

Two Biblical Positions That Argue Against Illegal Abortion Protest

William F. Cox, Jr.

Key words: Abortion protest, civil disobedience, parental authority, civil authority, God's sovereignty

Abstract: The highly volatile ongoing tactics of illegal abortion protest movements are typically proclaimed by proponents to be biblically sound and, in fact, biblically mandated. Taking just the opposite point of view, this article documents the wrongfulness of these illegal tactics as they actively violate two major biblical principles regarding obedience to civil authority and exclusiveness of parental authority. Parents and civil government are, in actuality, the primary law-breakers in that they have failed to act consistent with their biblically-ordained responsibilities. An alternate, biblically consistent rescue tactic is proposed, along with the proposition that others may be "more" in need of rescue than are innocent aborted babies.

In 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court, in its *Roe v Wade* decision, legalized what many believe the Bible declares to be a sin. Since that time approximately 40 million pre-born babies have been systematically and legally murdered.¹ At times individual citizens and the grass-roots ecumenical movement of Operation Rescue has attempted to physically and illegally block these legalized abortions. Others have used more extreme forms of violence, including murder. Some activists claim biblical or otherwise divine reasons for their actions. For instance, Proverbs 24:11 is interpreted as a "mandate" to break the law to blockade abortion clinics and verbally chastise those who fail to follow its lead.² It should be noted that Operation Rescue apparently no longer advocates illegal activities.³ But illegal abortion protest has not ceased.⁴

Those sympathetic to these illegal tactics bring additional supportive justification by way of what is known as "good Samaritan" laws. These civil laws legally excuse a person who breaks a civil law (like in trespassing) to

¹ U.S. Government Department of Health and Human Services, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, Abortion Surveillance – United States, 1999. Retrieved April 6, 2006 <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss5109al.htm>.

² Hess, Tom. Three Tough Questions for Randall Terry in *Focus on the Family Citizen* (June, 1989) 4-6.

³ Operation Rescue. Retrieved April 6, 2006 <http://www.operationrescue.org>.

⁴ Chapman, Kristin. Aborted Justice: *Roe v. Wade* Timeline in *WORLD* (January 21, 2006) 20-22.

prevent the breaking of a higher valued civil law (like in maliciously wounding a child). Similarly, other supporters appeal to the common law provision which allows efforts to protect a defenseless and innocent third party.

As logical and humane as these pro-rescue arguments appear, this author contends that all these illegal tactics are without biblical support and, in fact, actually violate two major biblical principles.

The purpose of this article is to document the antibiblical nature of illegal abortion-rescue type tactics. Those who agonize over the conflict between the urgings of their consciences to obey civil law and thereby not to participate in illegal protests, and the opposing claim that they are disobeying God's word if they do not "rescue" will hopefully find comfort in this writing. Further, this author presents an alternative biblically-based version of rescue tactics that provide for a proactive rather than a reactive response to murder by abortion.

To start, consider the appropriateness of those arguments that favor illegal rescuing. Right off we need to dismiss from consideration those appeals to the third-party protection and Good Samaritan laws of civil institutions for two reasons. First, such appeals emanate from civil law. Our intent is rather to seek for biblical guidelines to interpret civil responsibilities, not vice versa. Second, these laws are actually not even applicable, since currently these acts of abortion are not a civil offense. Thus, breaking civil laws (for example, trespassing) to stop abortion cannot be civilly excused because no higher valued civil law is being broken (via abortion) to excuse breaking of the less important civil laws. (Whether it is correct to break civil laws to preserve the higher valued moral or biblical law of "thou shalt not murder" as differentiated from exclusively civil law, will be answered soon but only in the specific context of abortion.)

It needs to be noted that Proverbs 24:11, a pivotal justification scripture for illegal protest, does not at all specify the tactic for rescuing. Verse 21 of the same chapter, in fact, implies that these activities are wrong, through the directive to believers to "fear the Lord and the king" (see also I Peter 2:17) and to "not join with the rebellious" (NIV). Breaking of civil law is not what is typically thought of as "fearing the king," not to mention "fearing the Lord."

APPROPRIATE BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES

To set the stage for discussing the two key biblical principles, it is necessary to see that all authority is given by God (Romans 13:1). More succinctly, there is no authority except from God. Therefore, actions by civil authorities that are not biblically correct do not axiomatically invalidate this authority and thus do not give automatic justification to private citizens to disobey such authority. For instance, the Jews did not want to pay tribute money to Caesar on the grounds that it would be a wrongful admission of the Roman right to rule. But Jesus told them in so many words to do it anyway, even while He himself protested the false claims of divinity made on the coins by the emperor (see notes to Matthew 22:17-21 and Mark 12:14-17--Zondervan NIV Study Bible). Similarly, but definitely more impactful, Jesus acknowledged the God-granted authority of civil

government to execute Him even while it did so on the basis of false charges (see John 19:11).

Civil disobedience against authority, based on the perceived wrongdoing of said authority by its citizens, if allowed, would quickly result in anarchy. After all, anyone at one time or another could thereby justify disobedience because of personally derived higher values. There is, in fact, only one way that citizens are authorized biblically to disobey while staying in submission to civil authority as the following principle indicates. This principle explains why Jesus spoke against not paying the tax (see Romans 13:6 also) and why He submitted to Pilate.

Principle #1 - We must always obey civil authority unless personally directed to disobey God.

This is the full essence of the Acts 5:29 verse, "We must obey God rather than man." The principle derives its validity from the fact that God commands us to obey authority (Romans 13:1-7; Titus 3:1; I Peter 2:13-14). We must therefore always do so unless required to obey a civil command that would cause us to disobey Him. In the example mentioned earlier, Jesus advised paying the tax imposed by civil authority (without assenting to the coin's inscription regarding Caesar's claim to divinity) since there was nothing about it that would force them to be disobedient to God, their own personal objections notwithstanding. Paying the tax is consistent with Jesus' teaching to "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's" (Matthew 22:21). We are, in fact, to obey civil authority in order to be obedient to God, but we must not obey when such authority forces us to disobey Him--this would amount to a logical impossibility. An author of confusion, He is not (I Corinthians 14:33).

Biblical examples abound in support of the above principle. For instance, the Hebrew midwives (Exodus 1:15-21); Moses' mother (Exodus 1:22-2:10); Daniel (Daniel 3:13-18); Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego (Daniel 6:7-28); the Magi with King Herod (Matthew 2:7-12); Peter and John with the Council (Acts 4:19 and 5:29); and Jesus healing on the Sabbath (John 9:13-16 and Luke 6:7-11) were all appropriately civilly disobedient because they were being directed to disobey God's ways or God's word. For illustration, consider the case of Peter and John who were ordered by the Council to stop preaching Jesus (see Acts 4:18 and again in 5:28). Yet they had no other option but to continue because they were told to preach Jesus first by Jesus in Acts 1:8 and then again by the Holy Spirit in Acts 5:20 right after their first encounter with the Council.

The authority and jurisdiction granted by God to civil leaders, even when the authority is wrong, remains intact as evidenced by the fact that in the above instances God did not interfere with the authorities' prerogative to assign punishing consequences, just that He sovereignly allowed or disallowed the occurrences or the impact of these consequences. (This point about authority is further elaborated in discussions that follow regarding principle #2.) This is probably nowhere more clearly seen than in the words by Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego--"The God we serve is able to save us . . . But if He does not . . ."

(Daniel 3:17-18). These He saved from the consequences of the fiery furnace, without abrogating the authority of the king to throw them in the furnace. While the story is different for Peter and John, the principle remains intact. God told them to keep preaching (Acts 5:20) in direct contradiction to the orders of the civil council. God did not spare these latter followers from the punishment He knew in advance they would receive from the authorities because of the civil disobedience He caused in them. In fact, they themselves acknowledged and submitted to the God-granted jurisdiction of the wrongly acting authorities to nevertheless punish them. They in fact counted it a privilege to be shamed for their Savior (Acts 5:40-41).

This principle of "obey authority unless it results in being disobedient to God" does not authorize any of the illegal protests favored by rescue proponents. Those not committing the abortions (i.e., the protesters) are not being forced to do anything in violation of God's commands, and so have no Biblical mandate to break civil laws. The claim that it would be disobedient to God not to rescue those being taken to slaughter ala Proverbs 24:11 is not a valid argument for the following reasons. First, as already discussed, Proverbs 24:11 does not specify tactics but is more an orientation regarding the preservation of human life. In fact, Proverbs are not commandments but more like statements of conventional wisdom. Second, and perhaps more important, if any of the justifying interpretations are valid, we could expect to find evidence that Jesus taught His disciples to illegally rescue all those unjustly being taken to slaughter like John the Baptist (His own natural cousin), Stephen, Peter, and even Jesus Himself. He would have also likely advised them not to pay any portion of the tribute tax that supported ungodly practices. These things, of course, Jesus did not command, nor is there evidence of any such behavior. In fact, Jesus demonstrated submission to authority and even healed the servant's ear that was cut off as a result of Peter's invalid civil disobedience (Luke 22:50-51). The enlightened Peter, in turn, directed believers to submit to civil authorities (I Peter 2:13), even those as brutal as Nero who eventually had Peter himself crucified. Third, if illegal abortion protests were biblically mandated, then considering the worth of a human life, anything short of ungodly actions toward the person of the abortionists themselves would seemingly be permitted to save the unborn child and would, in fact, be necessary to be fully obedient. Full scale civil disobedience, like destruction of abortion clinics, would have to be practiced just to stay obedient to the so-called high order biblical mandate to rescue human life. Containment of rescue actions to only "minor" acts like illegal sit-ins and other similar events would have to be construed as being wimpishly disobedient to a scriptural admonition analogous to the talent-keeper who did not aggressively pursue the master's orders to multiply the talents during his absence (Matthew 25:24-30). But obviously from what has been said up to this point, this interpretation has no biblical support.

The only biblically sound way in which principle #1 permits civil disobedience to stop abortion would be where abortion is not merely permitted but is actually mandated by civil law. In China, for instance, where families are

supposedly ordered by civil authority to abort after the first child, Biblical obedience would require civil disobedience by parents to keep from murdering their own children. But in this country, since abortion is not civilly ordered, civil disobedience is not authorized Biblically for the parents, much less for those who are not the parents.

Obviously, the Proverbs 24:11 interpretation justifying illegal protest runs counter to principle #1 as explained thus far. Either the Proverbs interpretation or principle #1 has to yield since such a foundational contradiction is not biblical. The nature of the yield is found by appeal to a second principle that is consistent with but far more important to this particular issue than even principle #1.

Principle #2 - The realm of authority that parents have over young children cannot be superseded by any other human or collection of humans.

As parents initiate the life of the child, they are responsible for it. The reason behind this principle is that children are gifts from God to parents, and parents alone (Psalm 127:3). Since neither the civil authority nor any other individuals bestowed the child unto its parents, these entities are not responsible for the child. While civil authority does have the right to punish the after-the-fact (see Romans 13:3,4) wrongdoing of its citizens, including parents, it has no biblical right to usurp parental authority.

This principle is embodied in two sets of directives from God: The directive regarding punishment for taking the life of one's child in sacrifice to an idol (Leviticus 20:1-5), and the directive regarding how parents are to treat a recalcitrant child (Deuteronomy 21:18-21). In the Leviticus reference, God commands believers and nonbelievers alike not to sacrifice--that is, not to kill their children. If they do, however, the punishment is that the parents themselves are to be put to death by the people. If the people fail to carry out the responsibility God will then set Himself against such murderers.

It is important to note that nowhere in this directive from God in the Book of Leviticus is anyone authorized to supersede or remove the authority of parents over their children. This parental accountability is to God and God alone. In these verses the heinousness of sin against God through child murder is juxtaposed with the sovereignty of the parent over the child against what the community should not and God will not do. Namely, in the Leviticus verses neither the community nor God is to supersede the parents' responsibility over the child, even if the child will be murdered. God and the community are only to punish the parents after the wrongdoing has occurred. This is not to discount certain preventative acts to save the child, but again, parental authority cannot be superseded.

This is indeed a very difficult teaching and certainly one that needs confirmation in keeping with the "two or more witnesses" principle (Deuteronomy 19:15; II Corinthians 13:1). The confirmation is found in Deuteronomy 21:18-21. In the case where a child is totally rebellious against his parents and obviously uncorrectable, the parents are, says God, to turn over the

child to the elders of the city who are to stone him to death. Apparently, even where the child is a civil nuisance ("a glutton and a drunkard"), the civil authorities need parental permission to permanently remove this rebelliousness from the land. The confirming point of these scripture verses is that parental authority over the child extends, according to God's Word, even to the life of the child.

While the parent, according to the Deuteronomy verses, has the biblical authority to sentence the child to death for biblically prescribed reasons, the parent is not authorized, according to both the Deuteronomy and Leviticus verses, to actually carry out the life-taking action. (Zechariah 13:3 gives parents an exception regarding offspring the singular instance regarding who are publicly known to be false prophets). Yet so inviolate is parental authority in God's eyes, He makes no generalized allowance or provision for civil agents to physically intervene before the fact, as is practiced in illegal rescue tactics, to deny parental authority (see Leviticus 20:1-5). This perhaps explains why many in our present society are reluctant to participate in these illegal tactics, yet all the while detesting the practice of abortion.

Examples of this principle of absolute parental authority being used for wrong purposes over children are evident in several different books of the Bible. In Genesis 19:8 the principle is exercised as Lot offered his two daughters as sex objects to an angry mob in substitute for the angels who visited him as men. In Judges 11:31-39 Jephthah offered his daughter in sacrifice by way of an earlier vow to God for his victory in battle. Also in Judges 19:24 the master of the house offered his daughter in place of his male visitor as demanded by a sexually perverted crowd of the town. The fact that the above three examples are wrong uses of this parental authority actually serve to reinforce the inviolate nature of this authority. In a similar way, proponents of illegal tactics are correct in their belief that parents who abort are using God-granted authority wrongly. Where the protesters err is in their illegal tactics. Ephesians 6:4 and Galatians 4:2 demonstrate two of the many ways parental authority is appropriately exercised.

NATURE OF BIBLICAL AUTHORITY

Confirmation of this absolute authority of parents is contained in the more general nature of biblical authority. The operation of biblically-ordained authority is as follows. Authority is given by God along with directions for its correct use. This authority remains intact with necessary changes brought about by consequences of the authority's action. For instance, God gave Adam and Eve authority with directions and consequences for how to use their authority. When they decided to disobey God, He did not suddenly revoke their authority to keep them from being disobedient. Nor did He revoke their authority after their disobedience. Instead, the negative consequences occurred just like He said they would. Perfectly illustrative of this second principle, all their children (that is, all of humanity) have suffered the fullness of their misused but providentially allowed authority. This pattern can be seen throughout scripture. For instance, in

Deuteronomy 28, God points the way for correct and incorrect behavior, and specifies the positive and negative consequences, respectively, of each option. But since authority is given to individuals to exercise their freewill choices, He does not intervene to stop the incorrect behaviors even when such behaviors will bring harm to the perpetrator, innocent others, and will even sadden the heart of God Himself. This, in fact, is the story of each individual's freewill choice which includes whether to accept or not accept the salvation purchased for us by Jesus Christ. And this is how parental authority over children operates making rescue tactics that violate parents' rights over their children biblically unsound, even when such rights are wrongly exercised.

A prime factor used by God to keep earthly authority from misusing their authority is the ordination of other authorities to deliver balancing consequences. Hence, the role of civil government is to reward those who do good and punish those who do evil. Romans 13:1-4 and I Peter 2:13-14 make it clear that civil authority is not ordained to cancel or remove authority wrongly-used, only to punish or to deliver negative after-the-fact consequences for wrong actions.

This biblical "irrevocable" nature of authority and the role of balancing authority is entirely consistent with the teaching of principle #2 regarding the absolute authority of parents over their children. That is, parents ultimately answer to God for how they raise their children since the children are given directly to them by God. Yet the institution of civil authority is established by God to punish those who do evil in His eyes, such as parents who murder (i.e., abort) their children. Thus, private citizens who violate laws to do what is assigned by God exclusively to the civil government do so counter to scriptural teaching. This is exactly the pattern of Leviticus 20:1-5. In fact, government is specifically and exclusively authorized as the sole agent of death in the rare times when the parents determine that the child must die, consistent with God's commands (Deuteronomy 21:18-21). In this way, parents are prohibited (again except where the child falsely represents the Lord as His divine agent--Zechariah 13:3) from being the agent to administer death--including death by abortion. The absolute authority granted to parents by God allows them to decree death (rightly or wrongly) to their children, but they are in principle authorized by God to administer life to children, not death.

Thus, as principle #2 has stated, parents are the absolute authority over children. They are ordained to be so by God, meaning no other authority has the right to supersede this authority, only to punish for un-biblical use of it. There seems to be no biblical guidelines to suggest how much parental authority a supposed superseding authority could assume to support the counter argument that parents are less than the ultimate authority. This teaching is confirmed by the specific scriptures relating to the absoluteness of parental authority (Leviticus 20, Deuteronomy 21, and Zechariah 13:3) and is also confirmed by the more general teaching regarding all God-ordained authority.

Additional support for the parental rights position espoused herein comes from another tangentially related set of Scripture verses. In Ephesians 6:1 and Colossians 3:20, children are commanded to obey their parents. The word obey

in the Greek is *hupakouo* and it means to hear as a subordinate and to answer, respond, and submit without reservation. It is the same word used to describe the obedience of the winds and sea to God (Matthew 8:27) and how people are supposed to obey Him (Hebrews 5:9). The word obey carries with it the sense of unconditional and/or absolute obedience somewhat as used in a military sense or master-slave relationship.

The nature of the meaning of the word obey as in children to parents again confirms the absolute authority that parents have over children. That is, children, according to the definition of the word obey, do not appear to have a legitimate option to do otherwise. Nor does the obedience seem to be conditional upon the appropriateness of parental behavior. A fitting example of such obedience is seen in Isaac's submission to Abraham in the events leading up to what initially appeared to be death at the hands of his father (Genesis 22:7-9).

Prior to leaving this point, a caution against rigid and legalistic interpretation is found in the balancing command to fathers not to provoke their children to anger (Ephesians 6:4, Colossians 3:21) and Paul's letter to Philemon to receive back his runaway but now returning and newly converted Christian slave as a brother in the Lord (v. 16). Paul even offered to personally cover the expenses of Onesimus' theft (v. 18-19) which was punishable by death under Roman law.

The role that God has given to the balancing authority, i.e., civil authority, is in fact the first place to look for resolving the crucial matter of whether and how to rescue the unborn from death by abortion. In fact to bypass this balancing authority is to act in the role of a vigilance committee.

ROLE OF CIVIL GOVERNORS

Romans 13 and I Peter 2, among other Scriptures, are replete with phrases that link the jurisdiction of governing authorities to delivering after-the-fact consequences to human activities. The focus is on what civil authority can do after a misdeed or wrong behavior has occurred, not before it has occurred. Thus, from this, civil authority has the jurisdiction and duty to punish those who murder their children since this is evil in God's eyes. But no provision exists to remove parenting authority from the parent. Recall that in Leviticus 20:1-5 civil authority was to punish the parent after the child was murdered with no provision to remove the parents' authority before the murder occurred. Even God in these scriptures would do nothing about the murder until after it happened and even then only when civil authority did not punish the parents as God so directed. The scriptures do not seem to be very clear on what options exist to prevent the misuse of parental authority without at the same time overriding it.

In the case of murder by abortion, civil authority is appointed by God to punish the murderous parents and abortioners. Neither the parents nor the abortioners are authorized but are in fact expressly prohibited by God from taking the life of the innocent child (Exodus 20:13, Leviticus 20:1-5, Deuteronomy 21:18-21). When civil authority does not punish the parent, it has failed in its

God-given role, and because of the responsibility of authority there will be adverse consequences.

This failure of civil government to punish parents for aborting children is indeed a most troublesome matter. As abominable as this large scale act of murder has been, equally abominable is the flagrant disregard of God's ways by this country's leaders. This does not seem to be a case of erroneous biblical interpretation by our leaders, given the almost complete absence of any biblical referencing in their explanations. As a result, murderous parents, the abortioners, and civil government itself are all allowed to do what is considered right in their own eyes (see Proverbs 3:7).

Now the crucial question in all of this relates to what role private citizens can assume where civil government does not punish nor even categorizes such as murderous acts. That is the question the illegal rescue activists have already answered by way of illegal civil protests. According to all that has been presented so far, and particularly in Leviticus 20:1-5 and Romans 13:1-4, private citizens apparently are not authorized by God to supersede the role of other authorities. Private citizens can neither take the child from the parents (see Leviticus 20:2-5) nor in other ways disobey civil authority to do what only civil authority has been ordained to do. The matter thus seems to be hopelessly stalemated.

At this point, a balancing perspective to what appears as a very hard teaching is obviously called for. Such a perspective is achieved with the recognition that God is sovereign. No greater wrongdoing has undoubtedly ever been committed on the face of the earth than the initial sin of Adam and Eve in the Garden against God. Through Adam and Eve's sin against God, all living creatures, human and otherwise, were then and thereafter contaminated with the effects of sin. Yet, like in all cases, God foreknew, specifically allowed, and purposefully used these events in His plan for mankind. He could have personally, or through others, prevented these events, but sovereignly did not. The freewill and authority that God gives, like to Adam and Eve and to all other parents, He does not generally remove. Those who justify their illegal rescue tactics from a professed possession of God's compassionate heart seem single-mindedly forgetful that He is not so easily fathomed. In fact, it is recorded that God Himself ordained the killing of Israelite babies and the ripping open of pregnant women (Hosea 13:16).

BIBLICALLY-CORRECT RESPONSE

Consistent with God's sovereignty and His Word, He has provided biblically correct tactics to rescue those being "slaughtered" and "taken away to death" as stated in Proverbs 24:11. These tactics operate in two different dimensions so to speak: the spiritual and the natural. The focus in the natural arena relates to lawfully bringing about changes in the civil legal structure to again treat abortion as murder. The focus in the spiritual arena relates to changing hearts, through prayer and righteous living, to acknowledge that abortion is a sin in God's eyes.

Obviously the two dimensions are interrelated; rescue tactics must acknowledge and address them both.

An appropriate biblical example of these tactics in operation is seen in the account of Esther's rescue of her people from being totally annihilated. Esther followed, for the first tactic, the legally sanctioned way (Esther 4:11) to persuade the king to legitimately nullify his order to kill the Jews. Regarding the second tactic, she requested fasting (4:16) so that the King's heart would be favorably disposed to her request. God did not authorize or allow the Jews to defend themselves through illegal means: This would have been in violation of principle #1 since they were never legally required by civil government to do anything against God's commands. Instead, God's plan was that they and their representative (Esther) work peacefully and correctly (see I Timothy 2:1-2) to change the law so that their own effort at self-defense was entirely legal.

The account of Esther, just like the abortion matter, ultimately is a spiritual concern. As the account reveals, Esther was providentially selected from the outset for this work. The words of her cousin Mordecai affirm: "For if you remain silent at this time, relief and deliverance will arise for the Jews from another place . . ." (Esther 5:14). Ephesians 6:12 confirms that our battle is not against flesh and blood, but against spiritual forces of wickedness. Christians are, just as with Esther, God's representative to bring healing. To be used as His instruments in this matter requires both civil compliance and personal intervention through prayer. But further, II Chronicles 7:14 directly as well as indirectly in Matthew 6:33 suggests that the ultimate answer is for God's people to be rightly related to Him. Then He will heal the land. Jesus confirmed in His prayer just before being arrested that it will take unity both among His believers and with Him for the world to accept His ways (John 17:20,21).

Thus the biblically correct form for rescuing those innocent ones being taken to slaughter is to work within the legally prescribed ways to change the laws for good, to educate society about God's laws, and to engage the spiritual weapons of prayer, fasting, and righteous living for hearts to be changed. While the intent of all rescue efforts is definitely biblically sound, illegal tactics are not. The tactics need to be changed to be consistent with the call for Christians to walk humbly (Micah 6:8) before God. Christians should also rest assured that while God holds them accountable to speak His ways to the unbelievers, He does not hold Christians accountable or guilty for the behavior of those who do otherwise (see Ezekiel 33:1-9).

As a postscript, the matter of interpreting Proverbs 24:11 needs to be considered in light of the question of what constitutes the more graver death, death of the body or death of soul (see Matthew 10:28)? Mainstream Christian theology tells us that the aborted infants will spend eternity in heaven (see Isaiah 7:16, Matthew 18:3-10). Conversely, the Bible says that murderers will spend eternity not in heaven but in hell (Galatians 5:21). This being the case, perhaps the abortioners, parents, and consenting judges, legislators, etc., are in need of rescue from a greater slaughter than these poor innocent unborn babes. From a salvation/eternity perspective (which has to be the ultimate perspective), those

who abort are actually being led to the ultimate slaughter because of their godless practices and thus are in "greater" need of rescue than those who are aborted.

William Cox (Ph.D. Florida State University) is Professor of Education at Regent University, Virginia Beach, and Director of Christian Education Programs.