

Scripture incorrectly used to support abortion view

To the editor:

It seems we have reached a critical point in this abortion debate. I applaud the participants' decision to argue about it based on Scripture. However, since both parties are offering opposite interpretations of the passages mentioned, one of them has to be wrong.

On Sept. 23, Julie Maslowski's most recent tome concerning this discussion was shown in the forum. In it she cited Genesis 2:7 and Exodus 21:22-25 as giving evidence that God "wouldn't have condemned Roe v. Wade." Considering "wouldn't" is past tense, it is clear that Maslowski got off on the wrong foot.

Genesis 2 is a narrative of the beginning of the history of mankind. Specifically, Genesis 2:7 explains how the first man was formed out of the "dust of the ground," and that God

breathed into the man's nostrils "the breath of life" (all quotations New King James Version). It also says that, after God breathed life into the man, man became a living being. Supposedly, this means that one is not human until one breathes. However, Adam, as should already be known, was never born. Hence, he was never unborn. Adam was not a living being until God breathed into his nostrils. This applies only to Adam and Eve.

Isaiah and Jeremiah were called to be servants of God before they were born (Isaiah 49:1, 5, Jeremiah 1:5). John the Baptist leaped in Elizabeth's womb "for joy" (Luke 41, 44). It would seem clear that the life of a human being, even before birth, is sacred to God. The distinct sequence in Genesis 2:7 is there to make perfectly clear that mankind, above all other creatures, was not created out of pre-existent life. God personally supplied the breath of life.

Exodus 21:22-25, like it or not, does not address the status of an embryo or fetus. It does not consider intentional abortions, but forced premature births. Therefore, it provides evidence for neither "pro-lifers" nor "pro-choicers." Verse 23 does not provide a direct object for "serious injury" (NIV). That said, it may as well be referring to both the woman and the child born prematurely. The passage does not elevate the life of a born woman over the life of an unborn child, nor vice versa. It simply raises the penalty to capital punishment (see Genesis 9:6) if a life, any life, is taken during the struggle.

In summary, neither of the verses Maslowski cited as pro-Roe v. Wade have anything whatsoever to do with the unborn or intentional abortions. Linking the practice of abortion to Scripture is nothing short of blasphemous. It's time Life and Liberty for Women picked on someone its own size.

Paul Boyne
Loveland