

Abortion in the Light of Scripture

by Gerhard H. Geiger

[Prepared for the Dakota-Montana District Pastoral Conference in session April 3-4, 1972, in Mobridge, SD]

Dear Brethren and Coworkers in Christ,

The subject of abortion currently is receiving great attention in the magazines and news media throughout our nation. There is a great demand for wider liberalization of laws dealing with abortion in all states where there still are legal restrictions against it.

The matter deserves our serious attention for it is actually a matter of life and death. It involves other aspects also. It is one phase of a larger sphere, i.e., birth control, which touches the privileges and responsibilities of marriage, the sanctity of life and the legal destruction of life, with the rights of the mothers at the expense of the right to live of an unborn child. One problem that leads to birth control, of course, is the fear of over-population.

We shall focus our attention primarily on abortion but also touch on related phases with the hope that this paper may be of assistance to you in your pastoral work as you become aware of different developments in thought, law, and medicine, the blessings and or problems they introduce.

One of our younger pastors in Wisconsin related an experience in his English class at the University: The lady instructor introduced what she described as a most delicate but practical matter: namely, the control of anxiety by means of copulation with the opposite sex. She went on to say with emphasis that in addition to discretion it was most practical to practice birth control with the simple purchase of a condom at the local pharmacy.

The Lord advises youth to control "anxiety" as well. He understands better than all of us what it means to be healthy, strong, virile at an age of development that provokes one's curiosity to an extreme degree. At no time, however, did the Lord advocate a permissive conduct in order to overcome the problem. His command is clear: "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Through the apostle Paul He says: "Flee youthful lusts; but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart" 2 Tim. 2:22). Jesus, who knows the evil nature of the human heart, also offers encouragement: "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation" (Mt.26:41).

Birth control, however, is not limited to the chastity of youth in our society. The interest expressed today for controlling birth arises out of a number of, social problems with which the world is unable to cope.

One of the main such problems in the minds of men is "overpopulation." Dr. Paul Ehrlich, author of the book *The Population Bomb* is very sensitive to overpopulation. There are truths which he introduces which responsible men cannot overlook if they are concerned about their neighbor's welfare. He introduces the problem in a dramatic manner. We quote:

I have understood the population explosion intellectually for a long time. I came to understand it emotionally one stinking hot night in Delhi a couple of years ago. My wife and daughter and I were returning to our hotel in an ancient taxi. The seats were hopping with fleas. The only functional gear was third. As we crawled through the city, we entered a crowded slum area. The temperature was well over 100, and the air was a haze of dust and smoke. The streets seemed alive with people. People eating, people washing, people sleeping. People visiting, arguing, and screaming. People thrusting their hands through the taxi window, begging. People defecating and urinating. People clinging to buses. People herding animals. People, people, people, people. As we moved slowly through the mob, hand horn squawking, the dust, noise, heat, and cooking fires gave the scene a hellish aspect. Would we ever get to our hotel? All three of us were, frankly, frightened. It seemed that anything could happen, but, of course, nothing did. Old India hands

will laugh at our reaction. We were just overprivileged tourists, unaccustomed to the sights and sounds of India. Perhaps, but since that night I've known the *feel* of overpopulation (p. 15).

This is a factual report. We add a note from Pastor Sauer written enroute to Africa, "Nairobi sure has changed from a little town-like city to a large lovely place. We especially appreciate it here, after what we saw in Bombay. So many poor people. Just masses of people all over."

In India alone, which is the 2nd largest country in the world as far as population is concerned, (China being first), one million people are added to their total population figures per month. Possibly there are those of us who cannot become emotionally moved because of the desperate and dismal dilemma of overcrowded India, but anyone who has Jesus as Savior must feel a pain in their heart for those precious souls we are not reaching with the Gospel.

In the article "How Many Babies Is Too Many?" (Newsweek 10/62), we are warned:

The current growth, continued in 600 years, would leave every inhabitant of the world with only 1 sq yd to live on. By the year 3500, the weight of human bodies on the earth's surface would equal the weight of the world itself. By the year 6000, the solid mass of humanity would be expanding outward into space at the speed of light. "The world has cancer," a top Rockefeller Foundation official has said "and that cancer cell is Man."

Rushdoony (an orthodox Presbyterian) reports other statements such as "London (UPI)—Jot down on the calendars for Nov. 13, 2026: Doomsday" "And don't plan on heading for the hills then. An American scientist says there won't be any room."

Dr. Robert White-Stevens, an American expert on fertilizers and insecticides, predicted recently that, at present growth rates, the world by Nov. 13, 2026, will no longer be able to feed its population and will be stumbling all over itself.

Dr. Paul Ehrlich is indeed a prophet of doom that paints a picture so bleak for the future that, if it were made into a movie, it would possibly receive a "X" rating. But are the prophets of doom like Ehrlich correct in every sense of the word? Rushdoony does not think so in his book *The Myth Of Over-population*. In defining over-population Rushdoony says that it "is an imbalance between the number of people living and their food supply, which results in hunger and even famine because the available production of food cannot match the population's need" (p.1). On the basis of this definition, he points to all the famines this world has experienced, both past and present, as times and eras in which the world has known "overpopulation."

An article in a Wisconsin newspaper a year ago entitled "The Population Explosion: Is It More Than Just Explosive Rhetoric?" concurs with Rushdoony that too much attention has been given to the "over-population drama." The author points out that the birth rate in the U.S.A. has been declining from 1957 to the present date.

The birth rate has declined every year from a high of 25.3/1000 in 1957 to a low of 17.4/1000 in 1968. The latter figure is the lowest in U.S. history.

Reduced birth rate is not only experienced in the U.S. but elsewhere in the world. In East Europe also, we are told there is a declining population. In Romania, the declining birth rate led officials to decree that abortions, previously promoted, be illegal; and, within a year, officials were claiming a "baby boom."

Although the birth rate declines it does not follow that there is a population decline. The broad base of humanity which now inhabits the world is responsible for an ever expanding population figure. If we accept the definition of overpopulation as Rushdoony gives it to us, we have to admit that there is an overpopulation problem in *certain* areas of the world. The problem of overpopulation would then be local rather than universal. Knowledgeable people state, however, that if we do not want to admit the problem today, it will be only a

matter of time before the problem is heaped upon us in such a way that we will be beyond the point of return. Pollution is also pointed to as an excrement of overpopulation. We will be swallowed up in our own waste eventually. We are warned of intense civil strife in areas of high density population which will affect country after country.

Scare tactics on the basis of numbers, however, will soon lose their sharp edge. The problems such as pollution and civil peace, along with any other problem, will still be with us. These problems will have to be solved on the basis of a moral and spiritual issue, not on scare tactics using numbers.

Because of the fear of having too many people for our world, science has introduced solutions to curb the population growth. If they can encourage families to have no more than two children, they will have accomplished what the conservative men in science wish to accomplish, namely, “zero growth population rate.” In order to accomplish their goal, which is the salvation of the world, certain devices, pills, and theories have been introduced to assist the control of births as well as to avoid possible conceptions.

Methods of birth control are nothing new. They have been practiced throughout the ages. The most common methods employed have been infanticide, sterilization, abstinence, and abortion. And to this have been added in our day the various contraceptive devices by which conception is prevented. Rehwinkel, in his book *Planned Parenthood* remarks that:

From an inscription discovered it was found that the Greeks were familiar with contraceptive drugs as early as 100 B.C., and from other sources, we know that as early as the 2nd century after Christ mechanical contraceptive devices for women were used. (p. 16)

Infanticide was well known in the ancient world. We note that it was practiced in Egypt to curb the number of births among the Israelites in Ex.1:15, at which time God spared Moses that he might become a leader among His people. The Greeks and Romans practiced infanticide in order to develop a strong people as well as reduce the problems of overpopulation. God forbade infanticide in Lev. 18:21.

Sterilization is another age-old practice which is exercised among male population by means of castration. The reasons for this practice were varied. Today sterilization is not quite so crude and it is also extended so as to include the female (in whom the fallopian tubes are closed). It is termed vasectomy in the male and is as common a procedure with prostate surgery as removal of the appendix with any abdominal surgery without any questions asked. There is given legal sanction to sterilization of such persons who are mentally feeble, insane, and epileptic. This is for all states of our country except one. The male that was sterilized during Biblical times was referred to as an eunuch. According to Dt. 23:1 an eunuch was excluded from the congregation of the Lord. Sterilization also excluded the sons of Levi from the priesthood whereas all other deformities, such as blindness, lameness, etc., did not. God looked upon sterilization with disfavor.

Abstinence—this is understood within the framework of marriage and is to be favored only in certain instances such as Paul mentions in 1 Cor 7:5, “Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan, tempt you not for your incontinency.”

Contraceptives. Because of man’s knowledge of the reproductive system, certain methods have been introduced to prevent conception. In no wise can this be looked upon as eliminating a human life, nor is it a form of abortion. A contraceptive may be a device known as a diaphragm for which females are to be fitted by a qualified physician. Other than this there are jellies, foams, and douches which are available but not nearly so popular.

Oral contraceptives are usually in the form of a pill which introduces a hormone or hormones into the female to stop ovulation and are usually called non-ovulatory medication. They are strongly recommended by physicians for a number of reasons other than for the purpose of preventing conception alone. There are side effects that are bothersome for some women which at times can have unfortunate results. It is for this reason that a number of debates constantly are being waged. The conservative physician states, however, that it will be several generations from now before we will know the results of the pill.

Another pill is already developed that is a non-ovulatory medication, but in reality is to serve as an agent to cause abortion for women who have missed their menstrual period. It is not yet on the market. Its placement in pharmacies is pending legislation to permit such medication to be placed into pharmacies throughout the U.S. It is prepared by Upjohn Chemical Corp, Kalamazoo, Mich.

This now leads us to the last method of birth control in which we are primarily interested at this time, namely *abortion*. The medical definition of abortion is noted in *An American Textbook Of Obstetrics For Practitioner And Students*.

By abortion in a general sense is meant the interruption and termination of pregnancy by the expulsion of the ovum before the end of the 28th week or the 7th lunar month of gestation.

Rehwinkel, in *Planned Parenthood*, defines the various kinds of abortion in a most concise way:

Embryonic abortion = that which occurs before the 4th month.

Fetal abortion = that which occurs after the 4th month.

Spontaneous abortion = miscarriage or premature birth.

Therapeutic abortion = the removal of the unborn new life by competent physicians and in conformity with the existing laws of a state or country in order to save the life of the pregnant mother.

Criminal abortion = one which is produced voluntarily and intentionally in violation of the law in order to terminate an undesirable pregnancy by a married or unmarried woman.

Any termination of pregnancy prior to the 7th month may be correctly termed an abortion. After the 7th month medically it is termed a premature delivery.

There are four kinds of induced abortion: 1) D & C 2) Suction 3) hysterotomy 4) Saline poisoning.

Abortion actually is not an operation on the body of the woman herself but an act that is inflicted on the unborn embryo or fetus of the child she is bearing, thus interfering with the natural reproduction of human life.

This is what makes abortion so different from any other surgical operation, for it interferes with and puts an end to the very act of God during the process of procreation. But it is at this point that many persons often are confused while under the pressure of strong personal feelings and possibly adverse, extenuating circumstances, with the result that they think they have the liberty to end what is frequently referred to as an “undesired” pregnancy. There has arisen a general uncertainty as to when the embryo has life, and in particular, when it can be considered to be a human being.

That the child received his body from his parents is readily acknowledged. But much confusion exists as to the origin of its life and the time that life is present. Some would say that only at birth does God put life into the newborn child; others set the time at the 12th week, the 4th month, or variously, for the “quickening” of the fetus. But such ideas are only speculation.

Since the embryo actually has its origin in conception, it most certainly is alive, for it was from *living* cells that its individual existence began! It *has* life, for it rapidly grows and develops into a fetus, which needs and receives nothing more than food to grow until it is to be born. At no time after the moment of conception is there the introduction or addition of any material, quality or influence that could be said to “give life” to the embryo or fetus—it has been alive every moment since its conception. And, since this living organism is a human embryo or fetus, it must also be said to be a *human being*, in the simple generic meaning of that term. Already in conception, all the traits and characteristics transmitted by the genes, and thus inherited from father and mother, are present, giving this new human being its individual identity. That this identity is present only in its incipient form, without the conscious knowledge or intelligence, in no way removes the reality that a new human life has now, in fact, come into being. Moreover, this is *God’s* act, for under His guidance and control, this fertilized cell, in its countless divisions and subdivisions will develop into all the varied and specialized cells, tissues, and, bodily structure it is to have, as will also the life now begin to develop all the traits and

characteristics that will be the distinctive make-up of this particular human being. From conception on, a new human being has come into existence by God's decree, through procreation.

With this as our understanding of what God does through the act of conception, any human act that would interfere with, or interrupt, a pregnancy once begun must be said to be contrary to God's purpose, plan, and will. That is why abortion must be labeled as simply one form of willful killing of human life. Therefore we contend that the artificially "induced abortion" is a criminal act which constitutes the murder of a human being. Only God has a right to take life except where He has delegated that right to the state for the punishment of criminals. Dr. Herm. Sasse, a Lutheran theologian, said: "There is from the very beginning a really remarkable agreement within the Church that abortion in the sense of willful termination of pregnancy is murder." Dr. Sasse adds:

If in wide parts of our Western World, the legislation of the State is being changed so as to correspond with the views held by the majority of the people who no longer understand the Christian principle, it is up to the church to educate its members and to uphold in its midst the eternal law of God. This is what the ancient church did. She never gave up the conviction that destruction of an embryo is equal to killing a human being.

Dr. Siegbert Becker says that abortion "is forbidden by the command of God that says: 'Thou shalt not kill.'" *The Northwestern Lutheran* in an editorial on abortion states: "It is time for us Christians to speak out against this violation of God's commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill,' and to proclaim loudly that which sets the human being apart from all other creatures, namely, that man originally was created in the image of God." Dr. Walter A. Maier, former *Lutheran Hour* speaker, is quoted as referring to abortion as "heinous murder."

Those who fight for liberalization of the laws to end the life of a developing child in the womb of the mother maintain that they are not taking human life because the "fetus is not yet a human being." What is this but man intruding into the counsels of God, presuming to decide a matter which God has reserved for His own judgment. God in His Word calls the developing "embryo" a *child*. "As thou knowest not what is the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones grow in the womb of her that is with child: even so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all" (Eccl. 11:5). In spite of all of man's advances in the field of embryology this statement of God's Word is true. Man does *not* know how the bones develop in the womb. But the point is that God is the one who "maketh all" and the pregnant woman is spoken of as "being with child." That which is growing in her womb is a *child*. God told Jeremiah the prophet, "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." What if his mother had decided to abort? It is clear that the prophet Jeremiah was a specified person with a definite status before God, ordained by God to perform a task, all while he was still in the womb. In this connection we should like to add a quote from Pieper's *Christian Dogmatics* (III, 473):

The election of grace may therefore be defined as the eternal act of God by which from eternity, out of pure grace for Christ's sake He has decreed to bestow those blessings on the Christians which through His call they now enjoy conversion, justification, sanctification, and preservation in faith.

This definition follows the procedure of Scripture. For Holy Writ traces the gracious blessings which God bestows on the Christians in time (Their call, conversion, justification, sanctification, and preservation in faith) back to their election, an act of God which antedates the Creation, which occurred therefore in eternity. In 2 Tim. 1:19 Paul confesses in the name of all Christians "God hath saved us and called us in Christ Jesus before the world began."

Accordingly, we have no right to interfere with a life which God has created and which He is determined to save, whether that life be in the womb or out of the womb. It is our responsibility to introduce all human life to the Gospel in Word and Sacrament as God gives the opportunity in order that they might "be

saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth.” Although it is true that God is not bound by the means of grace to secure a soul for eternal life, yet we are bound by either law or love to do God’s will.

Abortion is advocated by many only in the case of serious damage to the mother. Medical science is today being credited with far more knowledge and power than is warranted by the actual performance of the medical profession as a whole. A doctor may think that a woman will be harmed physically or mentally if the pregnancy is allowed to continue, but he cannot know positively. He cannot know whether or not God will terminate the pregnancy naturally, he cannot know if the baby’s development may actually trigger natural resources for better health within the mother’s own body, he cannot know what the future effect upon the mother’s mental health will be if she consents to the abortion of her child for *any* reason. The doctor has to perform abortion in view of his own infallibility and imagined foreknowledge. But God says, “Boast not thyself of tomorrow; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth” (Prov.27:1). The number of abortions performed for this reason is very small.

Another reason given to justify abortion is the case where medical science is able to predict with “reasonable certainty” that a deformed child will be born.

The basic assumption is that deformed children are unwanted and should therefore be eliminated. But why are they unwanted? Are parents so cold that they are capable of loving only those children which are in perfect physical and mental health. Children are children regardless of their weakness. Is it not possible for a parent to love a weak and deformed child just as much as a normal child? Oftentimes such a child is loved even more and receives much more attention. It may be one way which God uses to remove selfishness from parents and family members.

The ability on the part of medical science to predict with any degree of certainty which children are going to be born with serious birth defects is not by any means foolproof. An abortion may easily be performed on many perfectly healthy infants.

It should not be lightly brushed off that medical science has produced more defective babies by its great knowledge than it has succeeded in either predicting or preventing. Thalidomide has caused most horrible birth defects in much greater number than any other causes combined during the period of time it was in use. All other causes of deformity in pregnancy are not at this time predictable or understood with any degree of certainty. Here again we note that very few abortions in proportion to the total number performed each year in the U.S. and the rest of the world are performed because the parents fear a deformed child. This is a smokescreen in an argument to allow abortion eventually to be performed legally for the two biggest reasons, namely, unmarried mothers, and foolproof birth control.

Deformed embryos are most often naturally aborted without any intervention of man’s part. Seriously deformed babies usually die shortly after birth.

Pregnancies resulting from incestuous relations are given as a reason why abortion laws should be liberalized. The number of incestuous conceptions is quite small and furthermore, why should a child resulting from incest not be permitted to live? When Lot’s two daughters committed incest with him, the resulting two sons, Moab and Benammi were permitted to live becoming the fathers of the people of Moab and Ammonites. Had Moab been aborted Ruth would not have been an ancestor of Christ. God forbids incest and clearly sets its boundaries, declaring it to be an abomination in His eyes. If anyone is to be put to death for incest let it not be the poor children but the wicked parents who engage in it.

Rape is another basic reason given for abortion. Here again the poor infant is the one who is to die for a crime it had no part in. No one is suggesting the death penalty for rapists. Yet we doubt whether there are very many conceptions resulting from *genuine* rape. But it is nonetheless strange that this relatively rare occurrence should be used as an argument to legalize abortion while it is *never* used as an argument by these same lawmakers urging the death penalty for those who commit rape. In fact, we generally find that the same liberal crowd that agitates for the abolition of capital punishment and crusades for greater leniency toward criminals and sex perverts is here calling for the law to permit the murder of poor defenseless infants still in their mother’s womb! A strange combination indeed. Free criminals but murder infants.

We are told that it is merciful to the unborn to take their life if they cannot be assured of a “full life” free from defects and be guaranteed parents who will love and want them. Actually it is not the unborn who is the *chief* concern; it is the parent and the rest of society. Rather than have another burden thrust upon itself, the parent and the rest of society urge the elimination of the burden before it is born. Why be so hypocritical about it and talk about “merciful” abortions when in reality it is selfish abortion performed for the relief and satisfaction of the parent and society.

Mercy killing is totally in violation of the 5th commandment regardless of circumstances. We have no right to condemn an unborn child to death because it has been conceived out of wedlock. No one can take authority over his own life as though this were a matter of his own decision. Though of our flesh and blood, our children are separate persons, with their own identity, their own personal body and soul. No one has a right to say that this is part of my body before birth and I can decide what to do with this unborn child!!!

The statistics that 500 mothers die every year at the hands of quack abortionists who use primitive, unsterile techniques is used to justify allowing the law to permit women to go to hospitals to have their abortions performed under safe conditions. It is cruel for these mothers to have to suffer. Will it not also be cruel when hospitals have to turn away married mothers who want to have their babies delivered because the hospital is full beyond capacity and their obstetrician is too crowded and busy aborting and caring for women who want to rid themselves of their bastards. Imagine adding to the already crowded conditions of our maternity wards some 200,000 to a million (the number of illegal abortions in the U.S. one year ago) additional abortion patients. Why not arrest and jail the quacks so they cannot murder any more babies along with their mothers.

What may seem to be the happiest solution to a problem facing young woman may produce a far greater problem, later on in life. Who can predict the psychological result in later years from an abortion consented to by a mother seeking to dodge the responsibilities of life or the consequences of her own actions? Who can imagine the guilt that could overwhelm a woman during the period of life when her body’s hormonal balance is changing? Menopause guilt over all sorts of things is a familiar syndrome which ushers in insanity for many women. Consider the woman tormented by guilt over an abortion she consented to years earlier. All the reasons in the world telling her that the abortion was “necessary” or “justified” are likely to have little effect. Consider the difficulty of a pastor seeking to bring the woman to accept the forgiveness of God through Jesus Christ. He must first of all bring the woman to understand that she needs the blood of Christ shed for her sins. But all her life she has been told that abortion is not a sin. The sin is driving her insane with guilt but she cannot face it that it, was a sin and so repent. The pastor who seeks to bring the woman to a cleansing repentance of her sin is merely brushed aside as a “cruel” “old fashioned” preacher. Perhaps he will even be blamed when the woman is committed to a state hospital.

We have given consideration to some of the arguments presented to justify “legalized” abortion. They are very logical and would seem to be legitimate. When confronted with the problem personally, or in one’s own family, or professionally, a sympathetic person, moved purely on the basis of human emotion, can be easily influenced by them. A woman that is expecting a child under the circumstances mentioned, is personally, physically, and emotionally involved. Off-hand answers will not suffice. We as God’s children, want a God-pleasing answer, a God-pleasing decision.

We once more turn to the Scriptures and list a few salient points. Life is a creation of God. The miracle of conception and the birth of a human being is God’s marvelous creation. Man is God’s creation (Gen. 1:26,27). The miracle of procreation is God’s creation and order (Gen. 1:27,28; 2:18,21-24). Though God has given man and wife the privilege of conceiving children, it is still God who gives us life (Job 33:4; Ps. 119:73; Job 10:11-12). Hence children are a “gift” of God (Ps.127:3). Each child born has not only a body but also an immortal soul (so precious that Jesus Christ died to redeem it!!) (Gen. 2:7). Life is therefore to be cherished and protected for God stringently forbids taking life (Ex. 20:13; Dt. 5:17; 32:39; Lev. 24:17; Gen. 9:6; Ps.22:9; 31:15; Is. 44:2; 58:7; 1 John 3:17). Life is also man’s time of grace during which the Lord seeks to lead his soul to faith and redemption (Is. 55:6,7; Mt. 5:45).

Thus abortion clearly violates God's Word, Will, and Rule. Ending a pregnancy that has come about by the violation of the 6th commandment, out of wedlock, would be compounded by adding to it the violation of the 5th commandment, "Thou shalt not kill!"

Who has given man the right to arbitrarily declare and establish that an unborn child is a human being only then when it can live by itself, away from the mother's body, her blood and nourishment? Surely God has not given us such authority!

Not to forget—we must not despise and reject God's gracious forgiveness, preservation, sustaining grace, and strength to bear our burdens which would result from any situations as mentioned earlier. It would seem to us that this entire subject reveals a decadent, immoral, unmoral generation. Those who contend for abortion display a view of life that considers material, temporal conveniences and comfort above all else. The idea that life is a test of faith is not even considered. The possibility that God can work great blessings in a family when great challenges and difficulties are courageously accepted and met by faith is discounted. Abortion is merely another device of man designed to eliminate everything in this life that does not suit him irrespective of what God has ordained. It is making himself God.

30 years ago it would have been unthinkable to have an essay on abortion nor to hear of ministers supporting and advocating this practice. Today the situation is almost completely reversed. He who contends against abortion is in the clear minority. A person shudders to think of what the pastors 30 years from now will have to contend against if the world lasts so long. God tells us that, in the last days, we can expect that and that the moral conditions will be at low ebb. "Men will be lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God" and "without natural affection" (2 Tim 3:2). What could be more devoid of natural affection than for a mother to consent to the murder of her unborn child because it may be defective, because it may be too much of a burden, because it resulted from a sin, nay for any reason. In the last times false teachers will arise to teach things simply to satisfy the lust of their hearers (2 Tim. 4:3,4). "And many shall follow their pernicious ways: by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you; whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not" (2 Pet. 2:2,3).

That the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth is very evident in this matter. The moral attitude of society today does not hinder ambitious men from putting their plans into operation; rather, it is the small remnant of God-fearing, evangelical-minded Christians who hold the Word of God as the norm and standard of life that frustrates the designs of those who seek to remove the rights of individuals. For those who are inclined to make this world the center of their attention, and are convinced that the solution to man's many problems rests in man himself, they will not tire to put down the overprincipled elements in society, to squeeze out by legislation, social rejection, those who resist to have their Christ-centered conscience silenced and numbed. It appears that the Christian Church is in for some difficult times in the very near future. As Paul says: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places" Eph. 6:12). One reads various remarks and articles every so often directed against conservative Christianity, it being an obstacle for the welfare of our society, when controlling birth is concerned. A quote from *True* (Jan.1971):

If we are to escape world destruction, our beliefs, our aspirations, our ideals, must be centered upon this world exclusively, and we must all be very sure that, just as it is man alone that is destroying the world, so it must be man alone—*alone*—who must save the world.

Once we make up our mind to deal with the world like men and not like puppets waiting for the string-puller, we must next tackle the matter of motherhood.

You can be sure that the humanist will use every device he has to accomplish his end in establishing zero growth population or less. He will attack the Church openly; he will by legal, economic and social coercion silence the Christian who is labeled as overprincipled. This attempt is obvious when such titled as "Motherhood-Who Needs It?" is a lead article in the September *Look Magazine* which attacks the blessing God

gave man; namely, the promise and opportunity to bring forth children. Scripture is cited and misused to establish doubt and mistrust in God's Word. E.g.:

Originally, it was the word of God that got the ball rolling with "Be fruitful and multiply," a practical suggestion, since the only people around then were Adam and Eve. But in no time, super-moralists like St. Augustine changed the tone of the message: "Intercourse, even with one's legitimate wife is unlawful and wicked where the conception of the offspring is prevented," he, we assume, thundered. And the Roman Catholic position was thus cemented. So then and now, procreation took on a curious value among people who viewed (and view the pleasures of sex as sinful. One could partake in the sinful pleasure, but feel vindicated by the ensuing birth. Motherhood cleaned up sex. Also it cleaned up women, who have always been considered somewhat evil, because of Eve's transgression ("..but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet woman will be saved through bearing children..." 1 Tim. 2:14-15), and somewhat dirty because of menstruation (*Look*, Sept. 1970, p. 15).

This attempt to defame that which God intended as a blessing is a far cry from what the Lord, concerning child-bearing, inspired the psalmist to write: "Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine by the sides of thine house; thy children like olive plants round about thy table" (Ps. 128:3).

In all of this it finally becomes evident that the strong push toward the reform of laws in regard to abortion is because the world is losing or has lost a godly view of sex. It is less and less considered a blessing and a precious gift of God which is to be used wisely and responsibly in conformity with His Word. Sex is becoming sex for its own sake, a biological function, without the thought that God has given a tremendous power to man, to propagate. As a result, free love, loosening of morals and unwillingness to accept the responsibility for the results of using the gift called sex is ever gaining the ascendancy. Hence it is not surprising in such a moral climate that pressures are being brought to make it legally possible to rid oneself of the inconvenience germinating in the womb. If you don't want it, get rid of it. One hardly needs to be a theologian to see the misery and heartache that is caused by a careless and irresponsible attitude toward God's directives in a proper uses of this gift called sex.

Another influence, briefly, which plays into the picture is the Women's Lib movement. In striving to throw off the shackles of male domination, the home and children no longer, for this group, has appeal in its present form. Though we don't want to go into a detailed evaluation of this, we can see, where God's natural order of creation is abrogated, many additional problems do arise. Contrary to God's establishment of child-bearing as a God-pleasing function of the woman, the cry goes up that women should have a right to say what happens to their bodies. We agree that women should not be used, but when one couples this cry with the extreme position on abortion of the American Civil Liberties Union—June 1967, this plea takes on a more sinister form. "It is the civil right of a woman to seek to terminate a pregnancy, and of a physician to perform or refuse to perform, an abortion without the threat of criminal sanctions." In short this is "Abortion on demand" and is becoming a popular expression and could by and by find its way into legal form. A Word of God to be remembered in this connection is the one by Paul to the Corinthians: "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God and ye are not your own. Ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are God's." This should be enough for a Christian.

We are Christians! Christian decisions must be made by us. We dare not be engulfed by that which is readily accepted by the world. It should also be most clear that whether the Government legalizes abortion or not, just like divorce, it is God's Word that governs us! In this matter we will be very sensitive to God's Word. We will wish to recall how precious this miracle of birth really is. We will also be ready to testify concerning God's Will whenever the occasion arises and, for that reason, also be fully aware of what the Scripture's say so that we will know what to say—that human life from conception to eternity, is so precious to God as to send His dear Son to suffer and die and rise again that each human being may live with Him forever.

Our task, therefore, is not to make this world a better place to live (that has never been the task of the Church), but to proclaim to this world God's Word in Law and Gospel. We have to show how a Christian individual and the Christian congregation his to live and can live to be a living witness to the eternal truth of God. May God grant us His grace to carry out that task!

Gerhard H. Geiger