ABORTION AND THE CHURCH

Written by Dr. Max E. Anders, former pastor of Grace Covenant Church, Austin, Texas

INTRODUCTION

There are four reasons for Grace Covenant Church to present a statement on the sanctity of human life and the issue of abortion:

1. In a congregation as large as ours, with a significant influx of new people regularly, there is always the possibility that there are some who are still evaluating their position on the matter.
2. It is important to reconfirm and formalize the historic position of Grace on this matter.
3. We want to express solidarity with the national emphasis on the Sanctity of Life.
4. We want to present a clear call to action.

We begin by reminding ourselves of the biblical teaching on the inherent value of human life...

BIBLICAL TEACHING ON THE INHERENT VALUE OF HUMAN LIFE

1. Man was created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26 27 Ps. 139:14 16)
2. This image invested man with inherent value in God’s eyes. (John 3:16)
3. This value is inherent at the moment of conception. (Jeremiah 1:5 God knew and consecrated Jeremiah before he was born.)

   Luke 1:15 John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Spirit in his mother’s womb. There is no record that the Holy Spirit ever filled anything other than a person. That makes John the Baptist a person before he was born.

   Matthew 1:20 The angel told Joseph “that which is conceived in (Mary) is of the Holy Spirit.” It is unlikely that Jesus was not incarnate at the moment that the Holy Spirit conceived life in Mary’s womb.

These passages carry little weight with someone who has already decided that he does not believe the Bible. However, if a person accepts the Bible, he must conclude that God considers a person to be a person from the moment of conception. No other time can reasonably be held.

THE LEGAL TEACHING ON THE INHERENT VALUE OF HUMAN LIFE

1. The Declaration of Independence

   “We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

2. Based on this principle, the laws of the United States are designed to protect all people equally under the law.
How is it, then, that it is lawful for children to be aborted? The only way that abortion could be considered legal is to rule that the unborn child is not a person. If a 7 1/2 month old baby is inside the womb, it is not a person. If a 7 1/2 month old baby is outside the womb, it is a person, according to the law.

**THE FLAWS IN THE LAW**

1. **Constitutional Considerations**

   The Constitution does not determine when a person becomes a person. Therefore, the Constitution does not speak to the issue of a woman’s rights in this case. If the unborn child is not a person, then the woman has a right over her body. If the unborn child is a person, then the woman does not have the freedom to take that other person’s life.

   Nowhere do the plain words of the Constitution even hint at a “right” so sweeping as to permit abortion at any time up to the time the child is born, based solely on the discretion of the mother.

   Therefore, the Supreme Court did not have the right to make this decision. If the decision were going to be made, it should have been made at the polls. Therefore, either the Supreme Court must reverse its decision, or a Constitutional Amendment must be passed to clarify the law which the Supreme Court is commissioned to uphold.

   The Dred Scott decision of 1857 was a decision which the Supreme Court made deciding that black slaves were not people in the fullest sense of the word. That is how they were able to condone slavery... and not afford blacks full legal rights under our Constitution. Such decisions regarding the worth of other men are only in the province of God.

   The Roe vs. Wade decision is the same miscarriage of justice as the Dred Scott decision.

2. **Logical Considerations**

   It is commonly said by pro-abortionists that the woman has a right to control her own body. That would be accurate if it were only her body that were at stake. However, there are two bodies at stake, and a woman does not have the right to do anything she pleases with her own body if it costs the life of another body.

   Consider this:
   - the fetus is separate from the mother
   - the mother is a woman, the child may be a boy
   - the mother has one blood type, the child may have another
   - the mother has one gene pool, the child has another.
   (Regardless of what one’s position is on test tube babies, one thing is for sure... the baby is not part of the mother at any time. Dependent on her, for sure, but a separate and distinct human life.)
   - from the moment of conception to the moment of birth, through natural death, nothing is ever added to the union of egg and sperm except nutrition. Growth is the only thing necessary for the full expression of human ness.
   - when the pro-abortionists say that abortion is a private matter between a woman and her physician, they are forgetting someone.
THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE ROE VS. WADE DECISION

1. The Slippery Slide Syndrome

One of the most ominous implications of the Roe vs. Wade decision is that it puts us on a slippery slide toward other decisions which violate the inherent worth of man, and there is no logical place to stop. Infantacide is the next issue on the slide, followed by euthanasia of the old, followed by who knows what.

In 1973, when Roe vs. Wade was passed, pro abortionists people said, “Oh, that will never happen. Abortion will never be followed by infantacide.” But ten years later, it did happen. A baby in Indianapolis, Indiana was born with Down’s Syndrome, and needed a routine surgical procedure to unblock its esophagus to be able to eat. The parents did not want the procedure performed, and so, upheld by a judge, the baby was allowed to starve to death in full view of the nation simply because it was retarded. The issue is, however, that it was allowed to starve to death simply because it was unwanted. If we allow a child to be put to death because the reason why it was unwanted was that it was retarded, then the next step is to allow the child to be put to death for some other reason. There is no place to get off the slide.

Recently a Nobel Prize winning scientist suggested that if a handicapped child were not declared fully human until three days after birth, then all parents could be allowed the choice.” In other words, institute a “quality control” procedure to see if newly born human beings measure up to the desires of the parents.

The point is, those with power want to deny that every human life has intrinsic, sacred worth. They insist that a member of the human race must have certain qualities before they accord him or her status as a human being. The ultimate consequence of this is, of course, Hitlerism. He wanted to decide who lived and who died based on his criteria.

The value of any human life must never be determined by another human being. Eventually, that decision will result in the most heinous treatment of human beings the world has ever seen.

Abraham Lincoln once wrote, “I should like to know of taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal, upon principle and making exceptions to it where it would stop. If one man says it does not mean a Negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man?”

That is the principle of the Slippery Slide. There is no place to stop.

2. The Principle of Human Worth

President Reagan wrote, in THE CONSCIENCE OF A NATION:

“We must all educate ourselves to the reality of the horrors taking place. Doctors today know that unborn babies can feel a touch within the womb, and that they respond to pain. But how many Americans are aware that the abortion techniques are allowed today, in all 50 states, that burn the skin of a baby with a salt solution, in an agonizing death that can last for hours?”

Another example: several years ago, the Philadelphia Inquirer ran a Sunday special supplement on the “Dreaded Complication.” The dread complication referred to in the article — the complication feared by doctors who perform abortions — is the survival of the child despite all the painful attacks during the abortion procedure. Some unborn children do survive the late term abortions the Supreme Court has made legal. Is there any
question that these victims of abortion deserve our attention and protection? Is there any question that those who don't survive were living human beings before they were killed?

Whether we are talking about pain suffered by unborn children, or about late-term abortions, or about infanticide, we inevitably focus on the humanity of the unborn child. Each of these issues is a potential rallying point for the sanctity of life ethic. Once we as a nation rally around any one of these issues to affirm the sanctity of life, we will see the importance of affirming this principle across the board.

Malcomb Muggeridge, the English writer, goes to the heart of the matter: “Either life is always and in all circumstances sacred, or intrinsically of no account; it is inconceivable that it should be in some cases the one, and in some the other.”

Francis Schaeffer wrote: “It was not many years ago that when we heard stories brought back to us from other countries when they threw their babies out to starve to death that we recoiled in horror and thought of them as barbarians. Now we are the barbarians.”

THE FINAL BLOW

We need to trace back all these issues to their origin to understand what is really at stake. Where is the bottom line drawn? When we condone the taking of any innocent human life, both humanness and God are attacked.

1. The Destruction of Humanness.

It is not just babies that are lost. It is humanness. Man made in the image of God has lost its meaning. Humanness has lost its inherent and infinite value and man has become merely an animal, and therefore, it is not inconsistent to treat him as an animal. The law of the jungle becomes the law of the land: the survival of the fittest. Babies are not able to defend or protect themselves, and so they are destroyed.

2. The Destruction of God.

A lower view of man results from a lower view of God. Ultimately, abortion is an attack on God.

When the liberal theologians killed God in the 60’s, they signed the death warrant for the 20 million babies that have been killed since 1973. If man were what God says he is, man would not dare take his life in this way. To gain the freedom to kill man this way, you must first have killed God.

In the Old Testament, when the Israelites turned their back on God, they committed unspeakable atrocities, the most glaring of which was to offer their living babies as living sacrifices to Molech, and they burned them alive. The same thing which allowed such insensitivity in the Old Testament allows such insensitivity in the New Testament. When man turns his back on God, his darkened heart is capable of hideous inhumanity to other men. But we must understand that abortion does not stand alone. The same spirit that has produced abortion on demand has produced an acceptance of homosexuality, drugs, rock and roll music, free sex, pornography, child abuse, and a general self-centeredness that says, don’t tell me what to do. If it feels good, I will do it. We are simply seeing what the opposite of God is. When we look at these awful social issues, we are staring in the face of Satan.
It is good, right and just to fight these social evils. But we must understand that at the heart of them all is a turning away from God. This is a glaring example of the fact that righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.

If we can call a nation to repentance, we address a host of evils. If we call a people to righteousness, we challenge the root cause.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, then, we must ask ourselves, how should we respond to this moral cancer that is eating at the life of our nation? What can we as Christians do?

1. **We can pray regularly that:**
   - the hearts of people would be turned in regard to this matter.
   - that the laws of our country would be changed.

2. **We can live righteous lives ourselves.**

   Christians in America are morally camouflaged. We blend in with the people around us. We do not stand out in distinction against the bleak background of American moral standards. There are three areas in which we must stand out in moral relief when compared to the people around us:
   - We must be ethical. Honesty, integrity, and moral uprightness must be characteristic of us in our neighborhoods and in the workplace. We must be careful, even in the little things, to live a life above reproach by other people.
   - We must be excellent. We must give testimony to the God we serve by doing things as well as we can possibly do them. It means we work hard and do as good a job as we can in the workplace. It means that we keep our yards mowed so that the neighbors are pleased to live next to us. It means that we reflect our commitment to God as well as we can with the talents and resources that we have.
   - We must love others... how we treat others must be a hallmark of our lives. We must treat others with dignity and respect. We must speak well, not only removing from our vocabulary improper speech, but also building up and encouraging one another. Showing kindness and deference as we serve others with our lives.
     - Honest to a fault...
     - Excellent to a “T”...
     - Loving to the last person.

   As we let these three characteristics typify our lives, we stand out in bold relief against the dismal background of American values. We contribute to the preservation of moral values and godliness.

3. **We can share our faith, and actively seek to win others to Christ.**

   We ought to be doing this anyway, but sometimes there are things in our lives that jump out at us and motivate us to do something we ought to have been doing anyway. The more committed Christians there are, the fewer people there are to support a pro abortion position.
4. We can vote, and write our congressmen and other elected officials letting them know of your position on the sanctify of human life.

5. We can support pro-life causes.

Crisis Pregnancy Centers, housing for unwed mothers, Christian adoption agencies, and Right to life organizations - all have a severe shortage of funds.

6. We can become involved in the organized pro-life movement on whatever level we are comfortable.

When we think of doing what we can to fight abortion, typically we think only of picketing and protesting. That may be an option which many will choose. But all of us should be involved in prayer, righteous living, sharing our faith, and supporting the democratic process. If more of us were involved in those, we would not be fighting so desperately on other levels.

Whatever we do, the level of involvement we choose is up to us individually. We can love God and do as we please (remember that loving God means saturating ourselves with His word, praying to Him sufficiently, and obeying Him). But if we are loving God, we can do as we please in this matter. He will lead us to the level of involvement He wants us to have.

But we do not see anyone’s involvement being less than to pray, to live overtly righteous lives, sharing our faith, by voting, and by supporting Christian values through the democratic process. We even think it is hard to avoid supporting unwed mothers. If we do not want them to have an abortion, we must provide alternatives for them. And God may call some of us into direct involvement with the organized pro-life movement. Forgetting about it is not an option. We must pray and ask God what He would have us to do.

So there you have it... our position as a church.

* We stand firmly and overtly on the sanctity of human life, on the inherent and infinite value of all human life, and on the urgent need to uphold the image of God in man.

* We urge every Christian to assume personal responsibility for advancing this value, on whatever level he feels a personal conviction.

So there is much to be done, and if enough of us become involved on the level that God leads us, our impact will be felt.