



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

ABORTION - uproar from those offended at the truth being told



A video about abortion caused a rumpus in Ballyclare Secondary School.irate parents contacted the media, claiming that their children had been traumatised by scenes from the video, where the dismemberment and mutilation of the unborn child were clearly seen during an abortion.

Most of the parents seemed upset that their children should see such anti-abortion material, especially in the absence of the case for abortion. There was one claim that it was all an attempt to indoctrinate children against abortion by the organisation which owned the video, the Society for the Protection of the Unborn Child. One newspaper, which published pictures from the video, apologised for doing so by arguing that parents need to know what their children are being exposed to in the classroom.

We have to say that the hypocrisy of the media and many of the parents who objected to the video is almost as dreadful as the wickedness of abortion itself. If still and ultra-sound pictures of an abortion are shocking then we ought to direct our horror against abortion rather than the displaying of pictures of what is involved.

If it is unfair for such information to be presented without the case for abortion being likewise presented, every murder trial is basically unfair since there is never a case presented as to why the accused should have murdered the victim!

The abortion of unborn children is murder, albeit legalised, state-sanctioned murder. In the mid-80s, I published a booklet entitled: **"Abortion! - I dare call it murder"** and included pictures of the mutilated bodies of little children who had been aborted. I believed it correct to do so then and still do. It is the perpetrators of abortion who need to be ashamed rather than those who display but a little of the horrific results of their devilish trade. If the public were given access to the evidence of the murderous butchery of living children that abortion truly is, perhaps there would be a change in society's thinking. But then again, in an age that has cast away the Bible and the fear of God and is given over to ungodliness, perhaps not.

What was noticeable in the newspaper article was the extensive use of the term foetus. This is a medical term that means a fully developed child in the womb. However, it is a term which dehumanises the infant who is being destroyed and aids those who would promote the idea that the unborn infant is really less than human, and so its destruction is not really murder. The unborn John the Baptist joined in the rejoicing at the approaching advent of Christ when he responded to the greeting of Mary, the mother of Christ, as she spoke to his mother, Elisabeth. And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost: and she spake out with a loud voice, and said . . . lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy, Luke 1:41, 44.

It ought to be noted that John the Baptist was at that time an unborn babe of six months (Luke 1:26). It would be legal under the law in Britain today for him to have been aborted. Can anyone argue that he was not really a human being?