nothing but some tissue"; it won't feel a thing."

Wake up! That is not mercy killing! It is the cold-blooded murder and slaughter of an unborn, innocent child, who was created in the image of God! I am reminded of what the Lord stated in the Book of the Prophet Zechariah regarding the city of Jerusalem:

". . . for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye."

Zechariah 2:8b, KJV

That word "apple" is from a Hebrew word which actually means

the pupil of one's eye. In other words, that verse is really talking about poking God in the eye. We all know that people are very sensitive when it comes to their eyes. At the first sign of danger, we will raise our hands to protect our eyes. Surely this same thought can be applied to unborn children. How much more must the Lord cherish these unborn innocents. To try to harm them is like poking God in the eye. Obviously, He does not like it one bit. As Jesus said in the Gospel of Matthew:

"Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."

Matthew 18:10, KJV

As I pointed out a minute ago, absolutely no one knows the future of any of these unborn children with certainty, other than God Himself. To those of you who take the side of the two individuals that I mentioned earlier, I ask, how do you know that all of those unborn children have nothing to look forward to? Are you God? Can you see into the future of each and every single one of them? What gives you, or the parents, or the abortionist, the right to play "God"?

Now obviously, we all know that many children are born into an environment which is certainly less than desirable, and where they are at a disadvantage compared to other children. Some children are indeed born into bleak and even dangerous situations; however, to paint such a negative picture, where every single one of those 1.37 million aborted fetuses would become a drug dealer, or other type of criminal, if allowed to live, is, in my opinion, ludicrous, stretching the truth, over-exaggerating the facts, and quite frankly, a lie. It is just another lame excuse to try to justify the horrible act of abortion, which has slaughtered many millions of helpless, unborn, innocent children over the years.

Even if our life starts out rocky, we each still possess the power to make it better if we persevere at it, and if we do not give up, or try to take the easy way out through living a life of crime. As I explain in some of the aforementioned articles, a lot of things that happen in our personal lives are a direct result of our own choices. We are what we each choose to be, and we possess a certain degree of power over our lives. No one forces anyone to become a drug dealer, or any other kind of criminal. There is always another way if we seek it out, and we are each personally responsible for our actions.

If anything, negative experiences in our early lives should drive us even closer to the Lord, and not away from Him. We need to learn to cry out to God for His help and guidance during our times of trouble and distress. If we do so, the Bible tells us that God will hear us, and He will be there when we need Him. The Lord is always waiting and watching. Please consider the truth of the following verses:

"Behold, the LORD'S hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear:"
Isaiah 59:1, KJV

"I cried unto the LORD with my voice, and he heard me out of his holy hill. Selah."
Psalm 3:4, KJV

"For I said in my haste, I am cut off from before thine

eyes: nevertheless thou heardest the voice of my supplications when I cried unto thee."

Psalm 31:22, KJV

"I sought the LORD, and he heard me, and delivered me from all my fears."

Psalm 34:4, KJV

"I cried unto God with my voice, even unto God with my voice; and he gave ear unto me."

Psalm 77:1, KJV

"In my distress I cried unto the LORD, and he heard me."

Psalm 120:1, KJV

Only God knows what He has in store for each of our lives. Only He knows the true outcome of each and every situation. That is where faith enters the picture. We must possess so much faith in His love and care for us, that we know in our hearts that nothing will happen to us unless it is by His Will and Design. Faith equates to trust; and when we trust, we do not fear the future. We simply place our future in His Hands, for as Jesus said:

"Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Matthew 6:34, KJV

In the case where a young child is truly in danger, that is precisely what certain government social services are for. They are there to assist people in need, and to forcefully intervene when it becomes necessary. Granted, they are not perfect, and they do not always respond as quickly, or as efficiently, as they should, and some cases do fall through the cracks. None of us should be so naive as to think that any government-provided service is perfect; yet at the same time, even if certain cases do fall through the cracks, you can't tell me, or convince me, that it justifies the willful slaughter of 1.37 million innocent lives every single year in the United States alone. Let me remind you again that 93% of all abortions performed in the United States are due to some form of personal inconvenience. They are not the result of absolute necessity, such as to protect a woman's health, or to save the mother's life.

For many Americans, abortion has simply become the easy way out, just like those individuals who choose a life of crime. So which is really the worse crime, selling drugs to earn a big profit, or slaughtering unborn babies to earn a profit? Isn't the answer rather obvious? Please don't misinterpret my remarks. I am merely throwing this argument back in the face of those who offered such lame excuses. I obviously do not condone the sale of illegal drugs, or of anything else that may be harmful and/or illegal. But at the same time, neither do I condone the annual system-sanctioned slaughter of more than one million unborn innocent children, so that selfish parents can escape having to meet their parental responsibilities.

What also amazes me regarding the comments that were made by the previous two individuals, is that one of them had the audacity to state the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

"God wants everyone to live full and happy lives under the ten commandments. Therefore, would God want children brought into this world that won't be happy, at least for most of their child life?"

----- End Quote -----

I find it unbelievable that this person, who obviously finds nothing wrong with slaughtering more than 1.3 million unborn children every year, would even have the audacity to mention the Ten Commandments to me, and yet seemingly ignore the fact that one of those very Ten Commandments clearly tells us:

"Thou shalt not kill."

Exodus 20:13, KJV

It might interest you to know that in that verse, the word "kill" is derived from the Hebrew word "ratsach" which means intentional and premeditated murder, or assassination. That is exactly what abortion is. Let's not kid ourselves. Those abortion doctors know exactly what they are doing. They know that they are intentionally lying to those women, or at the very least, withholding the full truth from them, as we saw earlier in the case with Doctor Sheldon Turkish and Ms. Rosa Acuna. That evil man was caught red-handed sugar-coating the truth. It may surprise you to know that in November of 2007, the New Jersey Supreme Court ruled in favor of Turkish, and refused to reconsider the 1996 case. A month earlier, the US Supreme Court refused to hear the same case.

While I have pointed to Doctor Turkish's deception, I think that it is only fair to question these women who claim that they didn't know, and that they didn't realize that within their womb was a developing human being. I don't recall how old Ms. Acuna was at the time of her abortion in 1996, but it just seems to me that she should have known better, and should have been better informed. Given her Spanish name, it is possible that there may have been a language barrier, but I remain unconvinced. Acuna claimed that Turkish should have been more forthright with her, but does that really excuse her from her detestable actions?

Personally, if I were a woman, and if I were to discover that I have become pregnant for the very first time, I would want to learn everything that I possibly can about the new life that is growing within me. I would be fascinated by it, and would want to know what it looks like, how large it is, etc., at each stage of its development. I would endeavor to conduct my own personal research at the public library, via the web and by way of whatever resources are at my disposal. Now, God forbid, but if I were considering having an abortion, I would thoroughly research that as well. I most certainly would not rely upon the word of a man who obviously makes his living by slaughtering innocent babies. As I mentioned earlier in this series, claiming ignorance to the facts regarding abortion does not make anyone excusable before the Lord. So I believe that women are personally responsible for understanding both pregnancy, and abortion, if the latter is their decision.

But concerning the former issue regarding a child's happiness, let me also add, that when people have the right to murder an unborn child, based upon their personal speculation that said child may not be happy in life, our society has really passed the point of no return. By slaughtering these unborn children in cold blood, these parents, and unfit mothers, are in fact

not only robbing those children of life, but they're likewise robbing them of the freedom to make their own choices, once they have grown. Again, we are not God. None of us knows what choices an individual may make. Some of the greatest people in history have come from less than favorable childhoods. We simply do not have the right to say to our unborn children, "No child; you don't deserve a chance. I'm going to make the choice for you by terminating your life through an abortion."

As we have seen, a wide variety of arguments are set forth in order to try to justify abortion; yet one by one, we see that when we judge them by the Standard of God's Word, they fail to pass the test every time. Another justification that is commonly used by the abortionists is to point to the fact that young, teenaged girls who may still be in high school, simply should not be getting pregnant. I agree. In fact, I will take that argument even a step further by stating that they shouldn't be having sex at such a young age either, and yet they do. While we parents can try our hardest to instill in our children the importance of sexual abstinence until an appropriate age is reached, and until a proper relationship is established, nevertheless, many will rebel. We can blame it on hormones or whatever we like, but teenage pregnancies are still going to continue to occur. Teenage pregnancy is simply a fact of modern life.

My point is, we can't change the fact that millions of young boy and girls are having sex all across America, or the fact that many of those teenaged girls are becoming pregnant. Yes, we can reduce the number of American teenagers who choose to engage in sex by some degree through proper education, and by counseling them as their parents, but by how much? It's never really going to be enough, is it? So, we also need to strive to make a large impact on what happens after those teenaged girls become pregnant. Sadly, the System's solution seems to be twofold. One of these is abortion:

"Oh, sorry; that child made a very bad mistake. Don't worry; no problem; we can fix it; we will just slaughter the baby."

Their entire attitude is so callous that it really stuns me. As I've noted several times now, this is nothing more than an abortion for the sake of convenience. It has absolutely nothing to do with saving the girl's life. If anything, it is either done so that she can continue her studies, or to avoid public embarrassment to herself, or to avoid problems with her family, or a mixture of all three of these. Quite often, as we've already seen, these abortions are done in secret, protected by the right to privacy, even without the parents' knowledge or consent.

My personal perspective on teenage pregnancy is this. If a young girl defies the wisdom of her parents, and feels that she is mature enough to engage in sexual intercourse, then she should also be mature enough, and responsible enough, to parent the baby which results from her sexual encounter. Not only will she have the help of her family in most cases, but becoming an early mother may help to keep her out of a lot of the trouble that some pre-adults tend to get into at that age. Motherhood, and fatherhood, at a young age, will result in those children maturing, and taking on responsibilities a lot sooner than they might normally have expected to; but if they don't like it, then they should have thought about that before they engaged in sex. Becoming a parent at a young age will certainly help them to forsake the youthful foolishness that got them in that situation in the first place.

If a girl finds herself in a situation where her parents or other family members are unable, or perhaps even unwilling, to assist her, then as I noted earlier, there are government agencies and services which can offer the assistance that is required. Abortion is simply not the only, and certainly not the best, option. The murder of an unborn child for the sake of personal convenience is simply wrong, wrong, wrong.

One option that I briefly mentioned earlier is giving up the child for adoption. Again, it is not the best choice by any means, but it is a positive alternative to abortion, and one which should be seriously considered. If the young mother is so insistent that she does not want to keep the child, if she cannot accept the love that God has put in her heart for that child, then adoption may be the next best solution. If she, and her sex partner, are simply too selfish, or incapable of properly caring for that child, for whatever reasons, rather than sacrifice it on the altar of the abortionist's table, then surrendering it for adoption is such a much more humane option.

There are many childless couples who would love to have that child, but sadly, they are never given that opportunity; and the unborn child is never given the opportunity either. Why? Because it was easier, quicker, and less complicated to just slaughter it in a profiteering abortionist's clinic. Adoptive parents would take good care of the unwanted child; and when he or she grows up, they will undoubtedly be quite thankful that they were not secretly aborted, but rather were given an opportunity to enjoy life, and to make their own choices.

While I used the phrase "young age" a moment ago, we need to realize this term can be interpreted differently, depending on the culture where one is raised. It appears that it is in pampered Western societies where people have been brainwashed into believing that girls at that age are too young to become mature, responsible mothers. A study of other cultures will reveal that young women having children at that age is quite a common occurrence. Nothing odd is seen about it whatsoever. However, because in Western society, people are so focused on obtaining a higher education, so that they can earn a lot of money and climb the corporate ladder, early pregnancy is seen as a hinderance, and is undesirable.

Now, please don't misunderstand my words. I'm not saying, or suggesting, that young girls all across America should start becoming pregnant. I am merely making the point that how we view this issue is in large part determined by the culture in which we have been raised; and not everyone is convinced that American culture is the best by any means. In fact, as you may already know, some people consider American culture very evil, materialistic, and ungodly.

It seems that no matter how much I stress this point, there will be some people who still don't understand how harshly an act of violence against a child, born or unborn, is viewed by the Lord. From the Old Testament to the New Testament we find verses which demonstrate God's special love for children. We have already seen how conception and childbearing should be viewed as a blessing from the Lord, and that they are indeed ordained by God. We also saw how Jesus said that the Guardian Angels of children are constantly beholding the face of God. Consider also the example where Jesus chided His followers for refusing to allow young children to come to Him in order to be blessed:

"And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them."
Mark 10:13-16, KJV

"And they brought unto him also infants, that he would touch them: but when his disciples saw it, they rebuked them. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein."
Luke 18:15-17, KJV

Just as the U.S. Supreme Court interprets certain fundamental rights from the US Constitution and the Bill of Rights, even though those rights are not found therein in black and white, so it is with the Bible. In their zeal to try to defend the practice of abortion, some people may argue that there is no clear commandment in God's Word which plainly tells us "Thou shalt not commit abortion". While some modern-day issues are not specifically covered in the Bible due to the simple fact that the world has become a lot more complex during the past four thousand years, and such technology didn't exist at that time, we do need to rely upon the leading of God's Spirit and carefully study what is available in the Bible, in order to make wise decisions concerning these issues.

In my view, all of the verses which I have been sharing with you in this series, clearly demonstrate in an indirect way, God's view regarding abortion. In other words, just as with certain fundamental rights which have been implied from the U.S. Constitution by the court, and bestowed upon American citizens, the prohibition to perform abortion is implied in the Bible as well. However, please notice that there is one law that is found in the Book of Exodus which does shed some light on this issue. It is found in the following verses:

"If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follow: he shall be surely punished, according as the woman's husband will lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine. And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot,"
Exodus 21:22-24, KJV

What these verses are saying is that if two men struggle, and during the course of their fighting a pregnant woman is hurt, and loses her child, (involuntary abortion), the guilty man shall be brought before the judge and fined accordingly. But, if not only the child is accidentally aborted, but the woman is also harmed, or more specifically, killed, as a result of the skirmish, then the guilty man must pay with his life. The implication here seems to be that if the woman is harmed so that she can no longer bear more children, or in fact dies. This is because the word "mischief" is derived from a Hebrew word, "acown", which, according to my Hebrew lexicon, means evil, mischief, harm, or hurt. The fact that the last verse states "thou shalt give life for life" clarifies that the intent is that the woman probably dies.

The reason why the penalty is so severe under the Mosaic Law, is because back then, and even now, in Hebrew/Jewish culture, having progeny and continuing the family line is viewed as an extremely important issue. The Israelis have already realized that within a matter of years the Jewish population of Israel will be outnumbered by those of Arab and Palestinian descent. So, killing a man's pregnant wife, or killing the child that she carries, could be devastating to an Israelite. If we take into consideration the time period in which the Mosaic Laws were given, it becomes all the more apparent why this law was enforced. Israel was a young, budding nation, with enemies all around. Thus, increasing the population was of utmost importance.

But what I really want you to see from the previous verses is this: If a man was to be punished for accidentally causing a woman's involuntary abortion, (miscarriage), how do you think the Lord views our modern society where abortions are by no means accidents, but are in fact conscious acts of heartless, cold-blooded murder? Not only that, but they are profitable acts of cold-blooded murder. If God chose to hold all of us to the stiff penalties of the Mosaic Law, every abortionist, and every single parent, or would-be parent, who engages in this ungodly slaughter of the innocent, would be found guilty of death. It becomes evident then, that from the writings of the Old Testament to the New Testament, there is absolutely no Scriptural indication that God condones abortion. There is not a single verse to support this terrible, ugly crime.

A moment ago, I stated that the System offers two so-called "solutions" when it comes to the issue of teenage pregnancy. As we have already seen, one of these is abortion. The other is birth control. In the conversations that I have had over the years, some people have pointed to abortion as being a good reason to support birth control. The argument usually follows a line of thought which says that if it were not for unwanted pregnancies, then the problem of abortion would not exist; therefore, the solution is to promote birth control. Another person remarked how using some form of birth control prevents so-called "unplanned pregnancies".

Of course, if you have been carefully reading this series, then you will probably already realize that I have a problem with the latter comment. When two mutually-consenting adults engage in sexual intimacy, whether they have planned it or not, if God chooses to bless them with a conception, then it was planned by Him, whether they recognize His Will in the matter or not.

So the question is this: Is birth control truly any better than abortion? In my view, absolutely not, and here's why: An abortion murders a baby after it has been conceived and begins developing in a woman's womb; while birth control prevents that child from having ever been conceived in the first place. In both cases, selfishness is often a factor.

The fact is, many people want to enjoy sex, but they don't want to have to be responsible for the God-ordained fruit, (i.e., children), which results from their sexual relations. As we saw earlier, for many people who are caught up in the world's rat race and trying to scale the corporate ladder, an unexpected pregnancy, childbirth, and the child-rearing which follows it, is an inconvenience. Pregnancy brings a sudden halt to their plans, and their life of freedom, and they don't like it one bit; so they decide to either rely

upon birth control in order to "play it safe", or else they opt for abortion, so that they can continue to enjoy their selfish lifestyles. As we saw earlier, 93% of abortions in the United States are motivated by personal inconvenience, and for no other reason. They are not performed to save a woman's, or a teen's, life. And what do they do when birth control fails for one reason or another? Abortion.

So while we may possibly be tempted to view birth control as the so-called "lesser of two evils", being as taking a pill, (or whatever method is used), doesn't directly involve the outright murder of a developing fetus, nevertheless, it is still wrong; because regardless of which method is chosen, birth control or abortion, it is still a way to potentially interfere with what may be God's Will. In short, to accept birth control, and to promote it as a humane alternative to abortion, is in essence saying that it's alright to use one evil, birth control, in order to prevent another evil; i.e., abortion; and I personally can't accept this misguided form of reasoning.

Please go to part six for the continuation of this series.

This file was written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

End Of File

Last Updated : March 19, 2009

End Result Of Abortion And Birth Control Is Basically Equal, Judah Tamar & Death Of Onan, Onanism - Ancient Birth Control, Jesus' Heritage Through Judah And Tamar's Sexual Encounter, Rhythm Method, Standard Days Method And Fertility Awareness Method, Roman Catholic Church, John Smulders & Birth Control, Trust God, Barren - Sarah, Rachel, Manoah's Wife And Michal, Most American Abortions Obtained By Catholics & Protestants, Etienne Beaulieu & RU 486 - Mifepristone, Morning After Pill, Epostane, RU 486 Is An Abortion Pill, Mifepristone Is Hastily Approved By FDA During Last Months Of Clinton Administration, Slaughtering Unborn Babies Just Another Job For Abortionists, RU 486 (Mifeprex) Cloaks Abortion In More Secrecy, Mifeprex Has Increased Abortion Rate Since Its Introduction In 2000, Will RU 486 Increase Sexual Promiscuity?, RU 486 Use Is Low, Dangerous Side Effects Of Using Mifeprex - Infections, Blood Loss And Death, Holly Patterson's Sad Death And Holly's Law, Mifeprex Maker - Danco Laboratories - Denies Responsibility, Mifepristone Remains Legal In All 50 US States & Territories, Abortion Pills Equal Secret Chemical Warfare Against Unborn, Birth Control & Abortion Both Increase Promiscuity & STD's, My Opposition To Birth Control, Celibacy & Sexual Abstinence

As I mentioned at the conclusion of part five, regardless of which method is chosen, birth control or abortion, the end result is still basically the same, because both approaches offer a way to potentially interfere with what may possibly be God's Will; that is, bearing a child. Whether one relies upon contraceptives, or some form of abortion, their obvious intent is to prevent a new human life from being created, or to destroy that life if it has already been created; both of which are more often than not motivated by pure selfishness.

Earlier, we examined some verses in the Book of Exodus that offered us some hints regarding the Lord's view concerning abortion. While at first glance, the Scriptures don't appear to contain any specific commandments regarding birth control, there is one particular story which comes to mind, which may offer us some clues regarding God's views on this issue. It can be found in the thirty-eighth chapter of Genesis, and it deals with the sad tale of a fellow by the name of Onan, who was the second son of Judah. Judah was one of the twelve sons of the Patriarch Jacob.

At that time, Judah left the rest of his brethren and went down and pitched his tent near his Adullamite friend Hirah. Judah caught sight of a particular Canaanite girl, who was the daughter of one Shuah. We are told that Judah engaged in sexual relations with this unnamed daughter, and that it eventually resulted in the birth of three sons to Judah: Er, Onan and Shelah. After they had grown up, Judah obtained a wife for his eldest son, Er, by the name of Tamar. While we don't know exactly what happened, we are told that the Lord slew Er due to his wickedness.

Now, according to Hebrew custom at the time, called "yabam", a brother was supposed to produce an heir for his brother's wife, if that brother were to die prematurely before having any children. So Judah told his son Onan to fulfill "yabam" by marrying Tamar, and having intercourse with her, so that

Er's family line would continue. However, Onan knew that it would not be to his personal benefit, being as the child would be named after his brother Er; so rather than fulfill his responsibility to Tamar, we are told that Onan chose to ejaculate on the ground. Here is a part of the story:

"And Judah said unto Onan, Go in unto thy brother's wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother. And Onan knew that the seed should not be his; and it came to pass, when he went in unto his brother's wife, that he spilled it on the ground, lest that he should give seed to his brother. And the thing which he did displeased the LORD: wherefore he slew him also."

Genesis 38:8-10, KJV

So as you can see, Onan selfishly withdrew while engaging in intercourse with Tamar, and ejaculated on the ground. This selfish act angered the Lord, and so He slew Onan just as He had done with his older brother, Er. Onan's selfish actions were quite literally a form of birth control, so we could conclude that this story reveals God's opinion concerning this issue. In fact, today, this practice of withdrawal is referred to as onanism.

However, there is a lot more to this story than what meets the eye. While we could say that the reason why God smote Onan was because he was unwilling to provide his widowed sister-in-law -- now his wife -- with a son so that the line of Er could continue, the deeper story here is that it may be that the Lord was specifically working to preserve the seed of Judah, from which Jesus Christ would eventually be born.

If you take the time to read this story in its entirety, and then look at the genealogies of Jesus, you will discover that after the death of his two sons, Er and Onan, Judah himself unknowingly had sex with Tamar, his daughter-in-law, who set a scheme in motion by disguising herself and pretending to be a harlot. Tamar was apparently one determined woman, and she wanted what was rightfully hers according to their laws.

The reason why Tamar did this is because Judah failed to keep his promise by giving Tamar his youngest son, Shelah, when he became of age. Judah's sexual encounter with this temptress, Tamar, resulted in the birth of Phares and Zerah. It was from Phares' side of the family that the line of King David would eventually arise. It is for this very reason that Jesus is referred to as the son of David, as well as the Root of David and the Lion of the tribe of Judah in the Book of Revelation.

So when all is said and done, we are left with this question: Was Onan's sin that he practiced a form of birth control, and in so doing, refused to provide Tamar with an heir, which was her right according to the law of "yabam", or was it that by selfishly withdrawing, Onan was indirectly refusing to be a part of God's overall Plan of Salvation? I'll leave it to you the reader to make your own determination.

In addition to the cervical cap, diaphragm, spermicide gel, contraceptive sponge, a variety of contraceptive pills, etc., other forms of birth control which are commonly in use today are known as the Rhythm Method, the Standard Days Method and the Fertility Awareness Method. These forms of birth control are used by practicing Roman Catholics. In fact, the Rhythm Method was first developed by a Dutch Roman Catholic doctor by the name of John Smulders. As you may already know, the way that these forms of birth control work is that a married

couple will time their sexual intercourse so that it occurs when the wife is least likely to be in a fertile state. The Roman Catholic Church hierarchy teaches that this method is the only morally-acceptable, and more natural, form of birth control. In fact the RCC refers to these methods as Natural Family Planning, or NFP.

While this may offend some people, in my view, birth control is birth control, regardless of which method is used; and no method is more morally-acceptable than any other; because as everyone knows, the goal of all of these methods is the very same; to prevent pregnancy from occurring. It just seems to me that by relying upon these timing methods, Catholics are basically playing a kind of guessing game with God, and are trying to outsmart Him. Just like other worldly people, they want to enjoy sex, but without having it result in another pregnancy, and that is just plain selfishness.

The truth is, that just as occurred with their water baptism doctrine, the Roman Catholic Church found itself in quite a quandary. Due to the teachings of the RCC regarding the issue of birth control, many Roman Catholics were having very large families. As we have already seen, the Bible teaches us that children are a blessing of the Lord; yet at the same time, it is evident that having a large family places a rather heavy financial burden on a husband, particularly during a period when the world is experiencing a financial upheaval, such as at our current time. So what were Roman Catholics to do? How were they supposed to cope? How could Roman Catholics honor the teachings of the pope, and remain good Catholics by not using birth control, while still dealing with the realities of the world and its financial hardships?

Thus, beginning in 1930, a form of relief was developed when physician John Smulders introduced the Rhythm Method. Since that time, the RCC has cautiously permitted similar forms of birth control as well. In short, the Roman Catholic Church has offered some loopholes to its followers which circumvent the prohibition of using birth control pills. As I explain in "Roman Catholicism, Water Baptism And The Trinity", they did basically the same thing with the water baptism doctrine. So many people were dying without having been baptized in water, such as infants, young children, and other loved ones, that the Roman Catholic Church had to begin to make a number of exceptions to its doctrine which states that water baptism is absolutely necessary in order for one to obtain Salvation. I discuss this issue more in-depth in the aforementioned series.

It just seems to me that the fact that Roman Catholics would resort to any of these timing methods demonstrates their lack of faith in the Lord. Rather than simply trust that God knows what is the best situation for them, they are still trying to control the size of their families, regardless of how natural the method may be. As I've said before, if God wants a woman to become pregnant, then she will become pregnant, regardless of which method the couple may use. If the Lord does not want a woman to become pregnant, then she won't. We even find some examples in the Bible where God purposely struck some women barren for various reasons. Sometimes it was just temporary, such as in the case of Abraham's wife, Sarah, who gave birth at the age of ninety, and Jacob's wife, Rachel, who was dealt with by the Lord, as we see here:

"And when the LORD saw that Leah was hated, he opened her womb: but Rachel was barren. And Leah conceived, and bare a son, and she called his name Reuben: for she said, Surely the

LORD hath looked upon my affliction; now therefore my husband will love me. And she conceived again, and bare a son; and said, Because the LORD hath heard that I was hated, he hath therefore given me this son also: and she called his name Simeon. And she conceived again, and bare a son; and said, Now this time will my husband be joined unto me, because I have born him three sons: therefore was his name called Levi. And she conceived again, and bare a son: and she said, Now will I praise the LORD: therefore she called his name Judah; and left bearing. And when Rachel saw that she bare Jacob no children, Rachel envied her sister; and said unto Jacob, Give me children, or else I die. And Jacob's anger was kindled against Rachel: and he said, Am I in God's stead, who hath withheld from thee the fruit of the womb?"
Genesis 29:31-30:2, KJV

In Judges chapter thirteen we also find the story of Manoah's wife. Despite being barren, the Lord eventually blessed her, and she became the mother of the nazarite and Israelite strong man and judge, Samson. In other cases, the Lord cursed certain women by making them barren for life, such as in the case of David's jealous wife, Michal, as we see here:

"And David danced before the LORD with all his might; and David was girded with a linen ephod. So David and all the house of Israel brought up the ark of the LORD with shouting, and with the sound of the trumpet. And as the ark of the LORD came into the city of David, Michal Saul's daughter looked through a window, and saw king David leaping and dancing before the LORD; and she despised him in her heart. And they brought in the ark of the LORD, and set it in his place, in the midst of the tabernacle that David had pitched for it: and David offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before the LORD. And as soon as David had made an end of offering burnt offerings and peace offerings, he blessed the people in the name of the LORD of hosts. And he dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel, as well to the women as men, to every one a cake of bread, and a good piece of flesh, and a flagon of wine. So all the people departed every one to his house. Then David returned to bless his household. And Michal the daughter of Saul came out to meet David, and said, How glorious was the king of Israel to day, who uncovered himself to day in the eyes of the handmaids of his servants, as one of the vain fellows shamelessly uncovereth himself! And David said unto Michal, It was before the LORD, which chose me before thy father, and before all his house, to appoint me ruler over the people of the LORD, over Israel: therefore will I play before the LORD. And I will yet be more vile than thus, and will be base in mine own sight: and of the maidservants which thou hast spoken of, of them shall I be had in honour. Therefore Michal the daughter of Saul had no child unto the day of her death."
2 Samuel 6:14-23, KJV

Sadly, as we saw earlier in this series, despite their best attempts to use these various timing methods in order to keep pregnancy from occurring, in many cases, Roman Catholics, and other Christians as well, have failed, and these methods have not proven to be very reliable. As a direct result, Catholic and Protestant women form the two largest groups of those who are currently obtaining abortions in the United States. So it seems that what Rome deems as morally-acceptable is not quite the same as what the American Roman Catholic laity believes.

What further solidifies my opinion concerning this issue of birth control, is the fact that thanks to French researcher

Etienne Beaulieu, there is now a dangerous pill on the market that goes by the commercial name of Mifepristone. Technically referred to as RU 486, this so-called "Morning-After Pill" is not really a method of birth control as some pharmaceutical companies love to claim; it is in fact an abortion-inducing pill, the treatment of which begins the morning after one has had a sexual encounter. The idea of referring to RU 486 as a so-called "Morning-After Pill" is an intentional deception, because this pill is effective during the first seven weeks following a woman's last menstrual cycle. In short, RU 486, or Mifepristone, is just another form of abortion which is being disguised as a form of birth control.

A similar abortion-inducing drug, which likewise began being promoted during the 1980's, is Epostane. To prove that these pills are truly a form of abortion, consider what an article in the October 10, 1988 edition of Time magazine had to say concerning them:

----- Begin Quote -----

The two drugs act in a similar manner, by interfering with the hormone progesterone, which maintains a proper uterine environment for pregnancy. Epostane prevents the ovaries from making progesterone; RU 486 blocks the hormone's activity. In both cases, the uterine lining sloughs off and the embryo is expelled.

Studies of RU 486, which was first incorrectly dubbed the "morning-after pill" when it was discovered in 1982 by French researcher Etienne Beaulieu, have found it to be effective 95% of the time when taken during the first five weeks of pregnancy in conjunction with a prostaglandin, a substance that causes the uterus to contract. According to last week's Journal, Dutch researchers found epostane to be 84% effective in women five to eight weeks pregnant. Suction abortions, the usual surgical method, have a 96%-98% success rate. While both drugs allow women to avoid the dangers of surgery and anesthesia, they do carry a small risk of causing excessive bleeding. Should they fail, surgical abortion would be urged, since the drugs could damage the surviving fetus.

----- End Quote -----

Sadly, two years later, in September of 2000, near the very end of the liberal Clinton Administration, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration foolishly cut corners and rushed through the approval of the usage of RU 486 in the United States. In other words, rather than following the established protocol for testing and approving new drugs, the FDA lumped in and approved Mifepristone with other drugs that are designed for life-threatening illnesses such as cancer and AIDS. We must all ask the question: Since when is pregnancy regarded as a life-threatening illness? At this current time, Mifepristone is being manufactured and distributed in the United States under the name "Mifeprex" by a pharmaceutical company called Danco Laboratories. An Associated Press news article at that time confirmed what had been reported by Time magazine two years earlier. It stated in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

RU-486, now known by its chemical name mifepristone, can be used only within 49 days of the beginning of the woman's last menstrual period. The woman takes three mifepristone

pills. Two days later, she returns to the doctor to swallow a second drug, misoprostol, that causes uterine contractions to expel the embryo. She returns for a follow-up visit within two weeks to make sure the abortion is complete.

The FDA will allow mifepristone to be distributed only to doctors trained to accurately diagnose the duration of pregnancy and to detect ectopic, or tubal, pregnancies, because those women cannot receive mifepristone.

Also, the FDA restricted mifepristone's use to doctors who can operate in case a surgical abortion is needed to finish the job or in cases of severe bleeding -- or to doctors who have made advance arrangements for a surgeon to provide such care to their patients.

Studies show mifepristone is 92 percent to 95 percent effective in causing early abortion, by blocking action of a hormone essential for maintaining pregnancy. Without that hormone, progesterone, the uterine lining thins so an embryo cannot remain implanted and grow.

The pill-induced abortion can be painful, causing bleeding and nausea. Heavy bleeding is a potentially serious side effect but one the FDA determined is rare. In safety testing of the first 2,100 American women who took mifepristone, four bled enough to need a transfusion.

Health experts say mifepristone won't increase abortions -- that didn't happen in Europe. But the FDA's formal approval may encourage more doctors who don't offer surgical abortions to offer the pill, thus making it easier for women, particularly in rural areas, to get an abortion without traveling hundreds of miles or entering surgical clinics often staked out by protesters.

----- End Quote -----

As the previous excerpts make clear, these pills are not risk free. They can induce severe bleeding which may result in the necessity of a blood transfusion being performed. In fact, as you will see in a moment, Mifepristone, or RU 486, has a very bad track record, and can be deadly.

What I find particularly repulsive is the ungodly attitude, and the obvious lack of respect for the sanctity of human life, that is evident in the latter excerpt. I am referring to the writer's cold reference to the need "to finish the job" in case complications arise. These are unborn, living children that we are talking about; yet to the cold-hearted abortionist, it is just another job so that he can get his pay check. "Well, if the RU 486 fails to work properly, we will just have to 'finish the job' of slaughtering the baby by performing a regular abortion" seems to be the attitude of these cold-hearted monsters.

What I also find troubling about RU 486 is the fact that it adds yet another layer of secrecy to the abortion issue. In other words, it allows millions of women worldwide to murder their babies during the first seven weeks of gestation while making it easier to do so; because they won't have to go to a high-profile abortion clinic or Planned Parenthood center, where they may be vulnerable to attack or criticism by those people who oppose abortion. In other words, because of the legalization of this damnable pill, they will now be able to commit their sin against God more in secret. Because RU 486

only works for a very limited period of a woman's pregnancy, that is, during the first five to seven weeks, no one will ever know that she is aborting her baby, except herself and her doctor. Many women don't even begin to show that early. So as I said, Mifeprex/Mifepristone cloaks abortion in even more secrecy than before.

As the previous excerpts explain, all that these women have to do is visit their doctor; take three Mifepristone pills, return two days later to take another kind of pill, go home, and return two weeks later to make sure the entire fetus has been expelled through the pill-induced miscarriage. But it is not really an accidental miscarriage, it's an intentional chemical-induced abortion, plain and simple. RU 486 creates an environment where the fetus is unable to remain attached to the uterus. The second pill then forces the uterus to expel the fetus in a very painful way.

As I noted a moment ago, Mifepristone is not one hundred per cent safe by any means; and there are serious complications for a small number of women who use it. While the advocates of RU 486 claim that the additional layer of secrecy that is provided by this new form of terrorism against the unborn will not contribute to a rise in the abortion rate, I don't see how this can be true, and I must question their claims. If anything, RU 486 will increase the opportunity for many young girls to obtain an abortion in secret, without their parents ever knowing about it. This seems to be verified by information which I found on the Wikipedia website, which was itself extracted from a report by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. It states in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

Medical abortions as a percentage of total abortions in the United States have increased every year since the approval of mifepristone: 1.0% in 2000, 2.9% in 2001, 5.2% in 2002, 7.9% in 2003, 9.3% in 2004 (14.2% of those less than 9 weeks gestation); although data is limited by eleven states not reporting statistics to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (including California where an estimated >23% of total U.S. abortions were performed in 1997).

----- End Quote -----

In the previous excerpt, the phrase "medical abortions" is referring to the use of drugs, such as RU 486, in order to induce an abortion. As you can see, medical abortions have in fact risen every single year since Mifeprex/Mifepristone was first introduced into the United States and approved by the FDA during liberal President Bill Clinton's watch.

Furthermore, it should also be noted that RU 486 will also contribute to a rise in promiscuity, because the fear of a discovered pregnancy will be mitigated. In other words, the mentality will probably be "Well if the birth control fails, I can just fall back on this new abortion pill in order to abort the fetus before anyone finds out about it." In short, people will be more inclined to engage in promiscuous sex, because they will believe that they have now got all of the bases covered, in case a girl or woman does become pregnant.

Thankfully, Mifepristone/RU 486 has not fared as well in US pharmaceutical markets as had been hoped for and expected. A news article published in the June 20th, 2001 edition of the Maranatha Christian News stated in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

Experts expected the FDA's approval of the pill last fall to revolutionize abortion practices. But with less than a third of Planned Parenthood facilities providing it nationally, and with more women rejecting the complicated procedure of multiple medical visits required for the pill, RU-486's market penetration has been modest.

----- End Quote -----

In fact, a full four years after this dangerous abortion drug was approved by the FDA, a clear picture had begun to develop which clearly reveals that it was a very serious mistake to have ever allowed this hideous form of chemical abortion into the United States. A November, 2004 article in the New York Times states in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

The first woman in the United States whose death was tied to mifepristone suffered a ruptured ectopic pregnancy in September 2001. The F.D.A. has received 676 reports of problems with the drug, including 17 ectopic pregnancies, 72 cases of blood loss so severe that they required transfusions and 7 cases of serious infections, the agency reported.

The death of a California woman in January after she took an abortion pill prompted federal drug regulators on Monday to strengthen the warning label on the drug, RU-486, also known as mifepristone.

The death was the third in the United States that the Food and Drug Administration has linked to the pill since its approval in 2000.

Neither he nor Dr. Summers would disclose any further information about the case, but the latest death is similar to that of Holly Patterson, a woman from the San Francisco area, who died of sepsis after taking mifepristone on Sept. 17, 2003, less than a month after her 18th birthday.

"How many more women have to die before F.D.A. will put women's health and lives above the politics of abortion?" Ms. Wright said.

----- End Quote -----

As I said a moment ago, the legalization of Mifepristone made it even easier for young teenaged pregnant girls to obtain an abortion, without the knowledge or consent of their parents. As a direct result of the tragic death of eighteen year old Holly Patterson in California in September of 2003, a bill, commonly referred to as Holly's Law, but legally known as the RU-486 Suspension and Review Act, was proposed in Congress in 2003 by U.S. Representatives Jim DeMint and Roscoe Bartlett, and Senator Sam Brownback. The explicit purpose of the bill was to further review, and in fact to ban, the use of RU 486 in the United States. Sadly, to date, this bill continues to languish in the U.S. Congress. In their public letter, Monty and Helen Patterson, Holly's parents, described what happened to their young daughter as a "conspiracy of silence". If you would like to read their full letter, please go to this URL:

<http://www.godandscience.org/abortion/patterson.html>

In spite of the clear, undeniable health threats which are presented by RU 486, Dr. Cynthia Summers, a spokeswoman for Danco Laboratories, the pharmaceutical company that produces and distributes Mifepristone in the United States, had the audacity to state "We believe our drug is not to blame". It is totally unbelievable that this woman would even make such a preposterous claim, in light of overwhelming evidence. To add injury to insult, as of this date, in spite of the risks that Mifepristone presents to pregnant girls and women, it is still legally available in all fifty states, as well as in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the American territory of Guam.

To help you to fully understand the irony of using abortion pills, consider the following. Whenever we read news reports regarding instances where a particular nation resorts to the use of biological or chemical warfare against another nation, we are horrified and appalled. Suddenly, there is a flood of talk regarding genocide and crimes against humanity. We saw this happen in such cases as the trials of Slobodan Milosevic and Saddam Hussein, both of whom are now dead. Yet, strangely enough, at the same time, for almost two decades, (depending on where you live), an unspoken war, and in fact, a secret war against life has been waged, in which millions of unborn children have been cruelly slaughtered in cold blood through the use of chemical agents; that is to say, abortion pills such as Mifepristone. Why does the world condemn dictators, yet ignore similar evil tactics when they are used against the unborn? Do you see something seriously wrong with this picture? Abortion pills amount to secret chemical warfare against the unborn. Period.

As we have already seen, while birth control proponents claim that using some form of birth control reduces the number of pregnancies, statistical evidence points to the fact that the exact opposite holds true. Furthermore, as I have also noted, these same people fail to mention the fact that relying upon birth control encourages widespread promiscuity, which leads not only to more pregnancies, but also to more opportunities for sexually-transmitted diseases to propagate. So in a word, whether we are discussing abortion or birth control, the end results are still the same, and the exact opposite of what both birth control and abortion advocates are claiming.

Considering the harm that certain forms of birth control do to a woman's body, whether it is through inserting some kind of physical object deep into her vagina, or through taking a questionable chemical agent, I personally find all of it very unsettling, repugnant and morally unacceptable. The Lord made a woman's body so that it follows a natural monthly cycle. By introducing artificial chemicals into her body, she's in fact interrupting that natural cycle, causing who-knows-what kind of damage to herself. Personally, as a man, I simply do not feel that I have the right to ask a woman to take that kind of risk. I will admit that on one occasion, not quite twenty years ago, I did make such a request under a very unique set of conditions; however, I will never do it again. In fact, I seriously doubt that such an opportunity will ever present itself again in my life anyway. The reason for this is quite simple. I have been single, as well as a practicing celibate for the past seventeen years by my own personal choice.

My belief is that the only morally-acceptable way to refrain from having any children, is by totally abstaining from sex.

You cannot do this if you are not single. If you are married, then obviously, as the Apostle Paul tells us in his Epistles, you are obligated to meet the sexual needs of your partner, even if you do both agree to abstain from a sex for a time. Please refer to some of my other articles if you wish to know more about my views regarding this issue.

Please go to part seven for the continuation of this series.

This file was written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

End Of File

Last Updated : March 19, 2009

Unique Situations And Abortion, God's Mercy And Compassion, Liberal Entertainment Industry And A Super Sexed Up Society, Sexual Violence: Victims Of Traumatic Rape And Child Incest, Life-Threatening Decisions, Rape And Incest Do Not Justify Abortion, Our Sick Society & Free Will, Right Over Her Body, A Mother's Love, Adoption A Last Resort, Abortionist Tactic, Botox And Hollywood Movie Star Look, Dressing Provocatively, The Powerful Male Libido, Disciplining Our Minds And Bodies, Look But Don't Touch, Societal Boundaries, God's Law Of Love, Ectopic / Tubal Pregnancies And Female Reproductive Anatomy, My Position Regarding Abortion And Pregnancy Complications, Complex Conflict Between Personal Faith And Modern Medicine, Recognizing The Limits Of Our Faith, My Personal Experiences, God's Will And Intervention, Free Will, Love And Conception

It should be very obvious to you, the reader, by now, that I possess very strong feelings regarding the issues of birth control and abortion. I have arrived at my conclusions after years of serious contemplation, and I have strived to examine these issues from different angles, in order that I might be able to present a well-rounded discussion via this series. In order to make this discussion complete, there are still a few more issues which we must examine. One question which we have yet to address is the following: Is it possible that certain unique situations may exist where abortion may be permissible in God's eyes? In other words, do situations exist where God might be willing to extend His mercy, be more understanding of our condition, and even overlook our human frailties, even if those situations are a result of our own mistakes or maybe the mistakes of others? As I have always taught, our God is a God of love, patience and mercy, and not just a God of wrath as some critics like to assume. I am reminded of these Bible verses:

"It is of the LORD'S mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness."
Lamentations 3:22-23, KJV

"Like as a father pitieth his children, so the LORD pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust."
Psalms 103:13-14, KJV

"The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."
2 Peter 3:9, KJV

In thinking about the previous questions, the first unique situation which comes into my mind involves the atrocities that are committed against women who are victims of sexual violence and abuse. In many parts of the world, incest and rape have become a serious problem as individuals seek to fulfill their sexual fantasies and desires. This problem is not helped in the least by a liberal entertainment industry which does everything in its power to glamourize sexuality, as if it is the most important thing in life, when it most

certainly isn't. But regardless, this constant pumping out of sexual fare only serves to awaken our basest instincts. From movies, to magazines, to videos, to online porn sites, to mass emails, to television, it seems that raw sexuality is thrown in our faces at every opportunity. As a result of this never-ending stream of hyper-sex, we now have people who want to look good, feel sexy, and be sexy, even with young girls and women who aren't the least bit interested in their sexual advances. We've created a super sexed up society.

Some people, even Christians, have suggested that under such traumatic conditions, that is, rape and incest, where a baby is conceived without a woman's will or consent, and where a woman is stripped not only of her clothes, but also of her dignity, abortion might be a justifiable option. The people who favor abortion in these types of cases insist that it is unfair to force a young girl or woman to endure a pregnancy which wasn't the result of a true act of love, but rather a violent act of bestial pleasure. Young girls and women who are victimized in this way often feel humiliated, dirty and ashamed, even though they realize that the attack was not actually their fault, at least in some cases.

While I am not a woman, I do understand how carrying such a child in her womb for nine months can be a constant, dreadful, and even traumatic reminder of the horrible experience which she was forced to endure. I also realize that as a result of this unwanted act which was forced upon her, the woman, and possibly even her family, might even despise giving birth to, and having to raise, such a child. As we have already seen, some abortion advocates remind us that the unborn child, who is the most innocent victim of all, may be forced to live in a negative, unloving environment because of conditions which were beyond their control at the time of their conception. In light of these factors, abortionists argue that abortion is an acceptable alternative to forcing the girl or woman, and the unborn child, to needlessly suffer emotionally, or in other ways.

As I noted earlier, I pondered this issue in my heart for a number of years. I was forced to ask myself if the same rules apply when a woman's free will is abrogated through such acts of sexual violence. As I point out in several of my articles, free will is a right that is given to us by our Creator; so I had to question if God would judge a woman the same when she considers abortion, not as a matter of personal convenience, but rather as a result of having been a victim of rape, or in the case of a young girl, perhaps a victim of incest. If we look at these issues squarely in the eye, then we are forced to recognize that when a woman or a young girl is raped, she really only has one of two choices: either she can submit to her attacker and let him have his way with her, and hopefully save her life, or else she can choose to struggle and resist, and possibly end up dead.

That would be a very tough decision for any woman or girl to have to make, and she won't have very much time in which to make it: "Do I fight for my dear life to protect my honor and possibly die here, or do I submit and let this jerk have his way with me?" If you were in such a situation, what would you do? What if you have a loving family at home who needs you? What if you have children who need their mother? How would this factor affect your reactions to a rapist? Tragically, even if a woman does not resist, she could still die if the assailant is sufficiently scared and desperate. It is really

a risky situation regardless of which choice she makes; and no matter how we choose to look at it, she is going to pay a price one way or the other. If she isn't killed, the attack will leave her scarred for life, and she may end up pregnant as well. Her life will simply never be the same.

Obviously, I can't provide a definitive, one hundred per cent conclusive answer regarding how God views the abortion option when it involves cases of rape and incest, because no human truly knows the full mind of God. However, what we can do, as we have been doing throughout this series, is to make our own personal decision regarding these issues, based upon what we do know from the Scriptures. When I first began my own journey regarding abortion years ago, I concluded that sexual assault might possibly represent a valid exception to the prohibition to abortion rule; however, since then, I have become persuaded that this argument reveals itself to be flawed when we expose it to the light of God's Word. So reiterating a point that I made earlier, one selfish act of violence -- such as rape or incest -- doesn't justify an even worse act of violence; that is, slaughtering a defenseless, innocent, unborn child in the early stages of its development, through a cold-hearted act of abortion.

I obviously do not believe that young girls and women being subjected to rape or incest occurs by the Will of God. These things occur as a result of our sick, sinful society, and the fact that we each possess free will. If God were to somehow intervene in order to prevent sexual assaults from occurring, it would in essence deprive us of our free will. Yet at the same time, neither do I believe that if a pregnancy results from such a sexual attack, that it is the Lord's Will that the developing child be slaughtered through a merciless act of abortion. Two wrongs simply do not make a right. While a child may not have been conceived under ideal conditions, and in fact may have been conceived under horrific conditions, it still does not give anyone the right to destroy it, not even its mother. That is where her rights over her own body end. She did not create that life. She was just the vehicle of its creation. That new life belongs to God. He gave it a spark of His Spirit.

Having said that, I firmly believe that every effort should be made to try to convince a rape or incest victim to carry out her pregnancy. If enough emotional support is provided, who knows, perhaps as the months go by, the Lord will work on that girl's or woman's heart, so that she is willing to accept the role of motherhood, in spite of the fact that she was a victim of a terrible assault against her body. It may not be easy for her at first, and may in fact be emotionally very stressful, but God is capable of healing her wounds if she will allow Him to do so. Furthermore, when she finally sees her baby for the first time, maybe the child will just melt her heart and make her decide to keep it. Surely no one can love a child as much as their own mother who labored to bring them into this world. Even if the mother still chooses to surrender the baby for adoption, at least the child will have been given a chance at life, instead of being callously slaughtered by an abortionist.

In closing my argument regarding this particular issue, let me remind you again that, as we saw in part three, only one per cent of all abortions are attributed to rape and incest; and we can't even really be certain how valid this figure is, because some young girls and women will in fact lie when it comes to the true circumstances surrounding their pregnancy,

just to facilitate their obtaining the abortion. It seems to me, then, that highlighting these two issues is just another tactic that the abortionist camp likes to use in their quest to keep abortion legal. They obviously realize that if they push these sensitive issues in our face, more people will be inclined to be sympathetic towards abortion.

As we have already seen, in many sexual assault cases, women are the victims of unbridled sexual desire. Sadly, however, there are cases where the woman must be willing to accept at least some of the blame. As I said, we live in an age where we are constantly reminded that we must feel good, look good and act sexy. Modern technology has given us breast implants, tummy tucks, nose jobs, Botox treatments and other things as a means to achieve this worldly pursuit, and many women, and men, have embraced it. However, this vain desire to look like movie stars can have very negative consequences if we are not careful. For example, in the case of sexual assault, how many times have we heard someone say, or possibly even thought to ourselves, "Ah, just look at how she dresses. She must have been asking for it".

As we all know, the plain truth is that a lot of modern women enjoy dressing in a very provocative manner. Such women claim that they have a right to dress as they please, and that they do it because it makes them feel good about themselves, and lifts their ego. These women who "flaunt their stuff" and who "dress to kill" need to wake up and realize that if they want to send out those kinds of signals, then they are asking for trouble, because men are not made of stone.

Considering then how some women dress, as well as the barrage of sex-related influences which bombard our senses on a daily basis, and the general sexed up society in which we currently live, is it really any wonder that some males finally reach a point where their thoughts and sexual desires are translated into physical actions, resulting in cases of rape and incest? This is not to excuse them for their selfish actions by any means, but some women are surely to blame as well. They need to exercise wisdom in deciding when, where and with whom to dress in a certain manner. Doing this will help them to avoid unnecessary problems, and possibly even save their life. This is particularly true in large cities inhabited by hundreds of thousands, or even millions of people, where it's much easier to hide from the law.

If a woman chooses to dress "hot" and sends out signals that she is "hot", some men will automatically assume that she is looking for someone to cool her down, and they will oblige, whether that is really the woman's intention or not. God has endowed males with some very powerful emotions and hormonal reactions which we must deal with every time that we behold a beautiful woman. While the majority of men are capable of dealing with these powerful emotional and sexual urges in an appropriate manner, other men just don't know how to keep themselves in check. The Bible refers to this as having rule over our own spirits, and the Apostle Paul tells us that we must keep both our mind and body under subjection. In other words, we must discipline both our mind and body, as we see by these verses:

"He that hath no rule over his own spirit is like a city that is broken down, and without walls."
Proverbs 25:28, KJV

"But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest

that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."

1 Corinthians 9:27, KJV

"Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;"

2 Corinthians 10:5, KJV

I'm a regular guy; I enjoy looking at a pretty woman just as much as the next fellow; but it is in adopting the policy of discreetly looking, but not touching, that we can all avoid a lot of difficulties. God obviously made women to be beautiful and attractive to men, so I see absolutely nothing wrong with admiring what He has seen fit to create for His, as well as men's pleasure. However, it is in recognizing the boundaries where we will all do well. Most societies, regardless of how primitive they may be, have established some system of social boundaries. If we pass those boundaries, then we must expect to pay the consequences. In their most simplest form, most of man's universal laws are merely a reflection of God's primary and all-encompassing Law of Love, and doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. We shouldn't do anything which will harm another person in any way.

Having now examined rape and incest, do any other situations exist where abortion might be warranted, and even justified? What about a woman whose life is threatened by complications during her pregnancy? One example involves what is referred to as an ectopic pregnancy. This form of pregnancy results when a fertilized egg attaches itself in a place other than the wall of a woman's uterus. This kind of pregnancy, which is rare, usually occurs in the Fallopian tubes. Also known as oviducts, uterine tubes or salpinges, the Fallopian tubes are four minute, cilia-lined tubes, (one left pair and one right pair), which carry the ovum, or eggs, from a woman's left and right ovaries to her uterus, where they can then be fertilized by the male's sperm. When a pregnancy occurs in the Fallopian tubes, it is referred to as a tubal pregnancy.

About ninety-eight per cent of all ectopic pregnancies occur in the Fallopian tubes. However, please note that ectopic pregnancies can also occur in other areas; such as in the cervix, (the narrow neck that is located between the uterus and the vagina), in one of the ovaries, or in the abdomen.

Regardless of where an ectopic pregnancy occurs, it's viewed as a medical emergency, because unless it is discovered in time, and treated properly, it could possibly result in the death of the expectant mother. This is because a developing fetus produces certain types of enzymes which allow it to implant itself in different kinds of tissues. If, as occurs in ectopic pregnancies, the embryo implants itself anywhere other than the uterine wall, it can result in tissue damage, particularly to the surrounding blood vessels, as the embryo strives to find a sufficient source of blood. The damage can result in internal bleeding. In about 50% of cases, ectopic pregnancies can resolve themselves without medical treatment. This is because the intratubal bleeding serves to expel the implanted embryo in a process referred to medically as a tubal abortion.

In cases where an ectopic pregnancy is diagnosed late, and the intratubal bleeding becomes heavy, or where a Fallopian tube is in danger of rupturing, or has already ruptured, quick medical treatment is required, as these conditions can

threaten a woman's health or life. One approach is to use the abortion-inducing drugs Methotrexate and Misoprostol to expel the fetus. In more serious cases, surgery is required. Depending on where the ectopic pregnancy occurs, and when it is first discovered, it leaves ten to fifteen per cent of women infertile due to damage to the Fallopian tubes or to the ovaries, or due to necessary removal of the same. In the case of abdominal pregnancies, sometimes other organs may need to be removed as well. It should likewise be noted that death due to rupture of the Fallopian tube is rare in cases where women have access to modern medical facilities, so timely discovery and accessibility is extremely important.

As I noted earlier, ectopic pregnancies are rare, occurring in about one per cent of all pregnant women. Of those one per cent, ninety-eight per cent are tubal pregnancies. We've also seen that half of all tubal pregnancies are self-correcting, meaning that a woman's body often expels the embryo when it attaches itself in the wrong place. While some women mistake this for a miscarriage, in the medical profession, this is actually known as a tubal abortion. The general consensus is that all ectopic pregnancies should be terminated before they become a serious health threat. However, it should be noted that there have been a few rare cases where both mother and child have survived such pregnancies. In fact, according to my research, in recent years, one woman even gave birth to triplets through surgery.

In light of the above information, what position should we adopt concerning abortion, when it involves emergencies such as ectopic pregnancies? Are ectopic pregnancies a justifiable reason for undergoing an abortion? Obviously, this is clearly a question which must be answered on an individual, personal basis. You can't answer it for me, nor I for you. As much as I personally detest abortion, after serious consideration, I was forced to come to the following conclusion. If it can be medically proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that a woman's life will be in jeopardy if she continues to carry a child, or if her life is already in jeopardy due to complications with her pregnancy, then this is one case where I would have to agree that abortion may be a justifiable option. In fact, this is the only case where I can see that abortion might be a justifiable option. Short of a woman's life being in real danger, as verified by an honest physician, I don't see any other valid reason for ever considering abortion.

My reasons for adopting this position are the following. As I explained earlier, if a woman has a family who needs her, that is, a husband and children, then this is a case where the needs of the many may possibly outweigh the needs of the one; that is, the unborn fetus. God has already given this woman a husband, and possibly other children to care for. If this is the case, is it right for her to sacrifice her life, and jeopardize the needs of her family, in order to try to live up to a personal moral standard, or possibly to meet the expectations of her church? In a life-threatening situation such as an ectopic pregnancy, we need to ask ourselves which takes precedence; the life of the mother, or the life of the developing fetus. The central question is which decision will accomplish the greatest good. If a woman refuses to undergo an abortion, it is possible that both she and the fetus will die. No good can come from such a decision. Two lives may be lost, and the remaining family will suffer as well due to the loss of their wife and mother.

The Bible plainly teaches us "Thou shalt not kill"; so from

a Scriptural perspective, we could conclude that in the case of a Christian woman, she was willing to sacrifice her own life rather than kill the unborn fetus. On the surface, such an act may appear to be a noble gesture; however, if medical technology is available which can save her life, and if the woman refuses to avail herself of it, indirectly, is she not really killing herself, and committing an act of suicide? Is it possible that her religious convictions are clouding her common sense? Is it not better to save one life, rather than to lose both?

As I said, these are difficult questions which we must answer on a personal basis. In my case, I concluded that unless the woman has a great deal of faith, and is thoroughly convinced that God is going to perform a miracle by saving her life, as well as the life of the unborn child, then regardless of how distasteful it may be, an abortion may be the more pragmatic option in a case involving an ectopic pregnancy. In my view, it is better that the woman survives in order to care for her family. Not only that, but unless she suffers internal damage as a result of having an ectopic pregnancy, she may very well have other opportunities to bear children at a later date. On the other hand, if the woman dies due to complications which arise from her ectopic pregnancy, and if they are newly-weds, the husband will be left without any children whatsoever.

The conflict between personal faith and medicine is complex. It would be great if we all had the faith to effect miracles in our lives, but the truth of the matter is that most of us don't possess that kind of faith; so when it comes to hard choices such as ectopic pregnancies and abortion, we have to come to terms with ourselves and recognize the limits of our faith, and do what is both lawful and pragmatic, even if it means relying upon a medical procedure that we normally find utterly repulsive.

It is a humbling experience to recognize that we don't have the faith that we thought we had. In my own life I have been faced with this reality on a number of occasions. The most recent incident occurred more than seven years ago when my daughter was diagnosed with Type 1 Diabetes. Believe me, I prayed desperately that God would deliver my child from her affliction. It tore me up inside every time my little girl had to undergo a blood test or receive an insulin injection. The idea of her having to endure up to five blood tests per day, plus two or more insulin injections a day for the rest of her life was a heavy emotional burden on me. Why was God allowing my daughter to be afflicted in this way? Surely it was not her fault. After all, she was just a child. Were my sins so grievous that the Lord chose to punish me through my daughter? Had I done something wrong in caring for her which has caused her body to turn on itself?

I was flooded with questions, emotions and guilt. I begged the Lord to heal my daughter, but it never happened. In the end, I realized that my faith was not enough, and that God must have some reason for allowing this to happen to us; but to this day, I am still not certain what that reason is. Am I still plagued by guilt? To be honest, even though several doctors have told us that there is nothing that I could have done to prevent my daughter from getting Type 1 Diabetes, I must admit that, yes, at times, I still do feel the guilt. I wonder if I am being punished for my sins. After all, as we are told in God's Word:

"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;"

Romans 3:23, KJV

"For he doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men . . . Out of the mouth of the most High proceedeth not evil and good? Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins? Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the LORD."

Lamentations 3:33, 38-40, KJV

But the main point I wish to emphasize here is that if my daughter was to remain alive, we had no choice but to rely upon modern medicine. Legally, as well as medically, there was no other option. In my personal life, I have refused to take medicines for many years. I won't even take something for a migraine headache unless it is really severe. I would rather endure the pain until it subsides. It is not just a matter of personal religious convictions as you may possibly think; but rather the fact that I simply do not like to put artificial chemicals in my body. Only God knows what they do to us, particularly substances such as antibiotics which do good on one hand, while doing harm on the other. I've taught my daughter the same views, so maybe you can understand how profoundly the discovery, almost eight years ago, that she is a Type 1 diabetic, affected our lives.

Imagine if I had continued to convince myself that I had the faith, and that it was just a matter of time before the Lord would heal my daughter of her diabetes. Even worse, imagine if I had decided, based upon my personal faith, to withhold insulin injections from my daughter. Of course, I never did this, or even considered it, but if I had, she might be dead today, and I might be in jail. So my point is that we need to recognize the limits of our faith, and act accordingly. To do otherwise is simply to be motivated by our pride. It is also foolish and dangerous, particularly when it involves the life of another person. Which is better, to seek medical attention and save a person's life, or pretend to have faith and end up in jail as a result of contributing to a person's death through inaction?

In spite of what I've stated previously, there will no doubt be some Christians who will continue to argue that we should simply trust the Lord concerning situations such as ectopic pregnancies. Fundamentalists may insist that it is better to die trusting the Lord than to rely upon modern medicine, and that if the woman became pregnant, then it must have been by God's Will. For me personally, this line of thought leads to other difficulties, some of which I have not yet been able to resolve for myself, even after so many years of embracing the Christian faith. For example, where does God's Will and Intervention end, and human free will begin? Where does God's Will end, and normal, human biological reproductive functions begin?

As I mentioned earlier, when a young girl or woman is raped and she becomes pregnant, I have a difficult time accepting that it occurred by the Will of God. That baby is the result of a brutal act of selfish pleasure. It did not involve the woman's will, or much less God's Will. Previously, I clearly explained that I believe that human conception occurs by the Will of God, and that it is not just a biological function. So am I now contradicting myself and reversing my previous position? Before answering, please consider the following explanation.

While I do believe that conception involves the Will of God,

that is only a part of the overall equation. In my opinion, there is another condition which must first be met, in order to determine if a pregnancy has really occurred by the Will of God; and that is that the unborn child must have resulted from two individuals who engaged in a mutual, loving, sexual relationship. Love is a primary requisite, because the Bible tells us that God is love. In short, God blesses a mutual sexual union which is motivated by genuine love. Obviously, one-night-stands, casual sex, rape and incest do not qualify. While one-night-stands and casual sex may be a mutual act, they certainly don't involve real love. It is either lust or mere infatuation.

So I've considered the possibility that some pregnancies may occur by the Will of God, while others do not. Clear Biblical examples include the births of Isaac, Samson, and, of course, Jesus. These were obvious miraculous births which occurred in contradiction to our understanding of human conception. They required Divine Intervention. I'm not suggesting that a child must be miraculously conceived in order for a pregnancy to be viewed as the Will of God. As I said, if a pregnancy is the result of a mutual, loving sexual relationship, then it may very well have occurred by God's Will. Picture a triangle in which the man is at the bottom left corner, the woman is at the bottom right corner, and God is at the apex. When they are united by love, and their wills are in unity with each other and with God, it may result in a conception.

So what about all of the other pregnancies that occur in the world which are not the result of a genuine act of love? As with many things in this life, I posit that they occur, not necessarily because they are the explicit, perfect Will of God, but simply because the Lord has endowed each one of us with free will. In other words, God has stepped back a bit, and allowed each of us to make our own decisions, including with whom to engage in sexual intercourse. The pregnancies which result from such encounters are thus the normal fruit of human sexual intercourse and human biological processes, whether real love is present or not. The Lord set the human reproductive machine in motion in the Book of Genesis when He first said "Be fruitful and multiply", and we are witnessing the result of that commandment to this day.

As I explain in other articles, I also believe that the Lord has chosen not to interfere for a time, so that we humans can learn some valuable lessons through our own poor decisions and actions. Life is a school, and God is the Schoolmaster.

Returning to the issue of ectopic pregnancies and abortion, if we accept the view that everything comes from the Hand of God, as opposed to the belief that some things occur as a result of our own choices, and not necessarily because God willed them to happen, then we are confronted with a rather serious dilemma. Are we to believe that it is God's Will for a woman to become pregnant, to then develop life-threatening complications, such as a tubal pregnancy, and then for her family to watch her die? I certainly believe that God knows what is best for us, but I am not convinced that this is the manner in which He operates. Free will has to take over at some point. To know your wife may die if she continues with the pregnancy, and not do anything about it, is waiving your right to free will. Of course, some people may argue that in choosing to trust the Lord, they have exercised free will.

Personally, however, I don't think that I would make the same decision if I were in that position. As I said, the Lord has

given us a mind to make own own choices. In a situation such as I have just described, He expects us to decide what is the best course of action to take. In this case, as I explained earlier, I believe that it is better to try to save one life, than to lose both. After all, God is in the habit of creating life and saving life, not destroying it. If the Lord wants to take a Christian woman Home, I am sure that He can find a lot easier way to do it than to allow her to become pregnant with another life, which then threatens her own life, and then take both of them Home. This sounds illogical to me. So, to reiterate, as much as I detest abortion, this is one case where I might be willing to accept it, and only in this case.

Please go to part eight for the conclusion of this series.

This file was written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

End Of File

Last Updated : March 19, 2009

My Personal Reservations, Abuse Of Current Abortion Laws, My Personal Opinions, God's Opinion And His Word Are The Final Authority, Deceived By Abortionists, Doctor George Tiller, Freed Through Truth Of God's Word, We Have A Merciful God, Come To The Light And Seek The Lord's Forgiveness, Please Share This Series With Your Acquaintances And Save A Life

Let me clarify that I embrace my current position regarding ectopic pregnancy and abortion with some reservations. After all, it does involve placing the life of the mother above the life of the fetus. Furthermore, to even suggest that abortion may possibly be acceptable under certain conditions, opens the door to abuse, and there is already widespread abuse with current abortion laws, as we saw earlier in this series. Let me also add that what I have stated here is only my personal opinion. This is not "thus saith the Lord" and I can't refer you to any Biblical verses to support my position. I am only relying upon personal pragmatism and common sense; so if you wish to disagree with me on this issue, that is your choice. As with all of the opinions that I express in my articles and series, you are perfectly within your right to disagree with my views. The real danger occurs when we disagree with what we find in God's Word.

To reiterate my point, apart from medically-verified, life-threatening pregnancies, I can't think of any other situation where abortion may be a justifiable option. Personally, as a Christian, the bottom line remains that it does not matter what you think, or what I think, or what anyone thinks, when it comes to the issue of abortion. All that truly matters is what God thinks; and the way we know what He thinks, is by carefully studying His Word. If our personal views are not in line with God's Word, then we are wrong, no matter how good or how logical of an argument we may try to present. As I've explained a number of times before, for God-fearing, Bible-believing Christians, God's Word is the final authority in all matters. While the Scriptures do not offer us precise advice regarding the specific issue of abortion, as we have already seen, God is in favor of life, and murder is viewed as a very serious punishable offense. How much more does this hold true when it involves the intentional slaughter of so many unborn innocent children who have no voice of their own?

I feel so sorry for those people who have become so deceived by modern scientific explanations, and the misguided medical opinions of the profiteering abortionists, who claim that an embryo is "nothing more than a ball of cells", and not truly a person. Either through ignorance, or perhaps through their own selfishness, these young girls' and women's hearts have become hardened, and their consciences numbed, so that they can no longer clearly see the cold-hearted reality regarding the practice of abortion. It is encouraging to know that at least some of these murderous abortionists, such as Doctor George Tiller, a late-term abortionist in Wichita, Kansas, USA, are finally being brought to trial for their horrible crimes against innocent unborn children. The trial of Doctor George Tiller will not put a full end to the slaughter, but it is definitely a step in the right direction.

It is time for everyone to wake up, to shake off our blind ignorance, and to stop being deceived and brainwashed by all of the lies that are being propagated by the forces of the pro-abortion camp. It is time to let the truth of God's Word shine in our hearts, and then we will truly be set free; for as Jesus Himself promised in the Gospel of John:

". . . if ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free . . . If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

John 8:31a-32, 36, KJV

Before concluding this series, I would like to address those women and minors who have chosen to abort their children. If you have taken one life through the act of abortion; if you have sacrificed your unborn child to the abortionist, I urge you to make amends with the Lord as soon as possible. If you cry out for His Mercy, perhaps He will hear you, and extend His compassion to you. If what you did was truly done out of childish ignorance, the Lord is willing to forgive you. In fact, it is possible that He already has forgiven you, and that you have been carrying your burden for far too long. Consider the truth of the following Bible verses:

"It is of the LORD'S mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness."

Lamentations 3:22-23, KJV

"Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."

Isaiah 1:18, KJV

"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

Matthew 11:28-30, KJV

So as you can hopefully see, the Lord is more than willing to forgive us for our sins; even the unwise and selfish sin of abortion. It is our very sins and mistakes which keep us humble, and which also teach us valuable lessons throughout life. A humble man, or woman, is one who has made a lot of mistakes throughout life, and yet who has found forgiveness through Jesus Christ. As the old saying goes, honesty comes before humility. Yet, at the same time, the greater sin is when we refuse to come to the Light, and try to hide our sins; which is why Jesus also said the following regarding those Jews who had rejected Him:

"And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd."

John 3:19-20, KJV

Jesus has already paid the price for your sins, including the sin of abortion, and He is willing to forgive you, but you must come to Him in meekness and humility, and seek His forgiveness. I hope that you will do so soon.

It is my hope that you have found this series on abortion to be informative, and that you have been both encouraged and blessed by it as well. If that is the case, please consider sharing the URL for the first part of this series with your friends. As you surely understand, abortion is an extremely important issue, and sharing this series with others may possibly give them the information that they need in order to save a life, or perhaps even many lives. You can help the slaughter of the innocent to stop. Thanks so much.

This file was written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

End Of File