

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Africa Journal of Evangelical Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ajet-02.php

ABORTION TECHNOLOGY IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: A CHRISTIAN BIOETHICAL APPRAISAL

BY

EMEKA CHARLES EKEKE

Abstract

The issue of overpopulation has been a problem to many generations of scientists and political economists. Many countries have employed various means to tackle it but it has refused to abate, giving rise to increased poverty, unemployment and an economic downturn worldwide. Some of the technologies employed by many governments to control birth are the use of contraception, abortion and other family planning methods. This paper examines the technology of abortion as a means of population control from a Christian point of view, appraising it bio-ethically. It is suggested, among other things, that human life begins at conception. Therefore the unborn should be preserved until birth.

INTRODUCTION

The debate on the technology of abortion has been a long-standing one among ethicists, religious people and various legislatures and their judiciaries around the world. It has remained one of the bioethical issues that many societies will be grappling with for generations to come. This is because it involves the cardinal issues of life and death. Today, many countries of the world have legalized abortion so that in some countries abortion technology has become an industry in which many people are working. Everett gives this example:

I heard an abortionist testify under oath in San Diego in a Court of Law that he worked eighteen hours a week, did 150 abortions a week. According to my math, the minimum that abortionist could make is \$45,000 a month. That man testified he was paid in cash at the end of the day – no Form 1099, no W-2 form. That's what abortion is about! A part-time job, working 18hours a week, making \$45,000 a month cash- I'm sure they reported all of that to the IRS! (Everett, 1995: 62-63).

In the United States, for example, people can perform as many as 40,000 abortions a year showing that all the wars in the world have not been able to

kill as many people as have been killed by the abortion industry worldwide. In the United States, the Supreme Court ruled that capital punishment was an extraordinary and cruel punishment (*Furman V. Georgia*, 1972: 238). But this same Supreme Court, in one of the cruelest of its rulings declared concerning abortion:

1. Until a developing baby is “viable” or capable of meaningful life”, a state has no “compelling interest” which justifies it in restricting abortion in any way in favour of the foetus. For six or seven months the foetus is denied the protection of law explicit in either the 9th or the 14th Amendments.

2. Even after viability has been reached, the developing baby is not a person “in the whole sense” so even after viability the growing baby is not protected by the guarantee that Life shall not be taken without due process of law.

3. A state may not protect a viable human being by preventing an abortion undertaken to preserve the health of the mother. By this statement, a foetus as old as nine months, that is just before delivery, is placed in a position, by this decision, of having his right to life subordinated to the demand for abortion predicated on health (grounds)...(From *Koop*, 1976: 37, 38).

Koop (1976:38) further explains that Justice Blackmun who wrote the majority opinion of the Supreme Court ruling in January of 1973, made it “abundantly clear that if any religion was to be a guide to him it would be ‘Paganism’”. *Harris* (1985:157-173) takes time to argue in favour of abortion claiming that the embryo or the foetus has no value and so should be aborted at will.

WHAT IS ABORTION?

Shields (2004:237) defined abortion as “the deliberate and artificially induced removal of an embryo or a foetus from the womb”. *Dzurgba* (2005:37) sees abortion as a “willful decision to terminate the development of a pregnancy through an operation which kills the foetus and removes it from the woman’s body or the baby is killed, but allowed to be born dead”. *Wikipedia*, (2008:1), defines abortion as, “the termination of a pregnancy by the removal or expulsion of an embryo or foetus from the uterus, resulting in or caused by its death”. This encyclopedia explains that the term “abortion” commonly refers to the induced abortion of a human pregnancy, while spontaneous abortions are usually termed miscarriages. *Barcalow* (1994:229-230) sees abortion as a technology which involves a surgical operation, infection, drugs and other such procedures or techniques, used in removing the

foetus or the embryo out of the body of the woman. In advanced countries, abortions are carried out in hospitals and designated clinics but in Africa, abortion can be performed in various places ranging from homes, patent medicine stores, clinics, medical centers to hospitals.

MAJOR ABORTION TECHNIQUES

There are four major official ways today through which the technological techniques of abortion could be performed.

1. *D and C (Dilation and Curettage) or Suction Abortion.* D and C is the method that is often used for early abortions when the pregnancy is between the 7th and 12th week. Koop (1976:30) explains that in this method the uterus is approached through the vagina, while the cervix is stretched to permit the insertion of instruments. Hellman and Pritchard (1971) add that the surgeon using his instruments, which has already been inserted into the uterus, then scrapes the wall of the uterus, cutting the baby's body to pieces and scraping the placenta from its attachments on the uterine wall. They stress that bleeding is considerable. An alternate method preferred in United States and Canada is the suction method. Nathanson (1971:99-107) explains that 66 percent of all abortions performed in United States and Canada is done by this method. Koop (1976:30-31) narrates that "a powerful suction is inserted through the open cervix. This tears apart the body of the developing baby and his placenta, sucking them into a jar. These smaller parts of the body are recognizable as arms, legs, head, etc."

2. *Salt Poisoning Abortion:* When a pregnancy is in its second stage, about the sixteenth week, this method is used. The essence of this technological method according to Koop (1976:31) is to avoid the hemorrhaging on the part of the mother which is common if the D and C or suction method is used at this point. During the sixteenth week of pregnancy, fluid would have accumulated in the sac surrounding the baby. Bensen (1974:1092) explains that in this method a long needle is inserted through the mother's abdomen, which enters into the sac surrounding the baby and a solution of concentrated salt is injected into the sac. As the baby breathes and swallows the salt he is poisoned by it. This causes the brain of the child to experience hemorrhage and the outer layer of the body will be burned so that in about an hour the baby dies. About 24 hours later, the mother goes into labour and delivers a dead, shriveled baby.

3. *Hysterectomy:* This method is employed when the pregnancy is up to 24 weeks, approximately 6 months. Peel and Potts (1969:197-198) explain that a hysterectomy is the same as a "CS", ie., Caesarean Section. The only

difference is that while a caesarean section is done with the intension to save both the mother and baby, a hysterectomy is done with the full intension of killing the baby. Concerning babies aborted through a hysterectomy, Koop (1976:31) explains:

These babies look very much like other babies except that they are small, weighing, for example, about two pounds at the end of a twenty-four-week pregnancy. These babies are truly alive and they are allowed to die through neglect or are deliberately killed by a variety of methods.

4. R U – 486 Method of Abortion. This method of abortion is very prevalent in France. Willke (1995:66-67) explains that this pill blocks the action of progesterone – a hormone responsible for the thickening and preparation of the lining of the womb for the nesting of a new embryo. This hormone increases when pregnancy occurs until delivery. This pill, therefore, deprives the young baby, between the 4th and 6th week of pregnancy, “of this vital nutrient hormone, progesterone, and so this tiny one withers, dies, and is lost, along with the lining of the womb, which is not maintained because of the blocking of this hormone”. Another pill, prostaglandin, is then given to the woman to produce violent contractions of the uterus so that the remains of the embryo is flushed out.

These are the major techniques of abortion today, though there are some unorthodox methods such as the drinking of some traditional concoctions and other unhygienic methods employed by people, especially in Africa.

Having explained the various technologies of abortion available to orthodox medicine today, we now consider factors which many people think make abortion necessary.

THE PERCEIVED NECESSITY FOR ABORTION

Many factors are responsible for making women consider abortion. Bankole, Singh, and Haas (1998:117-127) conducted a study in 27 countries of the world on the reasons women have abortions, especially induced abortion. It was discovered that some of these women cited (1) a desire to delay or end childbearing, (2) concern over the interruption of work or education, (3) issues of financial stability, (4) issues of relationship stability, and (5) perceived immaturity. When Finer, Forhwirth, Dauphinee, Singh and Moore (2005:110-118) did another survey on why American women go for abortions, it was exactly the same as that of Bankole et al (1998) as listed above. Bankole et al

(1998:152) add that it was only in Bangladesh, India and Kenya that women cited health concerns as the reason for abortion. The survey by Finer et al (2005:110-118) explains that only one percent of women in U.S. became pregnant as a result of rape, while 0.5 percent as a result of incest. Cohen (2008:54-65) argues further that in United States most women who go for an abortion are people of colour who “have much higher rates of unintended pregnancy”.

Another reason prevalent among Asian women especially in China, Taiwan, South Korea and India, for abortion is sex selection. The advent of both sonography and amniocentesis, which allow women to determine the sex of the baby before birth, has led to the occurrence of sex-selective abortion or termination of the targeted foetus based upon its sex (Wikipedia...2008 “Abortion” 7). Nowiszewski (1988) has argued that other reasons include ignorance, that is, some of the women claimed that they did not know it was a baby. This is because the doctor called the baby inside her womb “a product of conception” or said, “it’s just a blob of tissue” (16). It may also be as a result of shame, pressure by the mother or boyfriend or deception by the doctor, claiming that the baby was deformed. In some other cases the doctor convinces the woman to have an abortion saying that it is very easy. In another case it may be the pastor of the woman saying to her “...it was up to you” (26). It may even come from the counselor who will argue that abortion is the only solution to teenage pregnancy or unwanted pregnancy (27-28). Whatever reasons one may give concerning the legalization of abortion or the performance of abortion, the truth of the matter is that it is the killing of a human being and God will not count him guiltless who takes life under any guise.

BIOETHICAL ISSUES FOR AND AGAINST ABORTION

Three basic positions exist about abortion. All these centre on the humanness of the unborn baby. Adopting these three positions are three groups who argue for or against the value or lack of value and the humanness or lack of humanness of the embryo or foetus. The first groups are those who see the unborn as “sub-human” and so it could be aborted at will by the mother. The second group views the unborn as “potentially human” and so favour abortion in specified instances such as in the case of incest, rape, and when the health of the mother is threatened. The third and final group are those who see the unborn as “fully human” and so they should be preserved. These groups are known as the pro-life group and so are against abortion.

In all the arguments by proponents and opponents of abortion, the issue is

always the status of the unborn. If the unborn is seen as human, then the law against murder should be applied to abortionists. "On the other hand, if the unborn are merely appendages or extensions of their mother's bodies, then abortion is no more serious than an appendectomy" (Geisler, 1989:136). Geisler (1989:136) argues further that another important issue is that of the relationship between the right to life and the right to privacy. He opines that, "if human life takes precedence over personal privacy then aborting a human fetus on the basis of the right to privacy is unjustified. If on the other hand, the mother's right to privacy takes priority over the baby's right to life, then abortion is justified".

THE UNBORN ARE A SUBHUMAN GROUP

This group, who see the unborn as subhuman, argue that the unborn should be aborted for any reason, supporting their argument by citing Scripture to prove that it is the breathing of air that shows humanness. They cite Genesis 2:7, "The Lord God formed the man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and the man became a living being" (NIV); Job 34:14–15, "if it were his intention and he withdraw his Spirit and breath, all mankind would perish together and man would return to dust" (NIV); and Isaiah 57: 16 which talks about "the breath of man that I have created". They also include such passages as Ecclesiastes 6:3-5 which says of the stillborn child, "it comes without meaning, it departs in darkness, and in darkness its name is shrouded. Though it never saw the sun or knew anything, it has more rest...." In the New Testament they cite Matthew 26:24 claiming that Jesus supported abortion by saying that "...it would be better for him if he had not been born". This group claims that life begins after birth when the baby breaths air and concludes that breathing air is the beginning of life.

They also argue that the unborn has no self consciousness and so cannot be a human. They further argue that abortion is the best option for the mother whose physical well-being is placed above that of the foetus because the foetus is dependent on the mother. The safety of the mother is improved when abortions are not done illegally. Abortions avoid abuse of unwanted children and children with genetic deformities. Abortion allows the right of a woman to privacy and to control over her own body. Abortion is also deemed necessary when rape has occurred, in teenage pregnancy, when the mother is not well educated, to restrict family size, as population control and in many other cases.

An Evaluation of this View: This group should understand that breath is not the beginning of humanness. David in Psalm 51:5 tells us that human life begins at conception, long before breathing begins (Geisler, 1989:138). Scripture further records that when Mary visited Elizabeth, the baby (John the Baptist) in the womb of Elizabeth leaped for joy showing both life and consciousness of the unborn. Luke writes,

When Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting the baby leaped in her womb, and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. In a loud voice she exclaimed: 'blessed are you among women, and blessed is the child you will bear... as soon as the sound of your greeting reached my ears, the baby in my womb leaped for joy...' (Lk. 1:41-44, NIV).

This passage shows that while in the womb, John the Baptist demonstrated signs of excitement, which his mother understood to be joy. Therefore the passages on breath do not really speak of the beginning of human life but simply of the initial "coming out" event. Geisler (1989:138) adds that people who take this view speak of the "beginning of observable life, not the beginning of life".

Furthermore, self-consciousness is not a sign of humanness. Consider those who are dreaming and those who are comatose. They are unconscious yet they are human. It is also a scientific fact according to Geisler (1989:140) that an embryo is not an extension of the mother. Embryos have sex, limbs, brain, blood type and their own unique fingerprints and so cannot be regarded as an extension of the mother that can be terminated at will.

On the issue of the mother's privacy, which includes her health, education, beauty, concern for overpopulation and restriction of family size, it should be noted that once intercourse is consented to, then any pregnancy becomes a responsibility to be accepted. Geisler (1989:139) suggests:

Abortion is more like killing an indigent person in our home because he will not leave. After all, evicting a non-viable embryo is fatal. It is tantamount to killing it, since it cannot live on its own outside the womb.... If one consents to intercourse, then one is responsible for the result of that free act. So... in 99 percent of abortions the "guest" was invited to begin with. This being the case, abortion is more like inviting an indigent guest to our home and then killing him (or evicting him to a sure death) simply because he is not wanted.

Rape is not a good reason for abortion. We earlier observed from the Finer et al (2005) survey that only one percent of women in United States became

pregnant from rape. If the rape is immediately reported, she will be medically treated and it will not result in pregnancy. But if pregnancy occurs, it is better the baby be born and given up for adoption to those who do not have children, than taking the life of the innocent baby who knows nothing about the problem. Ladies should also be careful of where they go, who they have as friends and the type of dress they wear in order to avoid rape. Ladies should not go through lonely areas late at night.

THE UNBORN AS POTENTIALLY HUMAN GROUP

This second group believes that abortion can sometimes be allowed because the unborn foetus is not a fully developed human but merely a potential human being who is in the process of gradual development into a human. To this group, abortion could be allowed, “to save the mother’s life, for rape, for incest, and (in many cases) for genetic deformities” (Geisler, 1989:142).

This group further argues that since the human personality only develops gradually, one becomes a person when one’s personality fully develops. They also see the physical development between conception and birth as an indication that the foetus, whose organs are not complete at conception, cannot be regarded as fully human but is potentially human until there is complete physical development.

These “abortion-sometimes” proponents have also argued from Scripture to find biblical backing for their stand. They cite such Bible passages as: Romans 5:12, “Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned” (NIV); Hebrews 7:9, “one might even say that Levi, who collects the tenth, paid the tenth through Abraham” (NIV); Exodus 21:22-23, “if men who are fighting hit a pregnant woman and she gives birth prematurely but there is no serious injury, the offender must be fined whatever the woman’s husband demands and the court allows. But if there is serious injury, you are to take life for life”; and finally Psalm 139:13, 16, “for you created my inmost being; you knit me together in my mother’s womb. Your eyes saw my unformed body.” (NIV)

A careful look at these passages does not in any way suggest that they support the view that the unborn is potentially a human who can be aborted.

A Brief Evaluation of this View: There are serious problems with the position of this group. In Exodus 21:22- 23, which they cite, the Bible teaches

that when there is harm it is serious harm. This serious harm has to do with both the baby and the mother. The same punishment is given, “life for life”. This shows that both the unborn and the mother are of equal value before God. Cassuto (1974:275) in his commentary explains the passage (Exodus 21:22-23) thus:

When they strive together and they hurt unintentionally a woman with child, and her children come forth but no mischief happens – that is, the woman and the children do not die – the one who hurts her shall surely be punished by a fine. But if any mischief happens, that is, if the woman dies or the children die, then you shall give life for life.

This commentary explains the meaning more clearly so that one understands that from God’s point of view, the unborn are of equal value to adult human beings.

Though Psalm 51:5 supports the fact that human beings are potential sinners at conception, it does not support the idea that at conception the unborn are potential humans. This passage rather supports the fact that the unborn are fully humans at conception because it is only humans who could be declared sinners.

Psalm 139 is another passage which fully supports the humanness of the foetus. The baby in the womb is referred to as *created*, the same word used for mankind in Genesis 2:27 to denote their being made in the image of God.

Furthermore, this group should carefully understand the difference between personality and personhood. They confuse the two or they conceal the difference between these two terms in order to continue with their blunder. “Personality is a property, but personhood is the substance of being human” (Geisler 1989:146). Personalities are formed by their surroundings, but personhood is created by God. This, then, means that personality is a product of the gradual developmental process, while personhood comes instantly at conception. It is therefore erroneous for this group to confuse personality with personhood. This evaluation points to one single fact that the unborn foetus or embryo is fully human and not simply potentially human.

THE UNBORN IS A FULLY HUMAN GROUP

This is the final group in this ethical debate about abortion. This group consists of those who say ‘No’ to abortion. They hold the view that “any intentional taking of an unborn child’s life is homicide” (Geisler 1989:148). In support of this stand, the group presents many biblical and non-biblical

points to buttress their argument. Geisler (1989:148) has enumerated these biblical points to enforce their argument including:

1. Unborn babies are called “children”, the same word used for infants and young children (Lk. 1:41, 44; 2:12, 16; Ex. 21:22) and sometimes even of adults (1 Kgs. 3:17).
2. The unborn are created by God (Ps. 139:13) just as God created Adam and Eve in his image (Gen. 1:27).
3. The life of the unborn is protected by the same punishment for injury or death (Ex. 2:22, 23), as we explained earlier, as that of an adult (Gen. 9:6).
4. Christ was human (the God-man) from the point he was conceived in Mary’s womb (Matt. 1:20-21, Lk. 1:26-27).
5. The image of God includes ‘male and female’ (Gen. 1:27) but it is a scientific fact that maleness or femaleness (sex) is determined at the moment of conception.
6. Unborn children possess personal characteristics such as sin (Ps. 51:5) and joy that are distinctive of humans (Lk. 1:44).
7. Personal pronouns are used to describe unborn children (Jer. 1:5; Matt. 1:20-21) just like any other human being.
8. The unborn are said to be known intimately and personally by God as he would know any other person (Ps. 139:15-16; Jer. 1:5).
9. The unborn are even called by God to his service before birth (Gen. 25:22-23; Judg. 13:2-7; Isa. 49:1, 5; Gal. 1:15).

A careful study of the above passages reveals that the unborn are fully human like any adult person. The unborn are created in God’s image just like any adult person, therefore their lives should be precious in the sight of their mothers and those medical doctors who have made abortion a business and an industry where they can become millionaires overnight.

From a scientific point of view, it has been proven that the foetus is fully human. In 1981, during the 9th U.S. Congressional Hearing on the report to the Senate Judiciary Committee S-158, 1st session, members of the sub-committee argued for the humanness of the foetus. These experts from around the world testified about the beginning of an individual life. Dr Micheline M. Matthe-Roth, himself a member of the committee, explains: “in biology and in medicine, it is an accepted fact that the life of any individual organism

reproducing by sexual reproduction begins at conception or fertilization.” (S-158).

Another member of the committee, Jerome Le-Jeune, a medical expert, said, “To accept the fact that after fertilization has taken place a new human has come into being is no longer a matter of taste or opinion. The human nature of a human being from conception to old age is not a metaphysical contention; it is plain experimental evidence.” (S-158).

Furthermore, Dr. Hymie Gordon of the same sub-committee argues in support of the full humanness of the foetus when he said:

But now we can say, unequivocally, that the question of when life begins is no longer a question for theological or philosophical dispute. It is an established scientific fact. Theologians and philosophers may go on to debate the meaning of life or the purpose of life, but it is an established fact that all life, including human life, begins at the moment of conception. (S-158).

These medical experts, speaking on the floor of US congress, have declared that human life begins at conception. Who can say otherwise, from a scientific point of view?

To further support this stand, which this researcher believes, we shall consider the development of the unborn according to Koop (1976:29-30) and Geisler (1989:149-150). These authors, in their separate books, have given the stages and developments of the unborn before birth.

At eighteen to twenty-five days, the heart is already beating, long before the mother realizes she is pregnant. Between forty to forty-five days, brain waves can be detected; the brain, fingerprints, nose, eyes, ears and toes appear. Her blood starts flowing, the skeleton develops and she is sensitive to touch through her lips and her reflexes. All her bodily systems are present and functioning.

By the 9th to 12th week, the thyroid and the adrenal glands are functioning; the baby can move, squint, swallow, move her tongue, grasp with the hands, suck her thumb, sex hormones are already present, fingernails appear and can recoil from pain. In the fourth month the baby’s weight increases six-fold and she is about eight to ten inches in height. At this time the baby can hear her mother’s heart beat and voice. The fifth month is mainly for the lengthening and strengthening of the baby. The baby is now viable. The skin, hair and nails grow. Sweat glands arise, oil glands excrete, the baby dreams (REM sleep),

she can now cry if there is air and can survive outside the womb but she is only half way to her scheduled birth date. In the sixth month, the baby responds to sound and light. In the seventh month, the nervous system becomes much more complex. The baby has now grown up to sixteen inches long and weighs about three pounds. The eight and ninth months are months of fattening and of continued growth.

From the above description who would say that the unborn is not fully human? It is my understanding that a biologist will easily identify an unborn pig as a pig or an unborn horse as a horse but not identify an unborn human as a human. I think the reason is so that it will not deter them from carrying out their heinous, murderous act against these innocent young humans. The unborn is not a mosquito, which has no consciousness and so can be killed at will (Dzurgba, 2005:42) but a full human being with all that it takes to be human. God created a person, not a sub-person or a potentially human person. Those who think that a foetus can be terminated at an earlier stage because to them it is not viable, or because the foetus is not yet a human, but could not be terminated at a later stage because the foetus has become human, should know that at conception the foetus is fully human (Dzurgba, 2005:40).

CONSEQUENCES OF ABORTION

Abortion can cause serious damage to the reproductive health of a mother. In some cases she may be rendered incapable of having future pregnancies and in others she may be more likely to have miscarriages (spontaneous abortion). Shields (2004:241) adds, “she has a 50 percent higher risk of getting breast cancer before the age of 45 than have other mothers of the same age group”.

The mother may also experience psychological problems as a result of abortion. This can manifest itself in the form of intense grief for the child she never knew. It may also lead to guilt, which may last for many years (Nowiszewski, 1988:77). Illsey and Hall (2006:11-34) corroborate Nowiszewski’s view when they argued that guilt and abortion have become synonymous. No matter what her reason for abortion, the woman will feel guilt to some degree, whether for a few hours immediately after the procedure is performed or for many years. Though some may conquer the grief and guilt, others suffer for a long period of time in “depression and some even develop acute eating disorders” (Shields, 2004: 241).

Many marriages have ended in divorce because of conflict caused by abortion.

Abortion has caused the death of many girls in Nigeria. Many girls and women, who would have been instrumental to the development of Nigeria, have been buried due to their demand for and practice of abortion. In many hospitals in Nigeria, clinics, maternity hospitals, health centers and patent medicine stores, doctors, nurses, midwives and quack practitioners in medicine, whose stock in trade is abortion, have turned from being physicians to murderers and executioners.

CONCLUSION

It is worthy of note that the Scripture unequivocally condemns the taking of human life whether it be a small or a big human life. Size is not the issue, life is what matters. It is clear that human life begins at conception, develops until birth and continues its development until death. Life is God's creation and whoever terminates it has committed homicide and will not go unpunished by Almighty God.

One may argue in favour of abortion by asking, "What if the mother's life is threatened?" Today, advances in medicine have made things easier, except in developing countries, so that it is only seldom that this option of abortion to save the life of the mother is ever considered. If this becomes the only available option, it is then morally justified that abortion should be allowed. In such circumstances, it should be noted that it would not be rightly called abortion because the intention is not to kill the baby, even when we know the baby will die, but to save the mother's life. It therefore means that it is a life-for-a-life issue, not an abortion on-demand situation. Geisler (1989:152) argues that in such case "when ones life is threatened, as the mother's is, one has a right to preserve on the basis of killing in self- defense" (Exodus 22:2).

In view of the above, it is homicide, murder and a heinous crime to commit abortion for whatever other reason one may give. It is known in history that Adolf Hitler killed about six million Jews in the Holocaust, and the world found him guilty of murder. Charles Taylor of Liberia is standing trial for the mass killing of Liberians in the civil war which ravaged that country. The ethnic cleansing among the Tutsis and Hutus which led to genocide in that area remains indelibly etched in the minds of the world and many of their leaders are standing trial today. But who is facing trial at the World Court in the Hague for the twelve billion babies who were aborted in 2003 alone? Who is facing trial for the countless unborn babies whose heartless mothers and heartless doctors and nurses have killed to maintain the beauty and privacy of their mother in Nigeria and the rest of the world, including the United States, the United Kingdom and France? Who is facing

trial for the genocide and infanticides being experienced today among undergraduates in the various institutions of higher learning who choose to kill in order to maintain their shape and continue their education even though they consented to the sexual intercourse that led to the pregnancy.

Those proponents of abortion should choose to change places with the aborted whose blood is crying every day before God for vengeance. These proponents should know that children are “a heritage from the Lord...[and] a reward from Him” (Ps. 27:3). “They [children] are not disposable assets that can be discarded through abortion before they are even born” (Shields, 2004: 248).

Works Cited

Bankole, A., Singh, S. and Haas, T. (1998) “Reasons Why Women Have Induced Abortions: Evidence from 27 Countries”. *International Family Planning Perspectives*. 24 (3) pp. 117-127.

Barcalow, E. (1994). *Moral Philosophy: Theory and Issues*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bensen, R.C. (1974) *Handbook of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. Los Altos, CA: Lange Medical.

Cassuto, U. (1974) *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Trans. Israel Abraham. Jerusalem: Magnes.

Cohen, S. A. (2008 Summer) “Abortion and Women of Color: The Bigger Picture” *Gutmacher Policy Review*. No. 11 (3) pp. 54-64.

Dzurgba, A. (2005) *Medical Ethics: Conceptual and Practical Issues*. Ibadan: John Achers.

Everett, C. N. (1995) “Getting Rich off a Woman’s Right to Choose Life”. In R.D. Land & L.A. Moore (eds.) *Life at Risk: The Crises in Medical Ethics*. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman and Holman.

Finer, L. B., Frohwirth, L. F., Dauphinee, L. A., Singh, S. and Moore, A. M. (2005) “Reasons U.S. Women Have Abortions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives”. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*. 37 (3) pp. 110-118.

Furman V. Georgia. (1972), Supreme Court of the United States 408, US p. 238.

Geisler, Norman L. (1989) *Christian Ethics: Options and Issues*, Grand Rapids,

Michigan: Baker Book House.

Harris, J. (1985) *The Value of Life: An Introduction to Medical Ethics*. London: Rutledge & Kegan.

Hellman, L. M. and Pritchard, J. A. (eds) (1971) *William's Obstetrics*. 14th Edition. New York: Appleton, pp. 1089-1091.

Koop, C.E. (1976) *The Right to Live; The Right to Die*. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House.

Nathanson, B.N. (1971) "Suction Curettage for Early Abortions: Experience with 645 Cases". *Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology*. (14) pp. 99-107.

Nowiszewski, N. M. (1988) *Helping Women Recover From Abortion*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Bethany House.

Peel, J. and Potts, M. (1969) *Textbook of Contraceptive Practice: Hysterectomy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shields, N. (2004) *Christian Ethics*, Bukuru: ACTS.

Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia (2008) "Abortion". Retrieved from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abortion> on January 13, 2009.

Willkie, J. C. (1995) "RU-486: Another Method of Abortion". In R.D. Land & L.A. Moore (eds.) *Life at Risk: The Crises in Medical Ethics*. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman.