

A Bitter Pill To Swallow

By ANDY DIESTELKAMP

There can be no doubt that the by-products of modern technology have produced scenarios full of ethical dilemmas. It is evident that a number of medical advances have in fact contributed to moral decline and/or vice versa. This is clearly illustrated in the field of human reproduction. Modern "medicine" has acquiesced to the amoral demands of a society which elevates convenience over conscience. So, to put it bluntly, offspring are killed in a sterile environment; it is called a "medical" procedure and thereby consciences are numbed to what it is they are really doing. As terrible as the so-called "back alley" or "coat hanger" methods of aborticide are, these methods, by their very awfulness, remind the participants of what it is they are actually doing... shedding innocent blood.

It seems, however, that this present world has devoted an inordinate amount of time and money to the research and development of quicker, simpler and cheaper ways to discard its young. The latest weapon in the arsenal of the promiscuous and/or selfish parent is an "abortion pill." RU-486 is a synthetic hormone which chemically resembles progesterone, a hormone naturally produced in women and necessary to the maintenance of pregnancy. The right amount of progesterone changes the womb into a hospitable, nourishing environment to which the baby and its placenta attach (implant) and develop for the next nine months. Without this hormone the baby would be rejected by the mother's body and she would miscarry. Since mifepristone (RU-486) is similar to progesterone it is received by the cells in the womb as such. However, mifepristone does not act like the natural hormone and counteracts its positive effects. Therefore, this pill changes the characteristics of the womb so that it is not receptive to the implantation of a fertilized egg. This "breakthrough" pill is effective prior to and after implantation. How sad that the human race has found yet another way to dispose of its "undesirables." The very thought of not allowing that one-week old baby to implant and nourish itself in the womb that God designed for that very purpose is repugnant, isn't it?

RU-486 is not yet available to the public in the U.S., but there are other means which employ similar methods and thereby obtain the same results—the miscarriage of a starved one-week old baby. I am not referring to the methods used by abortionists in their hospitals and clinics. I am speaking

about some so-called birth control methods. As usual many have been sloppy with their terminology. One who respects human life should be more concerned with preventing conception, which is the beginning of a new life, than in controlling birth. For this, a person needs a contraceptive. However, there are so-called contraceptive methods which may also cause the newly conceived baby to abort. Would such a method be any less immoral than the RU-486 "abortion pill"?

One such tool of destruction in current use is called an I.U.D. (intrauterine device). While in some cases it may interfere with conception, its primary function is to make the womb unsuitable for implantation. Another method which must also be opposed will be, quite literally for many, a bitter pill to swallow: the birth control pill. Space does not permit me to include all that I could to document that these pills can indeed act as abortifacients. Yes, the pill's primary and usual function is the prevention of conception by inhibiting ovulation (the monthly release of an egg), but should that fail (and it does), the new life would not likely survive because the womb is also made inhospitable. "... they [birth control pills] inhibit ovulation and change the characteristics of the uterus so that it is not receptive to a fertilized egg" (Women and the Pill, FDA Consumer, U.S. Government publication - May 1976). In other words, the backup mode of operation of the pill is similar to the primary mode of RU-486 and the results are the same—implantation is prevented causing a baby's death one week into life.

Please do not misunderstand. If you have taken, or are taking the pill it does not



mean you have aborted a baby, but that possibility and risk is always there. Christians will not take such risks merely for convenience. All married couples need to make choices about planning a family, but they need to be informed choices. If you desire more information or documentation, ask your doctor and show him/her this article, or write to me. Whatever you do, don't stay ignorant—a life may depend on it.

The author of this article solicits the help of any of our readers who may be qualified to either further substantiate or refute the findings in this article. Any who are willing and able to do so are asked to write the author, Andy Diestelkamp, 323 E. Indiana Ave., Pontiac, IL 61764.

God's People and Personal Choices

By AL DIESTELKAMP

There has been a concerted effort in recent years by some in our society to suggest that certain matters which were formerly classified as "moral issues" should now be considered "personal issues," and therefore left as a matter of choice rather than law. Any attempt to prohibit, or discourage behavior in these areas is met with strong opposition. In view of the wide acceptance of this doctrine we must prepare brethren to understand that God's revelation supersedes anything men may say or legislate.

Indeed the time may come when sinful behavior is so protected by civil law that those of us who discipline evildoers may be charged with (and convicted of) discrimination. If and when that kind of persecution comes only those whose spiritual education is superior to their "media indoctrination" will endure. Others "will not endure sound doctrine, but according to their own desires" (choices) they will "turn their ears away from the truth" (2 Tim. 4:4).