

Abortion - A Modest Proposal

DARRIN YEAGER

2024

When Roe v. Wade was overturned in 2022 neither side expressed joy as neither side understood what it meant. Pro-life didn't suddenly become the law of the land with abortion outlawed, the issue simply returned to the states. Some states increased limits on abortion, some went the other way, but the abortion debate rages on. For Christians, the issue isn't only a medical or legal one, it's a religious one — what does the Bible say regarding abortion? Many point to one verse in Jeremiah:

Then the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; Jeremiah 1:4-5a

A verse often cited opposing abortion, and one abortion proponents squirm away from. A few Christians embrace the liberal position of abortion for any reason, while others become abolitionists with abortion disallowed for any reason. We must never shy away from tough questions and concepts, and through heated arguments a way exists to decode the puzzle, because the Bible provides a similar situation with universally agreed implementations.

Over the last few years since the debate on nationalized healthcare began, discussions shifted from the sanctity of life to quality of life. It's a small slide, but vital to notice and keep in mind to understand events. From abortion to euthanasia, society moved from respecting life to quality of life, and if that quality isn't (in someone's view) sufficient, stripping them of protections and care granted others must be allowed. Combining the godlessness of the administration and Washington with the lack of money to pay for what they've promised, society ends up as other nations attempting to promise everyone a free lunch:

If you can't justify your existence, if you're not pulling your weight in the social boat, if you're not producing as much as you consume or perhaps a little more, then, clearly, we cannot use the organizations of our society for the purpose of keeping you alive, because your life does not benefit us and it can't be of very much use to yourself.

~ George Bernard Shaw

God says He knew you before you were born. Whatever life that might be, it's not a surprise. It's not quality of life, but sanctity of life.

A few might not accept a shift occurred, but the undeniable descent steers us to an unthinkable place, yet is the desired outcome of some. Netherlands employs traveling euthanasia trucks*, because if you're sick or not "pulling your weight" as Shaw says, society has an interest in ending your life, doubly so when the government pays the bills because not enough money exists to deliver what politicians promised.

Some deny we're headed (or arrived) there, but remember John Loeffler says your failure to be informed doesn't make me a wacko; consider an article from 2012 in the Journal of Medical Ethics, titled "After-birth Abortion: Why should the baby live?"

Abortion is largely accepted even for reasons that do not have anything to do with the fetus' health. By showing that (1) both fetuses and newborns do not have the same moral status as actual persons, (2) the fact that both are potential persons is morally irrelevant and (3) adoption is not always in the best interest of actual people, the authors argue that what we call 'after-birth abortion' (killing a newborn) should be permissible in all the cases where abortion is, including cases where the newborn is not disabled. † ‡

In most abortion discussions the topic of disabled children arises, as it unites quality-of-life with pulling-your-own-weight — do terminal children with genetic diseases have permission to exist, and do they deserve government assistance to continue living? Or should they be "aborted" for the good of society?

Nonetheless, to bring up such children might be an unbearable burden on the family and on society as a whole, when the state economically provides for their care. On these grounds, the fact that a fetus has the potential to

* <https://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/mar/01/dutch-mobile-euthanasia-units>

† Giubilini, Alberto, and Francesca Minerva. "After-birth abortion: why should the baby live?." Journal of medical ethics vol. 39,5 (2013): 261-3. doi:10.1136/medethics-2011-100411

‡ <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22361296/> retrieved July 2024

become a person who will have an (at least) acceptable life is no reason for prohibiting abortion. Therefore, we argue that, when circumstances occur after birth such that they would have justified abortion, what we call after-birth abortion should be permissible.

*In spite of the oxymoron in the expression, we propose to call this practice ‘after-birth abortion’, rather than ‘infanticide’... * †*

Liberals and progressives rarely want what they’re doing discovered; most would recoil in horror if extreme liberal positions became commonly known. The authors promote infanticide pure and simple, yet rename it abortion to make it less offensive. Why they fear calling it what it is would be a good question for the paper’s writers to answer. The paper continues, and if the previous wasn’t shocking enough, the authors commit a staggering mistake holding the key to comprehending liberal politics and theology.

If a potential person, like a fetus and a newborn, does not become an actual person, like you and us, then there is neither an actual nor a future person who can be harmed, which means that there is no harm at all.

God says He knew you before you were born. Whatever life that might be, it’s not a surprise. It’s not quality of life, but sanctity of life.

The push for socialized healthcare, whether you’re for or against it, accelerates the descent into complete godlessness, as the article enforces the point when government pays for healthcare they hold the right (some would say duty) to determine who lives and who dies, as disabled people present a burden to society (according to the paper) and don’t deserve protection. Those movements make government god, the logical result from believing man continues increasing in intelligence and knowledge; and in the absence of absolute morality permit society to arbitrarily define validity of life as they choose.

Paul Harvey illustrates their folly in his discussion of abortion using a hypothetical thought exercise. Two women arrive in your office, with you as a hypothetical doctor having no moral qualms with abortion. Each presents their case, and you realize these two pregnancies proceed with considerable risk. Paul Harvey poses the question for you as the doctor, what would be your advice? Hidden behind the question remains a troubling concept, as Paul Harvey says:

In addition to all immediate considerations — physical, moral, religious — the dilemma of whether to terminate a pregnancy is a philosophical question: Might this life, if

left to live, affect the consciousness or even the destiny of mankind?

What is your decision doctor?

Whether you choose to abort or keep both pregnancies lies a chilling conclusion, as Paul Harvey continues if you advised abortion you have denied the world the genius of Leonardo da Vinci ... and spared humanity the terror of Adolf Hitler. And that, as Paul Harvey says is *the rest of the story*.

We should not play God — The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the LORD (Proverbs 16:33).‡ Once society moves from sanctity of life because God breathed it, to quality of life where man plays God and chooses who lives and who dies on a whim or who “deserves” to live, society ends up in a place we would all rather not be. It’s a *guaranteed* outcome, resulting from choosing one world view over another. One world view is man-centered (liberal, progressive, atheist), the other is God-centered (theist, Biblical); which one chosen determines the way society governs its citizens.§

Atheist	Theist
Man-centered	God-centered
Post-Modern relative “truth”	Universal Absolute Truth
Relativistic Ethics and Morals	Morality comes from God
Liberal, progressive	Biblical
Every day in every way we’re getting better and better	Entropy exists and the universe moves to disorder and chaos
Group	Individual
Interchangeable Bricks	Living stones (unique)
Quality of life	Sanctity of life
Self-centered	Others-centered
Proponents of big powerful government as man improves daily	Promotes small government as man is sinful and should hold limited power over others

It’s obvious the liberal world-view commits the same mistake Satan did — move over God, let me take over I can do it better.¶ How’d that work out? The various life-decisions illustrate the contrast between two divergent world-views — terminating a life is acceptable if you feel like it, versus life is in God’s hands and difficult decisions must be made following Biblical principals as best we can.

So what about abortion? Show the verses saying abortion is respectable (and in some cases admired) if it blocks the path of your career, or a woman thinks a baby is inconvenient. Or show the verses saying abortion is *never* allowed for any reason, the health of the mother be damned. Can’t find those? Because they don’t exist.

* Giubilini A, Minerva F After-birth abortion: why should the baby live? Journal of Medical Ethics 2013;39:261-263.

† <https://jme.bmj.com/content/39/5/261> retrieved July 2024

‡ Proverbs 16:1 in the Good News Translation “We may make our plans, but God has the last word.”

§ This does NOT mean or imply a theocracy is a good idea. A few people equate following God’s absolute morality with theocracy or forcing religion on citizens. Not true.

¶ Isaiah 14:12-16, Ezekiel 28:13-15

Medical and end-of-life decisions are gut-wrenching and never easy — people promoting quick slogan answers likely have never seriously contemplated the issue (my body, my choice on one side versus abortion is murder on the other). How do we determine correct actions when an explicit Biblical declaration doesn't exist for a situation? Begin with a simple proposition; God is logical, reasonable, and consistent, an idea obvious from studying laws of nature (i.e. Physics). Then look to Biblical principals we *do* know and explained to us, deduce using logic combined with God's nature to arrive at the proper course of action.

Consider the ten commandments, specifically Exodus 20:13 "Thou shalt not kill" or in the Amplified Bible "You shall not commit murder (unjustified, deliberate homicide)." Most modern translations use murder in place of kill, and it's universally understood occasions exist when killing isn't murder — self-defense, a doctor performing triage, capital punishment, war, to name a few.

In other words, killing exists in a range — some justifiable, others should be punished as a crime. We all understand as a matter of moral, ethical, and legal the range of possibilities, and courts and law differentiate between levels of homicide. Due to a lack of quality education in logic (who completes debate classes in high school anymore?) and deductive skills, understanding those differences might be lacking. Modern dictionaries fail to provide insight; if you desire deeper understanding Webster's 1828 or 1913 editions illuminate over current editions. From Webster's 1828 dictionary:

Murder The act of unlawfully killing a human being with premeditated malice, by a person of sound mind. To constitute murder in law, the person killing another must be of sound mind or in possession of his reason, and the act must be done with malice prepense, aforethought or premeditated.

Manslaughter In law, the unlawful killing of a man without malice, express or implied. This may be voluntary, upon a sudden heat or excitement of anger; or involuntary, but in the commission of some unlawful act. *Manslaughter* differs from murder in not proceeding from malice prepense or deliberate, which is essential to constitute murder.

Homicide The killing of one man or human being by another. Homicide is of three kinds, *justifiable*, *excusable*, and *felonious*; *justifiable* when it proceeds from unavoidable necessity, without an intention to kill and without negligence; *excusable* when it happens from misadventure, or in self-defense; *felonious*, when it proceeds from malice, or is done in the prosecution of some unlawful act, or in a sudden passion. Homicide committed with premeditated malice, is murder.

Malice Extreme enmity of heart, or malevolence; a disposition to injure others without cause, from mere

personal gratification or from a spirit of revenge; unprovoked malignity or spite.

All murder is homicide, but not all homicide is murder. Understanding the difference unlocks the continuing discussion and illuminates what thou shalt not murder means, *as it relates to the abortion controversy*.

Society (correctly) realizes the god-given right of self-defense, also drawing a distinction between an argument over a parking place and a soldier in combat, and holds harmless a doctor performing triage as he faces dreadful choices of who can be saved . . . and who won't be . . . by allocating resources and time to certain patients over others.

Those carrying signs "abortion is murder" lack English understanding.* They should read "abortion is homicide" as no malice exists for a doctor working triage asking who can be saved? And at what cost to the living?

Do protesters differentiate between a doctor saving a woman's life due to pregnancy complications and a doctor performing triage after a disaster? One being murder, the other acceptable medical treatment? For what reason? Both involve medical choices for who lives and who does not. Both result in life lost, yet authorities never charge a triage doctor as a murderer; contradictions rush in when emotion replaces logic.

For abolitionists, are they comfortable condemning their wives and daughters to death if an unfortunate medical condition arises? Similar to a socialist spending other people's money, it's *easy* for abolitionists to play with other lives — sandwich-board-slogan easy — until it affects *your* family, when the issue loses its simplicity.

Another clue arises in 1 Samuel.

Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and donkey.

1 Samuel 15:2-3

It's difficult to imagine not *one* Amalekite was pregnant.

Everyone promoting extreme positions must explain why the universally understood commandment thou shalt not murder doesn't apply to abortion as understood in other concepts — triage, self-defense, war, malice, murder.

For those declaring abortion should be legal in any circumstance (i.e. it's holding back your job promotion possibilities), what differs from entering the office and stabbing your supervisor as they're holding back your job promotion? One is justifiable, the other murder, yet what makes them different? It's already been argued *after-birth abortion* differs not from pre-birth abortion, so what distinction exists between an abortion for job possibilities and aborting your boss for job possibilities?

* A discussion of education and the failure of it is a long discussion itself, but notice as emojis replace actual discussion, society regresses on the expression front. Read anything from the Founders era in the United States and notice how far recent communication skills have dropped.

For those asserting abortion should never be legal under any circumstance, what differs from a doctor performing triage at a disaster site making decisions on who should receive treatment, and a doctor triaging a dangerous life-threatening pregnancy? One is justifiable, the other murder, yet what makes them different?

Self-defense is universally recognized as a god-given right (morally, legally, and ethically); if a villain breaks into your house you can defend yourself and your family, but assault resulting in pregnancy no longer holds the mantle of self-defense? One is justifiable, the other murder, yet what makes them different?

It's clear extreme positions on both sides contain inconsistencies and logical error; when a specific situation isn't explicitly called out in the Bible we must seize what we *do* know, mix with the characteristics of God, and logically deduce a course of action *logically consistent when viewed in complete Biblical context*. In this case, a principle from the ten commandments — thou shalt not murder — holding universally agreed characteristics (i.e. difference between homicide of the various types, manslaughter, murder, and malice) provides illumination.

It's left to people promoting various positions to explain why universally agreed ideas from thou shalt not murder do not apply to their ideas. For those undertaking the task, it must be shown *from the Bible* why explicit concepts from thou shalt not murder do not apply to their abortion position, and not some generic "God condemns abortion" or the equivalent ad-hominem 10 year-old playground attack "your face is stupid."

After considering universally accepted ideas involving

thou shalt not kill, it's obvious both pro-abortion and pro-life make as much sense as saying pro-homicide — a canyon of difference exists between a home break-in requiring self-defense, and a stick-up man killing a bank teller because they didn't stuff the bag fast enough. Both may be homicide but one is justifiable, the other a major crime. Shallow slogan-based positions for complex issues stem from people failing to examine issues.

In the end, for medical (or other thorny issues) following two paths yields comprehensive results — obtain professional (medical, legal, etc) council in the specific area, and spiritual council. Professionals might fail to include Biblical principals in their analysis, and pastors routinely lack expertise in medicine, law, math, or science. Those facing gut-wrenching medical issues with pregnancy or any other we empathize with, and providing slogan-based solutions, shaming, or excommunication perpetrates a grave disservice to people facing difficult decisions (and displays the opposite of ministry).

Conclusions can be drawn from the commandment "thou shalt not murder" to abortion and those insights must guide us when thorny issues arise, as God is consistent and logical. God has *already* provided instruction on "thou shalt not murder" and the zealots on both sides of the abortion issue would do well to explain why their position on abortion should be exempt from the clear and universally agreed commandment — in both religious and secular legal contexts — regarding terminating a life. Terminating a life may or may not be murder, may or may not be justifiable, may or may not be medically needed and may or may not be a crime.