

There are "legal" reasons for abortion that are accepted by a large segment of society: rape, incest, deformation of fetus and factors of this nature. We can become emotionally sympathetic with a woman or girl who was maliciously molested by a sex maniac, or an unfortunate victim of incest, or innocently responsible for a mutated fetus because of medication, etc. But though we can be sympathetic, though we regret, though we have compassion, are our feelings sufficient reason for taking a life? Permit me to quote from Pieper's Christian Dogmatics, vol. III, P. 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. 1:9 Paul confesses in the name of all Christians: "God hath saved us and called us in Christ Jesus before the world began."

What if Jeremiah's mother decided to abort? Je. 1:5 "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and ordained thee a prophet unto the nations."

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 us the opportunity in order that they might "be saved and come unto the knowledge of 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.

The question should be asked, "Who has the right to determine when an abortion is to be performed?" According to the present status of our laws in the State of Wisconsin, it is the mother who has the right to determine birth or abortion of her child. According to the Legislative Bulletin, No. 61, Part IV, titled "INVASION OF PRIVATE RIGHTS" -

"The ninth amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

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

"An examination of recent Supreme Court pronouncements regarding the ninth amendment compels our conclusion that the State of Wisconsin may not, in the manner set forth in §§940.04(1) and (5), Wis. Stats., deprive a woman of her private decision whether to bear her unquicken child."

In the case of a therapeutic abortion two or more competent physicians consult to determine what should be done for a pregnant mother and the unborn child when it is obvious that one or the other's life is at stake. If the decision is proposed to terminate the life of the fetus, the mother and/or father are advised so that they may approve such a decision. With "abortion on demand" it may be expedient to ask for the husband's or the father's consent, but in some states it is not legally required. When competent physicians work with a pregnant woman, they consider that they have two patients, not only one, namely, the mother. But as we noted above the law in the State of Wisconsin recognizes only the mother having rights to life, as well as also having the right to deprive her unborn child of life. Our Lord says, "I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal." De. 32:39. Furthermore, the times of our life are set by God as David acknowledges, "My times are in Thy hand." Ps. 31:15. The numerous references in Scripture of being called from the womb, e.g. Ps. 22:9, Is. 44:2, Is. 49:1, Je. 5:1, that only God has the right to add or take from the embryonic life in the mother's womb.

The Bible says, "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." Ge. 8:21. In our enlightened age of technology that imagination has not diminished in activity or evil. The thought of mandatory birth control is already seriously considered. Rushdoony reports the remarks of Prof. H. Bentley Glass at Johns Hopkins University concerning birth control in the future.

The married couple of the future may need a special permit to have children...permits for a first and second child would be easy to get from the licensing agency...the first child would get a tax exemption.. a second child would be licensed, too, although there would not be a second exemption. Instead of gaining an exemption for a third child, even if licensed, a couple would have \$600 added to their taxable income. p. 32, The Myth of Over Population.

Dr. Sam McClatchie, M.D., believes that "Social Man" must face radical and total control by the state, the United Nations specifically, over birth. The scientific means for such control are very nearly available, we are told; vaccination against conception:

"I am presuming that, several generations from now, there has been no major war and extreme over-crowding is the problem of the day. Struggling desperately with the task, the United Nations have finally come together and brought forth a "Bill of Survival Rights," backed by the power of the United Nations countries, creeds and races. Vaccination against conception long banned in many areas, is now legal and in fact compulsory.

"To preserve the rights of the individual, all persons, except those obviously unfit by reason of severe hereditary, mental or physical defect, would be allowed to reproduce themselves, that is, each couple might have two children. After achieving this, most would be vaccinated. Certain males of superior qualification, if married to equally acceptable

wives, would be allowed to have large families. If their wives were unacceptable, artificial insemination from these males into suitable women, (probably with consent of their unsuitable husbands, with some sort of compensation for their wounded pride) might be done. Stored semen from great men of the past could be used in specially selected cases. An extension of this idea, which would infringe more on our cherished right of selection, would be to refuse marriage licenses to those considered unsuitable, or give them conditional licenses in which the number of children allowed, either natural or by insemination, would be part of the contract. One further advance in knowledge, the transplantation of ova from one female to another, and possibly the storage of ova, would enable us to preserve the characteristics of desirable women as well. Such transplants have already been done in animals. The effect on the ugly duck mother of producing a swan I leave to the psychiatrists and the authors of new children's fairy tales. Myth of Over Population, Rushdoony, p. 33.

The thought of mass sterilization by introducing into the food stuffs an element which would sterilize the male has been considered. One would have to obtain permission to go to a "pure food" store where such sterilizing elements are not introduced in order to become virile, and thus bring about conception.

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 frustrate 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, will not tire to put down the overprincipled elements in society, to squeeze out by legislation, social rejection, and direct or indirect taxation those who resist to have their Christ-centered conscience silenced and numbed. It appears that the Christian Church is in for some difficult times again in the very near future. As Paul says, "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Ep. 6:12. Out of the 7 magazines that I purchased off of newsstands, magazines which would be considered by and large as family magazines, there were three articles which made specific remarks against conservative Christianity, it being an obstacle for the welfare of our society, when controlling birth is concerned. Typical is the remark in 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." p. 33

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. For instance:

"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 prevent," 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 Timothy, 2:14-15) and somewhat dirty because of menstruation." Page 15. Look, Sept. 1970.

This attempt to defame that which God intended as a blessing is a far cry from what the Lord concerning child-bearing inspired Solomon to write: "Lo, children are an heritage of the Lord; and the fruit of the womb is his reward." Ps. 127:3. Or again as it is written, "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.

Before we go on, permit me to raise this question: "Is it wrong in every case to practice birth control within the framework of marriage?" There are three blessings pointed to in marriage: 1) Companionship - "The Lord God said, it is not good that man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him." Ge. 1:18. 2) Children - "As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man; so are children of the youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them." Ps. 127:4,5. And 3) Chastity - "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." 1 Co. 7:2.

There are marriages contracted for the sake of selfish reasons and for personal gratification. In such marriages birth control is practiced in order to be relieved of any responsibilities which children naturally introduce. Something is wrong with such a couple's mental and spiritual make-up.

However, birth control can and is a means to obtain healthier and possibly more children than if it were not practiced. Time and again we run into mothers who are no more than human incubators, wearied, physically run down, emotionally bankrupt, and even spiritually exhausted with a child in the arm, one tugging on the skirt, and another in the womb. In many cases happiness and health are truly lacking. If, however, the mother would have spaced her children so that they would have been born at two-year intervals so that she could have convalesced physically, emotionally, and mentally, it is known from statistics that the child then born has a better chance of survival, is stronger, and will definitely be enjoyed by mother and father alike, to a greater degree. We do have a fifth commandment which says, "Thou shalt not kill." This applies to the mother as well as to the unborn child. By practicing good stewardship of body and life, mothers will be able to produce more and healthier children. It is interesting to note that in some tribes in Africa there is a birth control method that is applied for the sake of spacing their children. It is practiced at the expense of their husbands' continence, but it is effective for the woman. The mother will not have any relation with her husband until the child is weaned. The African mother normally does not wean her child until it is two years old. And where venereal disease does not sterilize the man or the woman, families are of great size.

Family planning, however, takes on strange and bizarre dimensions in the minds of humanists and godless men of science. For instance, in the Milwaukee Journal magazine called Insight, April 4th issue, laboratory sex was revealed. Test tube babies are more than a biologist experiment away. Although I have no evidence to support this statement, there are enough inferences in general reading to make one believe that more than experiments are known in the matter of biological reproduction - namely, that the ovum is fertilized by the sperm in a test tube. The result is a test tube baby. My reading in various magazines and books on reproduction where this subject is brought up, I have not read where this procedure has failed. Robert T. Francoeur, associate professor of experimental embryology at Fairleigh Dickinson University, New Jersey, writes:

"The research into new modes of human reproduction now going on in biology laboratories around the world is forecasting a dilemma for man. It strikes at the very heart of human society because it deals directly with the relationship between husband and wife. Our exploding technology of human reproduction promises startling ways in which man may reproduce his image."

"With the development of the technique for freezing human eggs and sperm for later use in artificial insemination programs, embryologists are forcing a confrontation with traditional values and practices."  
Insight, April 4, 1971.

We are not now talking about science fiction; we are talking about science accomplishment. We are not talking about the 21st century; we are talking about our day and our age. With the stress on birth control, with the lobbyists pushing birth control legislation, with the talk of penalizing large families over our TV and radio today, with the practice of artificial insemination in our day, we must be ready to give an answer to our troubled people, to give direction in a world of confused values, and to give such answers that are the result of careful studies of our present moral trends in the light of Scripture. This paper, as you are most capable of evaluating, is no more than an introduction to the serious problems that are before us. Permit me to raise some questions now concerning artificial insemination for various reasons:

- Q 1) Most women are repulsed by the idea of having another man's seed to fertilize her egg. If the husband is the reason for her failing to conceive, could not another raise up seed as the husband's substitute?
- If not, why not? Does 1 Co. 7:2 apply here?
- Q 2) Would artificial insemination be tantamount to adultery? If it is, why? Would it be grounds for divorce?
- Q 3) Could it be possible that a single woman would have artificial insemination? If so, would it be an illegitimate birth? Would it be considered adultery?
- Q 4) If a pregnancy by artificial insemination is accepted, would then only the matter of lust for a woman be adulterous as in Mt. 5:28: "That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart"? In this passage is not the Lord pointing to the obvious sin that would be demonstrated physically that is already committed mentally?
- Q 5) If artificial insemination is tolerated, could one not rationalize then that any sexual union could accomplish the same thing?
- Q 6) Can you see how Christ-centered theology is going to be a real stumbling block for our progressive humanists? If the answer is yes, then truly we must be prepared for some real problems that are already upon us.

In closing now, I would like you to acquire for your library the book titled Planned Parenthood, Alfred M. Rehwinkel, CPH; and especially The Myth of Over-Population, Rousas J. Rushdoony, Craig Press. Rushdoony has many passages which are of great interest in dealing with blessed and unblessed fertility.

In the service of our Savior,

Robert L. Sawall  
Bethany Ev. Lutheran Church