



## Abortion & Lies

by Ronald L. Dart

Suppose a young couple have brought a baby into the world, and now they've decided *they don't want it*. The reason could be almost anything. Maybe they can't afford it. Maybe they've already got four children, and a fifth is just going to be more than they can handle. Or maybe the baby is the wrong gender: they wanted a boy and they got a girl. Or (perish the thought) the child is handicapped: maybe it has Down's Syndrome; or perhaps it was born blind, perhaps lame, perhaps deaf.

Would it be wrong...I mean, how do we feel as a society if this young couple should decide, since they don't want the child...would it be wrong for them to kill the child?

Now please, I'm asking this question seriously; because in the great debate going on right now in our land over questions of life and choice there's got to be common ground somewhere. Do we as a society have the right to force parents to take care of their children? Can we put parents in jail because they abuse their children? Or (God forbid) they go off on a vacation someplace and they're gone for a week, week and a half, and they left behind children that are far too young to take care of themselves; and the children get in trouble. Can we punish that couple for child neglect?

Well, *of course* we can. *Of course* we have the right to force parents to take care of their children. *Of course* we have the right to punish them in cases of child abuse, child neglect, or (God forbid) infanticide. We believe it is the responsibility of the community, of society, to protect children—to protect children from *their own parents* when it's necessary. And sometimes it is tragically necessary. Any society that does not protect children does not deserve to survive. Any society that does not exalt life over death does not deserve to survive.

Until very recently I would have said we had common ground in this country on the question of infanticide. We're a modern people. We're divorced from the old superstitions of the past. We're a progressive people. We can feed all the babies that will be born among us. We don't have to starve some of them to death or, let's say, neglect them to death by putting them out on the ice or burying them in the sand and killing them, because we can't afford to feed them. We've got plenty of food to give to children. We don't have to kill off female babies because we fear they'll never find husbands, as some ancient societies have done. Because in our society women have a value *on their own*; they don't have to have a husband to have a life.

We don't need to kill off our babies as some societies thought they needed to do in the past, and so consequently I would have said, "No, no, we're a modern society. We all agree that infanticide is wrong." I would have thought we are on common ground on this, whether we are pro-life or pro-choice. Now I am beginning to wonder, because partial-birth abortion seems to cross the line. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan said of partial-birth abortion, "It is as close to infanticide as anything I have come upon[...]" Now, *why* would he say that? Well, partial-birth abortion takes place very late in a pregnancy: the baby is fully formed; it moves its limbs; it reacts to stimuli; it opens and closes its fingers; and, as most expectant mothers will tell you, it can kick. In this procedure, the woman is fully dilated and the baby is turned so that he can be pulled out by its feet. When everything is out except the head of the baby—the baby can be seen moving its arms and its legs and opening closing its fingers—

the doctor then inserts scissors into the back of the skull; opens the scissors; inserts a suction tube; and sucks out the baby's brains, killing it. Only then is the dead baby removed.

Senator Moynihan says it's close to infanticide. Well, how close is it? Answer: about four inches. One more tug and the doctor will have a live baby on his hands. It may have a hard time surviving because, you know, at 24, 26, 28 weeks they are pretty young. But nevertheless, it's a baby; and for the moment it's alive. If he kills it now he has committed a crime. Four inches earlier and he has committed a medical procedure. And frankly, you and I know—and the doctor knows, Senator Moynihan knows, the press knows—the difference is pure fiction. And one wonders why it is that someone who would decry infanticide would lobby so hard to preserve such a procedure; and, in particular (pardon me), I wonder why they would *lie* about it. The abortion debate in this country is divisive enough already without the participants *falsifying* information. By now everyone knows the name of the man who confessed that he lied through his teeth trying to minimize the impact of partial-birth abortion. By now everyone knows he works for the abortion industry, he works for people who earn their living at it, he works for people who build their fortunes out of the abortion industry. They'd have to go do something else if abortion were outlawed. And so, as if he were a tobacco executive or some other type of executive who stands up and lies about his product—either to sell it, to maintain it, or to keep it out of trouble—he would lie about partial-birth abortion. But, you know, I don't think we should really be unduly surprised that someone who would choose death over life would choose lies over the truth. But I'm not a politician, and I'm not going to enter into the political debate over abortion. I can grasp the politics of pro-choice; the theology is another matter entirely.

I had a friend once who went on a big-game hunt in what was then called Rhodesia. One evening he was sitting on the porch talking to his guide, who was a white man; and they were discussing the problem of the Bantu and relations with the Bantu in South Africa and Rhodesia at the time. (The word "bantú", by the way, simply means "people". It's the term that's used in southern Africa for any person who is black.) As they carried on the conversation, my friend was startled when in the process the Rhodesian man informed him that he didn't believe that the Bantu had souls. A black man, he said, has no soul.

Now, when I thought about this several things came together: There are those who not only believe that black people had no soul, but they were the "beasts of the field" mentioned in the Bible. In other words, they were less than human. Otherwise, it was very difficult for them in centuries past to justify that particularly vile black slave trade that went. No one knows how many slaves there were who died in the ships crossing the Atlantic. It was sort of like the wastage of cargo on something that was perishable as you took it along. If a black man died in the hold, or a black woman died in the hold of the ship, they just dragged the body up topside and threw it over the side. Simple as that. No reason to worry about it; it was no more than a cow or a pig or a chicken dying to them. They weren't human; they were beasts. They were beasts of burden, they were beasts of labor, and so they were transporting them for sale to the New World so they could be sold off—terribly dehumanizing thing.

You know, something similar was going on in Nazi Germany—when the Jews were dehumanized and then carried off to be disposed of, used as slave labor for a while, and when they couldn't do that anymore just killed. There were so many of them, and the killing took on such proportions, that the Germans had to find more efficient means to dispose of them. Always, it seems, when we charge off on these terrible examples of fratricide in our world (and by "fratricide" I mean the killing off of our brothers; because we're all brothers in the skin), we dehumanize the person we're going to kill or abuse or oppress.

Now the argument is made that a fetus does not have a soul, that the fetus is less than human; therefore, what we do to it doesn't really matter. We're saving the mother's life, or we're saving the mother's livelihood, or we're saving the mother's health, or whatever other excuse we like to toss around about why we're going through this procedure. The problem with this argument about the fetus and a soul is it has a fatal weakness: A fetus may not have a soul, but then *neither do you*.

John Shelby Spong (who is Episcopal Bishop of Newark, New Jersey) wrote a book about Jesus; and in this book he made a startling statement (at least, it was startling to me). He said, quote:

Immortality of the soul is not a biblical concept.

*John Shelby Spong - This Hebrew Lord*

Now, there aren't very many concepts that are more intrinsic to Christianity than the immortality of the soul; and here is a Christian bishop—major denomination, major city, probably the dominant voice in the northeast part of the United States in his denomination—who says the idea of the immortality of the soul “is not a biblical concept”. Now, he was dead right. I wasn't surprised because I thought he was wrong, but because I was just surprised to hear it from him; and he went on to point out, correctly, that there is no word in Hebrew to express what the English word “soul” conveys. The Hebrew word often translated “spirit” or “soul” [שָׁמַיִם, nephesh, H5315] means simply *life*.

Bishop Spong went on to say that, in a biblical sense, to receive the spirit is to receive life. To be spiritual is not to be a mystic who goes away in a cave and contemplates and stares into the distance; to be spiritual is not to be a monk hidden away in a monastery; to be spiritual is to encounter life to the full and to live it to the full—to be *fully alive*.

Now, if there is one thing that science has taught us about the human fetus, it is this: The fetus *is* alive. And when the doctor pulls the baby from the womb feet-first and prepares to kill it, there are two things that are apparent: One, it is alive and it is human. And two, he is about to destroy a *human* life.

Science has told us that everything the human being is going to be—his identity, his hair color, his eye color, whether he's going to be 6'3" tall or 5'7" tall—for the most part, in a general way is determined before he's born. It's written in the DNA of the developing fetus. Oddly enough, the new science of cloning has underlined it still further. The identity *is there*. They tell us that whenever they take the DNA from whomever the original source is, that everything that needs to be there to describe what that person is going to be in a physical sense *is all there*. It is all those things that make that one person distinct from every other person who has ever lived—they are all in that DNA. You combine it with the egg of the new mother; and with the genetic material that's there, it starts to grow; because that genetic material commands it to grow in all of its parts, and you can actually recreate the original animal; and without a doubt the original human (as far as genetics will determine who they are).

Now, what you may not know is: The Bible revealed this a long, long time ago. King David knew it, for example. When he was writing his 139<sup>th</sup> psalm, he said this to God in a prayer:

**Psalm 139**

*AKJV*

<sup>13</sup> For you have possessed my reins: you have covered me in my mother's womb.

<sup>14</sup> I will praise you; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvelous are your works; and that my soul knows right well.

<sup>15</sup> My substance was not hid from you, when I was made in secret, and curiously worked in the lowest parts of the earth.

The metaphor here, folks, is that while he was in the womb and covered there that he was not hidden from God while he was being made in secret. He said in verse 16:

### Psalm 139

AKJV

<sup>16</sup> Your eyes did see my substance, yet being imperfect; and in your book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.

What a way of putting it. Actually, I think David's way is much more poetic than science—which says, “Aw, it's all written down in the DNA molecule”—and David says, “Lord, in your book all of my members were written, while they were being fashioned, when as yet there were none of them.” And David says that he had a *personality*, he had an *identity*—he was *David* in the womb—and that God knew him and knew who he was.

Jeremiah expressed a similar sentiment; because God came to him, called him, and turned him into a prophet when Jeremiah didn't very much want to be involved in that activity. And in Jeremiah 1, verse 4, he says:

### Jeremiah 1

AKJV

<sup>4</sup> Then the word of the LORD came to me, saying,

<sup>5</sup> Before I formed you in the belly I knew you; and before you came forth out of the womb I sanctified you, and I ordained you a prophet to the nations.

Now, I don't know how far you think identity can go; but here is a child who, while he was *still in the womb*, was identified as a prophet to the nations. He was set apart. He was sanctified. God *knew him* while he was in his mother's belly. And, of course, God also said, “before I formed you”...in other words, while he was still an embryo—before the form of a child took place in his mother's womb—God knew him and ordained him a prophet. Now, if he was knowable, then he had identity, didn't he? He was a *person*, he was *life*, he was *alive*, he was *human*, and God *knew* him—before he was born. Isaiah...Isaiah learned the same thing. He said:

### Isaiah 49

AKJV

<sup>1</sup> Listen, O isles, to me; and listen, you people, from far; The LORD has called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother has he made mention of my name.

He's not only known, he's known by name, from his mother's womb. So I suppose we ought to face up to the fact that, when you go through this dilation process for a woman and bring her back to the clinic after the dilation is complete, and you reach inside you could be grabbing ahold of the heels of Isaiah or Jeremiah or David—pulling him *almost* into the world; and killing a child whom God could call by name, whom God already knows, whom God was forming in the womb.

Now mind you, I'm not talking politics here. I'm talking theology. I'm standing on the Bible, and I'm looking at this thing from a biblical perspective. And don't talk to me about whether a fetus has a soul or not. Don't talk to me about whether a fetus has *life* or not. It is *alive*. It is *human*. It is made in the image of God. And those who call it a “baby” seem fully justified when one watches the terribly ugly, partial-birth abortion.

When one does an abortion, one *destroys* a human being. Theology tells us that's true. Simple logic tells us that's true. Why do you suppose this is so hard to understand? Well, one of the reasons is that we've been lied to, again and again; and it didn't start with one man lying in his teeth about the number of partial-birth abortions being performed every year in this country. It has been going on for a very long time, as pitiful women have chosen death for the new life forming inside of them rather than face life with the burden of a child; or rather than face a husband when they got pregnant when he's overseas

and it's not his child; rather than face their father who they think will kill them if he finds out they've gotten pregnant out of wedlock. And so...we lie. And all this is a lot easier to do when there is a *fabric* of lies to fall back on. I think it was C. P. Snow that wrote somewhere:

The only ethical principle which has made science possible is that the truth shall be told all the time. If we do not penalize false statements made in error, we open up the way for false statements by intention. And a false statement of fact, made deliberately, is the most serious crime a scientist can commit.

*C. P. Snow - The Search*

But science and politics and everything else has gotten corrupted in this abortion debate. Why do they lie to us? Why do they get on television and *spin* the facts in such a way as to try to make it look like what it's not? Are they afraid of us? Are they afraid the truth is not strong enough that it will prevail over error? Or do they fear the truth is not strong enough to get their way? Is it a political thing? Is it a power thing? What's going on? Well, what happens when a society chooses lying over truth, when a society chooses death over life? It's happened before, and it is written that it will happen again.

When God spoke to a prophet in ancient times and gave him a prophecy, it wasn't just because he wanted us to know what was going to happen in the future; it was because he wanted us to know *why* it was going to happen. And here we sit staring the end of the age, frankly, in the face, with a lot of the things that happened before happening again all around us; and we don't go back and look as we should to the past to understand what happened, and to understand why it's going to happen again. There's a *fascinating* prophecy in Isaiah 59. God says to Isaiah:

**Isaiah 59**

*AKJV*

<sup>1</sup> Behold, the LORD's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear:

<sup>2</sup> But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear.

And *why* won't God hear us? He continues:

**Isaiah 59**

*AKJV*

<sup>3</sup> For your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity; your lips have spoken lies, your tongue has muttered perverseness.

<sup>4</sup> None calls for justice, nor any pleads for truth: they trust in vanity, and speak lies; they conceive mischief, and bring forth iniquity.

It's painful to think of it, but the image of one whose hands are defiled with blood—the blood of the absolute, ultimate innocence: a child, a fetus—whose fingers work that death...then it is coupled with the fact that your lips have spoken lies and your tongue has muttered perverseness. It's a perfect image of the discussions you see on television when politicians and abortion advocates and others get on there to discuss whys and wherefores of what we're doing. Lies and spin. Isaiah's imagery is maybe a little hard to follow, but it's strong. He says:

**Isaiah 59**

AKJV

<sup>5</sup> They hatch cockatrice' eggs, and weave the spider's web: he that eats of their eggs dies, and that which is crushed breaks out into a viper.  
<sup>6</sup> Their webs shall not become garments, neither shall they cover themselves with their works: their works are works of iniquity, and the act of violence is in their hands.

The indictment of Israel of old reads almost like it was written yesterday for our people. He said:

**Isaiah 59**

AKJV

<sup>7</sup> Their feet run to evil, [...]

They don't just cozy over to it; they *run* to it.

**Isaiah 59**

AKJV

<sup>7</sup> [...] and they make haste to shed innocent blood: their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity; wasting and destruction are in their paths.

And I think of the *staggering waste* of human life, of maybe...now they tell me up to *35 million* potential United States citizens *destroyed* in abortion clinics. They're going up in smoke from the incinerators; or being ground up into some sort of paste to be made into cosmetics; or maybe their little organs used to transplant, to save another baby's life (which is perhaps one good that could come of the whole thing). But they have shed, he says, "innocent blood"; and there is no more innocent blood than the blood of a child.

**Isaiah 59**

AKJV

<sup>8</sup> The way of peace they know not; and there is no judgment in their goings: they have made them crooked paths: whoever goes therein shall not know peace.  
<sup>9</sup> Therefore is judgment far from us, neither does justice overtake us: we wait for light, but behold obscurity; for brightness, but we walk in darkness.

And you know *why* we do it? Because of lies. Because people won't tell the truth. I know the truth sometimes is a little hard to come by, but the *least* we can do is not lie.

**Isaiah 59**

AKJV

<sup>10</sup> We grope for the wall like the blind, and we grope as if we had no eyes: we stumble at noon day as in the night; we are in desolate places as dead men.

Why? Because we lie, that's why. Because the truth has no value.

**Isaiah 59**

AKJV

<sup>12</sup> For our transgressions are multiplied before you, and our sins testify against us: for our transgressions are with us; and as for our iniquities, we know them;  
<sup>13</sup> In transgressing and lying against the LORD, and departing away from our God, speaking oppression and revolt, conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood.

<sup>14</sup> And judgment is turned away backward, and justice stands afar off: for truth is fallen in the street[....]

I can't think of a more apt metaphor: truth lying in the street, lying in the mud. *Why* are we confused? *Why* are we wandering around in the dark? Because we have cast down truth. Says Isaiah:

**Isaiah 59**

*AKJV*

<sup>15</sup> Yes, truth fails; and he that departs from evil makes himself a prey: [...]

Other people will try to prey on the poor guy that will try to depart from evil.

**Isaiah 59**

*AKJV*

<sup>15</sup> [...] and the LORD saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment.

<sup>16</sup> And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: [...]

And so he said, "I guess I'm going to have to do it myself."

**Isaiah 59**

*AKJV*

<sup>18</sup> According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay, fury to his adversaries, recompense to his enemies[....]

Until next time, remember: Liars are losers. This is Ronald Dart; don't forget: You were *born to win*.

Transcript of a *Born to Win*  
radio program by  
Ronald L. Dart.

*Christian Educational Ministries*

P.O. Box 560 ❖ Whitehouse, Texas 75791  
Phone: 1-888-BIBLE-44 ❖ Fax: (903) 839-9311  
❖ [www.borntowin.net](http://www.borntowin.net) ❖

*Abortion & Lies*

DATE: 3/27/97

ID: 97ABO