

Interesting... I'll make sure not to vote for you if you ever run for elected office because, according to this boggling view of yours, the person in e.g., the U.S. where Capital Punishment is practised, who e.g, skids on black ice and strikes a pedestrian and kills them, will be summarily executed!??

Originally Posted By: kland

....It is not off topic, but your main premise.

Trying to decide if abortion is murder by the tangential, circuitous route of figuring out if God's order to have certain people killed was murder or not is indeed completely off topic and a calculated red-herring, even if you obviously won't allow yourself to see this!

Originally Posted By: kland

You have said the difference is based upon popular vote. ... Therefore, the only way you can condemn abortion is by saying it is "murder" in certain countries, but if the vote changes, it is only "killing". From what you've said, there is no way to conclude killing babies is absolutely wrong, but only wrong for certain cultures at certain periods of history.

That is absolutely not what I meant. I know abortion is murder because there is never judicious reason to end the conceived life of infant, except in a objective life-for-life situation, which in many cases may still be averted by a premature (i.e., ca. 5 month) birthing.

What I said was that countries today are free to decide what they will consider murder or not. That is indeed how abortion became acceptable in Protestant America. Namely, a majority of judges who had been appointed by popularly elected President ruled that it was legal. Along the same lines, my planned New Country project will not only accept that abortion is not murder, but will also be endeavoring to save the lives of infants all around the world who otherwise would be aborted. So what another country may popularly decide is not wrong does not at all determine what I, Biblical should know is right or wrong.

Originally Posted By: kland

The reason you are having to go through all these arbitrary distinctions between the two terms is you are trying to justify that God says it's ok to kill people, but not murder them. I disagree.

Please, don't put words in my mouth. My distinction between killing and murder is not at all arbitrary but based on long standing Biblical and also judicial precedents. When God declares that it is okay to judiciously or militaristically kill a person, then I believe that it is indeed okay, although I will hate to do it. This is never the case in abortions.

Originally Posted By: kland

ratsach: a primitive root; properly, to dash in pieces, i.e. kill (a human being), especially to murder:--put to death, kill, (man-)slay(-er), murder(-er). To me, "especially" does not mean "only".

Contrary to what you may “scholarly” know, Strong’s definitions are not the best, nor most authoritative on arriving at the precise meaning of a word, moreoverly as Strong’s definitions are based upon the KJV translation of these terms. Try instead the Theological Dictionary|Wordbook of the OT (TDOT & TWOT) and for the NT uses of murder vs. kill the TDNT Exegetical Dictionary of the NT (EDNT), among many other scholarly lexicons for Biblical languages.

If you don’t have access to these resources, then I recommend a comparative study between the primary OT terms for “murder” (Strong’s #07523 = 40X) and “kill” (#02026 - 157X) and for the NT “murder” (#5407) vs. “kill” (#615). Also include, if you can LXX usages. (Keep in mind that the frame of mind of the subject at times also determines whether the act was a justified (thus a killing) or unjustified (= murder)

I personally do not need to do such a study to understand this Biblical, and even modern judicial difference between judicious killing vs. outright murder.

Originally Posted By: kland

Why did people accept the concept of the Inquisition? It's only because they thought God said it's ok to kill people. Then, they made the distinction between murder and killing, and the killing began. How else would the people go along with it?

Well they simply made the incorrect distinction. As I said before, now where in the Bible does God send Israel to kill people who merely did not have the same beliefs as them. It is only when the sinful practices of those people became a threat to the very life and/or health of Israel and the world that such a command from God was given.

And just because the Catholic Church made a mistake in regards to killing vs. murder, it does not then wholesaley dictate what I can or cannot understand in the Bible on that topic! Thus: Capital punishment for murder is Biblical (cf. Gen 9:6) and: Abortion is an act of murder.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/11/11 12:50 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

... This is so outrageous, I am at a loss finding the right words to express my amazement. ...

Nic, I’ll save, more importantly for me, myself many words, seeing the general slant that you need this objection to take... You go on and complete your project and I’ll do the same and in the end it will be tangibly seen which one is more significant. Nonetheless, as stated before, in simple terms of achievable potential, your elaborate address to SDA Church leaders through a history of views on this topic will at best save ca. 1500 infants per year, but actually most likely a net 0 lives; on the other hand the NJK Project has the quite realizable potential of saving 65,000,000 infants annually. The posted facts and figures on this Project speak for themselves and so I will not waste my time justify it nor myself. In the end all will see who had the “half-baked” approach here.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

FROM PRO-LIFE TO PRO-CHOICE: THE DRAMATIC SHIFT OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ABORTION http://letsfocusonlife.com/?page_id=717 (Link: http://letsfocusonlife.com/?page_id=717)

I glanced through your work and readily saw that, as generally stated before, it is not worthwhile for me to invest my time and effort in such an approach. I have much bigger fish to fry than to merely be begging SDA leaders, who should know better, to do what is Biblical. Good Luck with your work!

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/12/11 12:35 AM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Green Cochoa said: "So far, no one here has presented the clarification between "kill" and "murder," in accordance with the Bible standard. ... When we have our answer to this, I think it will shed significant light on the abortion topic."

Nic responds: We have tried and failed, according to your judgment. This means that it is your turn to explain the difference between killing and murder.

I second Nic's challenge, which I have also made. It seems quite suspicious to me that Green Cochoa evidently wants to show that the Bible teaches that abortion is not murder, yet he cannot even state one (valid) text in support of this. Talk about eisogesis -reading your preconceived ideas into the Biblical text, and in the present case, no text has yet to even be produce. So this is really an independent, "private belief" irrespective of what the Bible says.

NJK,

I'm underimpressed with the tone of your response. As Christians, it is our responsibility to discuss things with civility and graciousness insofar as possible. Especially should we be ready to support our views of some substance. Your view here that "It seems quite suspicious to me that Green Cochoa evidently wants to show that the Bible teaches that abortion is not murder, yet he cannot even state one (valid) text in support of this," is impatient at best, and an unfounded accusation. This approach reminds me of that of Saul in waiting for Samuel. He also thought that Samuel would not meet the appointed time, and went ahead in his own course.

I note that there is a contrast between these statements of yours...

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

How about listing the references to this texts so that they can be independently examined.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

For me personally, as I do not see any justified, prima facie case for abortion not being murder, I deliberately do not invest my time in responding to such spurious objections through more involved exegetical work. I have more pressing issues, that require such detailed involvement at hand.

...and your willingness to examine the issue yourself to support your own cause.

Those who are so eager to fight for the right should know where their best ammunition is. I'm surprised that for such a fighter as yourself you are unwilling to "invest [your] time in responding," nor to study out the issue for yourself, yet at the same time you are quite willing to take a bold stand upon it.

You have asked for the texts on abortion...the Bible is at your elbows as much as it is at mine. Seek and you will find. May God bless your endeavors. We are counseled to search as for buried treasure--to dig deeply.

I have been quite busy with projects this week myself, and haven't taken the time to reply yet. This does not mean, by any means, that I cannot answer you. Nevertheless, your response does not encourage me to do so.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/12/11 05:28 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

NJK,

I'm underimpressed with the tone of your response. As Christians, it is our responsibility to discuss things with civility and graciousness insofar as possible. Especially should we be ready to support our views of some substance.

Here we go again with the typical, childish and petty "I'm so offended" peripheral quibbles. Suit yourself this prideful approach - the patent bastion of last resort for those who clearly have nothing substantive to say. It does not affect me in any detrimental way. And I am not even trying to "impress" you. I really couldn't care less what you personally think of me. What God thinks of me and what I am doing is my sole concern.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Your view here that "It seems quite suspicious to me that Green Cochoa evidently wants to show that the Bible teaches that abortion is not murder, yet he cannot even state one (valid) text in support of this," is impatient at best, and an unfounded accusation.

It actually is now even more suspicious!

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

This approach reminds me of that of Saul in waiting for Samuel. He also thought that Samuel would not meet the appointed time, and went ahead in his own course.

Yeah... If only you were guided by God's spirit like Samuele instead of 'ignoring what God had said in order to do what was best in your eyes' like Saul.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I note that there is a contrast between these statements of yours...

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

How about listing the references to this texts so that they can be independently examined.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

For me personally, as I do not see any justified, prima facie case for abortion not being murder, I deliberately do not invest my time in responding to such spurious objections through more involved exegetical work. I have more pressing issues, that require such detailed involvement at hand.

Absolutely nothing contradictorily said or meant here:

Statement #1 - Let's see your claimed proof, which assumes that you have already found a list of texts. (Obviously not.... Instead of making this peripheral spiel, you could have just listed these texts. Oh yeah.... I "offended" you, so you are threatening to take your (actually deflated) ball and go home!

Statement #2 - Since God has said "You shall not commit murder" and since abortion is a *prima facie* systematic and deliberate act of unjustified killing to me, thus "murder", I do not need to search throughout the Bible for a text that does not exist where God tells man that 'they can murder infants for their own pleasure.' You are here asking God to come down to Mount Sinai again and proof Himself. As EGW says:

"All the thunders and lightnings of Mount Sinai [Exod. 19:18-20:25ff] cannot move those who will not be moved by the plain truths in the Word of God. Neither would an angel's message move or awake them." {EW 50.3}

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

...and your willingness to examine the issue yourself to support your own cause.

....my view is already firmly supported by the express Word of God (e.g., Exod 20:13; Matt 25:45). You, quite tellingly enough, like the crafty Serpent want/need to cast doubt on what God has clearly said. Good Luck with that enchanted course. I like to see where you end up.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Those who are so eager to fight for the right should know where their best ammunition is.

I have already found and packed my ammunitions, so instead of wasting my time pointlessly looking for another round (which actually does not exist) in a haystack, I have long ago decided to enter the battlefield and fight back. Like I have said many times to many other who typically have the same objection as you, I rather seek to do what is right, then merely try to be right. And thus far I have not had to regret this Gospel Action Plan. Indeed God has most greatly Approved, Guided and Blessed this course. (Matt 6:33 Rev 19:8)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I'm surprised that for such a fighter as yourself you are unwilling to "invest [your] time in responding," nor to study out the issue for yourself, yet at the same time you are quite willing to take a bold stand upon it.

Hmmmm... It must be because I have chosen to simply obey what God has already clearly stated. If on the other hand the issue here was to kill adulterers, than I would invest the necessary time to painstakingly find out all what the Bible is wholly (i.e., OT & NT) saying and teaching on this topic. But since the issue is saving the life of infants, and since the case has already been clearly resolved, then I'll endeavor and invest my time to saving their lives. If I turn out to be wrong later, then you can, at least try, to "kill" those living would-be aborted children!?! How's that for being fair and reasonable!

Since you are evidently so self deceived on this stance of yours, you cannot realize that your attempts to justify abortion is actually, ultimately in worship of the All Mighty Dollar. That is indeed the reason why it is seen as "beneficial" to wholesalely kill these infants in the first place.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

You have asked for the texts on abortion...the Bible is at your elbows as much as it is at mine.

Obviously your claimed list of text is not at your elbows, since all you have to do is copy and paste them and click "Submit".

(And by the way, finding texts on this issue is as easy as doing a Google search for "biblical support for against abortion". Many passages emerge from such a search however, when exegetically applicable, only texts that say that God knew of a infant when they were in the womb.)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Seek and you will find. May God bless your endeavors. We are counseled to search as for buried treasure--to dig deeply.

A case in point of your ultimate worshipful religious devotion for wanting to justify abortion. You obviously think that finding a text that will justify killing 65,000,000 people per year for one's own pleasure and economic benefit will be a "treasure"!! I have already found my treasure in this regards, and am working to build up the needed establishments to save the

lives of these infants.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I have been quite busy with projects this week myself, and haven't taken the time to reply yet.

Copy-Paste-Submit takes less than 2 seconds. Self-evidently your claim of having a list of text is not true, or simply that prior list, if it ever existed, is not as valid as you first thought.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

This does not mean, by any means, that I cannot answer you.

Given your transpiring pattern of quibbles and obfuscation, when you actually do then I'll at the very least, perfunctorily consider that you could actually answer me on this issue. The Biblical/exegetical validity of what you will have claimed is an entirely different matter.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Nevertheless, your response does not encourage me to do so.

And how is that going to hurt or be detrimental me or my Project??? As I said, you can endeavor to justify murder, I'll keep on working on preserving the precious lives of these "little ones" Suit yourself. In case you need another excuse to take your deflated ball and go home, then: "I can't wait to testify against you in the final judgement!!!"

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Blessings,

Definitely not... but, like a "Curse", only a detrimental waste of my time.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/12/11 10:37 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

NJK Project said: "You go on and complete your project and I'll do the same and in the end it will be tangibly seen which one is more significant."

Nic responds: I didn't claim that my project was superior to yours. You are the one claiming that your project will yield better results, and I have never attempted to deny your claim.

NJK Project said: "I have much bigger fish to fry than to merely be begging SDA leaders, who should know better, to do what is Biblical. Good Luck with your work! ."

Nic responds: If you have bigger fish to fry, my congratulations to you. I am content with the mission the Lord has laid on my hart. Someone needs to warn God's Remnant church about the fact that it has deviated from the straight path regardless of whether the church will hear or not. My mission is similar to that of prophet Ezekiel although in a much smaller scale. Notice what the Lord told him:

Quote: "You must speak my words to them, whether they listen or fail to listen" [Ezek. 2:7]

This reminds me of what Mother Teresa said on one occasion in response to a similar observation by someone who questioned her mission:

Quote: "The Lord has not asked me to be successful, but rather to be faithful."

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/13/11 09:56 AM

Posted by: [Daryl F](#)

ADMIN HAT ON

This is a reminder to everybody here to please be respectful of each other in your posts.

ADMIN HAT OFF

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/13/11 10:56 AM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Originally Posted By: Daryl F

ADMIN HAT ON

This is a reminder to everybody here to please be respectful of each other in your posts.

ADMIN HAT OFF

Your warning is directed at everyone. If I have failed in this respect, I would like someone to provide the evidence so that I may correct myself. I believe I have made every effort to respond in a redemptive and considerate manner.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/13/11 11:03 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

NJK Project said: "You go on and complete your project and I'll do the same and in the end it will be tangibly seen which one is more significant."

Nic responds: I didn't claim that my project was superior to yours. You are the one claiming that your project will yield better results, and I have never attempted to deny your claim.

Well the plans and the numbers in the objectives do speak for themselves. For me, in this literal life and death issue this is a vital numbers issue, so I therefore concentrate my efforts and time on the plan that will bring the most successful result.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

NJK Project said: "I have much bigger fish to fry than to merely be begging SDA leaders, who should know better, to do what is Biblical. Good Luck with your work!"

Nic responds: If you have bigger fish to fry, my congratulations to you. I am content with the mission the Lord has laid on my heart. Someone needs to warn God's Remnant church about the fact that it has deviated from the straight path regardless of whether the church will hear or not. My mission is similar to that of prophet Ezekiel although in a much smaller scale. Notice what the Lord told him:

Quote: "You must speak my words to them, whether they listen or fail to listen" [Ezek. 2:7]

I do readily understand and personally share your Ezekiel-type concern towards these leaders of Judah, however, following a period of various warning to these leaders, Ezekiel did also move on to work amongst the exiles in Babylon in order to share and attempt to implement the greater plans that God had for Judah and Israel. The way our Church can be easily communicated with and given the overt and explicit black and white issue of life and death here, I just feel that anything more than a simple email to the GC President's office is both overkill and a waste of time. I take my example from Jesus, (Ezekiel's "Son of Man" anti-type) as He did not spend His entire 3.5 year ministry trying to convince the leaders then of things they already knew they should be doing, but for various reasons, were knowingly choosing not to. Christ merely, at best told them of their duty, once and that in veiled statements of parable. He then focused all of his time and effort in helping and teaching those who were in various vital need. When people accept the responsibility of being a leader in the SDA Church, they step into a whole different realm of judgement where they are held more responsible than the average lay person. (cf. [this post \(Link: http://njkproject.blogspot.com/2011/01/gods-whirlwind-judgement-on-sda-church.html\)](http://njkproject.blogspot.com/2011/01/gods-whirlwind-judgement-on-sda-church.html)). So in summary, I personally do not see a Biblical precedence to put aside a greater plan that will save millions of infants in order to, beg, for lack of a more fitting word, SDA Leaders to ban abortion in SDA Hospitals. These leaders will have to answer for their choice as we will also have to answer for neglecting even the least of Christ's brethren.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

This reminds me of what Mother Teresa said on one occasion in response to a similar observation by someone who questioned her mission:

Quote: "The Lord has not asked me to be successful, but rather to be faithful."

It is just too bad that you are not seeing helping millions of infants as a more worthwhile pursuit as Mother Teresa did. She did not try to be faithful in convincing the local clergy or popes, or even politician to spare some of their various personal/ecclesiastical wealth to help the poor she was trying to reach.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/13/11 11:12 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Originally Posted By: Daryl F

ADMIN HAT ON

This is a reminder to everybody here to please be respectful of each other in your posts.

ADMIN HAT OFF

Your warning is directed at everyone. If I have failed in this respect, I would like someone to provide the evidence so that I may correct myself. I believe I have made every effort to respond in a redemptive and considerate manner.

Not to belabour this equally fair reminder, which I'll personally keep in mind, but I can indicate that I felt quite "disrespected" by your baseless and irrelevant Jimmy Swaggart association.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/13/11 12:02 PM

Posted by: [Daryl F](#)

As I preferred not to single out anybody, this reminder was for everybody, therefore, please accept this simply as a reminder only and also please do not discuss this reminder here any further.

Thank you.



Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/13/11 05:23 PM

Posted by: [Daryl F](#)

Does anybody know if our Adventist Hospitals are in the abortion business today, as in 2011, and if so, can you provide evidence that they are?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/13/11 07:57 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Daryl F

Does anybody know if our Adventist Hospitals are in the abortion business today, as in 2011, and if so, can you provide evidence that they are?

I merely accepted that as true from the Washington Post article posted earlier as I trust that they did their homework on this issue which dealt with recent developments. I presume that the threat of a libel/slander lawsuit would force them to first ascertain this fact before publishing. However, I also would like to see concrete, current numbers on this.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/14/11 09:33 AM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Originally Posted By: Daryl F

Does anybody know if our Adventist Hospitals are in the abortion business today, as in 2011, and if so, can you provide evidence that they are?

Isn't there something which requires hospitals to provide statistics? I would think it would be

available if someone could know where to find it. That is what I was saying would be more convincing to me on a brochure than what was listed.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/14/11 09:45 AM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

I personally do not need to do such a study to understand this Biblical, and even modern judicial difference between judicious killing vs. outright murder.

NJK, I have found your comment very disturbing. Rather than me making conclusions, maybe you could explain what you meant by it.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/14/11 02:18 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

I appreciate you attempt to first ascertain my precise view here kland, but I did already respond to such a question (from [this post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130814#Post130814\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130814#Post130814)):

Quote:

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I'm surprised that for such a fighter as yourself you are unwilling to "invest [your] time in responding," nor to study out the issue for yourself, yet at the same time you are quite willing to take a bold stand upon it.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Hmmmm... It must be because I have chosen to simply obey what God has already clearly stated. If on the other hand the issue here was to kill adulterers, than I would invest the necessary time to painstakingly find out all what the Bible is wholly (i.e., OT & NT) saying and teaching on this topic. But since the issue is saving the life of infants, and since the case has already been clearly resolved, then I'll endeavor and invest my time to saving their lives. If I turn out to be wrong later, then you can, at least try, to "kill" those living would-be aborted children!?! How's that for being fair and reasonable!

In this most urgent matter of life and death, I expediently pick my battles, and setting out to help these infants being murdered is indeed more important to me than this, both, self-evidently unnecessary and actually irrelevant '(judicious) killing vs. murder' side discussion.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/15/11 09:59 AM

Posted by: [kland](#)

I do recall having read that. So, it seems to me, that such statements, and several similar ones, you consider as self-evident truths and therefore need not dig diligently into the scriptures.

There is another here who has stated similarly as you said: "It must be because I have chosen to simply obey what God has already clearly stated." Does that sound to you like some who would say, God said it, I believe it, and therefore I can turn my brain off? With all

the knowledge you have, I would tend to agree with Green that you don't strike me as one like that.

I come from a science background and have trouble accepting things assumed to be true and with no study. Perhaps we have no common basis for a discussion.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/15/11 01:54 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojsluk](#)

NJK Project: "I do readily understand and personally share your Ezekiel-type concern towards these leaders of Judah, however, following a period of various warning to these leaders, Ezekiel did also move on to work amongst the exiles in Babylon in order to share and attempt to implement the greater plans that God had for Judah and Israel."

Nic responds: My main point is that Ezekiel did work on behalf of his people, in spite of their departure from the straight path the Lord had set for them. If you visit my web sites, you will realize that my main effort is not centered on writing letters to the GC. My mission is to warn my fellow Adventists about the danger of being accomplices in the destruction of the lives of innocent human beings, thus neutralizing the effectiveness of the Gospel.

NJK Project: "I take my example from Jesus, (Ezekiel's "Son of Man" anti-type) as He did not spend His entire 3.5 year ministry trying to convince the leaders then of things they already knew they should be doing, but for various reasons, were knowingly choosing not to. Christ merely, at best told them of their duty, once and that in veiled statements of parable. He then focused all of his time and effort in helping and teaching those who were in various vital need."

Nic responds: Do not forget that Jesus spent 99 percent of his mission of love for the members of his own nation. There were people suffering in the rest of the world, but Jesus concentrated his efforts to warn his own people about their need of repentance and forgiveness.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/15/11 02:08 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojsluk](#)

NJK Project: "I felt quite "disrespected" by your baseless and irrelevant Jimmy Swaggart association."

Nic responds: Can you explain what was offensive about what I stated about Jimmy Swaggart? I am at a total loss trying to figure out what you mean!

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/15/11 02:26 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojsluk](#)

Originally Posted By: Daryl F

Does anybody know if our Adventist Hospitals are in the abortion business today, as in 2011, and if so, can you provide evidence that they are?

I suggest you read the following recent article published by the Washington Post which, I believe, answers your question. I have more evidence in the event you need more.

"Seventh-Day Adventists and abortion

Christians of all denominations are gathering on the National Mall today to protest the 38th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion

nationwide. But one denomination that may be sparsely represented is Seventh-day Adventists whose large worldwide network of 170 hospitals allows [elective abortions](#).

This stance was revealed last week when Maryland state regulators gave Holy Cross Hospital, a Catholic institution, permission to build a hospital in growing northern Montgomery County, shutting out the Seventh-day Adventists, who also wanted to build a hospital in the area. Some abortion rights advocates opposed Holy Cross's selection because it does not allow abortions.

Adventists resemble many conservative Protestant denominations as they believe in divinely inspired Scripture, six literal days of Creation, justification by faith and baptism by immersion.

Their distinctive rites include worshiping on Saturday, the seventh day of the week as opposed to Sunday, an emphasis on the Second Coming of Christ and an emphasis on following Jewish dietary laws concerning abstinence from pork, shellfish and other foods proscribed as "unclean" in the Old Testament. The denomination is known for its emphasis on health. Alcohol and tobacco are prohibited and many Adventists are vegetarians.

[But the denomination may be the only theologically conservative Protestant group that allows elective abortions](#). Many of their own members didn't know that their worldwide hospital network performed the procedure, which has been quite the discussion on the Adventists for Life Facebook page. A number of posters were shocked to learn the denomination's stance.

"I can't belong to a organization who advocates abortion," one poster wrote. "I believe in Christ my Saviour, the Sabbath & etc. I believe in Sister White also," referring to Ellen G. White, one of the revered founders of the denomination.

Another poster said that Adventists opposed abortion until 1970. That is when Hawaii legalized abortion and Castle Memorial Hospital, an Adventist institution in Kailua, Hawaii, the poster said, was pressured by its own doctors, and donors, to start offering abortions. At the time, Adventist leaders in Washington indicated they did not oppose the procedure and thus, more Adventist hospitals began offering the procedure. In 1992, the denomination issued these guidelines on abortion. The official position of the church is that abortion is allowed in "extraordinary circumstances."

SDA evangelist Kevin Paulson has given the longest defense of the church's position here where he agrees the church essentially has no restrictions on the practice and might do well to restrict it more. "Many [Adventists] are forming opinions about abortion," he wrote, "not from the study of Scripture or the Spirit of Prophecy (Ellen G. White's) writings, but from listening to popular Christian leaders like James Dobson, Tim LaHaye, Franky Schaeffer, and Bill Gothard," all of whom oppose abortion.

"Sincere though they may be, these men espouse many theological errors and have no understanding of God's truth for this time," Paulson wrote. "Seventh-day Adventists should listen to such persons with extreme care and discriminating judgment. ...Among the Adventist pioneers, J.N. Andrews and John Harvey Kellogg wrote against abortion, yet the writings of Ellen White maintain the silence of Scripture on the subject... We find it interesting that when Ellen White speaks of the "earliest moments" of our children, she speaks of birth, not conception," he concluded.

Is the Seventh-day Adventists' heavy focus on healthful practices inconsistent with its position on abortion? Tell us in the comments section. ..."

By Julia Duin JANUARY 24, 2011

Source:

http://onfaith.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/undergod/2011/01/adventists_and_abortion.html

(Link:

http://onfaith.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/undergod/2011/01/adventists_and_abortion.html)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/15/11 02:49 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

NJK Project: "However, I also would like to see concrete, current numbers on this."

Nic responds: I do share your desire for concrete numbers. The only concrete numbers I have ever seen is what the Washington Post provided several decades ago in which it was reported that our Washington Adventist Hospital did perform 1494 abortion in a seven-year period.

The problem is: How do you secure those numbers? I did write to the WAH several months ago and I am still waiting for a response from them. I seriously doubt that they will ever respond. I believe that this hospital is one of the main offenders in this respect. Some years ago, Spectrum magazine published the result of a survey showing that five of our medical institutions were offering elective abortions to their patients, but they did not provide any numbers.

A few weeks ago I sent an email to Dr. Gerald Winslow, the alleged architect of our guidelines on abortion, asking the same question. No response. He could be on vacation, but I doubt that such is the case. Two years ago I wrote to him regarding the abortion issue and he did not respond. There seems to exist a conspiracy of silence on the subject. I have also written to the former president of the General Conference and the current one without any success. It is evident that the church prefers to be silent on this issue.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/15/11 03:42 PM

Posted by: [Daryl F](#)

I wonder how our more higher profile people like Pastor Doug Batchelor feels about this?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 03:03 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

I do recall having read that. So, it seems to me, that such statements, and several similar ones, you consider as self-evident truths and therefore need not dig diligently into the scriptures.

Correct! I do not need "more time and study" to know that abortion is murder and to try to do something tangible to seek to fully "abort it."

Originally Posted By: kland

There is another here who has stated similarly as you said: "It must be because I have chosen to simply obey what God has already clearly stated." Does that sound to you like some who would say, God said it, I believe it, and therefore I can turn my brain off?

No. In this present context. This only sound like how you would want to disparaging and discredit him and pigeon-hole him. It doesn't take much to go from Christian to scoffer!

Originally Posted By: kland

With all the knowledge you have, I would tend to agree with Green that you don't strike me as one like that.

Neither I, nor that other person is "like that" and, again, in this present, pertinent context in which this is being said of abortion, it is actually the types of you and Green Cochoa who are choosing to close their eyes and turn off their brain and not see here abortion as murder. The attempted side discussion of the actually already settled issue of the difference between killing and murder is completely irrelevant to this clear-cut murder case that abortion is.

Originally Posted By: kland

I come from a science background and have trouble accepting things assumed to be true and with no study. Perhaps we have no common basis for a discussion.

This is more than an science issue. It is a Spiritual one. And this is indeed where we have a difference. Further "science" will clearly tell you that abortion is murder because if the life of that conceived infant was not so interfered with, they would have most probably been born and lived a normal, full life. So the real issue is not science at all, but cherished, fallen, base and selfishly and murderously degenerate human nature. Or as EGW prophetically says, in indeed this Shaking issue, "science falsely so-called" (LDE 176, 177; FLB 321, 322).

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 03:05 AMPosted by: [NJK Project](#)**Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk**

My main point is that Ezekiel did work on behalf of his people, in spite of their departure from the straight path the Lord had set for them. If you visit my web sites, you will realize that my main effort is not centered on writing letters to the GC. My mission is to warn my fellow Adventists about the danger of being accomplices in the destruction of the lives of innocent human beings, thus neutralizing the effectiveness of the Gospel.

Point taken since I indeed did not take the time to go through your website, and have indeed seen, in your many posts on this issue in various SDA Forums that you are indeed working with the (lay) people. However what does puzzle me is why you would not more actively (and not necessarily right now with donated money, as you evidently misunderstood, in this ".info" stage of the Project (vs. is later ".org" establishment phase, and then ".njk" fully-functioning end), support this project which indeed has the potential to do what you ultimately want to do, at a much fuller scale? Indeed your work and expertise in this issue can be of great help to this ministry.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Do not forget that Jesus spent 99 percent of his mission of love for the members of his own nation. There were people suffering in the rest of the world, but Jesus concentrated his efforts to warn his own people about their need of repentance and forgiveness.

Indeed as Jesus explicitly said, He was primarily sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt 15:24; cf. 10:6), however the exegetically accurate/full truth is that, since the completion of Christ's ministry and His ascension so that the Holy Spirit could be sent, our mission is unequivocally and most pivotally, to the entire world, to even the least of these Christ's brethren (Matt 25:45). So an excuse of permanent Israel-only ministry is not Biblically/exegetically supported.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 03:05 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Can you explain what was offensive about what I stated about Jimmy Swaggart? I am at a total loss trying to figure out what you mean!

Just reread your "This reminds me of Jimmy Swaggart." comment and its context. You had just insinuated that I was being egoistical and trying to take the place of Christ and then went on to relate how Swaggart Swindled you out of his money, and through his scandalous, degenerate fall. Since all of this was completely "baseless and irrelevant" to me, my project and Gospel/Bible-based and emphasized admonitions, then I only saw this as a desperate attempt to "shoot the messenger since the message clearly cannot be Biblically disputed." Since, as you realize and admit, my project will bring the better/best results, then why are you still not wholly supporting it?? I can deduce several Spiritual, cause-effect reasons... If I was offering you a realizable chance to get \$65,000,000 over the next year would you similarly not now begin to meet the requirements for it, so that you spend \$1,494 in order to make \$1,494 over the next 12+ years???

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 03:06 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I do share your desire for concrete numbers....

Perhaps you can instead contact the author of that Washington Post article to ask him where/how he got his facts/numbers?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 09:02 AM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

The attempted side discussion of the actually already settled issue of the difference between killing and murder is completely irrelevant to this clear-cut murder case that abortion is.

That strikes me as an argument evolutionists use about evolution being a settled fact and therefore needs no further discussion nor study.

Babies are being killed. For some reason, you feel the need to make the distinction that it's "murder" as in, if it was just "killing" it would be ok to do. I can only suspect you have some innate need to justify the need of killing. Which I believe you have so stated. Killing is never ok to do. It seals that person's eternity.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 09:39 AM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

NJK Project: "Just reread your "This reminds me of Jimmy Swaggart." comment and its context. You had just insinuated that I was being egoistical and trying to take the place of

Christ and then went on to relate how Swaggart Swindled you out of his money, and through his scandalous, degenerate fall.”

Nic responds: Your attitude reminded me of Jimmy Swaggart for the simple reason that you attempted to take me on guilt trip the moment I failed to follow your request. That is not the way Jesus or his Spirit operates. The Lord does not force the will, and much less on the first encounter with an individual. I take my orders from above instead of prone to err human beings.

And, by the way, Swaggart did not swindle my financial contribution from me. I made only a single monetary contribution to his cause, and it was before his fall. When he attempted to take me on a guilt trip, I simply ignored this clever strategy of his.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 09:50 AM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I do share your desire for concrete numbers....

Perhaps you can instead contact the author of that Washington Post article to ask him where/how he got his facts/numbers?

Those figures by the Washington Post were published two decades ago. The only thing I have is the information provided by an article written at the time by George Gainer entitled “The Wisdom of Solomon” and published by Spectrum magazine. My attempt to locate the original WP article failed. How can I contact the author of said article if I don’t even know the name of its author? The two recent articles published by the WP do not include any numerical data about abortion.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 11:48 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

That strikes me as an argument evolutionists use about evolution being a settled fact and therefore needs no further discussion nor study

Is that really the one thing that this “strikes” you as, or the best you could come up with?? There is a myriad of other potential, similarly, mindless and irrelevant possibilities that this could “strike you as.” Don’t let me stop you. Funny, I rather mostly hear “Evolution” being called a “Theory”, but of course you desperately needed to draw a comparison from a fringe few.

Originally Posted By: kland

Babies are being killed. For some reason, you feel the need to make the distinction that it's "murder" as in, if it was just "killing" it would be ok to do.

So that was your trump card all this time. No wonder you kept it in the shadows all of this time. That falsely equating rationale would only make sense to you.

Answer this: what would you do if it was a scientific fact that a maintained pregnancy of a mother, even within the first 5 months, will surely cause her death??!

Originally Posted By: kland

I can only suspect you have some innate need to justify the need of killing. Which I believe you have so stated.

Indeed I do, mainly in terms of e.g., capital punishment, as a deterrent for the crime of most irreparable harm, and in matters of (justified) self-defense, so that I can continue to live.

Originally Posted By: kland

Killing is never ok to do. It seals that person's eternity.

Now that's "Utopian"!! As the saying goes, there are no Atheist in foxholes, I'll like to see you in a personal, defensible but inevitable, life or death situation vs. a endeavoring murderer. Someone's "eternity" will have to be sealed. Are you then, effectively, going to "kill yourself"??

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 11:50 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Your attitude reminded me of Jimmy Swaggart for the simple reason that you attempted to take me on guilt trip the moment I failed to follow your request. When he [**Swaggart**] attempted to take me on a guilt trip, I simply ignored this clever strategy of his.

As I said before, you "guilt issue" is not wiht me but with the unequivocal, inevitable and stringent mandate of Christ's Gospel. So first show me where my Project and/or my emphasizing of its Biblical and Gospel conformity is "unbibilical" and then you'll have a personal issue with me!

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

That is not the way Jesus or his Spirit operates. The Lord does not force the will, and much less on the first encounter with an individual.

Really.... Have you ever read Matt 19:16-26|DA 518-523!??

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I take my orders from above instead of prone to err human beings.

Take this as you prefer but, if you and others like you, did indeed 'take your orders from above,' then I wouldn't have to make these posts about my Project for you would already be fully doing this ultimate Gospel work. (I personally would welcome the removal, due to

mootness, of this added "promotional" workload.) This Gospel mandate is equally, fully binding upon us all.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/16/11 11:51 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

...How can I contact the author of said article if I don't even know the name of its author?

Uhhhh.... contact the Washington Post....!!

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/17/11 09:46 AM

Posted by: [kland](#)

I didn't limit it to one. Global warmists' arguments are another it strikes me as.

I don't know what you are saying about a trump card. I've been saying the same for many posts now.

Quote:

Answer this: what would you do if it was a scientific fact that a maintained pregnancy of a mother, even within the first 5 months, will surely cause her death??!

But that's weird. First, I think it was you who said killing a baby is murder, but now you suggest that sometimes it's ok to kill a baby, that sometimes the act on the same "innocence" is murder and other times it's killing? Do you see how weird this is becoming when you attempt to make a distinction?

Quote:

Now that's "Utopian"!! As the saying goes, there are no Atheist in foxholes, I'll like to see you in a personal, defensible but inevitable, life or death situation vs. a endeavoring murderer. Someone's "eternity" will have to be sealed. Are you then, effectively, going to "kill yourself"??

Hmmm...

So you see a problem with a saved person dying versus an unsaved person dying?

Saying killing is ok, is non-Biblical. Jesus never supported such an idea.

Mt 26:52 But Jesus said to him, "Put your sword in its place, for all who take the sword will perish by the sword.

Mind you, that's not the only verse. 🤔

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/17/11 01:28 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

I didn't limit it to one. Global warmists' arguments are another it strikes me as.

The issue, and my point, in this statement is that no matter how many "other examples" you can come with it will still not substantive address the issues involved in abortion. SO it is both irrelevant and pointless. Confront the present issue of abortion exclusively and head on.

Originally Posted By: kland

I don't know what you are saying about a trump card. I've been saying the same for many posts now.

I hadn't gotten that clear impression from your prior statement. It seems to me that you backed your way to this now clearest/definitive (to me at least) statement of you opinion.

Originally Posted By: kland

But that's weird. First, I think it was you who said killing a baby is murder, but now you suggest that sometimes it's ok to kill a baby, that sometimes the act on the same "innocence" is murder and other times it's killing? Do you see how weird this is becoming when you attempt to make a distinction?

See [here \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130085#Post130085\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130085#Post130085) for my clearly expressed earlier view. I have always said that murdering a baby is wrong. Only in such objective and inevitable life-for-life issues where it is best to save the most viable life of the two would this "killing" be justified. What is really weird is that since you view all killing as wrong, you won't "kill" the baby and thus eventually kill both the mother and the baby!!?

Originally Posted By: kland

Hmmm...
So you see a problem with a saved person dying versus an unsaved person dying?

Who said anything about a saved person vs. an unsaved person. To be frank with you, and to say the very least given your reasonings thus far, I have no opinion either way about you. That scenario could actually be involving an out of controlled enraged Christian deciding to take justice into his own hands and seeking to murder you for having had an affair with his wife from the past 5 years?!!

Originally Posted By: kland

Saying killing is ok, is non-Biblical. Jesus never supported such an idea.

The funny things is, contrary to this whole forced side conversation on killing vs. murder, I have been saying that saying that the murder of infant is not okay (contra. abortion). While Jesus clearly injected an element of grace on especially the capital punishment that was permitted in the OT, and that because none present were righteous enough to cast the first stone, he did not however here or anywhere else say that judicious killing, e.g., capital punishment, was wrong. If that was his case he would have clearly said so in a "you have heard it said.... but I say unto you....". Matt 5: 38, 39 (=Exo 21:24) is limited to lesser interpersonal squabbles and not to fatal judicious matters. Notice that He starts with the statements in Exod 21:24, which are descending in their order of severity of damage (i.e., eye, hand, foot, tooth, burn wound, bruise), and not with "life" of verse 23.

You still need to resolve the life-threatened pregnant mother, and in case you may be considering this out: -you *are* the only doctor in the world!

Originally Posted By: kland

Mt 26:52 But Jesus said to him, "Put your sword in its place, for all who take the sword will perish by the sword.

Good advice for a way to live, one that Peter indeed needed to learn. Nonetheless, "Justice", by inherent function and definition, does not involve a "living by the sword". It does not even "wield a sword", so to speak. That advice of Christ also applies to nations whose foreign policy is established by the "sword" vs. diplomacy.

Originally Posted By: kland

Mind you, that's not the only verse.

Do cite the others and let's find out the exegetical truth!

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/17/11 04:09 PM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Quote:

See here for my clearly expressed earlier view. I have always said that murdering a baby is wrong. Only in such objective and inevitable life-for-life issues where it is best to save the most viable life of the two would this "murdering" be justified. What is really weird is that since you view all killing as wrong, you won't "kill" the baby and thus eventually kill both the mother and the baby!!?

Fixed it for you.

Quote:

SO it is both irrelevant and pointless. Confront the present issue of abortion exclusively and head on.

Ok. I haven't been talking about abortion, but a statement you claimed or at least agreed with.

So, let's talk about abortion in Adventist hospitals. At the one nearest to you, how many abortions were performed last year?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/17/11 05:48 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

Fixed it for you.

Huhhh!!!... To paraphrase an ethnic saying: 'Who died and made you me???' You are either just full of yourself and/or are completely in a fog as to the actual difference between "killing" and "murder". Given the judicial decision that has to be made in order to save a life, that is most definitely a matter of "killing" and not "murder" and the only valid reason for an abortion! So in the future, don't presume to know what I mean, but first ask for a clarification

when **you** don't understand.

So... back to that scenario question that you can't/won't answer... what would you do (other than, of course, 'live and let die')?

Originally Posted By: kland

So, let's talk about abortion in Adventist hospitals. At the one nearest to you, how many abortions were performed last year?

Don't know.... don't "prioritorily" care! As I already said, instead of focusing on something that won't really make a difference, as if SDA's stopped doing abortions, other clinics/hospitals will still do these, I am working on a plan that will not only deal with that handful from SDA Hospitals, but the 65+ million others. So raise your "standard" to that Biblical level.

(And as far as I know, there are no SDA Hospitals in Canada, so the nearest SDA Hospital to me (which I have visited in the past) is probably the one next to the Campus of Washington Adventist University in Takoma Park, MD, some 850 miles from my house.) And, sorry you can't handle it, but I do not have a limited, local, denominational mandate.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/17/11 05:55 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

The attempted side discussion of the actually already settled issue of the difference between killing and murder is completely irrelevant to this clear-cut murder case that abortion is.

That strikes me as an argument evolutionists use about evolution being a settled fact and therefore needs no further discussion nor study.

Babies are being killed. For some reason, you feel the need to make the distinction that it's "murder" as in, if it was just "killing" it would be ok to do. I can only suspect you have some innate need to justify the need of killing. Which I believe you have so stated. Killing is never ok to do. It seals that person's eternity.

kland,

I have noticed the same insistence on reaching conclusions without any "side discussion," or study. As Jesus advocated that one not choose to cast pearls before swine, it seems best not to force those "studies" into this discussion when they would be manifestly unappreciated. Therefore, I have not continued with the Biblical texts distinguishing murder from killing.

However, the challenge has been presented to me that it was not possible to come up with a list of texts from the Bible in regards to abortion or I would have done so already in "two seconds." Well, first of all, I did not have said list on file. It takes more time than that to look them up and compile them. Secondly, I have been quite busy lately, and have had internet outages for hours at a time as well during the past several days. Of course, NJK and others would be unaware of those details, but in a public forum such as this, it is always nice to give others some benefit of the doubt.

Anyhow, in the next post, I'll share some texts for the sake of Biblical truth and clarity.

God bless,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/17/11 06:25 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

First, let us be clear on the definitions of "abortion." The Bible does not use the word, nor is it utilized with our modern sense in any of the writings of Mrs. White. What did the word itself mean in her day?

Originally Posted By: Webster's 1828 Dictionary

ABORT, v.i. [L. aborto; ab and ortus, orior.] To miscarry in birth. [Not in use.]

ABORT, n. An abortion. [Not in use.]

ABORTION, n. [L. abortio, a miscarriage; usually deduced from ab and orior.]

1. The act of miscarrying, or producing young before the natural time, or before the fetus is perfectly formed.

2. In a figurative sense, any fruit or produce that does not come to maturity, or any thing which fails in its progress, before it is matured or perfect, as a design or project.

3. The fetus brought forth before it is perfectly formed.

ABORTIVE, a.

1. Brought forth in an immature state; failing, or coming to naught, before it is complete.

2. Failing in its effect; miscarrying; producing nothing; as an abortive scheme.

3. Rendering abortive; as abortive gulf, in Milton, but not legitimate.

4. Pertaining to abortion; as abortive vellum, made of the skin of an abortive calf.

5. In botany, an abortive flower is one which falls without producing fruit.

ABORTIVE, n. That which is brought forth or born prematurely. [Little used.]

ABORTIVELY, adv. Immaturely; in an untimely manner.

ABORTIVENESS, n. The state of being abortive; a failing in the progress to perfection or maturity; a failure of producing the intended effect.

ABORTMENT, n. An untimely birth.

In the Webster's dictionary of 1828, you see that term "untimely birth" several times in the definitions for abortion. By definition, an untimely birth would include both "miscarriage" and "abortion" in our modern sense. Neither situation has brought the birth to maturity, but has produced its fruit prematurely.

This term "untimely birth" is the one we find used in the Bible. Before we go on to the texts which utilize this term, let us look at the definition of the Hebrew word behind the term. You may check this information yourself online at BlueLetterBible.org following [THIS LINK](http://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongs=H5309&t=KJV). (Link: <http://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongs=H5309&t=KJV>) (The picture did not embed itself here as desired. Please see picture of Hebrew definition attached to bottom of this post.)

Now, here are the passages that refer to these "untimely births" or "abortions."

Originally Posted By: The Bible

Why did the knees prevent me? or why the breasts that I should suck? (Job 3:12, KJV)

For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept: then had I been at rest, (Job 3:13, KJV)

...

Or as an hidden untimely birth I had not been; as infants which never saw light. (Job 3:16, KJV)

Job is wishing here that he had been aborted, and had not been nursed and dandled from birth. He says it would have been better to thus have "not been." This seems significant. Job was "not" until he was born.

Originally Posted By: The Bible

The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies. (Psalms 58:3, KJV)

Their poison is like the poison of a serpent: they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear; (Psalms 58:4, KJV)

...

As a snail which melteth, let every one of them pass away: like the untimely birth of a woman, that they may not see the sun. (Psalms 58:8, KJV)

Here David is praying that the wicked "pass away" or be aborted before they should "see the sun."

Finally, the "wisest man on earth" promotes abortion in the following passage:

Originally Posted By: The Bible

If a man beget an hundred children, and live many years, so that the days of his years be many, and his soul be not filled with good, and also that he have no burial; I say, that an untimely birth is better than he. (Ecclesiastes 6:3, KJV)

In that verse, Solomon says that it is better to have been aborted than to have lived a long life of evil.

To say that the Bible is strongly anti-abortion is simply not supportable. These are the only verses on the topic in the Bible, and in every one of them, abortion is the desired outcome.

God bless,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/17/11 07:19 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

LOL preposterous... Okay then, let's abort infants who: will be suicidally depressed when deliberately afflicted by Satan in a bet with God; or will live evil lives or not be satisfied despite the fullness of their life. As with the mentality for abortion, when you're a god, and one who knows the future, I'll accept that you know who should live and who should die, and

that, of course, before they are born, because after that, it is no longer allowed!?? In the mean time I'll continue to obey God. And those, literally, private wishes do not trump God's command (Exod 20:13)!

And while your at it worshipping "Solomon", why don't you go ahead and do all that he "wisely" did. I'll listened to and follow Jesus instead (Matt 12:42; 25:45).

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/17/11 08:51 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

LOL preposterous...

Calling the Bible preposterous? the dictionary? the Hebrew language? the words of Solomon? of Job? of David?

Would you truly laugh at these witnesses and call them absurd?

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Okay then, let's abort infants who: will be suicidally depressed when deliberately afflicted by Satan in a bet with God; or will live evil lives or not be satisfied despite the fullness of their life.

I notice that you do not here choose to refute the facts. That is admirable. Instead, however, you have asked some rather deep questions. I have not asked these questions, however.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

As with the mentality for abortion, when you're a god, and one who knows the future, I'll accept that you know who should live and who should die, and that, of course, before they are born, because after that, it is no longer allowed!??

There are more natural abortions (i.e. "acts of God") that are performed in this world by far (known as "miscarriages") than the ones which man has deliberately induced. God does seem to have His reasons for this, and frequently it is on account of the deformity of the fetus. God has designed the mother's body in such a way that it will naturally reject the fetus if it passes a certain threshold of quality. We can be thankful that these abortions occur, because if they did not, our planet would be filled with many miserable and deformed creatures that even a mother might have difficulty loving. The burden that such beings, frequently with zero quality of life or having no intelligence by which to understand their own existence, would be upon society would be tremendous. I'm glad God has permitted, even designed, for such abortions to take place.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

In the mean time I'll continue to obey God. And those, literally, private wishes do not trump God's command (Exod 20:13)!

This commandment follows the line of study that you weren't interested in earlier, so no further discussion here is necessary regarding "murder" vs. "kill," unless you would like to reopen that line of study.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

And while your at it worshipping "Solomon", why don't you go ahead and do all that he "wisely" did. I'll listened to and follow Jesus instead (Matt 12:42; 25:45).

I'm not worshipping Solomon, are you? These disparaging comments of the Bible authors are simply uncalled for here in this discussion. I do not worship Moses or Matthew either, but it is in my best interest to follow what they wrote. God's commandments are given to us through men. I notice that you quoted from Matthew's book. I'm sure you don't worship him. Then you should follow the "golden rule" which Matthew also wrote down for us which would have prevented you from speaking as you did.

God bless,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/17/11 10:07 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Calling the Bible preposterous? the dictionary? the Hebrew language? the words of Solomon? of Job? of David? Would you truly laugh at these witnesses and call them absurd?

Uhhh.. No..... I considered your eisogesis to be incongruous with the Bible and actual intent of these specific writers and thus inviting ridicule. Obviously you are too, at worst, self-deceived on this matter to have seen this exegetical deficiency for yourself.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I notice that you do not here choose to refute the facts. That is admirable. Instead, however, you have asked some rather deep questions. I have not asked these questions, however.

No need to call the fire department when it was only a flash in the pan. As proper exegesis demand and given that this is actually the contextual intent of these writers, you should have asked these "deeper" questions. Biblical exegesis is not limited by what you may or may not know, or worse prefer to ignore.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

There are more natural abortions (i.e. "acts of God") that are performed in this world by far (known as "miscarriages") than the ones which man has deliberately induced.

On top of being actually also topically irrelevant, since this, if it even was the case, would, like His other judicious killings, also be God's doing and not man's "preferential choice"; try this theological thought on for size: Other than the miraculous conceptions in the Bible (e.g., Isaac's; Samuel's, Jesus') there has not been other God does not intervene in the natural birthing process. Also seems to me that God does not need to do miscarriages since he can render a woman barren if he wants to. So no "acts of God" here and were not going to take your unsupported word for it in order to, effectively justify the continuation of abortions. And I guess, with all of the wicked people alive today, according to your view God has let many slip

through his fingers, including, e.g., Adolph Hitler.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

God does seem to have His reasons for this, and frequently it is on account of the deformity of the fetus. God has designed the mother's body in such a way that it will naturally reject the fetus if it passes a certain threshold of quality. We can be thankful that these abortions occur, because if they did not, our planet would be filled with many miserable and deformed creatures that even a mother might have difficulty loving.

Whatever... Just more of you wishful thinking. Judging by the many severely deformed and sickly people that have lived, God also had many misses here??... Or was it simply, scientifically speaking, that these infants and or, in many, if not the predominant, most cases, the mother reproductive system was not able to sustain the fetus life. By the way, how do you know that so many miscarried fetuses were "so deformed," that they God knew in advance that they would not be loved, by anyone, including His professed people who should be adopting such "orphanedly" cast away infants. Clearly this is just your deeply seated wishful thinking that expressing itself out loud.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

The burden that such beings, frequently with zero quality of life or having no intelligence by which to understand their own existence, would be upon society would be tremendous. I'm glad God has permitted, even designed, for such abortions to take place

Bingo...speaking of being joined to you idols (Hos 4:17). Couldn't infer it better myself. - So since you "Capitalistically" believe that supposedly all miscarriages must be deformed infants that no one at all should love or care for as they will be a great economic burden then that must be the Word of God. Now that's both making a graven image and worshipping in the place of God, not to mention blaspheming God's name and trodden under foot His Sabbatical principles!! You're four for four on violating the first 4 Commandments!

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

This commandment follows the line of study that you weren't interested in earlier, so no further discussion here is necessary regarding "murder" vs. "kill," unless you would like to reopen that line of study.

Don't flatter yourself. I'm not interested in watching you frantically trying to inflate a deflated ball which has a slash right through it, let alone helping you. You can indeed take your deflated soccer ball and go home, this baseball game (i.e., abortion if murder and murder is condemned in the Bible) will go on just fine. And quite seriously, the offer to later redress my "error" is still open if I should have been using your deflated soccer ball for this baseball game! While you are trying to be right, I'll still go ahead and do what is right! And murder for the sake of the economic is compoundedly Satanically "Unrighteous" to anyone who actually has God's Spirit. (Luke 16:13). According to your understanding, God must have not known what He was talking about when He said "Populate (i.e., Swarm in) the earth abundantly and multiply in it" after the Flood when the earth was as it currently is (Gen 9:7) or did He just

have in mind "economically viable" people?! Have you seen all of the unpopulated space in the earth. (Check it out through Google Earth) The whole world can easily live in the territory of the U.S. and given or present technology easily thrive.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I'm not worshipping Solomon, are you?

That was actually my point to you.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

These disparaging comments of the Bible authors are simply uncalled for here in this discussion.

Solomon (if he actually is "the Preacher") apologetically opened himself to such, actually healthy, criticism (in terms of making God's word and not any man's "wisdom" our authority) for having most foolishly lived in the past, -capital sins and waywardness that led to the uncircumventible rifting of God's Israel. (1 Kgs 11:11, 31; 12:15, 24).

By the way Solomon statements, which are the only non-desperately and angry wishful thinking of those three passage, are deliberately hyperbolically goading people to enjoy the life that they have, especially if they are so blessed as to have 100 children. And not as you esiogetically claimed, an endorsement for abortion.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I do not worship Moses or Matthew either, but it is in my best interest to follow what they wrote. God's commandments are given to us through men. I notice that you quoted from Matthew's book. I'm sure you don't worship him. Then you should follow the "golden rule" which Matthew also wrote down for us which would have prevented you from speaking as you did.

Simply playing along here: At least I am not encouraging/condoning the of murdering infants, especially as 'I do not wish that this would have been done to me' as it actually could have as my mom repeatedly tells me had she not, actually effortlessly, categorically reject as evil the "advice" of a Church Sister (who, by the way, had her grown son murdered later in life! Probably just a coincidence, but I would have love to see if she shed a (effectively hypocritical) tear at the funeral).

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

God bless,

In the light of what you have expressed to believe... which "God" - Your economic/natural selection god of Mammon, or the All Mighty, Loving Creator God?!?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 12:58 AM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

ADMIN HAT ON

NJK Project,

If you would like to continue posting in this thread, please follow our forum rules. Please review them under the [FAQ link \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=faq\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=faq) at the top right hand side of this forum. From the list, click on the plus sign beside "What are the rules of conduct for the forum?"

ADMIN HAT OFF

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 02:59 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

ADMIN HAT ON

NJK Project,

If you would like to continue posting in this thread, please follow our forum rules. Please review them under the [FAQ link \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=faq\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=faq) at the top right hand side of this forum. From the list, click on the plus sign beside "What are the rules of conduct for the forum?"

ADMIN HAT OFF

Great! Being exegetical (i.e., avoiding "proof-texting") should also be a requirement, especially for SDA's:

Originally Posted By: Hans K. Larondelle

"Nineteen-seventy-four seems to be a new beginning in Adventist eschatology; because the General Conference had then organized a series of Bible studies called Symposium on the Biblical Hermeneutic [the science of Biblical interpretation]. And most of us will have that book of that title. Under the leadership of Gordon Hyde. It seems to me that that year, and that series of Bible studies, all over the United States, and then snowballing over other parts of the world, was inaugurating the end of a certain phase-which I would call the 'old style "proof-text" method.' Not that we are no longer using proof texts. But the old style of detached proof-text method, that was popular, and that I also have used for many years to prove our doctrines. And there is nothing wrong with proving a doctrine, as long as we know what we're doing. But this symposium on Biblical hermeneutics, with the supervision of the General Conference, all over the world, was teaching our ministry that we have to do a little better with handling the Bible.

That we have to consider more the organic unity in the Bible, treating the Bible with more respect and not misusing it as an arsenal to use to draw from weapons to hit our opponents over the head in order to prove that we are right and they are wrong, but to use the Bible more as it ought to be done. As a historical book, coming from an Oriental culture. As a book that has the message of God hidden in it, not always lying on the surface, and that a lot of work and homework and study is needed, to enter into the essence of the Biblical message."

Still awaiting your substantive response.

And, according to your own rules, shouldn't this specific/personalized message have been PM'ed (1T 578???)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 04:10 AM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

NJK,

There are gray areas in the scriptures. It appears to me that the abortion issue is one of them. I have not found any text which clearly prohibits abortions. Yes, there is the text which says "Thou shalt not murder." Yet "murder" is subject to definition, and according to the Bible, there are several salient points from which to define it. As you have yourself said, an "act of God" cannot be judged in human terms, and God is free to do things which we as humans may not do. I agree with this. There are things we should not do. One of those things was to take vengeance. God has said, "Vengeance is mine." It is not our place to exact vengeance, it is God's place. Killing as an act of vengeance is murder.

Killing as an act of war is not murder. Killing as capital punishment is not murder, as long as the punishment was met according to God's prescribed laws. And killing of animals is not murder, for they are not human and are soul-less.

Here is where we may diverge a little in our understanding, but I hope you can be sufficiently broad-minded as to understand that God's Word may sometimes be understood in other ways by other people, and those ways are not automatically wrong simply because they do not agree with your own understanding. My understanding is based firmly on scripture. I do not criticize you for your view and interpretation of this subject, and I expect the same equanimity on your part. We can both recognize that there are diverse possible understandings of the same scriptures.

Without further ado, here is my understanding and the reason why I have, for the moment (for I am always open to learning more and adopting new truths as I find them), adopted the view toward abortion which I have.

According to the Bible, as I understand it, one does not become a living soul before birth. It is at birth that the new being separates from his or her mother and begins to breathe independently of her. It is this "breath of life" which is so Biblically significant. When we die, our breath is said to return to God who gave it. The breath signifies the life. There are many texts which would confirm this from the Bible.

Originally Posted By: The Bible

Thus saith the Lord GOD unto these bones; Behold, I will cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live: And I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and ye shall live; and ye shall know that I am the LORD. (Ezekiel 37:5-6)

Then said he unto me, Prophecy unto the wind, prophesy, son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army. (Ezekiel 37:9-10)

Ezekiel is quoting God, who indicates that it is the breath which causes one to live.

Originally Posted By: The Bible

And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. (Genesis 2:7)

God breathed into Adam's nostrils before he became a "living soul." God did not put the breath into Adam's navel, nor into his blood, but into his nostrils.

Originally Posted By: The Bible

7:22 All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark. And the waters prevailed upon the earth an hundred and fifty days. (Genesis 7:22-24)

Here again, the "breath of life" is described as that which is in the nostrils.

Originally Posted By: The Bible

And all the spoil of these cities, and the cattle, the children of Israel took for a prey unto themselves; but every man they smote with the edge of the sword, until they had destroyed them, neither left they any to breathe. (Joshua 11:14)

Not breathing, in this verse, means not alive.

Originally Posted By: The Bible

The spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life. (Job 33:4)

The word "spirit" is frequently synonymous with "breath." The Greek word for this is "pneuma," which has as one of its definitions "breath of nostrils or mouth." It is the same word from which we derive modern air/breath/lung terms such as pneumatic, pneumonia, and pneumograph (an instrument which records movements of the chest in breathing). Without this "spirit" we are not yet "made" alive.

An unborn fetus has not yet taken a breath. It is not yet counted as a living soul, and the Bible calls it a "fruit." One cannot "murder" that which is not a living soul.

Lines do have to be drawn somewhere. We should respect life. We should not seek to destroy life. Even the animals should be preserved and cared for by mankind, for they are given us by God and He has given us dominion over them. However, Mrs. White makes clear that we need not fear killing the vermin and pests which destroy our crops or bring disease upon us. There is a difference between the life of a mosquito and that of a horse. There are clear lines of distinction between classes of animals.

And there must be a line of distinction between humans and would-be humans. Many of the ancient religions worshiped gods and goddesses of fertility. The Catholic church today, with its strong stance against contraception, essentially worships those gods of fertility still. Ultimately, the message they send is that it is tantamount to "murder" to allow one's seed or egg to go to waste.

Mrs. White, however, gives us an opposite view. She says parents should not bring children into this world without proper ability to care for them. Parents are to be responsible, and not just bring child after child into the world as if one did not know where babies come from. Many in the world today are doing just this, and they are most usually in the lower classes of society.

Originally Posted By: Ellen White

Economic Considerations.--[Parents] should calmly consider what provision can be made for their children. **They have no right to bring children into the world to be a burden to others.** Have they a business that they can rely upon to sustain a family so that they need not become a burden to others? If they have not, they commit a crime in bringing children into the world to suffer for want of proper care, food, and clothing. {AH 164.3}

Do not misunderstand me here, I am not pushing for abortion. What I am advocating here is responsibility in parenthood and carefulness in understanding the Bible. Above all, I feel there are some issues that are simply best left as a right of conscience. While I may not choose to recommend an abortion, I feel compelled to allow others the right to make their own educated decision on the matter.

God bless,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 09:22 AM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

NJK Project said: "As I said before, you "guilt issue" is not with me but with the unequivocal, inevitable and stringent mandate of Christ's Gospel."

Nic responds: Show me where is the Bible's text stating that I have to neglect the mission the Lord laid on my heart and involve myself with your personal mission?

NJK Project said: "So first show me where my Project and/or my emphasizing of its Biblical and Gospel conformity is "unbiblical" and then you'll have a personal issue with me!"

Nic responds: I did take the time to read some of the material you made reference to and I did congratulate you for your work, and you conclude from this that I am now required to prove that your project is unbiblical? I don't get it! How did you manage to jump from A to B?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 11:22 AM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Calling the Bible preposterous? the dictionary? the Hebrew language? the words of Solomon? of Job? of David?

Would you truly laugh at these witnesses and call them absurd?

While I believe you did a good research of the Bible and terms, I would have to agree with NJK that it's your conclusion which is false. There are places in the Bible (Job?) where the writer says he wishes he was dead. Should we conclude that suicide is supported by the

Bible - a desired outcome? Or killing people for their wives?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 12:04 PM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Quote:

Nic: What the Bible condemns is killing the innocent. Murder is defined as the killing of innocent human beings. The death penalty is not condemned in Scripture.

NJK: Technically speaking, I did not say the above quote. Nic Samojluk did. I nonetheless fully agree with him here.

NJK: See here for my clearly expressed earlier view. I have always said that murdering a baby is wrong. Only in such objective and inevitable life-for-life issues where it is best to save the most viable life of the two would this "killing" be justified.

NJK: First of all, I think the Bible is clear that no man has the power or authority to take the innocent life of another person. Even God abides by that "capital punishment" principle (e.g Gen 6:5-7; 15:16). So I personally see that the only justification for performing an abortion is solely when the life of the pregnant mother is objectively at vital risk. The same "life for a life" (= self-defense, "just war") is also established in the Bible.

It seems to me that you are saying, murdering a baby is always wrong -- except in certain circumstances.

Now that I go back and read it, I see you agree that killing of innocent human beings is considered "murder". Maybe, just maybe, in order to make your statements make some sense, maybe you think babies who threaten the life of a mother are not innocent and therefore killing of such would not be "murder"?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 01:07 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Calling the Bible preposterous? the dictionary? the Hebrew language? the words of Solomon? of Job? of David?

Would you truly laugh at these witnesses and call them absurd?

While I believe you did a good research of the Bible and terms, I would have to agree with NJK that it's your conclusion which is false. There are places in the Bible (Job?) where the writer says he wishes he was dead. Should we conclude that suicide is supported by the Bible - a desired outcome? Or killing people for their wives?

kland,

What I said in my post was true. In every direct mention of abortion in the Bible, it was the desired outcome. I am not attempting to proclaim that the desire was righteous or best. But if God were telling us that abortion is wrong, why would we not have at least one of the

abortion texts indicating so? Instead, we have every single one of them coming down on the same side of saying abortion would be better than the alternative (e.g. a long life of evil).

I'm not trying to say that the Bible supports abortion. My point was that the Bible is not necessarily *anti*-abortion. As I said earlier, it appears to be one of the gray areas in the Bible.

God bless,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 01:47 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Green Cochoa, I appreciate your extended presentation of your stance, as I was about to ask you point blankly to state where you stand on the issue. After have read all of the reasons for your position it seems non-sequitur to my why you would not be wholly for abortion, because, it in essence would like 'killing lifeless and "soul-less animals" and even already dead ones. I can only see this as you not being convinced by what you are finding/using to support your view.

Above all of the various elements involved in Biblical exegesis, the, arguably, most crucial element, in my view, solely because it can be readily dealt with by even lay people, is that of context. It is by examining a text in its context that we draw out its true meaning as that text/statement becomes define by how the author was intending it to be, as it should be. I think you can easily see that if texts are taking out of their contexts, almost anything can then be "supported" from the Bible. Through such contextual analysis, it can then be seen what the Bible simple "describes" vs. what it "prescribes" which are at two complete interpretational extremes.

To get right to the applicable point here, the 3 texts you have used to, as I understood them, claim that 'abortion [actually the different medical issue of "miscarriage"] both, occurred in the Bible and, was viewed as good' fall rather, when read in their context, on the side of 'what is described.' That is, none of these text say that either these Bible writers, nor God, were "prescribing" miscarriages as something Godly and good. Like I said/showed before: Job was in a state of utter depression where he was wishing that he was dead, in fact never been born. Job here was directly reprimanding God for the trials he was going through despite his righteously lived life. So in that context, he is effectively saying to God, 'if serving you unfairly brings this end, then what is the point of even living.' Notice that it never enters into Job's mind to wish that he had lived a wicked life instead and here got his just reward, but staying on the side of God, he wishes for a relatively speaking "good" suicide. That occurs many time with other similar righteous Bible figures, like Elijah. So Job was not prescribing "abortion" in any way but, also considering his "why did the knees receive me" 'or the complete absence of breasts to nurse him', (Job 3:12) he was desperately looking some freak accident of nature, from his birth, to have occurred so that he would not have live (Job 3:13), and that includes naturally occurring womb-deaths, still-births and miscarriages (Job 3:11, 16). So this is merely describing Job's, emotionally-charged, most-reactionary, suicidal feeling in this time of crisis, indeed just after the start of his calamities (ch. 3).

The exact same line of exegetical analysis applies to David's vindictive wish in Psa 58:8 in his 'Prayer for the Punishment of the Wicked.' When read carefully, David is not even asking God to have aborted them, but to now kill them so that they can be as if they never had been, like a miscarried pregnancy where the child actually never saw the light of day. So again that passage falls in the descriptive category and not what the Bible exhorts us to practise as Biblical. SO David is actually praying for an "extent of the effect of God's judgement" and not even for the process (i.e., miscarriages, and not even "abortions") for this judgement. Praying

for God to enter into judgement the wicked however is prescribed because here we are leaving the “vengeance” in the hands of the All Knowing and All wise God. David could also have prayed for God to so “miscarry” all of the wicked for the future, but he does not, for what I believe he knew was theologically completely moot. He instead prays this in relation to those who have lived and lived a life of wickedness, thus concretely showing what side they are on.

I think I have already explained in detailed what “Solomon” was hyperbolically trying to get across through a type of proverb, namely that if one is not going to enjoy the full life they have, i.e., e.g., being the father of 100 children, then it would be better for them if they had been miscarried, because life then really has no meaning for them.

So non of these text are prescribing abortion. At best they are describing that miscarriages do naturally occur. Indeed if they were speaking of “abortion” vs. miscarriages as it is distinctly understood, with abortion being an active act and not a passive one, each of them would have explicitly said: ‘why didn’t my/their mother force/do my/a “miscarriage”, which then would be an “abortion”. So again, proper exegesis forces us to view things from the perspective of the authors and not reading our present day understandings back into the text. As I understand it (see [here \(Link: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_abortion\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_abortion)) abortions as we know them, of actively trying to cause the womb death of a fetus was practised from ancient times, even, documentedly, in Egypt around the time (1550 B.C.) Israel were slaves there, so Israel surely (increasingly) heard of these. It seems that this was not the Pharaoh recommend method in (Cf. Exod 1:15, 16ff where abortion could not be practices simply because it first had to be seen if it was a male or female child). So if this ‘active causing of death’ had been the intended understanding of these 3 Bible writers, they would have made this clear by mentioning the active part the mother was to play. So these text, at best only speak of naturally occurring miscarriages.

So there is no Biblical support for “abortion” in any way from those above cited 3 texts.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

According to the Bible, as I understand it, one does not become a living soul before birth.... etc
--

Now in regards to this view of yours which essentially/effectively says that killing an unbirthed baby is acceptable because they actually dead until birth, succinctly said that is both non-scientific and also non-Biblical, especially with the texts you’ve cited.

Let alone the clear Biblical teaching that God, who is not a ‘God of the dead’ (Matt 22:32 - even if this is because God views all beings as alive - Luke 20:38; cf. full approval in vs. 39), knows and repeated has interacted with the infant in the womb (e.g., Jer 1:5). On a more scientific level, which non-accidentally also involves Biblical theology, a fetus in the womb is breathing, even if this is through the mother. So the breath of life originally from God is in them, again, even if through the mother. All of this is readily understood by the fact that if a fetus gets wrapped up around the umbilical cord they can asphyxiate to death, which of course is “be deprive of oxygen and thus be prevented from breathing”. When the newborn takes its first breath at birth, they simply resuming breathing, now on their own. Indeed no matter how hard you try to make a baby who had been prevented from breathing in the womb once they are outside the womb, they will not because, they had already died. So a baby is well alive in the womb and breathing, and thus is a viable life from conception. So your

argument does not hold in the light of both science and the Bible and thus here also is no support for abortion. By extension, this also goes against your claim that “there must be a line of distinction between humans and would-be humans” because an alive human is anyone who is breathing and that scientifically begins at conception, because, as I understand it (see [here \(Link: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Embryogenesis\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Embryogenesis)), from that time the conceived eggs begin to intake/ingest such life give sustenance from the mother’s placenta.

The Catholic’s understanding of fertility where the seed or egg is not to go to waste, indeed as seen in their ban of contraception, is both, not prescribed in the Bible, nor scientific, because e.g., God has made it a natural process for unused women’s egg to indeed ‘go to waste’ as also seen in the Biblical institution of having children only within the context of an adult marriage and not when a child becomes capable of reproduction. So here too, one cannot let Catholic extreme teachings affect what they will fully understand from the Bible, as also confirmed in Science.

Lack of scientific education is indeed a major reason why there is such a high birthing rate in overall poor countries. However, even EGW, does not, as she easily could have, prescribe abortion for infants born in a poor context. She rightly admonishes parents to be responsible in child bearing but no where condones or even suggests abortion. Two wrong do not make a right. And letting these “unsupportable” children suffer and die is also completely unbiblical as Jesus mandates us to help anyone in need, even to the least person. (Matt 25:45). So since abortion, nor letting people die from needs are an option, those births infant have to be cared for, and when the world “cannot” or won’t do it, it becomes the utmost, even pivotal, responsibility of the true follower of Christ (Matt 25:31-46).

I had said “cannot” in quotes above because the fact is that there are enough resources in the world to fully support all of the lives that have been aborted and are being aborted annually. It is only the unwritten globalized law of Capitalism, that want to restrict access and use of these resources to a trickle-down scheme where those who recursively control the capital can profit from this, that these resources are artificially and grossly unscientifically limited and even wasted (i.e., non-recycling, throwaways, continued use of wasteful and superceded technologies, etc). So I am clear-mindedly completely against this Socio-economic system which squarely opposes God’s sabbatical one

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Above all, I feel there are some issues that are simply best left as a right of conscience. While I may not choose to recommend an abortion, I feel compelled to allow others the right to make their own educated decision on the matter.

This ‘acting according to what one feels is right’ policy is exactly what God had always wanted to avoid for man, starting in the Garden of Eden. However Satan felt that God’s created beings should have this freedom to live outside his Law if they so felt like it. It is through this mentality that we have the fallen world and society that we have today. Our Creator God, who thus knows what is best for us, instead wanted to avoid all of these sufferings and pains and thus had prescribed His perfect law, which also includes a statement against committing murder, which abortion, Biblically, Scientifically and (*prima facie*) Legally, unequivocally is. These are collectively all of the reasons why I am against it, and given the fact that independent and innocent lives are being snuffed out because of it, I am actively seeking to do something against it. You won’t see me doing this interposition for other violations of God’s commandments unless others are unfairly being affected and put to death. As the Bible says, the one who knows to do good and does not do it has committed a sin, even the sin that he is condoning, and I think Christians, especially SDA Christians

should, at the very least, Biblically know and understand that murder of infants is being committed in abortion and they should do all that is possible to rescue these "little ones". That is the proof of true love for our brother, upon which hangs the last six commandments and as Jesus said not loving someone, i.e., "hating" them in here letting them suffer and die is tantamount to having committed murder. And the Bible is clear that no one who violates the inextricably linked Letter and Spirit of God's 10 commandments, i.e., here a direct or indirect "murderer", will be honoured, nor welcomed into God's Heavenly Kingdom. (Matt 5:19; see also Matt 18:6 for the punishment for simply causing a little one to stumble; how much more allowing/condoning/advocating/causing their death.)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 02:48 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

NJK Project said: "As I said before, you "guilt issue" is not with me but with the unequivocal, inevitable and stringent mandate of Christ's Gospel."

Nic responds: Show me where is the Bible's text stating that I have to neglect the mission the Lord laid on my heart and involve myself with your personal mission?

NJK Project said: "So first show me where my Project and/or my emphasizing of its Biblical and Gospel conformity is "unbiblical" and then you'll have a personal issue with me!"

Nic responds: I did take the time to read some of the material you made reference to and I did congratulate you for your work, and you conclude from this that I am now required to prove that your project is unbiblical? I don't get it! How did you manage to jump from A to B?

The pointed point in my challenge here is that if you think that I am trying to emphasize something that is so unbiblical that it should not be followed, but much lesser objectives, involving similar individual efforts and resources, particularly in regards to time, and whereas, for especially westerners, \$3000 over 7 years should not be a crippling burden, should instead be pursued vs. the standard heightening project (i.e., per year, 65,000,000 infants vs. 1494 (or actually ca. 213 per annum)) then prove it. Otherwise you would not have a Biblical reason for not aiding a cause the actually is much more in line with doing exactly what Jesus mandated. I, Biblically can only see this unreasonably limiting reasons as the same excuse that was used in Matt 25:24-30. And, given your manifestation passion for this cause, I just thought you would be interested in saving 65,000,000 per year vs. hopefully, 213, but, most probably, a net zero.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 02:49 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

It seems to me that you are saying, murdering a baby is always wrong -- except in certain circumstances.

Again. as already made clear [in this post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131006#Post131006\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131006#Post131006) and in it referenced post, I do not Biblically nor Scientifically/Legally consider a defensive life-for-life "killing" murder. Obviously you continue to see no difference between the two, however that

is not my view, therefore not the light in which I make these statements.

Originally Posted By: kland

Now that I go back and read it, I see you agree that killing of innocent human beings is considered "murder". Maybe, just maybe, in order to make your statements make some sense, maybe you think babies who threaten the life of a mother are not innocent and therefore killing of such would not be "murder"?

Back in [this post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130126#Post130126\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130126#Post130126) I removed this notion, per se, of "innocence" from my statement, indeed to avoid this extreme interpretation of it. Nonetheless, as stated [in here \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130119#Post130119\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130119#Post130119) I still implicitly hold that in the case of the life-threatened pregnant mother, both the child and the mother are completely innocent. I.e., the mother does not want to murder the child and vice versa. Nonetheless, objectively and scientifically speaking, one life will die (the mother) or both will if the pregnancy is not terminated. So the judicious choice has to be made to preserve the mother's child since also without it, the child will still not live.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 02:49 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

But if God were telling us that abortion is wrong, why would we not have at least one of the abortion texts indicating so?

I think, as already discussed [here \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130671#Post130671\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130671#Post130671) and [here \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130704#Post130704\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130704#Post130704) the Bible in Exodus 21:22-25 clearly speaks against the active/direct harm and death caused to an unborn infant. Indeed if a simple, natural "miscarriage" had been intended here then, the Hebrew term "*nephef*" (Strong's #5309) -(from the term "to [naturally] fall" #5307) used only in your (non-supporting) cited texts of Job 3:16; Psa 58:8; Ecc 6:3, would also easily have been used here. That statements is related to the Sixth Commandment in Exod 20:13. Apparently a life-for-life penalty is to be applied even if that death causing blow was accidental. God seems to have clearly condemned getting into a physical fight with a pregnant woman. Clearly out of an utmost concern for the well being of an unborn life. So wanting to see a "you shall not commit abortion" is not Biblical, nor really realistic and is the same as wanting to see a commandment against, smoking, snorting cocaine, committing suicide, or drinking and driving. God succinctly speaks against all of these life destroying and threatening modern developments in His Wise, Potent, and Eternal words: "You shall not commit murder."

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I'm not trying to say that the Bible supports abortion. My point was that the Bible is not necessarily anti-abortion. As I said earlier, it appears to be one of the gray areas in the Bible.

I do not see the Bible being prescriptively "gray" at all on this life-or-death, murder issue. And

it moreoverly is not “having it both ways” where, effectively, murder is a matter of personal preference and choice. A “survival of the fittest/strongest/richest and (arbitrarily/subjectively “most righteous”” debacle would occur is this was to be the deciding private criteria to differentiate judicially justified killing from murder.

And, if as you have posited, God practised abortion through miscarriage, why didn't He caused Bathsheba to “miscarry” as He clearly made it known while Bathsheba was pregnant that this Child would die, which occurred within 7 days after its birth. (2 Sam 12:14-18a). This clearly shows to me that God does not even practice abortion, especially not even forcefully and even “naturally” through miscarriages.

To a larger extent all of this harmonizes perfectly with my Biblical Theology of God and the Future that the course of life of a person (i.e., either for good or evil) is not at all known in advance by God, but only as that person makes life choices is this course set. That is the reason why God is not so created Satan and Evil, and also allowed Satan, and fallen angels to live and fully carry out their wayward course as what they would do in this course could not be definitely stated in advance or else surely God would have, at the earliest times, shown a heavenly White Throne “panoramic” type of judgement screen showing in advance what these evil angels and Satan would do and then instantly and most approvingly destroyed them. The same goes will all person who have lived a life of wickedness. That all is the Biblical/GC reality of things. So, as already expressed, God certainly does not engage in preemptive of people through miscarriages.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 03:09 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

NJK,

First, thank you for posting courteously. This is a very controversial topic, and emotions can run high on both sides. Your even keel here is appreciated.

I was with you until the last paragraph, agreeing with most of your post. The last paragraph, however, appears based on a misunderstanding of what I was expressing.

I think it boils down to this: there are gray areas in the Bible. Grays areas are places where it is best for individual conscience to reign, and for us not to impose our own conscience upon the right of another individual. Let me give you an example.

Meat eating.

Meat eating is a gray area in the Bible. It was not provided in the Garden of Eden. It was expressly permitted by God later on, but limited to the clean meats. Jesus Himself, said to be our example, is recorded as having eaten meat. He even did so following His resurrection.

But some in the world today say it is wrong. They say we should all be vegans. It is true that the condition of the meat has changed. Technically speaking, so has the condition of our fruits and vegetables. In Jesus' time, they did not use herbicides, pesticides, or GMO foods.

I am a vegetarian. I am strongly opposed to meat eating, and could hardly stomach a bite of it. It tastes awful to me. I've been a vegetarian all my life. Furthermore, there would be more food in this world if we did not waste so much feeding the livestock to convert them to meat.

Does this all mean that I should be adamant about legislation prohibiting meat eating? Shall we press our senators and representatives for legislation outlawing slaughterhouses and feedlots? Don't they all smell bad anyhow? Isn't it animal cruelty?

The fact is, the Bible is gray on this issue. I do not choose to enforce my conservative conscience upon the rest of society. I feel God is honored when we are generous enough with our fellow man to allow others the same rights of liberty of conscience which we would wish to have for ourselves. Eating meat is never prohibited in scripture.

Neither is abortion.

There are no clear texts prohibiting abortion in all of the Bible. It certainly is not ideal. Eating meat is not ideal, yet Jesus ate meat and fed 5000 with it. Capital punishment is not ideal, yet God honored the Levites for executing it. Killing in war is not ideal, yet God honored Caleb and Joshua for their faithfulness in doing so. David is honored for killing Goliath. Polygamy is not ideal, yet God tells David He has given him his wives (through the prophet Nathan). Drinking wine is not ideal, yet it is allowed for certain classes of people (see Prov. 31). Wearing jewelry may not be ideal (outward adornment), yet brides were never chastised for it in the Bible.

Biblically speaking, these are gray areas. These are areas where each individual should have the privilege of choosing for himself or herself.

I am not pro-abortion. But I am pro-choice. Here are some reasons why: 1) To the extent that this is a religious issue, I am pro-separation of church and state; 2) To the extent that it is an issue of conscience, government has no right to intervene; 3) Some circumstances require it to save the life of the mother; 4) Cases of rape should not force the mother to accept a 21-year commitment from the dead-beat "dad" who will hopefully be in jail or executed for said crime, especially if the mother has no way to support the child and will hate it on account of its origins (rape causes intense hatred only understood by the victims of rape); 5) [And this is the most important point to me] Government has no way of fairly enforcing an anti-abortion law.

Consider this (and it has happened in Europe where abortions are illegal): A parent looks forward to the upcoming child. They've been wanting this baby so much! One day, the expectant mother goes to the restroom, and...is shocked to lose her pregnancy. It is a miscarriage. They'd been to the hospital. Their friends knew they were expecting. Suddenly, there is no baby...and now there is a police investigation. Had she taken some drugs to abort the baby? Had she intentionally caused the "miscarriage" in some way? Without being able to prove her innocence, the woman is put in jail! What a travesty! This is an abortion/miscarriage of justice.

If laws are put in place in this country against abortions, every miscarriage would be a crime scene. Furthermore, this country tends more and more toward "guilty until proven innocent." This is why I am opposed to legislation on the matter. As I said earlier, there are far more natural abortions than deliberately induced ones. These natural ones would suddenly be suspect if abortions were made illegal. Imagine the worry this might cause to the mother who was already having difficulty keeping a child. There are some who have a hard time conceiving, and some who miscarry several times before being able to bring a child to full term. Imagine the stress of having such a law upon them! Consider the prenatal influence of this burden.

I am against abortions as a method of contraception. But I am in favor of abortions when the mother's life is at stake. I am also in favor of liberty of conscience on the issue for the mother who has been raped. No one should force her to carry that baby against her will. If she willingly does so, that is fine. But if she chooses to abort, that should be her right. The Bible would have the rapist executed. We are too "pro-life" these days to do such. Instead, they

frequently serve some years in jail, and are released to offend the same way again!

These are just some things to think about.

God bless,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 03:13 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Originally Posted By: kland

It seems to me that you are saying, murdering a baby is always wrong -- except in certain circumstances.

Again. as already made clear [in this post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131006#Post131006\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131006#Post131006) and in it referenced post, I do not Biblically nor Scientifically/Legally consider a defensive life-for-life "killing" murder. Obviously you continue to see no difference between the two, however that is not my view, therefore not the light in which I make these statements.

Just thought I would point out here that the "life for life" principle meant one must die if one killed another. This principle cannot apply to a fetus, unless you were to use it in the situation of a twins in the womb where one twin strangled the other. 🤔

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 04:37 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

In order to say that 'the Bible is not against abortion' you need to show case where God or even Biblical people committed abortion, which for the reasons already cited in my above posts, is not at all synonymous with miscarriages. That distinction is also clearly expressed in science. None of the passages you have cited support you view, so it cannot be held that the Bible teaches, describes or prescribes something (namely abortion) when it quite objectively, exegetically, factually does not at all! Reading "abortion" for what is a "miscarriage" is an eisogetical approach and does not uphold Biblical truth. And an argument from silence is not a valid proof for anything.

The Bible in Exod 21:22-25 clearly consider that ending the life of a fetus, even if non-intentionally carries the penalty of death. So you need to exegetically refute what this passage clearly says before claiming that it does not have this life of the fetus penalty in mind.

To answer your opposing enumerated objections:

(1) Separation of Church and State is an American/Western concept. And that does not automatically nor defaultly make it God's ideal. God has always wanted His people to live according to His Laws, and that should at least spiritually apply amongst his professed people irrespective of the national jurisdiction in which they happen to currently live in. Notice

however that in my plans to “Abort-Abortion” I am not, nor have ever, considered taking over secular governments to accomplish this, though democratically speaking that is perfectly allowed through the general population voting process. I have instead set out to establish a new country which will fully uphold all of God’s commandment and people are free to immigrate to it, if they also want to live according to these Biblical ideals.

(2) Since abortion is murder, it (would) be involved in the laws against murder and not left to a matter of conscience, just like one is not free to murder someone else if they feel in their conscience that it is right. So it is because you also do not view abortion as murder that you see ambivalently see it as a matter of subjectively personal preference.

(4) Laws and Benevolent Social provisions, such as foster care, adoption, “orphanages” could easily not impose a “21-year” commitment on a mother who was rape. So the solution here also is not aborting the infant. Again here, economics are not to determine who will live and who should die/be murdered.

-Execution for rape seems to have been included in the “less-than-life” damages that Jesus said should be at best forgiven and not certainly carry a death penalty (Matt 5:38, 39). So I do not see in the NT Covenant of Christ that the execution of rapist is warranted, nor still required by God. Any “resulting hate” should surely fall under the forgiveness principle that Jesus established. A just criminal/even civil penalty should however be required from the offender, even forced child support to the party that takes care of the child. That economic penalty would also greatly help to cause people to think twice before committing the crime of rape. (And no one who is freed from jail is free to commit any crime again. That is just a choice that some make.)

(5) In the case that abortion is considered illegal in a society, it, especially in our advanced day and age, can scientifically be determined if a miscarriage was a criminal act or not. A woman who has a miscarriage, would have to, by law, immediately report this to police. Then hospital clinic tests can be done to see if there were any signs or traces of unnatural agents/causes for this miscarriage. Sure that will have a economic price however again here, the economy is not to determine what is to be considered as right or wrong. A woman not immediately or timely reporting this quite observable miscarriage to authorities where these scientific test cannot be properly/conclusively done, will automatically and quite logically/naturally become suspect and such case would justify criminal charges and judicial proceedings to ascertain the truth in this matter. This is the same natural/logical legal principle that if someone knows that someone else is dead and does not report it to police, they automatically become “suspects” in that death ad that to a criminal degree if there are signs that the death was not natural.

So I do not see any valid Scientific, Legal, Democratic, nor Biblical reasons to not consider abortion as murder, but merely economic ones, which in my view are completely invalid as also not even justly applicable.

Even in countries were the judicial law (democratically) is (guilty until proven innocent) I think through a bail process, which innocent-until-proven-guilty countries impose on accused parties, a person suspect of having induced a miscarriage, thus committed and abortion will be freed on bond until they’re then judicial case can be resolved.

Justice is not a simple thing, but in the life-or-death issue involved in abortion, I think that it is most worthwhile here.

In my Biblical view, again one that does not seek to impose this on a democratic society that wants to live secularly, I do not see that a “Liberty of Conscience” allows one to pick and choose which one of God’s laws they will follow and also to what extent. So in my efforts

against abortion, I am not even forcing anyone to carry a pregnancy to term and then giving the child up to adoption to the NJK. They will freely choose this and the influential incentive of economic/pecuniary advantage will also be offered to counteract greatly influence the choice for Life. However as Biblical Christian, I will not personally endorse, nor encourage acts that I know go against God's will such as upholding/justifying 'Choice for abortions.'

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Just thought I would point out here that the "life for life" principle meant one must die if one killed another. This principle cannot apply to a fetus, unless you were to use it in the situation of a twins in the womb where one twin strangled the other.

I do really not (exegetically) get the Biblical, nor natural "logic" of this conclusion/statement of yours. Show me e.g., how the underlying passage of Exod 21:22-25 comes to mean this??

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 05:54 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Just thought I would point out here that the "life for life" principle meant one must die if one killed another. This principle cannot apply to a fetus, unless you were to use it in the situation of a twins in the womb where one twin strangled the other.

I do really not (exegetically) get the Biblical, nor natural "logic" of this conclusion/statement of yours. Show me e.g., how the underlying passage of Exod 21:22-25 comes to mean this??

I'll answer this part for now...

This statement of mine has nothing at all whatsoever to do with the text in Exodus you are quoting. It has everything to do with the fact that there is no justifiable way to commit an abortion based on the "life for life" principle. One cannot say "my fetus killed somebody, so I am going to kill it!"

That's all I was saying. Unless, of course, your fetus really did strangle his twin....

God bless,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/18/11 06:05 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

NJK,

Regarding the text in Exodus 21 that you keep quoting, it is very ambiguous, even in the Hebrew. Many scholars argue about its meaning. We had several rather energetic discussions about it while I was in college, involving our professors who were better acquainted with the Hebrew language. It was well understood on both sides of the discussion

that the "mischief" referred to in the text could not reliably be applied to either mother or child, but that the Hebrew was ambiguous on this point.

Find me a scholar who is 100% convinced he understands the exact meaning of the verse, and I will show you a biased scholar. The verse is open to interpretation. This is why I have not made a large point of using that verse to support any side of this discussion.

God bless,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 12:09 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I'll answer this part for now...

This statement of mine has nothing at all whatsoever to do with the text in Exodus you are quoting. It has everything to do with the fact that there is no justifiable way to commit an abortion based on the "life for life" principle. One cannot say "my fetus killed somebody, so I am going to kill it!"

That's all I was saying. Unless, of course, your fetus really did strangle his twin....

Ahh... I indeed did not perceive the 'threatened mother's life' as the background scenario here.

I think I have addressed this issue in [this recent post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131038#Post131038\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131038#Post131038). The area causing confusion might be what I understand as "life for life" here. I certainly do not understand it in a capital punishment type of way as, as I have already stated, there is no murder done, nor intended, here at all, from both sides, so both sides are indeed innocent. There is however the notion that they fetus will "kill" i.e. involuntarily cause the death of the mother if his life continues. So by "life for life" I actually meant/mean that a life, inevitably and uncircumventibly/unavoidably has to be taken in order to save one, and in such a case, that objectively and scientifically is the mother.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 12:09 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Regarding the text in Exodus 21 that you keep quoting, it is very ambiguous, even in the Hebrew. Many scholars argue about its meaning. We had several rather energetic discussions about it while I was in college, involving our professors who were better acquainted with the Hebrew language. It was well understood on both sides of the discussion that the "mischief" referred to in the text could not reliably be applied to either mother or child, but that the Hebrew was ambiguous on this point.

Find me a scholar who is 100% convinced he understands the exact meaning of the verse, and I will show you a biased scholar. The verse is open to interpretation...

Having done an original and more indepth exegetical study on this passage, I instead see that its intended meaning can be easily understood.

Succinctly said here, reading the context of that passage of Exod 21:12-36 on these Laws Against Damaging Violence (cf. Lev 24:17-24; [Deut 19:21]) and resulting Personal Injuries, (whether premeditated or not), where the scenario of a 'man striking another man and causing his death' is fully (chiefly) covered in the opening vs. 12; and quite logically, based on the patriarchal society of that time, (which incidentally lasted until quite recent times (cf. early U.S. Constitutional Documents) understanding here that "man" is being generically used to also include a female, I can only see the subsequent scenario in vs. 22-24 which interjects, not only a woman (probably trying to break up the fight), but a *pregnant* woman, then I can only sequiturly (i.e., in context, see that all of the various degrees of "harm" which are listed after the mention of a "premature birth" is said to have occurred, as all focusing on how this violent act has affect the fetus or birth infant and not the pregnant woman at all. Also this "harm" to the fetus is only observable and reckon because of this necessary premature birth. It apparently is understood that if no premature birth occurred because of the blow, then the baby is more than likely still okay and the blow, even if it did occur, was not serious/strong enough to have caused harm to the maintained fetus. Damage done to someone else not involving a fetus clearly had been covered in vs. 18, 19, again through a generical mention of man.

Notice that a gender distinction is made for a slave (Exod 21:20, 26). That is probably also stated because, while it was unlikely in those days, as it was enduringly the case until recent days, to here of a man acting violently vs. a woman or two woman get into a physical fight, it was on the other hand expected that a slave owner would inflict corporal punishment on both a male and a female slave. So given the likelihood of this scenario, the mention of the female was naturally made. This further adds weight to the fact that not merely a woman was intended in vs. 22-25, as she would have been mentioned without mentioning that she was pregnant, even if she was, but indeed the fetus of a pregnant mother.

Cf. the similar law in Lev 24:17-24 where "any life" and "neighbor" is used for the victimized party thus also suggesting that for a "fight" two men are prominently envisioned in Exod 21:22.

Now in regards to the term "mischief" (KJV) ["harm" NASB which I see is the best translation of the two for our modern English understood "mischief" (legally) implies more a 'bothersome act that however has no permanent/serious consequence'], its 3 other uses in the Bible other than the 2 in Exod 21, thus Gen 42:4,38; 44:29, shows that serious harm/injury was understood by that term. They are all used in regards to what Jacob feared would happen to Benjamin if he went to Egypt with his brothers, Jacob consistently says that if any harm occurs to Benjamin, that will surely cause his own death (Gen 42:38; 44:29), since he said his 'since his **life** was bound up in the lad's **life**' (Gen 44:30). Clearly something vitally serious was understood by that term. SO the uses in Exod 21:22, 23 also should be understood as having this seriousness, and that, as discussed above, solely focused on the fetus.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

...This is why I have not made a large point of using that verse to support any side of this discussion.

Based on this study, I am now personally, fully convince that Exod 21:22-25 is pointedly given solely in relation to the fetus, and even if there was any valid "ambiguousness" here where this can either refer to fetus or the woman, I personally think that since this would on this one

part show that God is against any degree of harm being done to an unborn child, even if involuntarily, thus how much more vs. voluntary acts causing death as with abortions, and given that a life and death issue is depends on this verse with aborted infants, then I would here do what is "right" and "err", if applicable, on the side of life. So such a text would, and do encourage me to have this same consideration for the well-being of the unborn that God most possibly, even contextually (i.e., exegetically) speaking, probably has. That will still not affect the belief of a secular person in a secular society/government, but it will cause me, the Believer in the Bible and God to indeed to all that is possible to come to the rescue of would-be aborted infants.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 01:28 AM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

NJK,

In defense of the KJV, the word "mischief" does not mean what some might have supposed. As of 1828, here was the definition:

Originally Posted By: Webster's 1828 Dictionary

MISCHIEF, n.

1. Harm; hurt; injury; damage; evil, whether intended or not. A new law is made to remedy the mischief.

2. Intentional injury; harm or damage done by design.

Thy tongue deviseth mischief. Psalm 52:2.

3. Ill consequence; evil; vexatious affair.

The mischief was, these allies would never allow that the common enemy was subdued.

MISCHIEF, v.t. To hurt; to harm; to injure.

MISCHIEF-MAKER, n. One who makes mischief; one who excites or instigates quarrels or enmity.

MISCHIEF-MAKING, a. Causing harm; exciting enmity or quarrels.

MISCHIEVOUS, a. Harmful; hurtful; injurious; making mischief; of persons; as a mischievous man or disposition.

1. Hurtful; noxious; as a mischievous thing.

2. Inclined to do harm; as a mischievous boy.

MISCHIEVOUSLY, adv. With injury, hurt, loss or damage. We say, the law operates mischievously.

1. With evil intention or disposition. The injury was done mischievously.

MISCHIEVOUSNESS, n. Hurtfulness; noxiousness.

1. Disposition to do harm, or to vex or annoy; as the mischievousness of youth.

Mischief denotes injury, harm or damage of less malignity and magnitude than what are usually called crimes. We never give the name of mischief to theft, robbery or murder. And it so commonly implies intention in committing petty offenses, that it shocks us to hear the word applied to the calamities inflicted by Providence. We say, a tempest has done great damage, but not mischief. In like manner, the adjective mischievous is not applied to thieves, pirates and other felons, but to persons committing petty trespasses and offenses.

In other words, the NASB "harm" is nearly the same meaning as the KJV "mischief" for the most part. In fact, "mischief" is a little more colorful, if anything.

Now, the interesting thing here is that if we understand the word to mean "harm," (as

opposed to something stronger, such as "death"), then in terms of the fetus, have we not already caused "harm" to have forced it out prematurely on account of the fighting? It seems logical, then, that the "harm" here is not related to the fetus, but to its mother. If she only lost her fruit, but did not receive any other lasting injury (or death, as the passage later indicates), then for the loss of her fruit a penalty is required as determined by the judges. However, if she dies, "life for life," etc.

The rest of that is important for the context here.

Originally Posted By: The Bible

And if [any] mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, Burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe. (Exodus 21:23-25)

God gives full instructions about what the punishment was to be for any of the "mischief." If the woman has lost an eye, then the one who hit her must also. If she has lost a tooth, so must he. If she were burned, or wounded, the one who inflicted these wounds must receive like ones.

How do we know that this refers to the woman and not to her fruit? How many newborns, and especially preemies, have you seen with teeth? This law can only be properly applied to the mother.

The context of the proscribed punishments fairly clearly points to the mother as the recipient of the mischief. However, in the text referring to the mischief, the grammar is such as to be less clear. I will grant that. It simply cannot be ascertained with certainty, and if anything, points to the mother.

It seems to go without saying that the mother would be hurt if she were hit hard enough to lose her pregnancy. It should be taken for granted that she would not be ignored in terms of the just punishment of the offender. Could he get away with hurting her so long as the fetus turned out alright? Of course not. Then it is obvious that the punishment for the mischief must necessarily be in terms of the mother.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 03:03 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Point considered for "mischief" however, as there is in today society a connotative difference in degree between mischief and harm, where "mischief" is understood a being trivial and inconsequential, then I would opt to update the English language here to reflect our distinct modern understanding. As the norms of society have degraded over time, it very well may be that all that was considered a 'harming mischief' back then needed to be replaced with a stronger term today as to legally/colloquially not included what is numbly considered today as just being "petty".

Surfacely speaking, if the understanding of this passage is going to revolve around one term, i.e., a "tooth", then it can be argued that a "burn" cannot be caused by merely "striking" a pregnant woman. At best, this argument revolving around a "tooth" would make this listing of damages applicable to both, even collectively speaking, the woman and the fetus, wherever applicable.

Contextually, I also still see that the context which, as shown above, has generically already dealt with harm to a woman, therefore is focusing on the fetus and also by vital implication the woman carrying it. This specific scenario with a pregnant also does strongly show how God value the well-being of the unborn, by providing such added, cushioning/hedging protection for it while the mother is carrying it.

So based on this alone, there still, for me, is no spiritually convincing reason to not understand this verse to also be protecting the unborn.

Most exegetically crucially/concretely though, the verse speaks both of the case where (1) a premature birth occurs and there is no “harm” and also (2) where there is no premature birth but injury occurs. What is interesting here is that the expression (based on the Hebrew grammar *qal imperfect* (= ‘naturally resulting/consequential future’) of the verb *hayah* “to become/be done” (Strong’s #01961) occurring twice in Exod 21:22, 23 but left untranslated) ‘harm *will* be done/become’) is used to speak of the injury to may result in the future. What is exegetically further interesting is that the verb *hayah* as seen in several other examples does concord in gender with the noun it is modifying, and here in Exod 21:22, 23 it is in the masculine while its subject, a ‘woman [f] (#0802) with (an unborn) child [m] (#2030)’, is in the feminine. Furthermore, as seen a few verses earlier in Exod 21:4, a similar expression: ‘a woman [f] (#0802) with her children [m.p.] (#3206)’ however *hayah* there is in the feminine singular, thus squarely focusing on the mother and not even on her children, which clearly here must suffer the same “fate” she has to. So not only is this “woman” gender concord not done just a little later in Exod 21:22, 23, but there, the baby inside the mother is also not even considered as “a subject part of the woman’s body” with the absence of the possessive pronoun “her” as back in vs. 4.

So it is here this statement is fully keeping in mind how this blow can and may impede the *future* development of pointedly the fetus, and that can include *future* teeth, e.g. if the gums were damaged. Now since it may also not be seen how a burn is involved here, unless of course the mother was “burned” during this fight, which again, does not follow with the simple mention of a “striking blow”, this listing of damages itself may be a generically all-inclusive listing to therefore mean: “any imaginable harm that may, as a result, occur to, indeed pointedly in this law stipulation, the fetus. So this also further shows how seriously God takes any harm that is done to the fetus, indeed probably the most vulnerable time of a human’s life, even compared to newborns. This observation can also be seen by the quite succinct similar lists in Lev 24:17-23; cf. Deut 19:11. Also as the damages and matching penalties are given in Lev 24:17-23 in a specific scenario basis, whereas in Exod 21:23, 24 they are all given in one shot, this may be because this will indeed cover any relatable future damages to the fetus. And thus the one liable cause of the man striking the pregnant mother, has already been given.

So in all of this God is here going out of His way to make it painstakingly clear how much He cares for the unborn.... and that over-concretely settles it for me! (Jos 24:14, 15)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 06:12 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Editing Time expiration note:

[I am/will be re-investigating the gender concord of *hayah* mentioned above.]

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 10:13 AM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

As I said earlier, NJK, even our theology professors had good discussions with us (all the way to the cafeteria, actually) over this verse and whether or not it pertained to the mother or the fetus. Both sides of the discussion knew and understood that the Hebrew did not make

the matter distinctly clear, but that it could be understood either way. This had nothing to do with double entendre, but everything to do with the loose and "dangling modifier" structure of the grammar in the Hebrew.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 11:12 AM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

NJK,

I'm not sure why you struggle to figure how the woman might get burned during a fight. Women cook. They would work over a fire. A striking blow would easily push them or cause them to lose their balance.

On the other hand, how would the fetus, surrounded by amniotic fluid (mostly water), get burned? In any case, the focus here (to my view) is on the mother. I will freely recognize that my view cannot be proven with 100% certainty. I also understand that there is no certainty for either side.

I'm sure you will be seeking to uphold your view through some means of persuasion. It is, however, just one view among possibilities. The Hebrew is simply too ambiguous here to be 100% certain.

As I said earlier, though...and I'm not sure you noticed this part: if the text were speaking of "mischief" to the fetus, does that mean the man who hit the mother gets off scot free so long as the fetus is ok? Suppose the mother lost her eye...?

It seems obvious to me that the mother stands in the more likely position for bodily harm, whereas the fetus would be unlikely to even survive if the mother had miscarried mid-pregnancy.

The fact that there was to be a fine, determined by the judges in conjunction with the woman's husband, for the loss of the fetus (as opposed to a life-for-life) seems indicative of a distinction between the life of an individual and that of a fetus. God is not saying the fetus is worthless, no. There is a fine. It may have been a heavy fine, we do not know. But that the fetus is not equal to a full-grown human should be logical to any of us.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 01:54 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

What is exegetically further interesting is that the verb *hayah* as seen in several other examples does concord in gender with the noun it is modifying, and here in Exod 21:22, 23 it is in the masculine while its subject, a 'woman [f] (#0802) with (an unborn) child [m] (#2030)', is in the feminine. Furthermore, as seen a few verses earlier in Exod 21:4, a similar expression: 'a woman [f] (#0802) with her children [m.p.] (#3206)' however *hayah* there is in the feminine singular, thus squarely focusing on the mother and not even on her children, which clearly here must suffer the same "fate" she has to. So not only is this "woman" gender concord not done just a little later in Exod 21:22, 23, but there, the baby inside the mother is also not even considered as "a subject part of the woman's body" with the absence of the possessive pronoun "her" as back in vs. 4.

*My previously stated concurring correction here is that the subject of *hayah* in Exod 21:22, 23 is the masc. sing. word "injury" and not masc. *plur.* "the fetus(es)/child(ren)". So I no longer hold that specific point, however the remaining point which are not derived from this still stand.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 01:55 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

As I said earlier, NJK, even our theology professors had good discussions with us (all the way to the cafeteria, actually) over this verse and whether or not it pertained to the mother or the fetus. Both sides of the discussion knew and understood that the Hebrew did not make the matter distinctly clear, but that it could be understood either way. This had nothing to do with double entendre, but everything to do with the loose and "dangling modifier" structure of the grammar in the Hebrew.

Over the course of my now 14 years of scholarly Biblical Research I have copiously come across this "unresolvable ambiguousness" objection, whether from live professors/scholars or in their written works. (Usually from people, as Bacchiocchi also used to lament, who had stopped advancing their studies in the 70's & 80's; and also before pre-computer study tools days). Very, very early on, I used to trust them, however, through original reviews and deeper probing of their work/subject, I have exegetically literally resolved all of these hundreds of objections. So I no longer stop at what people may think when there are several exegetical indications ignored and left undiscussed.

Case in point, I have made supporting arguments from the context of this verse, showing, among other things, that the mention of a specifically a pregnant woman vs. merely a woman is quite indicative that it is the fetus inside of the woman that is significant. So, even simply out of 'discussion sincerity,' as stated in the rules you had referred me to, if you still want to maintain your view here, you have to state why you do not see these exegetical indicators as being contributive to the proper understanding.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I'm not sure why you struggle to figure how the woman might get burned during a fight. Women cook. They would work over a fire. A striking blow would easily push them or cause them to lose their balance. On the other hand, how would the fetus, surrounded by amniotic fluid (mostly water), get burned?

Excellent point, I did not think of that. However it further supports my point since it is a premature birthed baby that is the focus here. As already explained, the legal stipulations here actually are (1) if there is a (successful/fruitful) premature birth with no 'naturally consequential injury that is done, even in the future,' (as the qal imperfect indicates here); or (2) if there no premature birth but such consequential injuries in the future. So the woman may have fallen in the fire and either directly then or if she is pulled out but still inflamed and wholly a partially birthed baby could be burned. Also a life penalty is imposed if the injury is death to the fetus.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

In any case, the focus here (to my view) is on the mother.

You will need to address my contextual arguments to maintain this view, namely that the context had gender inclusively already covered injuries done to a (free) woman.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I will freely recognize that my view cannot be proven with 100% certainty. I also understand that there is no certainty for either side. I'm sure you will be seeking to uphold your view through some means of persuasion. It is, however, just one view among possibilities. The Hebrew is simply too ambiguous here to be 100% certain.

Since this may come down to a preponderance of exegetical evidence, I think you are falling behind by not addressing all opposing points, even if they are "circumstantial". Just blanketly claiming "ambiguity" does not actually refute these points. And such contextual, "circumstantial" "persuasion" is actually a norm in Biblical Hebrew and also Greek since these languages, especially Hebrew were not "wordy" or syntactically precise languages. So, as you should know since you apparently took Biblical Hebrew classes, context is always the key.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

As I said earlier, though...and I'm not sure you noticed this part: if the text were speaking of "mischief" to the fetus, does that mean the man who hit the mother gets off scot free so long as the fetus is ok?

From the plain text itself, I think that it is clearly stipulated that (1) if there is a premature birth and no future consequential injury (i.e., then and in the future); then only a fine needs to be paid. So clearly the man does not get of "scot free" if he only caused a premature birth. Also (2) if there is even no premature birth, but still future injuries for that past blow, thus to the fetus, including a still birth, then the penalties listed in 23b, 24 are to apply as the case is.

By the use of a qal imperfect of *hayah* "injury to happen/be done/to become" this law pointedly focuses on the future development of the child. If only immediate and non future injury had been intended then I syntactically understand that a "perfect" tense would have been used instead of the "imperfect". This is also seen that when it is said that the woman "gives birth" prematurely, that verb is in the perfect as that situation, having happened, was thus completed, yet *hayah* that soon immediately follows is rather in the imperfect. Injury to the woman would be immediately observable vs. the still needing to develop fetus.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Suppose the mother lost her eye....? It seems obvious to me that the mother stands in the more likely position for bodily harm,...

As it was shown before, such damages to a woman were covered in the previous stipulations. This is another category focusing on the person hidden inside the pregnant woman.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

whereas the fetus would be unlikely to even survive if the mother had miscarried mid-pregnancy.

The notion of "miscarriage" is not at all mentioned, nor in mind, in this verse. If that was the case, the same word "*nephef*" (#05309) used in Job 3:16; Psa 58:8; Ecc 6:3 would have here straightly been. It is rather the possibility of a future still birth that is spoken of. Nonetheless a caused miscarriage could also result from this blow and thus would be covered by the life penalty. So once again, the harm to the body/person of the woman is already covered whereas the hidden child has not been and so is pointedly covered in this distinct stipulations on the laws on damages from violence. All this shows how God cares for and distinctly considers the unborn child.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

The fact that there was to be a fine, determined by the judges in conjunction with the woman's husband, for the loss of the fetus (as opposed to a life-for-life) seems indicative of a distinction between the life of an individual and that of a fetus. God is not saying the fetus is worthless, no. There is a fine. It may have been a heavy fine, we do not know. But that the fetus is not equal to a full-grown human should be logical to any of us.

It seems here you have retrofitted back to an understanding that what is spoken of is a miscarriage. That had been discussed and resolved back in [this post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130704#Post130704\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=130704#Post130704) and forward. So you first need to state why you, manifestly, disagree with that correcting/specifying point before returning to that prior understanding of yours and others.

With that rightly understood, it is clearly seen that the fine is for a successful, though premature birth with no injuries that follow vs. a future normal birth that however has sequels of this previous blow including death. So the fine was for an even injury free premature birth and not a miscarriage. So it shows to me just how much God fairly cared about the fetus even leaving it up to a judge to impose the specific amount for this successful and injury free premature birth.

Also given the lack of medical technology, it is highly unlikely that a child not about to be born (i.e., ca. Within its 9th month) would not result in a successful premature birth as death would likely follow before that time. Again any damages to the woman are covered

elsewhere.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 03:41 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

As pointed out in [this article \(Link: http://www.christiancourier.com/articles/786-does-exodus-21-sanction-abortion\)](http://www.christiancourier.com/articles/786-does-exodus-21-sanction-abortion), the Hebrew term for “abortion”, even distinct from a miscarriage, in the Bible seems to be “*shakol*” #07921 (22X (i.e., ‘the sudden loss of a perfectly viable life, even a birthed and living person, through an active act; - often translated as “bereaved” = “deprive through death”). The “miscarriage” of the term *nephel* (#05309 - 3X) # seems to be a more natural accident, i.e., during the early stages of pregnancy, by [scientific definition \(Link: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Miscarriage\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Miscarriage) “at a stage where the embryo or fetus is incapable of surviving independently, generally defined in humans at prior to 20 weeks of gestation.”

Note: For the exegetical reasons already cited above, I do not agree with his “double entendre” meaning of either the child and/or the mother.

See also [this article \(Link: http://www.str.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5700\)](http://www.str.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5700) which deals in more details with these key Hebrew terms: *nephel* (“miscarry”); *yatsa* (“birth”); *yeled* (“child-ren”); *shakol* (“abort”).

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/19/11 04:42 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

While Jesus clearly injected an element of grace on especially the capital punishment that was permitted in the OT, and that because none present were righteous enough to cast the first stone, he did not however here or anywhere else say that judicious killing, e.g., capital punishment, was wrong. If that was his case he would have clearly said so in a “you have heard it said.... but I say unto you....”. Matt 5: 38, 39 (=Exo 21:24) is limited to lesser interpersonal squabbles and not to fatal judicious matters. Notice that He starts with the statements in Exod 21:24, which are descending in their order of severity of damage (i.e., eye, hand, foot, tooth, burn wound, bruise), and not with “life” of verse 23.

Just a slight (additive?) correction to the apparent OT reference of this statement of Christ. It rather seems that He was referring to, or also to, Lev 24:19, 20 which deal with injuries. Again here with him starting with damages lower than a loss of life (Lev 24:17, even 18), he did not do away with capital punishment, probably leaving it as indeed a just protective deterrent. (Cf. Deut 19:21b)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 10:56 AM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Kland said: “Now that I go back and read it, I see you agree that killing of innocent human beings is considered “murder”. Maybe, just maybe, in order to make your statements make some sense, maybe you think babies who threaten the life of a mother are not innocent and therefore killing of such would not be “murder”?”

My answer: The unborn baby that threatens the life of the pregnant woman is still innocent. The guilty individual is the human sinful race which has violated the rules of health to such extent that innocent babies become a threat to the woman carrying it. A good example is an ectopic pregnancy. Would you argue that the baby is guilty of endangering the life of the woman? The baby did nothing wrong! And remember that saving one life instead of losing two is still pro-life!

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 12:36 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Green Cochoa said: "I am not attempting to proclaim that the desire was righteous or best. But if God were telling us that abortion is wrong, why would we not have at least one of the abortion texts indicating so?"

I say: Do you know when the term "abortion" was coined? Did it exist when the Bible was written? How about the texts which condemn murder and the shedding of innocent blood? Do they apply to the unborn? Are they not human beings? Does not blood run through their veins? How many bloodless abortions are performed in the U.S. and in our own hospitals? What percentage of the 50 million abortions done in our country since 1973 were bloodless?

Quote: "They shed innocent blood, the blood of their sons and daughters, whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan, and the land was desecrated by their blood." [Psalm 106:38]

Quote: "For he had filled Jerusalem with innocent blood, and the LORD was not willing to forgive." [2 Kings 24:4]

Quote: "Do this so that innocent blood will not be shed in your land, which the LORD your God is giving you as your inheritance, and so that you will not be guilty of bloodshed." [Deut. 19:10]

Quote: "Moreover, Manasseh also shed so much innocent blood that he filled Jerusalem from end to end--besides the sin that he had caused Judah to commit, so that they did evil in the eyes of the LORD." [2 Kings 21:16]

Quote: "Their feet rush into sin; they are swift to shed innocent blood. Their thoughts are evil thoughts; ruin and destruction mark their ways." [Is. 59:7]

Quote: "You must purge from Israel the guilt of shedding innocent blood, so that it may go well with you." [Deut. 19:13]

And remember that there are 37 additional passages in Scripture condemning the shedding of innocent blood!

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 12:58 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

And, given your manifestation passion for this cause, I just thought you would be interested in saving 65,000,000 per year vs. hopefully, 213, but, most probably, a net zero.

The Lord has led me into my current mission, and the Lord probably led you to yours. The day the Lord tells me to replace my mission with yours, I will respond. Meanwhile, I press forward towards the completion of what God has called me to do on behalf of the unborn.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 01:35 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Green Cochoa said: "Eating meat is never prohibited in scripture. Neither is abortion. There are no clear texts prohibiting abortion in all of the Bible."

I say: Yes on meat eating! No on abortion! Read my previous posting. The Bible condemns the shedding of innocent blood not one time but rather 43 times in Scripture, and in 99 percent of abortions this injunction against shedding innocent blood is violated. Aren't the

texts I cited in my previous posting clear enough for you?

Green Cochoa said: "Had she intentionally caused the "miscarriage" in some way? Without being able to prove her innocence, the woman is put in jail! What a travesty!"

I say: Can you cite specific examples where women were jailed for intentionally causing a miscarriage in our country before abortion was legalized?

Green Cochoa said: "I am also in favor of liberty of conscience on the issue for the mother who has been raped. No one should force her to carry that baby against her will."

I say: Is killing the innocent baby the best option available for the woman in crisis pregnancy? Have you heard about adoption? Aren't we supposed to choose the best option?

In rape cases, we have a guilty individual and two innocent victims. We let the guilty live, but execute one of the victims. Is this the kind of justice you defend?

In some Moslem countries the woman who is a victim of rape is executed, and we are horrified; but if the baby is executed, we say that this represents a reasonable and moral solution. Have we developed a blind spot on this issue?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 01:43 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

The Lord has led me into my current mission, and the Lord probably led you to yours. The day the Lord tells me to replace my mission with yours, I will respond. Meanwhile, I press forward towards the completion of what God has called me to do on behalf of the unborn.

The way I see it, Nic, you would not actually be replacing your mission but increasing its potential. You had said that you plan/envision for this to be an issue at the next GC in 2015, and all that to end ca. 200 abortions per year in Adventist Hospitals, which most likely will still result in these 200 per year being murdered at other medical facilities. So I was just suggesting to you a plan to save the life of these 200 and much, much more. Furthermore, in the current ".info" stage of my project, there is no money collecting, but solely the spreading of this "information". So any participation in the project now is mostly on this "spreading the word" level as it will indeed take some people to help implement and operate this project. (At least in one of 4 projected ways in which this project can be fully funded and concretely established.)

By the way, I had looked over your posted work and it seem quite presentable to me, at least enough to convince someone. What more exactly do you need to do? Perhaps I can be of cursory/suggestive assistance. Of course you are free to freely use whatever I have posted here. In regards to addressing the SDA Church itself, I personally do not see any valid value in investing more time, than, as already said, as simple email to GC President Ted Wilson's office. Anything more is, spiritually speaking, really "overkill," at least to me, especially, again given the most likely net zero lives saved through this even if successful, and that not until 2015 or after.

(You may also want to look into how much power the General Conference, if not actually Division, Union and/or Local Conference have over the operations of Hospital, if any. If the GC cannot ban the teaching of evolution at La Sierra university despite formally passing a

mostly in favor, if not unanimous, resolution, they may similarly only have a merely suggestive power over SDA Hospitals, especially as most of these large medical institutions operating income comes directly from the insurance policies of the patient they treat and/or the patient's private funds. So an even GC level resolution may not have any effect, and the petitioning/convincing of individual Medical Centers may be the only solution to do something concrete here.

...

Also, those texts you've cited on 'God's abhorrence for the shedding of innocent blood' are indeed most pertinent to this topic. I had not considered that pertinent angle. Also additionally keep in mind that the Bible/God considered "life to be in the blood" (e.g., Gen 9:4; Lev 17:11-14; cf. Deut 19:6; 1 Sam 19:5; Psa 72:14; Eze 33:5; Jon 1:14)

The Biblical Canon, completed in ca. 95 A.D., indeed logically cannot account for every modern language terms and expression, however the applicable underlying principles are indeed so completely covered.

I have also seen, as posted later, that the Hebrew word in the Bible that we in English currently understand as "abortion" -thus the ending of a viable life, which is actually from conception since, if left unharmed a viable life will indeed be the end result, is **shakol** and is distinct from the inherently natural/spontaneous "miscarriage" as also understood medically today.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 02:43 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

NJK said: "In defense of the KJV, the word "mischief" does not mean what some might have supposed."

I say: The Bible predicted that knowledge would be increased. This prediction very likely includes the knowledge of the Bible as well. If his is true, then it might be significant the fact that many modern scholars render said biblical passage using the "premature birth" as a reasonable option, which would imply that the harm refers to the baby instead of the mother, or perhaps to both.

New International Version (©1984)

"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.

New Living Translation (©2007)

"Now suppose two men are fighting, and in the process they accidentally strike a pregnant woman so she gives birth **prematurely**. If no further injury results, the man who struck the woman must pay the amount of compensation the woman's husband demands and the judges approve.

New American Standard Bible (©1995)

"If men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child so that she gives birth **prematurely**, yet there is no injury, he shall surely be fined as the woman's husband may demand of him, and he shall pay as the judges decide.

GOD'S WORD® Translation (©1995)

"This is what you must do whenever men fight and injure a pregnant woman so that she gives birth **prematurely**. If there are no other injuries, the offender must pay whatever fine the

court allows the woman's husband to demand.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 03:31 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

NJK said: "In defense of the KJV, the word "mischief" does not mean what some might have supposed. ..."

Let's get the quotes identifications straight Nic! 😊 It was actually Green Cochoa who made this argument to me in [this post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131064#Post131064\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131064#Post131064), which I subsequently refuted [here \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131065#Post131065\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131065#Post131065).

The Bible is clear the what is meant by, more determinatively, the Hebrew Term here: "**ason**" (Strong's #0611), is harm that can involve the loss of life. And as I said in that previous response, "mischief" in 1600 English and then 1824 English, as quotes by Green Cochoa in support of the KJV translation, the term mischief has today been demoted to only refer to petty crimes and not to "felony" types of crimes, including life-taking/death-causing acts.

Also "**ason**" is probably best translated as "hurt".

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 03:45 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

NJK Project said: "You had said that you plan/envision for this to be an issue at the next GC in 2015, and all that to end ca. 200 abortions per year in Adventist Hospitals, which most likely will still result in these 200 per year being murdered at other medical facilities."

I say: Who told you that the number of abortions in Adventist hospitals is 200? We have hundreds of Adventist hospitals and I have seen published data for only one: Washington Adventist Hospital, and it was reported that in a seven-year period in that hospital alone there were 1494 abortions performed, which equals to 213 per year. What would be your estimate if we included all the abortions done in other SDA hospitals?

The fact that those babies would end being murdered in non-Adventist medical institutions is besides the point. If Adventists were engaged in burglary, rape, and grand theft; would you argue that if Adventists were to stop committing those crimes non-Adventist would then take over? Abortion is a moral cancer which is threatening the mission of the church, and I want to do something about this!

NJK Project said: "By the way, I had looked over your posted work and it seem quite presentable to me, at least enough to convince someone. What more exactly do you need to do? Perhaps I can be of cursory/suggestive assistance.

I say: If you have the time to do this, here is my suggestion: Give me your email address, and I will send to you the PDF edited version of my doctoral dissertation which I am planning to publish in book form. I am still working on it, and you might provide some valuable input for my project.

NJK Project said: "You may also want to look into how much power the General Conference, if not actually Division, Union and/or Local Conference have over the operations of Hospital, if any. If the GC cannot ban the teaching of evolution at La Sierra university despite formally passing a mostly in favor, if not unanimous, resolution, they may similarly only have a merely suggestive power over SDA Hospitals, especially as most of these large

medical institutions operating income comes directly from the insurance policies of the patient they treat and/or the patient's private funds."

I say: I agree; nevertheless, the GC has the power to disconnect itself from any institution which is involved in the direct and persistent violation of one of God's Commandments. Suppose a SDA church decided to abandon the truth about the Sabbath, wouldn't the GC sever its connection with such and institution. Isn't human life as sacred as the Sabbath? Didn't Jesus state hat the Sabbath was made for the sake of man and not the reverse?

NJK Project said: "I have also seen, as posted later, that the Hebrew word in the Bible that we in English currently understand as "abortion" ... is shakol and is distinct from the inherently natural/spontaneous "miscarriage" as also understood medically today."

I say: I did notice that, and I think that this is quite relevant to the issue, since most Adventists have been so far arguing that the Bible's silence on abortion justifies the destruction of human life.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 03:49 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

NJK said: "In defense of the KJV, the word "mischief" does not mean what some might have supposed. ..."

Let's get the quotes identifications straight Nic! 😊 It was actually Green Cochoa who made this argument to me in [this post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131064#Post131064\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131064#Post131064), which I subsequently refuted [here \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131065#Post131065\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131065#Post131065).

The Bible is clear the what is meant by, more determinatively, the Hebrew Term here: "**ason**" (Strong's #0611), is harm that can involve the loss of life. And as I said in that previous response, "mischief" in 1600 English and then 1824 English, as quotes by Green Cochoa in support of the KJV translation, the term mischief has today been demoted to only refer to petty crimes and not to "felony" types of crimes, including life-taking/death-causing acts.

Also "**ason**" is probably best translated as "hurt".

I'm glad you noticed my mistake!

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 07:20 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

The study of the previously cited pertinent significant syntactical meaning of Hebrew Perfect vs. Imperfect Tense (aka. the Suffix vs. Prefix Conjugation), can be done from [this online-accessible, great work on Hebrew Syntax \(Link: http://books.google.ca/books?id=jZlwYGilLW0C&pg=PP1&dq=waltke%20Biblical%20hebrew%20syntax%20pdf&pg=PA496#v](http://books.google.ca/books?id=jZlwYGilLW0C&pg=PP1&dq=waltke%20Biblical%20hebrew%20syntax%20pdf&pg=PA496#v) See esp. Chapters 30 & 31.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 07:23 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

I am in shock. I have just noticed that the Adventist Hospital that I had visited while on a

8600-mile road trip in the summer of 1996, and proudly taken pictures of because it looked “so nice,” was the [Washington Adventist Hospital \(Link: http://www.washingtonadventisthospital.com/WAH/index.aspx\)](http://www.washingtonadventisthospital.com/WAH/index.aspx) in Takoma Park, MD (located next to the Washington Adventist University, home also to the widely known, Sligo Church. Given this prominent context, no wonder this facility is a lightning rod for this issue. I feel guilty merely by that visitation

With that confessing dissociation, -in a purging attempt, now to your comments:

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Who told you that the number of abortions in Adventist hospitals is 200? We have hundreds of Adventist hospitals and I have seen published data for only one: Washington Adventist Hospital, and it was reported that in a seven-year period in that hospital alone there were 1494 abortions performed, which equals to 213 per year. What would be your estimate if we included all the abortions done in other SDA hospitals?

I indeed did not take that into full consideration, so I'll endeavor to be more factual to properly weigh this question. To fairly consider this issue, I think a per beds pro-rating calculation would be more fair/accurate than a per hospital one, since hospitals do vary in their patient capacity.

Had to do some digging for accurate info but based on 2007 data in a 100th Anniversary booklets (download from [this page \(Link: http://www.washingtonadventisthospital.com/WAH/about/100/index.aspx\)](http://www.washingtonadventisthospital.com/WAH/about/100/index.aspx)) claiming ‘an estimated 46,000 patient visits in 2007’ (PDF p. 12), indiscriminately considering them all as “outpatient” visits, also taking into consideration that it is said that the hospitals activity has doubled in 15 years, thus since 1992, with these abortion figures being in the 1990's, thus doubled here to ca. 426 for 2007, that results in an approximate estimate of ca. 108 outpatient visit per abortion (or reversely, 0.009 abortions per outpatient visit). [That is all of course if WAH still practices abortions. It is not, at least explicitly, listed on [their webpage \(Link: http://www.washingtonadventisthospital.com/WAH/services/index.aspx#Medical-Services\)](http://www.washingtonadventisthospital.com/WAH/services/index.aspx#Medical-Services) as one of the “Medical Services” that they provide, not even in their “Maternity section”.] Now, given, as stated [here \(Link: http://www.adventist.org/world-church/facts-and-figures/index.html\)](http://www.adventist.org/world-church/facts-and-figures/index.html) that SDA medical institutions had 14,997,107 (Dec. 31, 2008 stat) (this however could include Sanitariums (and maybe Dispensaries(?)) visits, that would grossly result in ca. 139,162. However given the fact that, as stated [in this 2007 article \(Link: http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/oct/08/health.lifeandhealth\)](http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/oct/08/health.lifeandhealth) 26% of the world's population live in the 69 countries that ban abortion (some allow it for mother's life risk (which likely is a very low, thus here negligible percentage), countries in which SDA Hospitals are, generally said, located, that figure could be grossly reduced by this 26%, thus resulting now in: **102,983** abortions. These stats can be made further specific by more data, especially in regards to the exact listing of these 69 quasi-wholly banning countries and how may medical facilities SDA's have in these countries as obtainable through the [SDA Yearbook \(Link: http://www.adventistyearbook.org/default.aspx\)](http://www.adventistyearbook.org/default.aspx) info and/or the annual [Adventist Statistical Report \(ASR\) \(Link: http://www.adventiststatistics.org/\)](http://www.adventiststatistics.org/). More precise calculations can also be made by correspondingly taking into account the abortion per country totals (see such stats on a [webpage \(Link: http://www.njkproject.info/njk/hc_ministry/worldaid/abortions/abortingabortiondata.html\)](http://www.njkproject.info/njk/hc_ministry/worldaid/abortions/abortingabortiondata.html) from my Aborting-Abortion plan) and the number of medical facilities that SDA have there. E.g., SDA's have many medical facilities in countries that have very little abortions then the abortions per outpatient rate would be drastically lower. (I personally do not have the time for

that more indepth calculation.)

(Also according to ASR 2009 the number of outpatient visits dropped to 13,648,626.)

Now while this quite extremely reckoned total of ca. 103,000 is quite high, it is still only 0.2% of the 65,000,000 annual global abortions.

By the way you can submit an "Online Information Request" to the WAH [here \(Link: http://www.washingtonadventisthospital.com/WAH/about/inforequest.aspx\)](http://www.washingtonadventisthospital.com/WAH/about/inforequest.aspx).

(It is/(would be) quite odd to read WAH speak of "Changing the World, Saving Lives" in regards to fighting smoking on one hand, while, (presumably), performing abortions on the other hand!?!)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

The fact that those babies would end being murdered in non-Adventist medical institutions is besides the point. If Adventists were engaged in burglary, rape, and grand theft; would you argue that if Adventists were to stop committing those crimes non-Adventist would then take over?

I can see how you can surfacely say this, but if you deeply think about what is involved in this correlation, it does not result in equivalence that you claim. First of all, I think it can be assumed that the vast majority of abortions committed by SDA Hospitals are for non-Adventists, for various statistical reasons, including SDA membership vs. general population figures. That however, in itself is besides the point. The real analogy actually focuses around the fact that what is being committed here is actually fully legal in the U.S. whereas the other crimes you have listed are not. Thus it would also hold true that if SDA's did not perform a, for-profit, legal service, that demand would surely be taken on by a non-Adventist Institution. So pitting "legalized abortion" to "illegal acts" is an "apples vs. oranges" comparison. Indeed the hard fact and reality still remains, and needs to be dealt with, that SDA-performed abortions will be done by other facilities, and the net total will remain the same. SDA participation does not at all affect the number of abortion being sought or done. And in this matter of life and death, I see that one should rather energetically pursue the actual "life" option.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Abortion is a moral cancer which is threatening the mission of the church, and I want to do something about this!

Think about it... If performing Christ's Ultimate, Character-perfectly-emulating, Gospel Mandate, as clearly modelled throughout His ministry and expressed in e.g, Matt 25:31-46, what would impress non-believers more: (A) SDA's do not perform any abortions at all, or (B) SDA's, as it is concretely, actually quite feasible, are saving the lives of 65,000,000 per year. For me, even being an SDA, option be would make me much more proud of my Church, whereas option (B) for me would, in many ways, given that lives are still being lost when something could actually be done about this were it but for the general sin of [selfishness](http://njkproject.blogspot.com/2010/01/testimony-to-church-3-judgement.html) (Link: <http://njkproject.blogspot.com/2010/01/testimony-to-church-3-judgement.html>) in the Church, indeed as prophetically foreseen, be fitting of the many condemnations that Jesus made in Matt 23.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

If you have the time to do this, here is my suggestion: Give me your email address, and I will send to you the PDF edited version of my doctoral dissertation which I am planning to publish in book form. I am still working on it, and you might provide some valuable input for my project.

If your dissertation is in regards to review the History of the abortion issue in the SDA Church, I am afraid I do not have time for that angle on the topic. If not, then my email address is publicly made available in my profile. I am more concerned with a Biblical study on the topic vs. a historical one, because, in my view, the contribution of the Bible here, as in most cases, trump whatever may or may not have been stated, believed and/or practised in history. The determinative issue here is if abortion is murder and if the Bible, indeed, speaks against murder. So I cannot take time to do historical studies or reviews here.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I agree; nevertheless, the GC has the power to disconnect itself from any institution which is involved in the direct and persistent violation of one of God's Commandments. Suppose a SDA church decided to abandon the truth about the Sabbath, wouldn't the GC sever its connection with such and institution.

The GC will first have to itself get on the Biblical side of this abortion issue and not formally provide 'endorsing "guidelines" for the practise of elective abortions.'

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Isn't human life as sacred as the Sabbath? Didn't Jesus state hat the Sabbath was made for the sake of man and not the reverse?

It certainly is, actually even more, which is indeed why "doing good" is permitted on the Sabbath as seen in Jesus' healing miracles. With that Godly Spirit understanding in mind, consider Isa 58 where God considers the Sabbath to include meeting that vital needs of qualifying people. Now what is more in line with the Letter and Spirit of that stipulation, is it the above Option A or Option B?? When, as depicted in Matt 25:31-46, Jesus will ask what did you do about the 65,000,000 infants, including even the 103,000 from SDA Hospitals, that were murdered each year, do you really believe that a "Well at least our Hospitals didn't kill them" excuse will be acceptable? (And if so, Biblically speaking, exactly how?). I think Jesus will ask, why didn't you instead seek to encourage the GC, SDA Church and SDA Hospitals to seek to save these lives, rather than choosing to, effectively, be neutral in this issue.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I did notice that, and I think that this is quite relevant to the issue, since most Adventists have been so far arguing that the Bible's silence on abortion justifies the destruction of human life.

I also certainly do not get both the claimed "silence" basis in itself and the derived and active

adverse action here, as if nothing deadly was being done here.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/20/11 07:25 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I'm glad you noticed my mistake!

No problem! So am I...

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 10:03 AM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

NJK Project said: "However given the fact that, as stated in this 2007 article 26% of the world's population live in the 69 countries that ban abortion (some allow it for mother's life risk (which likely is a very low, thus here negligible percentage), countries in which SDA Hospitals are, generally said, located, that figure could be grossly reduced by this 26%, thus resulting now in: 102,983 abortions."

I say: I believe that your estimate is exceedingly high for the following reasons: A. Not all Adventist hospitals are actively participating in the abortion business and many of them are doing so in a much smaller scale than the one reported for our Washington Adventist Hospital. B. The only serious survey I am familiar with indicated that only five of our hospitals were offering elective abortions to their patients. C. I have evidence suggesting that the practice of offering abortion services in our hospitals is a North American phenomenon. I have friends in Europe and South America who have told me so.

NJK Project said: "By the way you can submit an "Online Information Request" to the WAH here."

I say: I did, many months ago, and I am still waiting for a response. I have also written to individuals in highly responsible position in our Loma Linda University and the only answer I received is deep silence.

NJK Project said: "The real analogy actually focuses around the fact that what is being committed here is actually fully legal in the U.S. whereas the other crimes you have listed are not."

I say: I was talking about morality—not legality.

NJK Project said: "... what would impress non-believers more: (A) SDA's do not perform any abortions at all, or (B) SDA's, as it is concretely, actually quite feasible, are saving the lives of 65,000,000 per year."

I say: I have not questioned the alleged superiority of your project over mine. Can't we have both? Dr. Bailey is doing a very impressive work saving an average of five babies a year from a sure death. Suppose Adventists could increase this to 10,000 a year; would this erase our guilt resulting from the hundreds or thousands of babies we kill per year? Will the world be impressed if we tell them: "We save more babies than those we kill"?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 11:39 AM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

What I said in my post was true. In every direct mention of abortion in the Bible, it was the desired outcome. I am not attempting to proclaim that the desire was righteous or best. But if God were telling us that abortion is wrong, why would we not have at least one of the abortion texts indicating so? Instead, we have every single one of them coming down on the same side of saying abortion would be better than the alternative (e.g. a long life of evil).

I'm not trying to say that the Bible supports abortion. My point was that the Bible is not necessarily *anti*-abortion. As I said earlier, it appears to be one of the gray areas in the Bible.

Would you say that if we find something in the Bible where there is a "desired" outcome (whether righteous or not), and if it doesn't specifically say it is wrong, then we can conclude the Bible is not *anti*- that action, no matter what the context implies?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 12:05 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

Would you say that if we find something in the Bible where there is a "desired" outcome (whether righteous or not), and if it doesn't specifically say it is wrong, then we can conclude the Bible is not *anti*- that action, no matter what the context implies?

Other than abortion? Can you give me an example of this?

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 12:09 PM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Just asking what the general principle is.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 12:45 PM

Posted by: [kland](#)

There may be a reason why it's hard to get real numbers.

<http://www.news1130.com/article/print/54619> (Link:

<http://www.news1130.com/article/print/54619>)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 01:22 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I believe that your estimate is exceedingly high for the following reasons: A. Not all Adventist hospitals are actively participating in the abortion business and many of them are doing so in a much smaller scale than the one reported for our Washington Adventist Hospital. B. The only serious survey I am familiar with indicated that only five of our hospitals were offering elective abortions to their patients. C. I have evidence suggesting that the practice of offering abortion services in our hospitals is a North American phenomenon. I have friends in Europe and South America who have told me so.

Excellent point. Given the lack of definiteness here, that is partly why I had labelled my estimates as “extreme” and quantitatively “gross”. So according to your info, that would, at a high end, equal 2,130 (426x5) abortions (2007 pro-rated figures). This all did seem like a “individual freedom-over-Biblical morality,” Western, even pointedly American, (as there are no SDA Hospitals in Canada (See ASR pp. 65 & 66 (PDF 49, 50)) mentality. (Also, I didn’t see this before, as ASR 2009 shows (p. 66/70 (PDF 50/54) shows that 9,397,033+810,880 = 10,207,913 of outpatient visits in hospitals, sanitarium and clinics (=64 %) occurred in those 58+2 U.S. medical facilities.)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I did, many months ago, and I am still waiting for a response. I have also written to individuals in highly responsible position in our Loma Linda University and the only answer I received is deep silence.

Admission in silence?!? Indeed it applicably is as suspect as being accused of murder and not outright and immediately denying it. People who somehow, even remotely, can be associated with such a crime usually are counselled to ‘remain silent’ or “plead the 5th”.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I was talking about morality—not legality.

I am dealing with the reality of the issue at hand which does not need any hypothetical scenario to understand it. And the reality of the issue here is that such “legal” and “morally whitewashed” for profit medical cases will surely be readily picked up by other medical facilities.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

I have not questioned the alleged superiority of your project over mine. Can’t we have both?

Perhaps, for some reason, you see absolutely no problem with this but, I rather invest my time, effort and even money in something that will yield 65,000,000 vs. 0. The incontrovertible fact is without this “Aborting-Abortion” project which aims to save lives rather than, effectively, merely redirect abortion-seeking mothers to non-SDA facilities, your efforts will not result in any life saving. Evidently your conscience somehow will be clear in all of this.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Dr. Bailey is doing a very impressive work saving an average of five babies a year from a sure death. Suppose Adventists could increase this to 10,000 a year;...

Great! This project could use more people like him for it is only when such life-saving, like minded people work together that, at the very least, even that 10,000 infants per year figure can be achieved. And... what about the 64,990,000 other annual and rescuable lives??? This is not a matter of “salvific quotas.” (See e.g., Matt 25:45, 46).

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

would this erase our guilt resulting from the hundreds or thousands of babies we kill per year? Will the world be impressed if we tell them: "We save more babies than those we kill"?

I certainly do not look at this from this, actually, spiritually selfish, perspective of "erasing our guilt" but in saving lives. Christ's Gospels is always other-centered and not so "self-centered" for, as Chris himself taught and the SOP enjoins, that unChristlike motive alone, despite any good works being done, still incurs this sin of selfishness and pride, thus annulling any, actually and unbiblically, 'righteousness through works' effort here.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 01:23 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Other than abortion? Can you give me an example of this?

I see this argument and follow up 'request for proof' as both moot because in the 3, actually miscarriage and not "abortion" (= Heb. "*shakol*") texts that you are using for this point (i.e., Job 3:16; Psa 58:8; Ecc 6:3) The was actually no "outcome". Sure it was "desired" but there was not follow up indication that God, especially as it was possible with David's request, did not even proceed to destroy his enemies and render them as unknown if they had been (spontaneously) miscarried, thus early in the pregnancy process. So to me this is only 'trying to prove a negative,' and thus not a valid method of proof.

Notwithstanding: Samson, after have lived a fool's life and squandered God's blessing and gift, prayed for supernatural strength (despite his hair having grown back (PP 566.3)) so that he may, pointedly, "avenge himself for his lost eyes" and die with the Philistines (i.e., commit suicide). (Jud 16:27-30). He did not even ask for this supernatural strength to kill the God's enemies of God. Yet god granted him his wish. So is selfishly praying for murderous vengeance (i.e., '3000 lives for 2 eyes') and for suicide (since if Samson had prayed for God to help him survive this, God surely could have sent angels to either do this destructive work with Samson having, for some reason been removed from the hall, or these angels could have shielded Samson from the fall debris), is this all thus, in this God effectuated outcome, God ideal and will. I think not only *not*, but not even close. Seems to me that God mercifully 'put Samson down' here, as even in this dying wish, he still did not seem to get his mission. And that is despite the fact that Samson will probably be saved (Heb 11:32).

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 04:38 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

Just asking what the general principle is.

kland,

I was just trying to establish that there are areas in the Bible in which God has permitted *choice*. We call them "gray areas" sometimes. Wearing jewelry is a good example. There is no specific prohibition to jewelry in the Bible. There is the admonition that our adorning should be of the heart, and not just external adornment. But where, in all of the Bible, do we

see jewelry prohibited? Can we safely conclude that the Bible is anti-jewelry?

There are some posting in this topic who feel strongly that the Bible is anti-abortion. But upon what basis can we conclude so? Are we interpreting the Bible from a broad and unbiased perspective, or are we trying to mold it into our own private interpretations? It is human to be biased. We are all biased. How, then, should we approach the Word of God in search of unbiased truth? Should we not closely examine the texts, their context and meaning?

I do not for a moment believe the Bible is pro-abortion. But I do not see much evidence that it is anti-abortion either. As an honest student of God's Word, I must recognize that the matter is less than clear, and then be more accepting of the right of individual belief on the issue.

If you choose to believe that abortion is wrong, good for you. If you choose to accept that abortion is permissible, I have no criticism for you. The Bible, to my view, leans more that direction. But I accept that either view is within the scope of Christian belief, just as there are meat-eating and jewelry-wearing Christians whom I must not judge, lest I be judged.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 10:05 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I was just trying to establish that there are areas in the Bible in which God has permitted choice.... There are some posting in this topic who feel strongly that the Bible is anti-abortion. But upon what basis can we conclude so? ... I do not for a moment believe the Bible is pro-abortion. But I do not see much evidence that it is anti-abortion either. As an honest student of God's Word, I must recognize that the matter is less than clear, and then be more accepting of the right of individual belief on the issue.

If you choose to believe that abortion is wrong, good for you. If you choose to accept that abortion is permissible, I have no criticism for you. The Bible, to my view, leans more that direction.

The ever increasing problem with this persisted view of yours it that all of the Bible "proofs" that you have cited for this position have been disproven, yet you quasi-explicitly and indirectly continue to state that holding the position that God is against the murdering, not to mention, even hurting an unborn infant is wrong. So in keeping with this Forum's Rules of Conduct #4:

Originally Posted By: Forum Rules #4

One may state that a position, or fact, is wrong. ... But, there is an expectation that one who does this will then propose a correct fact or position.

you need to substantively "propose a correct fact or position". Just merely repeating something, and now with any Biblical support is not a "proof". (Of course to circumvent having to follow this rule, you have chosen to just ignore those who have opposed your view.) Surely it should be easy to understand that we as SDA should be seeking to be as Biblical as possible.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Are we interpreting the Bible from a broad and unbiased perspective, or are we trying to mold it into our own private interpretations? It is human to be biased. We are all biased. How, then, should we approach the Word of God in search of unbiased truth? Should we not closely examine the texts, their context and meaning?

I think that anyone who will read through this post will clearly see that you are the one who is being "biased", "narrow", 'using private interpretations' and not "closely examine the texts, their context and meaning". Jesus had a specific term for such behavior (see e.g., Matt 23)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

But I accept that either view is within the scope of Christian belief, just as there are meat-eating and jewelry-wearing Christians whom I must not judge, lest I be judged.

I have my views, on particularly the wearing and jewelry and the Bible, however that is not even relevant to the life and death issue of Abortion.

God has clearly said, not to murder, abortion is murder in that it causes the death of someone when without a vital reason, a completely innocent infant who surely would say he/she wants to live if asked. So it seems spiritually clearly to me that your view is only rooted in that, selfish feministic "it's my body" argue on top of, as already expressed, economic concerns, both of which are, as obvious as it is to say, non Biblical reason to "kill", let alone "murder" anyone.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/21/11 10:45 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

The ever increasing problem with this persisted view of yours it that all of the Bible "proofs" that you have cited for this position have been disproven, yet you quasi-explicitly and indirectly continue to state that holding the position that God is against the murdering, not to mention, even hurting an unborn infant is wrong.

You have not disproven all of the Bible "proofs." Far from it. You have not contested, for example, that the three abortion texts in the Bible all express a desire for it. Not one of them says "Thou shalt not have an abortion."

You have tried, in various ways and by various rabbit trails to distract from the clear evidence which I have presented from the Bible, but I have not always felt the need to respond to these red herrings. For example, you have spoken against so-called "proof texting," and yet you have used texts in the discussion yourself. How can you criticize others for that which you do yourself? I did not respond on this point, simply because I deemed it to be off topic and pointless. The fact that a point you make is not responded to does not mean you have a valid point. If such were true, I could say any number of things on this forum and then claim that they were all "proven" if nobody decided to contest them. On the issue of so-called "proof texting," if you wish for me to accept your anti-proof-texting position, prove to me that Ellen White, Paul, Peter, and Jesus did NOT do it. (They did. And, by the way, please find or start

another topic for this side discussion if you wish to discuss it.)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

So in keeping with this Forum's Rules of Conduct #4:

Originally Posted By: Forum Rules #4

One may state that a position, or fact, is wrong. ... But, there is an expectation that one who does this will then propose a correct fact or position.

The spirit of this rule is in keeping with Christian courtesy. It is not appropriate to simply lamb into someone's points and criticize them subjectively for no reason. I have presented reasons for my position in this topic, and if you feel otherwise, you are welcome to address the specifics further.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

you need to substantively "propose a correct fact or position". Just merely repeating something, and now with any Biblical support is not a "proof". (Of course to circumvent having to follow this rule, you have chosen to just ignore those who have opposed your view.) Surely it should be easy to understand that we as SDA should be seeking to be as Biblical as possible.

I have not answered every single argument of yours for one or more of the following reasons:

- 1) Lack of time
- 2) Lack of interest
- 3) A desire to keep the discussion courteous, and not get too personal
- 4) Many of the arguments are merely re-worded presentations of that which I have already addressed.

It should be understood that participation in this forum is voluntary. Completely voluntary. No one is obligated, however much you might wish it were so, to respond to you or to anyone. You are not obligated to answer me. I understand this, and I hope you do too.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Are we interpreting the Bible from a broad and unbiased perspective, or are we trying to mold it into our own private interpretations? It is human to be biased. We are all biased. How, then, should we approach the Word of God in search of unbiased truth? Should we not closely examine the texts, their context and meaning?

I think that anyone who will read through this post will clearly see that you are the one who is being "biased", "narrow", 'using private interpretations' and not "closely examine the texts, their context and meaning". Jesus had a specific term for such behavior (see e.g., Matt 23)

Anyone who reads here will have the liberty of making that judgment for themselves,

certainly. They may or may not see things as you do, however. 🤔

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

But I accept that either view is within the scope of Christian belief, just as there are meat-eating and jewelry-wearing Christians whom I must not judge, lest I be judged.

I have my views, on particularly the wearing and jewelry and the Bible, however that is not even relevant to the life and death issue of Abortion.

God has clearly said, not to murder, abortion is murder in that it causes the death of someone when without a vital reason, a completely innocent infant who surely would say he/she wants to live if asked. So it seems spiritually clearly to me that your view is only rooted in that, selfish feministic "it's my body" argue on top of, as already expressed, economic concerns, both of which are, as obvious as it is to say, non Biblical reason to "kill", let alone "murder" anyone.

You have not fully demonstrated that an abortion is murder. I know that you are thus persuaded in your own mind. That is clear. But the Bible presents many forms of death that were not murder. The abortion issue was never specifically addressed. If the Bible is essentially silent on the issue, how can you be so sure of your position?

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/22/11 12:02 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Talk about red herrings....I'll ignore all of your quibbling and unsubstantive side comments and address this surfacely relevant one (I too am not going to restate my points):

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

You have not contested, for example, that the three abortion texts in the Bible all express a desire for it. Not one of them says "Thou shalt not have an abortion."

I have stated and shown that what you had understood as "abortions" were actually "spontaneous miscarriages" and none of them prescribe such a desire for even these "miscarriages". So now prove that these 3 texts are saying that "abortion" and not even a "spontaneous miscarriages" is either "prescribed" or even "approved" by God!!

(And by the way, Jesus, Paul and EGW did not use proof-text, because when their passage are exegetically studied out, their indeed pertinently applicable literal and/or spiritual relation is seen.)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/22/11 12:48 AM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

I have stated and shown that what you had understood as “abortions” were actually “spontaneous miscarriages” and none of them prescribe such a desire for even these “miscarriages”. So now prove that these 3 texts are saying that “abortion” and not even a “spontaneous miscarriages” is either “prescribed” or even “approved” by God!!

I have not taken a position that these abortions are prescribed or approved of by God. Perhaps you have misunderstood my position, or perhaps I have not made it sufficiently clear. My position is that the Bible is virtually silent on the issue. My position is that of saying the Bible has not taken a clear stand to one side or the other on this issue.

Regarding your understanding of the word "abortion," I would invite you to investigate the term in your dictionary. I already posted the Hebrew word definition in English, which included the term "abortion." "Abortion" is a word comprising the superset of which "miscarriage" and "untimely birth" would be subsets. As such, every miscarriage, untimely birth, etc. are abortions by definition. If you want another form of abortions, as specified in the Bible but which I have not yet brought up, look up "Hazeal" in reference to Elijah's prophecy. He committed some very violent abortions--ones in which the mothers certainly died. (Look at [this link \(Link: http://www.blueletterbible.org/search/translationResults.cfm?Criteria=%22women+with+child%22&t=KJV\)](http://www.blueletterbible.org/search/translationResults.cfm?Criteria=%22women+with+child%22&t=KJV) for some texts which speak of some gruesome "abortions.")

On the other hand, there is also that passage in the Bible which blesses those who seem to, well...I'll let you look at the text yourself.

Originally Posted By: The Bible

Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones.
(Psalm 137:9)

The word translated there as "little ones" (Strong's #5768) is the same Hebrew word that shows up as "infants" in the following verse:

Originally Posted By: The Bible

Samaria shall become desolate; for she hath rebelled against her God: they shall fall by the sword: their infants shall be dashed in pieces, and their women with child shall be ripped up. (Hosea 13:16)

This appears to be a God-ordained punishment for their sins, as this entire chapter in Hosea is written in God's first-person voice.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/22/11 10:13 AM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Originally Posted By: kland

Just asking what the general principle is.

kland,....

If you are unable, or willing, to provide what you suggest the general principle is, how could I possibly give any example which meets it? For I sense that without you specifically stating it, no matter what is presented will be construed otherwise. Which I also sense, based upon your question, was the intent or defense mechanism. Am I wrong?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/22/11 10:54 AM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

NJK Project: "Evidently your conscience somehow will be clear in all of this."

I say: My conscience has been clear from day one when the Lord laid on my heart my personal assignment on which I have been working for the last 15 years. No argument of yours will dissuade me from neglecting what the Lord told me to do!

By the way, yesterday I personally spoke with Ted Wilson, the president of the GC, and I think that he reacted positively to what I am doing.

NJK Project: "Great! This project could use more people like him for it is only when such life-saving"

I say: Are you aware that each baby Dr. Bailey saves requires an expenditure of over \$100,000 dollars. While he is saving the lives of born babies with a defective heart at such a great cost, other Adventist physicians are killing healthy babies in our own hospitals. Does this makes sense? Methinks our modern Adventists have developed a moral blind spot in their eyes.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/22/11 11:50 AM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Originally Posted By: kland

Just asking what the general principle is.

kland,....

If you are unable, or willing, to provide what you suggest the general principle is, how could I possibly give any example which meets it? For I sense that without you specifically stating it, no matter what is presented will be construed otherwise. Which I also sense, based upon your question, was the intent or defense mechanism. Am I wrong?

Perhaps I have not comprehended your question. I wasn't sure what sort of "general principle" you were getting at, but tried to answer anyhow. If you could clarify it might be helpful. There have been many points of view expressed in this thread, on a variety of texts and issues, and a "general principle" for any of it seems ambiguous. I thought you were getting at the "general principle" for understanding scripture on this topic. But I may have misunderstood.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/22/11 02:38 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

I do not want to take the time to go on this renewedly blazed meandering trail, which seeks to trivialize, confusing, grey up; “ambiguitize”; and obfuscately conflate the otherwise clear cut issues here so here are my, actually, concise replies:

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I have not taken a position that these abortions are prescribed or approved of by God. Perhaps you have misunderstood my position, or perhaps I have not made it sufficiently clear. My position is that the Bible is virtually silent on the issue. My position is that of saying the Bible has not taken a clear stand to one side or the other on this issue.

So I guess that is what you meant in [this post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131026#Post131026\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131026#Post131026) when you said:

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Now, here are the passages that refer to these "untimely births" or "abortions."

and then proceeded to cite Job 3:16; Psa 58:8 and Ecc 6:3. Surely did fool me!

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Regarding your understanding of the word "abortion," I would invite you to investigate the term in your dictionary.

No need to insult anyone’s intelligence or “gaslight” people here. The abortion issue that is clearly under discussion is ‘when a pregnant woman goes to a clinic to have the viable pregnancy terminated by a medical procedure for reasons other than a life/death one. That is distinct from a “miscarriage” which is by inherent meaning spontaneous/natural and not “induced” in any way. No one is holding it against a woman for having had a miscarriage, nor an “untimely birth”, which with this birth term straightly refers to a “premature birth” and with the term untimely implying a non-successful one.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

I already posted the Hebrew word definition in English, which included the term "abortion." "Abortion" is a word comprising the superset of which "miscarriage" and "untimely birth" would be subsets. As such, every miscarriage, untimely birth, etc. are abortions by definition.

If you are referring to *nepheh* #05039 from your three texts it is a **noun** (i.e., not a *verb*) that refers to the actual matter of a miscarriage. The actual word in the Bible that describes what is done in an “abortion” as straightly understood is the predominantly used **verb** *shakol* #07921 + 3 other related forms, and it is in 18 out of 25 uses in the most intensive Hebrew verbal form, the *Piel* stem (= “to (actively/effortfully) **make** childless”) vs. the other possible stems: *Qal* ‘to naturally be childless’; or *Hiphil* ‘to (indirectly) cause to be childless’. The LXX

also consistently translates this Hebrew word as *a-tekno* = “no-child”.

Much, much more can be said in term of syntactical analysis, however, for the sake of the time need to fully and transparently reproduce such studies, this should do.

And in case you may not know, which would surprise me since you apparently took Hebrew classes at some time in your life, unless you actually just meet with these Hebrew professors at your Lunch Break, no matter how accessible the “Blue Letter Bible” is, it is an atrocious Bible Resource for both its underlying Biblical version the KJV and its definition (mirroring Strong’s lack of scholastics). When I first started out in Biblical Research in 1997, I used it thinking it was great, until I discovered (in 1998) more scholarly, precise, exhaustive, analytical, comprehensive and more widely comparative (i.e., using cognate languages) such as the TDOT, TWOT, TDNT & EDNT. So it is, for such substantive reasons, not an authoritative, even official definitions reference for me. Hebrew verbal tenses play an important part in the meaning of term, which the BLB does not consider at all. (Englishmann’s concordance is also much better than Strong’s)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

If you want another form of abortions, as specified in the Bible but which I have not yet brought up, look up "Hazeal" in reference to Elijah's prophecy. He committed some very violent abortions--ones in which the mothers certainly died. (Look at this link for some texts which speak of some gruesome "abortions.")

The texts you have cited/linked to (2Kgs 8:12; Hos 13:16; Amos 1:13) are, at least the first two, in a judgement decreed by God. (Hazeal did not even have in mind to do this until it was approvingly “suggested” by God through Elisha. (2 Kgs 8:13, 14)). This ‘just decreed judgement of God’ is a side theme that was previously discussed in the killing vs. murder issue and like I said there, when God decrees that something to be done, I’ll trust that it is the just and right thing to do. God does punish unto the 3rd and 4th generation (Exod 34:7; Num 14:18) especially for idolatry (Exod 20:5/Deu 5:9 = 10 Commandments), which was the prominent sin of that Baal worshipping generation of Elijah’s/Elisha’s time. So killing the next generation here was in keeping with that previously, clearly warned consequence. Amos 1:13 speaks of such a sin of Ammon that God will judge showing that he is against this act when not done in judgement and as He apparently only has the prerogative to do.

The Hebrew word *shakol* speaks pointedly to ‘the “forceful” (Piel) ending of a viable life equally whether in the womb (e.g. Exo 23:26; cf. Hos 9:14) or not (e.g., Ezek 36:12-14)’. So if God is against what could even be a bodily defect, how much more would he be against the deliberate “abortions” of today. Interestingly enough in Exod 23:26 a Piel verb is used indicating this intensive forcefulness whereas in Hos 9:14 where it is prayed that God punish Ephraim with women whose wombs (#07359) ‘deprive viable pregnancies of life’ the indirect and causative Hiphil verb form is used and also a masculine gender for the “womb”. However in Exod 23:26 which would seem to imply the same “indirect” notion, a Piel stem is used and also a feminine form thus clearly saying ‘no woman who will make a viable pregnancy be deprived of life’ (i.e., an abortion). The natural term for “miscarriage” *nephe*l #5309 (from #5307 “to fall”) is not even used here as it should have been.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

On the other hand, there is also that passage in the Bible which blesses those who seem to, well...I'll let you look at the text yourself.

Originally Posted By: The Bible

Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones.
(Psalm 137:9) The word translated there as "little ones" (Strong's #5768) is the same Hebrew word that shows up as "infants" in the following verse: [Hos 13:16]

Since you evidently believe or want to make it seem that whatever is merely stated in the Bible must be prescriptively followed, I am surprised, since God will never prescribe anything that is unlawful, that you are not going around 'murdering little ones' or even not encouraging or engaging in performing abortions. I personally allow exegesis to determine what is the message of the Bible and not such isolated, textbook, "proof-texts". In that Psalms mourning the Babylonian Captivity (years after David's time so most likely not written before the fact, nor by him), a "just recompense" is being prayed against the "daughter of Babylon, the devastator" (vs. 8a - NASB + margin), for what she had previously done to God's people (8b). Even God had said that Babylon had done too much against Israel in its "(divinely-mandated) judging of her" (Jer 51 (see esp. vss. 1, 5, 6, 24, 36). So this prayer and wish in vs. 9 is one for a judicious, "equatingly compensating judgement" and the judgement against infants is in keeping with the decreed judgement of total depopulation in Jer 51:29. So it most certainly is not a 'green light to perform abortions'.

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

This appears to be a God-ordained punishment for their sins, as this entire chapter in Hosea is written in God's first-person voice.

As you rightly have realized, this is indeed God's direct and most explicit call for judgement on Ephraim and in Psa 137=Jer 51 on Babylon. So again, as seen e.g., in the case of Saul vs. Agag and the Amalekites (1 Sam 15) and God's just (see 1 Sam 15:2 & Exod 17:8-16) total judgement on them who continued to "plunder" Israel (1 Sam 14:48), when God decrees that such a complete judgement is to be done, then I trust that it is both righteous and most expedient. God has, in focused relation to this discussion, not given, ordained or injunctively "spoken" this right to any woman in regards to the child in her womb. The commandment still stands here: Thou shall not commit murder. Which reminds me, you have not Biblically explained why you manifestly do not see abortion as murder???

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/22/11 02:40 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

If you are unable, or willing, to provide what you suggest the general principle is, how could I possibly give any example which meets it? For I sense that without you specifically stating it, no matter what is presented will be construed otherwise. Which I also sense, based upon your question, was the intent or defense mechanism. Am I wrong?

I am glad kland, that I am not the only one who noticed that vacuous, deflecting tactic of Green Cochoa!

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/22/11 02:42 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

My conscience has been clear from day one when the Lord laid on my heart my personal assignment on which I have been working for the last 15 years.

Well the Biblical principle is that God does not require from us more than we can bear, however that is often limited by our faith and so God also only gives us “according to our faith.”

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

No argument of yours will dissuade me from neglecting what the Lord told me to do!

I was actually trying to exhort you to raise the standard here from 0 lives saved to all of these 65,000,000 infants annually, as Christ’s fully expects (Matt 25:45, 46). So sorry that this is not a priority for you or that your 15 years of work has not placed you in a position to seize this opportunity. But, for various private reasons, members of the SDA Church are not interested in “raising the standard”, which is most crucial to the “destiny of the Church”, (1T 181) but just perfectly satisfied with what they have done or are doing. However it should be known and clear to all that we are judged by what we could do with the various “privileges and advantages” (i.e., opportunities and blessings/spiritual “gifts”) that we have and come across lest ‘when we are weighed in the balances we are found wanting’. (8T 247.2)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

By the way, yesterday I personally spoke with Ted Wilson, the president of the GC, and I think that he reacted positively to what I am doing.

Awesome. That should quickly resolve this issue, right. No need to even email him! Unfortunately you both seem to believe that resolving this life and death issue must be complex, drawn out and complicated. Such passivity is not the Spiritual or even temporal function of a “President” but merely an “administrator”.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Are you aware that each baby Dr. Bailey saves requires an expenditure of over \$100,000 dollars. While he is saving the lives of born babies with a defective heart at such a great cost,...

I was doubtfully wondering where this Dr. Bailey example was coming from so out of the blue and suspected that he was not actually rescuing would be aborted infants, but gave you a benefit of the doubt. By the way, who is paying this \$100,000. The NJK Project itself is being set up so that such saves and abortion rescues will literally cost a fraction of these over inflated, capitalistic market prices/costs. It can be easily deduced that over 80% of that \$100,000 cost is, variously and at variously levels, in Human Services costs, which in the NJK Economy will all be [Free Services of Good Will \(Link: http://www.njkproject.info/njk/hc_economy/njkeconomy.html\)](http://www.njkproject.info/njk/hc_economy/njkeconomy.html), with expenditures only for raw materials that cannot be freely obtained.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

... other Adventist physicians are killing healthy babies in our own hospitals. Does this makes sense? Methinks our modern Adventists have developed a moral blind spot in their eyes.

So I moreoverly recommend the NJK Project to Dr. Bailey and any other SDA or others who are *truly* interested in saving **as many lives as possible**.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/23/11 09:26 AM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

NJK Project: "I was actually trying to exhort you to raise the standard here from 0 lives saved to all of these 65,000,000 infants annually"

I say: It might be helpful if you would tell us how many unborn babies you have saved so far with your special project. You keep talking about 65,000. Is that the number of unborn babies you have been saving per year?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/23/11 03:10 PM

Posted by: [kland](#)

GC, I was getting at the general principle in regard to the question in which I referred to. Oh well.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/23/11 03:16 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

It might be helpful if you would tell us how many unborn babies you have saved so far with your special project. You keep talking about 65,000. Is that the number of unborn babies you have been saving per year?

How slyly cute... Spiritually sound like Matt 27:39-45|DA 749, 750. Notwithstanding, since it will be "helpful" to you, (for clear and obvious reasons): **0** (at least not directly) since the start of this project in the Spring of 2000. And that is because no one in the SDA or Christian Church, or other thus far wants to help. So the blood of all of these infants thus far is certainly not on me who wants to help them and is actively endeavoring to despite being, human-speaking, entirely alone in this, but on those who refuse to join in and help for various, indeed selfish, self-justifying excuses. (Isa 63:1-6 = Rev 14:17-20).

[And, as if you really didn't know and understand, the 65,000,**000** is the current number of known global abortions per year, and that is entirely my pointed and strived for goal (Matt 25:45, 46)]

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/24/11 12:08 PM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

[And, as if you really didn't know and understand, the 65,000,**000** is the current number of known global abortions per year, and that is entirely my pointed and strived for goal (Matt 25:45, 46)]

"Known"? I thought they were hidden, whether Adventist hospitals or otherwise. But if they are known, how are they known? Are there numbers of some sort that are real?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/24/11 02:43 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: kland

"Known"? I thought they were hidden, whether Adventist hospitals or otherwise. But if they are known, how are they known? Are there numbers of some sort that are real?

By "known," it is meant numbers which could be most accurately approximated because of known data by the institutes that do in depth research on this issue. The "unknown/unknowable" numbers are mostly in e.g., the 69 countries where abortion is illegal and thus abortion that surely go on there clandestinely are not reported/recorded at all in any way. China also wants to keep these numbers secret for apparently fears of human right abuses with their controversial one-child policy. Access to information approaches can reveal such information in countries where abortion is legalized, especially in public medical facilities. The [Online Johnston Archive \(Link: http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/superindex-A-B.html\)](http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/superindex-A-B.html) has many links for its estimates; upon which my figures are based.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/24/11 02:44 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Green Cochoa, to claim, as you have been, that 'the Bible is silent, or even (ambivalently) "grey" on the issue of abortion is inevitably to believe that abortion is not murder, since the Bible is clearly against murder. So, once again, according to your view, how then is abortion not murder??

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/24/11 05:11 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Green Cochoa, to claim, as you have been, that 'the Bible is silent, or even (ambivalently) "grey" on the issue of abortion is inevitably to believe that abortion is not murder, since the Bible is clearly against murder. So, once again, according to your view, how then is abortion not murder??

That is correct. That is, you have understood my view correctly. And the question you ask is a good and reasonable one. I have already answered it in a previous post. I don't have time to look it up, but you are welcome to go back and find it.

Here is the "succinct" version:

1. Murder is defined as taking a human life. (There are more accurate definitions in terms of detail, but the important point here is the "human life.")
2. Biblically, life is defined upon two things: blood and breath.

Remember, instructions were given not to eat the blood (Lev. 3:17). The Israelites were taught that the blood represents the life.

Furthermore, breath represents the life. If one is not breathing, they are not considered to be alive. Multiple texts would bear this out, some of which I quoted in the earlier post.

It is safe to say that if one of Noah's daughters-in-law had become pregnant on the ark during the flood (and this may actually have happened, we simply do not know), that the Bible would

not yet count them as a person or "soul" until they were born and breathing on their own. It is clear that only "eight souls" are counted on the ark. If one of the wives had become pregnant, the number would still have been counted as eight.

I know this next example is a stretch, but perhaps it will serve to get the thinking wheels turning...the Bible does not speak of "Joseph, Mary, and Jesus" going to Bethlehem to be taxed. Even though they had been told to name the baby "Jesus," the naming did not occur until after the birth. Until then, she was simply "great with child," meaning "pregnant and nearly due." Jesus' cousin John was likewise not given his name until after his birth, even though Zachariah was told to name him "John" before he had even been conceived.

Until the child is separated from its mother at birth, they count as one. The child is not yet "a living soul" by definition. When the child is born and takes its first breath, it is then a living being. There is much emphasis throughout the scriptures on being "born." This also applies spiritually. John 3 speaks of the spiritual birth that we all need. We are not "alive" spiritually until we have had this birth. If we are just "interested" in God, but haven't received Him yet into our hearts in the "new birth" experience, we are still "dead in trespasses and sins." Until we learn to "breathe" spiritually and on our own, we are not "alive."

There is a line to be drawn between death and life, unsaved and saved, wicked and good. As humans, we are often tempted, for political reasons, to set the line back further to make it appear that there are more of us in the "alive", "saved" and "good" categories. But this is just so much political gerrymandering and a risk to spiritual destiny.

The point at which a baby becomes "alive" is also, in my understanding, the point at which it might be eligible for salvation. I do not believe that God is going to save in Heaven every fetus which has been the victim of miscarriage or abortion. I do not believe that the little blastocyst which missed implantation and was washed out in the menses is going to be taken to Heaven. The threshold it must cross to become a living soul is that of breathing on its own, independent of its mother.

Well, that's more than I really had time for, and with added detail as compared to my earlier post on the subject. But the earlier one, if you find it, had the scriptural support for my position.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/24/11 06:14 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

I do recall that position of yours stated [here \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131026#Post131026\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131026#Post131026) and had refuted it in [this post \(Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131036#Post131036\)](http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=131036#Post131036) for being both unscientific and not Biblical as babies are breathing in the womb, as well as receiving other life sustenance, even if through the mother and, among other factors, such as God Himself repeatedly pointedly considering an infant in the womb and referring to it as a distinct person (e.g., Gen 25:23; Jdg 13:5, 7; Ruth 1:11 (cf. Psa 127:3); Job 31:15; Psa 139:12-17; Isa 44:2, 24; 49:1, 5; Jer 1:5; Hos 12:3; Luke 1:15; Gal 1:15), the fact that the Bible also repeatedly also calls this fetus an "infant child" (Gr. *brephos* Luke 1:41, 44; 2:12; 16; 18:15; 2 Ti 3:15; 1 Pet 2:2 (and Luke was a physician)) easily disproves your view which is indeed a "stretch". All you really have are mere, removed third-party and isolative, non-exegetical and unscientific suppositions. Anything could be claimed to be "proven" with that subjective approach. You are also

expecting the Bible to be as technical as today medical textbooks, which it is not. But that certainly does not lessen its knowledge of such scientific realities. So you, as with other countering arguments I have made, need to disprove these views before, effectively, continuing to claim that 'killing an unborn child is not murder since they are not a person.'

And it seems to me from Luke 1:13, 59 & 2:21 that it was normal to name Jewish children to be named only eight days after they were born. I.e., when they were circumcised. So, based upon your reasoning, were they being considered as non-person or dead in those prior 8 days??

You seem to be quite ambivalently confused in your views since your are nonetheless against abortion. Why?? How could you be guilty of anything for killing something that (somehow) 'does not even exist'??

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/24/11 07:04 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

NJK,

Babies have amniotic fluid in their lungs while in the womb, and they may practice a sort of "breathing" on same. However, this is not the "breath of life." It would never hope to sustain them independent of the mother. Your "refutation" was more a matter of your viewpoint, and not a Biblically-sound doctrine. Scientists tell us that the day starts at midnight too. But the Bible has its own standard. Define a life by science if you will, I still accept the Biblical definitions for it. In this sense, I am happy to accept as doctrine things which may seem "unscientific" to you.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/24/11 07:36 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Babies have amniotic fluid in their lungs while in the womb, and they may practice a sort of "breathing" on same. However, this is not the "breath of life." It would never hope to sustain them independent of the mother.

Fetuses actually mainly receive air/oxygen through the umbilical cord; air/oxygen which ultimately comes from the air around us. So they still have this 'breath that gives life' in them even though they cannot breathe on their own. You therefore need to find a "Biblical definition" which says that 'when an infant breathe air on its own then and only then is it a person or alive.'

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Scientists tell us that the day starts at midnight too. But the Bible has its own standard.

The maintained Ancient Roman view (which is not synonymous with "science"), on a day's reckoning (arbitrarily) starting at midnight is not scientific, whereas a day ending at sunset, and thus a new one beginning then, is. (I.e., it harmonizes with observable facts.)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Define a life by science if you will, I still accept the Biblical definitions for it. In this sense, I am happy to accept as doctrine things which may seem "unscientific" to you.

The Bible and science are in perfect harmony here: Life, and God-valued life at that, begins at the very earliest, at conception. Abortionists, and evidently you also, need to reject this scientific fact to consider life to be valid only at birth, and for you, only after they take their first breath. So never causing a newborn infant to take a first breath and letting it asphyxiate would also not be murder to you since they were never alive??

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Your "refutation" was more a matter of your viewpoint, and not a Biblically-sound doctrine.

I've added many Biblical texts above that show that the infant is clearly considered as alive by God and others when in the womb, among other added points

So your view continues to be, and even more, unscientific on top of being not supported by what the Bible actually soundly teaches.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/25/11 09:28 AM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Green Cochoa said: "Until the child is separated from its mother at birth, they count as one. The child is not yet "a living soul" by definition. When the child is born and takes its first breath, it is then a living being."

I say: I have a few questions for you:

1. Does this mean that killing an unborn child is morally justified?
2. Is society wrong in counting as a double murder when someone kills a pregnant woman?
3. Does the fact that the development of the unborn baby is not finished give us incense to kill it?
4. Who do unborn babies belong to: the pregnant women or God?
5. Doesn't the Bible teach that we all belong to God?
6. If we all belong to God, and pregnant women don't even own their own bodies, what right do we have to destroy what the Lord is building?
7. Does the fact that a cathedral is unfinished mean we can destroy it with impunity?
8. Suppose you are working on a project, and it is not finished, does this mean that I can destroy it simply because it is not finished?
9. Suppose Mary, the mother of Jesus had decided to have an abortion, would she have been morally blameless?
10. Jesus identified himself with "the least of these." Can you think of any groups of human beings more deserving of the "the least of these" label than the unborn?

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/25/11 10:51 AM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Nic,

Good questions, all of them.

Originally Posted By: Nic Samojluk

Green Cochoa said: "Until the child is separated from its mother at birth, they count as one. The child is not yet "a living soul" by definition. When the child is born and takes its first breath, it is then a living being."

I say: I have a few questions for you:

1. Does this mean that killing an unborn child is morally justified?
2. Is society wrong in counting as a double murder when someone kills a pregnant woman?
3. Does the fact that the development of the unborn baby is not finished give us incense to kill it?
4. Who do unborn babies belong to: the pregnant women or God?
5. Doesn't the Bible teach that we all belong to God?
6. If we all belong to God, and pregnant women don't even own their own bodies, what right do we have to destroy what the Lord is building?
7. Does the fact that a cathedral is unfinished mean we can destroy it with impunity?
8. Suppose you are working on a project, and it is not finished, does this mean that I can destroy it simply because it is not finished?
9. Suppose Mary, the mother of Jesus had decided to have an abortion, would she have been morally blameless?
10. Jesus identified himself with "the least of these." Can you think of any groups of human beings more deserving of the "the least of these" label than the unborn?

1. Certainly not. Just because the woman's "fruit" is not yet equivalent to "human soul" does not mean we can butcher it at will. It does mean, however, that it is of a lesser value to that of an ordinary human life.
2. Perhaps. Society has developed many rules which have no Biblical basis. The fact that many murders and rapes are not punished with death is one of these.
3. This is nearly the same question as your #1. I assume you meant "license" to kill it. Again, the answer is similar: no, not necessarily. The developing fetus is, however, of lesser value to that of a mature human.
4. Both. God already owns the pregnant woman, doesn't He?
5. Yes. And the cattle on a thousand hills belong to Him too, yet God commanded sacrifices of them. Cattle are of lesser value to humans.
6. I agree with you. We don't have a "right" to destroy. We do have a "responsibility," however, to protect our health and to be responsible for each child that should enter this world via our family. We are not to take on "21-year commitments" without being properly prepared to honor God by such a commitment. In other words, women are not just "creation" machines, meant to pop out babies as fast as possible so as to "fill the earth and subdue it." Responsible parents will not have more children than they can properly care for.
7. I'm not sure what a Cathedral has to compare with the value of a human life. If the Cathedral belongs to you, and you would not be destroying someone else's property, I suppose you could destroy your unfinished Cathedral without sin. It is just property. It is not alive. The only question would be whether or not this would be best in light of furthering God's mission on earth.
8. Again, if it is my project, not yours, no, you cannot. To destroy someone else's property is on a par with stealing. You would be obligated to reimburse me for the damages. Here again is why in Exodus 21 God imposed a fine to be determined by the woman's husband and the judges.

9. Of course not.

10. Sure. Slaves, indentured servants, people who do not know the Gospel, nor have heard of Jesus, etc. We are to be as Jesus to them.

By way of comparison, the Bible does put certain "values" upon people. This gets highly controversial, and is not, perhaps, a "politically correct" topic. Yet the value system took into account one's age, in addition to gender. Furthermore, slaves were counted as "property." Yes, rules were given for how to manage the slaves, but it seems that if a man killed his slave, it was less punishment than if he had killed his neighbor, simply on account of the fact that he had already punished himself, in a sense, to have lost his slave/property. I've never quite understood it. But I cannot, simply because I don't understand something, say it is not so. I must do my best to properly interpret, regardless of whether or not I "like" the interpretation.

Here is the passage about the death of one's slave:

Originally Posted By: The Bible

And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money. (Exodus 21:20-21)

Yes, those are the two verses just prior to the scenario of the woman with child who loses her pregnancy on account of a fight. I believe these provide appropriate context to that distinction between "life for life" and "pay as the judges determine."

It appears here that if the slave died right there that day, the owner must be punished. (And I'm understanding that punishment to be "life for life," but as it is not spelled out as such in the verse itself, you may interpret otherwise.) But if the slave continued a day or two first, i.e. died a day or two later, he was not to be punished. Does this make sense? Not to me. But it is still God's own law, and I am obliged to respect it and learn principles from it that should be applied elsewhere.

If a slave were mere "property," how much more so a woman's "fruit?" In the Bible, even children were counted as a man's property.

Nic, if it weren't for the Bible teachings on these topics, I would tend to favor your viewpoint on the subject myself. I am a tenderhearted sort who cringes when crushing a cockroach. Yet the cockroach, frequently harboring uncleanliness and disease as it does, is not of as much worth as I am, being a human being. It is my duty and responsibility to care for myself and others, putting a higher priority on human life than upon other of God's creatures. We are counseled to kill such pests in order to make our homes safer and cleaner.

On your question #6, you ask what right we have to destroy what the Lord is building. May I ask a return question or two? Would you say the Lord is building that which is implanted forcibly into a woman by rape against her will? Secondly, if God is honored to have such babies brought into the world, did the rapist honor God by planting his seed in fertile soil? Should he then honor God the more by raping many women?

If your son or daughter were driving down the road and a dog ran in front of the car just as a semi-truck was approaching from the opposite way, would you wish for your offspring to swerve into the other lane in order to miss the dog? Or would you wish he or she had the common sense to hit the dog, that the safety of all in the vehicle might be preserved?

I know that's an easy one for us both to answer, but it illustrates the next point.

Since dogs are of lesser value to human life, can we destroy them "with impunity?" Would it be "morally justified" to do so?

That is how your questions come across to me. The answer is, of course not. And yet, we may find it sometimes best to destroy them--not because we simply "want" to or capriciously take pleasure in it, but for other well-founded reasons of concern to us, to our health and safety and life.

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/25/11 02:35 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

I read through this "exposition" by Green Cochoa on trying to find a Biblical justification to consider and unborn child as a "lesser life" by comparing it to a slave 'since the law on punishment for a beaten slave occurs just before this one' and could not but chuckle at the "depth of resourcefulness" used here, especially by typically, obviously ignoring all previously debunked arguments.

First of all, slavery in Israel must be understood within the context of Israel and how and why God permitted it. I think EGW best sums this up in PP 310 when she says:

Originally Posted By: SOP

In ancient times criminals were sometimes sold into slavery by the judges; in some cases, debtors were sold by their creditors; and poverty even led persons to sell themselves or their children. But a Hebrew could not be sold as a slave for life. His term of service was limited to six years; on the seventh he was to be set at liberty. Manstealing, deliberate murder, and rebellion against parental authority were to be punished with death. The holding of slaves not of Israelitish birth was permitted, but their life and person were strictly guarded. The murderer of a slave was to be punished; an injury inflicted upon one by his master, though no more than the loss of a tooth, entitled him to his freedom.

The Israelites had lately been servants themselves, and now that they were to have servants under them, they were to beware of indulging the spirit of cruelty and exaction from which they had suffered under their Egyptian taskmasters. The memory of their own bitter servitude should enable them to put themselves in the servant's place, leading them to be kind and compassionate, to deal with others as they would wish to be dealt with.

Strictly limited indentured servitude was God's allowed method to repay any debts incurred by a person and conversely, and because of this due repayment, Israelites had to be most generous to anyone who came in need, fully meeting their needs despite how much time was left in the Sabbatical cycle (Deut 15:7-11). If someone could not make monetary repayments during that time, then they were to do this repayment in the form of servitude at twice the rate of a hired person (vss. 12-18). So, to pointedly aspect of that Green Cochoa exposition, it was solely in that sense that a slave was considered to be the creditor's "silver/money" and not because the slave was in any way inherently considered as another's valueless/rightless property.

Now with God being the just and fair God that He is, He made certain that a slave would not

take advantage of this strictly limited servitude and also the required generous assistance, and so an owed creditor (i.e., not even a “slave owner” as such servitude was only temporary) was permitted to exact this due “double work” from the slave even if it meant inflicting corporal punishment. The slave could not just mope around and do nothing killing time until the year of release. However the creditor was not allowed to beat the slave to death. And that would be considered the de facto case if a beating resulted in the instantaneous death of the slave, and the normal “vengeance” life-for-life penalties from the next of kin were then fully applicable. However God considered that if the slave was able to survive a day or two then the beating had not been excessive, though an implicit trust and benefit of the doubt was to be given to the creditor given that if the slave died, so would his chance of collecting his owed money. So if the beaten had been severe to the point where the slave did die a couple of days later, it more than likely was fully deserving. I.e., the slave was being rebellious and slothful. Thus this slave was effectively guilty of the high handed crime of, what we call, “grand larceny”. It can also be assumed that such a severe beating was not the result of a first instance offense, but a persisted, rebellious stance. So this attitude of the slave was most synonymous with that of a stubborn and rebellious son who even refuses to change despite chastisement, with also the slave’s conduct being as unproductive to the creditor as a glutton and drunkard who indeed is wasting the creditor’s food and other provided care and being as useless as a drunk. So a resulting death in this case, 1 or 2 days later would be as blameless as the death penalty that was to be imposed on that incorrigible son (Deut 21:18-21).

So the law for a slave in Exo 21:20, 21 had absolutely nothing to do with the child in the distinct law of vss. 22-24. That is mainly the case because the child is not a slave to anyone; and especially not a ‘financial burden’ thus property or a lesser life. The unborn child, unlike the slave is completely blameless. So that law stipulation does not in any way affect what is to be understood in the one that follows it. The Bible has no such unjustified “lesser life” notion for anyone. As stated above, even as slave was not considered as a lesser life, but mere as someone who was temporarily deprived of certain aspects of their freedom and pertinently related free will while they repaid their debt. Even non-Israelites were not considered as “lesser lives”. (cf. Exo 22:21; 23:9). “Death penalties”, i.e., through war was to be imposed on Israel’s (factual) enemies, and that indeed through the fair action of a war which could go either way, were it but the support of God if needed, and that only for a just people and a caused judiciously deemed just by Him.

And as shown in the many Bible texts in my previous (unanswered) post, the Bible fully considers the “fruit” of the woman’s womb as a child and live person, full of value as shown in the penalties for any harm done to it in Exo 21:22-24. It is not the pregnant’s woman’s property to be disposed of at a whim for even if children were considered as the parent’s property, they could not just wake up one morning and decided to, as the Bible calls this act, even for born people, “abort” them (Heb. *shakol* e.g., Deut 32:25; Lam 1:20; Hos 9:12).

It is quite telling to me Green Cochoa, that you look through the Bible for any supposed excuse to maintain your 20th century views on this issue which results in eisogesis and which selectively ignores any Biblical passage and derived point that opposes your view, even not being afraid to carelessly “throw God Himself under the bus” when expedient, as if you knew better than Him. On top of that not being an honest “discussion,” is certainly is not the way the Spirit in which God’s Word is to be approached. I suggest rather than such “finding faults” with God, you instead force yourself to first prayerfully find out why He has said what He has said. And no matter what sort of brownie points you are trying to score with your double-talk on this life and death issue, your murder endorsing “actions” speak much louder than you empty ‘abortion abhorring facade and words’. No matter how nice you aim to be, your garments are still stained with blood for such shoddy dealings on this most vital issue. As Nic cited, Matt 25:45, 46 fully applies here, so don’t fool yourself and deceive

others. (cf. the double application of Matt 18:1-7 for this issue).

*******Last Paragraph Removed by Admin per PM exchanges with you**

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/25/11 04:22 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

I read through this "exposition" by Green Cochoa on trying to find a Biblical justification to consider and unborn child as a "lesser life" by comparing it to a slave 'since the law on punishment for a beaten slave occurs just before this one' and could not but chuckle at the "depth of resourcefulness" used here, especially by typically, obliviously ignoring all previously debunked arguments.

I think you are misjudging here. I'm not "trying to find a Biblical justification" for anything. I'm finding what the Bible says, instead of what I wish for it to say, that's all.

Are you trying to tell me that you would rather "proof-text" than to use the **context** of the verse? Do you see no connection between the slave verse and the one just after it, as if they were three chapters apart? Are you trying to convince us all to study only those snippets "of interest" instead of taking a contextual approach to a passage? Do you really think you will convince scholars that such a method is without bias?

What are *you* "trying to find?"

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

First of all, slavery in Israel must be understood within the context of Israel and how and why God permitted it. I think EGW best sums this up in PP 310 when she says:

Originally Posted By: SOP

In ancient times criminals were sometimes sold into slavery by the judges; in some cases, debtors were sold by their creditors; and poverty even led persons to sell themselves or their children. But a Hebrew could not be sold as a slave for life. His term of service was limited to six years; on the seventh he was to be set at liberty. Manstealing, deliberate murder, and rebellion against parental authority were to be punished with death. The holding of slaves not of Israelitish birth was permitted, but their life and person were strictly guarded. The murderer of a slave was to be punished; an injury inflicted upon one by his master, though no more than the loss of a tooth, entitled him to his freedom. The Israelites had lately been servants themselves, and now that they were to have servants under them, they were to beware of indulging the spirit of cruelty and exaction from which they had suffered under their Egyptian taskmasters. The memory of their own bitter servitude should enable them to put themselves in the servant's place, leading them to be kind and compassionate, to deal with others as they would wish to be dealt with.

Strictly limited indentured servitude was God's allowed method to repay any debts incurred by a person and conversely, and because of this due repayment, Israelites had to be most generous to anyone who came in need, fully meeting their needs despite how much time was left in the Sabbatical cycle (Deut 15:7-11). If someone could not make monetary repayments during that time, then they were to do this repayment in the form of servitude at twice the rate of a hired person (vss. 12-18). So, to pointedly aspect of that Green Cochoa exposition, it was solely in that sense that a slave was considered to be the creditor's "silver/money" and not because the slave was in any way inherently considered as another's valueless/rightless property.

You do not properly interpret what I said. I never said a slave or servant was "valueless" nor "rightless". Property, yes. There is, however, a difference between property with rights and property without such. The Ten Commandments themselves speak of servants as property. I like the Deuteronomy rendition:

Originally Posted By: The Bible

Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house, his field, or **his** manservant, or **his** maidservant, his ox, or his ass, or any thing that is thy neighbour's.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

Now with God being the just and fair God that He is, He made certain that a slave would not take advantage of this strictly limited servitude and also the required generous assistance, and so an owed creditor (i.e., not even a "slave owner" as such servitude was only temporary) was permitted to exact this due "double work" from the slave even if it meant inflicting corporal punishment. The slave could not just mope around and do nothing killing time until the year of release.

Of course not. This follows the Biblical principle of "if you don't work, you don't eat."

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

However the creditor was not allowed to beat the slave to death. And that would be considered the de facto case if a beating resulted in the instantaneous death of the slave, and the normal "vengeance" life-for-life penalties from the next of kin were then fully applicable.

Up to here we agree. Beating a slave to death was equivalent to murder.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

However God considered that if the slave was able to survive a day or two then the beating had not been excessive, though an implicit trust and benefit of the doubt was to be given to the creditor given that if the slave died, so would his chance of collecting his owed money. So if the beaten had been severe to the point where the slave did die a couple of days later, it more than likely was fully deserving. I.e., the slave was being rebellious and slothful. Thus this slave was effectively guilty of the high handed crime of, what we call, "grand larceny". It can also be assumed that such a severe beating was not the result of a first instance offense, but a persisted, rebellious stance. So this attitude of the slave was most synonymous with that of a stubborn and rebellious son who even refuses to change despite chastisement, with also the slave's conduct being as unproductive to the creditor as a glutton and drunkard who indeed is wasting the creditor's food and other provided care and being as useless as a drunk. So a resulting death in this case, 1 or 2 days later would be as blameless as the death penalty that was to be imposed on that incorrigible son (Deut 21:18-21).

Here I disagree. Any death caused by beating meant the beating was too severe. There was zero valid justification for such severity. Perhaps you recall this verse?

Originally Posted By: The Bible

And it shall be, if the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, that the judge shall cause him to lie down, and to be beaten before his face, according to his fault, by a certain number. Forty stripes he may give him, and not exceed: lest, if he should exceed, and beat him above these with many stripes, then thy brother should seem vile unto thee. (Deuteronomy 25:2-3)

That's speaking of a "wicked man." One who is "worthy to be beaten." Furthermore, this is not just private vengeance or impassioned rage, but the hand of the law (judge). There was a limit to the number of stripes.

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

So the law for a slave in Exo 21:20, 21 had absolutely nothing to do with the child in the distinct law of vss. 22-24. That is mainly the case because the child is not a slave to anyone; and especially not a 'financial burden' thus property or a lesser life. The unborn child, unlike the slave is completely blameless. So that law stipulation does not in any way affect what is to be understood in the one that follows it.

Clearly, the unborn is not a slave. Nor did I try to make such a point. However, God is here in this passage providing some basic principles for their legal justice system. The principle here is the same in that in both situations (slave and pregnant woman), a distinction is made between a "life-for-life" offense and a lesser offense which is not punishable by the same measures.

...

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/25/11 06:25 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

-I am not "misjudging" anything Green Cochoa. Your pattern thus far has been consistently clear. You have the default and quite mindless approach of e.g.,: "Look what God Himself did here... He killed this person for no reason ergo a man choosing to kill an unborn child for "no reason" is also justified. I could go through many of your responses and show how you do indeed expediently just "throw God under the bus" through quite shallow, to say the least, "exegesis". It is your *a priori* (if even that) Theological view of God that is defective in this issue. It is quite tellingly to me that I get this exact Divine-impeaching attitude from heathen who want to find any excuse to reject the authority and claims of God on their lives.

-Exegetical "Context" is not merely determined, nor limited, by what immediately precedes or surrounds a text, but by what thematically applied. In this law stipulation listing, one law does not necessarily define a next one. So the laws for a slave is not the "context" of the law for the unborn. So as Hans K. Larondelle said in the quote I had previously made: it is recommended that we treat the Bible "as a book that has the message of God hidden in it, not always lying on the surface, and that a lot of work and homework and study is needed, to enter into the essence of the Biblical message,"" and I'll add in pointed regard to this issue of Life and Death that approaching the Bible with the Godly Spirit that our Loving and Wise God equally loves every one and greatly favors life and not death rather than imposing 20th degenerate self-worshipping and selfish mentalities that: chiefly says: "I am my own god and all that should matter is me." It is this approach that does not let the **Word of God** speak for itself, i.e., working from what is generally, certainly known about God and His Character. Proper exegesis indeed works from what is clearly known to what is unclear and not vice versa and also involves the applicable wider context of the entire Bible if necessary.

-A creditor who beat his slave with more than 40 stripes would have broken the law and would have been guilty of abuse and murder if the slave died, even if more than 2 days later. Anyone could bring up that charge against him. God made the law on the guilt of a dying slave in the full context of a lawful beating. However just 10 stripes could kill a person while 80 would not affect another. All depending upon their physical make up. So as the law allowed for, with the punishment being variable from 1-40, the creditor was suppose to also take this into full consideration and either lessen the number of blows (cf. Luke 12:47, 48) and/or even lessen the force of the blows if up to 40. So, e.g., a child was not to be beaten as an adult. That is why if the force and/or extent of punishment was excessively imposed and the slave died immediately from this it would not be considered as "lawful" and the creditor

was to be held responsible for that death.

-I have already shown in previous posts that the “pregnant woman” herself is not the object of the law in Exod 21:22-24. That would be unnecessarily redundant as being pregnant does not change the fact that this is still a woman and was thus personally, gender-inclusively covered in the stipulations in vs. 18, 19, among other exegetical points also stated. So you’ll first need to actually refute/disprove those points before here obviously persisting with this disproven, and thus baseless, understanding. (As a person who purportedly took Hebrew classes, that should not be a burden for you.) I am sure the spirit of you rules in this regard is to avoid such prideful and disdainful attitudes where you effectively say, “although I cannot refute what you have demonstrated, I just completely ignore it and persist with my still “superior” view.

-And in keeping with the Character of God where He does not consider His intelligently created being to be animals or objects, I’ll revise my prior statement which said:

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

...even if children were considered as the parent’s property,...

to now say:

Originally Posted By: NJK Project

...even though parents had “great authority” over their children,...

Furthermore, the Tenth commandment is not referring to humans (i.e, wife, slaves) as property, but merely was speaking of things which belonged to one’s neighbor. That does not make a wife the husband’s property, nor slaves, but just describes the relationship it has with that head of household, who has Biblical authority over them. (Clearly it is non-natural relationships that are emphasized here, which could indeed be unlawfully taken away from someone through follow up acts for this coveting, as “children” are not included in this list. (As they should have been according to a “children are property” understanding.)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/27/11 05:41 PM

Posted by: [Daryl F](#)

First, I want to ask everybody to be more respectful in the manner in which we address one another's post content.

Second, I want to post a link here to what teens are saying about abortion in our SDA hospitals:

<http://www.atoday.com/content/teens-speak-abortion-sda-hospitals> (Link:
<http://www.atoday.com/content/teens-speak-abortion-sda-hospitals>)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/27/11 09:50 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Thank you, Daryl. That is an interesting topic for sure. The following post there gave me some food for thought as I had forgotten about the particular passage of the Bible referred to in it.

Quote:

Abortions should not only be allowed, in some cases, perhaps most, they should be required. Children conceived through illicit relationships by irresponsible individuals who themselves should have never been born, have little to offer any society.

The Bible actually sets forth the guidelines in Numbers, chapter 5: 27,28. Children conceived in adulterous affairs were aborted and their mothers were sterilized. Better abortion than stoning to death later, after the children became nuisances to society.

Men also suffer, knowing that their offspring will be destroyed. Many of us are bums who would be lousy parents. anyway. An acquaintance of mine, having an affair with a married woman, experienced two of his children being aborted by his tart. He felt somewhat uncomfortable.

"Anti abortion" is another moronic movement fueled by the same papacy who gives us celibacy and a priesthood loaded with homosexuals and gay pedophiles.

Children conceived in a loving family with a reasonable hope of a stable future are what society needs. There are enough sociopathic, personality disordered individuals at large

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/27/11 11:58 PM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

Re-read Num 5:27, 28 and, not even neededly, in its context of vss. 11-31. It says absolutely nothing about the abortion of any conceived life. It was just a test to find out a woman who was secretly/discreetly involved in an adulterous affair and her "zealously/jealous" husband could use this priest administered test to determine the truth here. She would, if guilty, only later become sterile and incapable of conceiving. So no aborting of "sure-to-be-nuisant, bastard" children was being instituted by God here. That is purely a Capitalist tenet.

That is also not a measure to 'avoid having bastard children in the future, through such a promiscuous woman', (there is no exegetical support for that (eisogetical) extrapolation). It was merely the lasting punishment for, pointedly, that unfaithful woman.

In Deut 23:2, it is shown that God was also not at all opposed to 'children born out of adulterous relations when it had been through two Israelite adults,' but solely "illegitimate children," (= "mongrels" Heb. *mamzer* Strong's #04464) born from an Israelite's relation with an non-Israelite. That was indeed for just, Spiritual, and not even *economical* reasons. Furthermore, these illegitimate children, who here are understood to be living in the Israelite camp, were clearly allowed to live. Indeed, the Adultery Test in Num 5:11-31 was not to "abort any illegitimate child," because it was done merely at the suspicion of unfaithfulness, and not a manifested sign of pregnancy. There is no hint of this at all in that test. Had God been teaching here that child born out of adulterous relations should be aborted. There is also no statement of disapproval for such "bastard" children.

Also if Deut 23:2 was teaching the 'abortion of children', in any way, and here, "mongrel children", God would here not be saying that they should merely be 'excluded from Israelite assemblies,' but rather that they should be taken outside the camp and stoned to death,

especially as they then would most manifestly be this supposed "economic nuisance"! Clearly that assembly exclusion here was to protect against any possibility foreign influence and encroachment into God's Holy Community. Towards this end, God also had strongly forbade Israelites to be "unequally yoked". Nonetheless, as shown in Isa 56:3-7ff, God expect to later allow for such "foreigner" to become a fully functioning part of Israel, indeed as seen in the converts which would come to from His New Covenant Israel/Church.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/28/11 03:27 AM

Posted by: [NJK Project](#)

I am also, out of deeper exegesis, greatly inclined to understand that when David, in his "adultery confession" statement in Psa 51:5, announcedly said '**Behold** (#2005) **he was "birthed/laboured"** (#02342a - cf. Deut 32:18; Job 15:7; 39:1; Psa 29:9; 90:2; Isa 23:4; 26:17, 18; 45:10; 51:2; 54:1; 66:7, 8; Jer 4:31; Mic 4:10) **in guilt'** (#05771 - e.g., [Isa 53:5, 6, 11](#) (Link: <http://njkproject.blogspot.com/2010/01/sacrifice-of-christ.html>)) [a.k.a. "iniquity" - indeed the same word that he used in vss. 2 & 9 to refer to his own 'guilt/iniquity of adultery'] **for in sin** (#02399) **did his mother* conceived him (or literally= "had mated (for) him"** (see Gen 30:41; 31:10),' that he was probably a "bastard child". Yet it would be quite an understatement to say just how much God approved of him. Clearly God had no problem with this child that, evidently, was born out of adultery, "apparently" out of Jesse' sin. This may also explain why he was initially left out/not called during the consideration for a king from Jesse's sons. (1 Sam 16:5b-11ff; cf. the apparent 'two sets|sides of David's brothers' in Psa 69:8). This also may be, as David seems to want to claim, the background/bad parental model/example reason why He himself had committed this sin of adultery (which further would explain God's great mercy towards him on this point, given that God could rightly read his heart and exhaustively verify that excusing claim.)

*[A Jewish tradition recorded in the Talmud states that David's mother's was Nitzevet, daughter of Adael (Talmud, Tractate Bava Batra 91a.)]

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/28/11 10:43 AM

Posted by: [kland](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Here is the "succinct" version:

1. Murder is defined as taking a human life. (There are more accurate definitions in terms of detail, but the important point here is the "human life.")
2. Biblically, life is defined upon two things: blood and breath.

Glad to hear that, though quite surprised. It sounds like you are saying that taking a human life is murder. Is that correct?

Quote:

Furthermore, breath represents the life. If one is not breathing, they are not considered to be alive. Multiple texts would bear this out, some of which I quoted in the earlier post.

wow. You sound like the liberals who spin things to justify killing their baby. So, would you say anything that is not "breathing", with your assumption that breathing means inhaling oxygen through their lungs, is not alive?

Fish ain't alive.

Intestinal worms ain't alive.
Trees ain't alive.
Then, there's grasshoppers which don't have "blood".

Someone who stops breathing, can be "killed" and not be considered murdered.

Quote:

Until then, she was simply "great with child," meaning "pregnant and nearly due."

Sounds like you just said children aren't alive.

(Need I go on or have I made my point?)

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/28/11 08:52 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Kland,

I won't here try to argue with your logic. Your logic is sound, and many others will agree with you. If logic and common sense were all that were required to arrive at truth, perhaps the Bible would be unnecessary.

I'm simply seeking to live by the Bible's own definitions. They are not always as intuitive as one might think. In order to understand the Bible, it is important to set aside preconceived ideas. Mrs. White also makes this principle clear in her writings.

Kland, if you can answer this one question from the Bible, and the Bible only, I think it has a direct bearing on the definitions which are so important for this topic:

"At what point in time does an individual become a living SOUL?"

Corollary questions would be: What is a soul? Who has a soul? and When?

Does an ovum have a soul? Do souls pre-exist conception? Are they up in heaven just waiting for a body to occupy? Can they be reincarnated into an animal, a fish, or another human? Do animals have souls? Are there different "kinds" of souls, or differing levels of definitions (i.e. senses) of the word "soul?" Does a blastocyst have a soul? A fetus? A corpse?

Those are questions that the Bible should be able to answer, right? After all, it is the Bible that gives us so many soul-related messages, such as "the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/28/11 09:02 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Green Cochoa said: "The developing fetus is, however, of lesser value to that of a mature human."

I say: Do you mean of lesser value in the eyes of men or in the eyes of God? Do you really believe that our value is based on how long we have lived or how many have been our good works?

Green Cochoa said: "If the Cathedral belongs to you, and you would not be destroying someone else's property, I suppose you could destroy your unfinished Cathedral without sin."

I say: How can a Cathedral belong to men? A Cathedral is built in honor of God. It cannot then belong to men. King Herod built the Temple for the Jews, yet Jesus referred to it as "My House," which seems to suggest that a Cathedral, finished or unfinished, belongs to God.

Green Cochoa said: "Would you say the Lord is building that which is implanted forcibly into a woman by rape against her will? Secondarily, if God is honored to have such babies brought into the world, did the rapist honor God by planting his seed in fertile soil? Should he then honor God the more by raping many women?"

I say: If God is not working in the development of the baby which was the result of a rape, then who is? The Lord could have prevented Bathsheba from getting impregnated or from the baby being born. If the Lord didn't interrupt said pregnancy, does this mean that we can play God? Are we smart enough to determine what plan does the Lord have for such a baby?

On one occasion the disciples asked Jesus who had sinned for the blind man to be born with said handicap. Jesus refused to discuss the moral responsibility for such an event and said rather that this would result in God's glory. Jesus' actions were redemptive.

The Lord is in the business of bringing glory to his name out of the most unfortunate circumstances. The story of Joseph is a good example. Joseph brothers sold him as a slave out of envy. The Lord transformed what was meant to be a curse into a blessing. Can we trust the Lord to bring good out of evil and misfortune?

If we are merciful towards the rapist and we let him live, this means that we have more reason to show mercy for one of the victims of rape: the unborn baby. This is my view. Otherwise, for consistency sake, if we kill one of the victims of rape, we should also kill the guilty of the crime. For legal equity to prevail, we have more reasons to show mercy to the unborn baby than the rapist right to life.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/28/11 09:57 PM

Posted by: [Green Cochoa](#)

Nic,

The valuation based on age of an individual is Biblical. This was God's system. If you want to say that He does not value a mature human above that of a developing fetus (and considering that God knows the future of each of us I can see how this would appeal to logic), how would you respond to the following?

Originally Posted By: The Bible

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When a man shall make a singular vow, the persons shall be for the LORD by thy estimation. And thy estimation shall be of the male from twenty years old even unto sixty years old, even thy estimation shall be fifty shekels of silver, after the shekel of the sanctuary. And if it be a female, then thy estimation shall be thirty shekels. And if it be from five years old even unto twenty years old, then thy estimation shall be of the male twenty shekels, and for the female ten shekels. And if it be from a month old even unto five years old, then thy estimation shall be of the male five shekels of silver, and for the female thy estimation shall be three shekels of silver. And if it be from sixty years old and above; if it be a male, then thy estimation shall be fifteen shekels, and for the female ten shekels.
(Leviticus 27:1-7)

God is telling us how to estimate the worth of these persons. I realize this is the old KJV, but the "estimation" here is essentially setting a price or value for each.

Notice also that God starts the values from those of a month old and upward. Under a month, no value is given at all. This is noticeable again in Numbers:

Originally Posted By: The Bible

And those that are to be redeemed from a month old shalt thou redeem, according to thine estimation, for the money of five shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary, which is twenty gerahs. (Numbers 18:16)

The same value as before is given, and quoted in an alternate unit of exchange as well. In the first case, the price was set for the purpose of fulfilling vows; but now in this second case, the price is used for the redemption of firstborn.

What do you suppose might be the significance of redemption for those a month or more in age? Why not redeem them at birth, or at least on the eighth day when they would be circumcised?

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/28/11 10:10 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Green Cochoa cited the following: "The Bible actually sets forth the guidelines in Numbers, chapter 5: 27,28. Children conceived in adulterous affairs were aborted and their mothers were sterilized. Better abortion than stoning to death later, after the children became nuisances to society."

I say: I don't find any reference to abortion in said biblical passage. The punishment for infidelity was sterility—not abortion.

Green Cochoa cited the following: "Anti abortion" is another moronic movement fueled by the same papacy who gives us celibacy and a priesthood loaded with homosexuals and gay pedophiles."

I say: Celibacy might be moronic, but this does not mean that everything Rome does is moronic. I know Adventists who see nothing wrong with killing an unborn baby, but would never drink coffee. This reminds me of those Adventists in Rwanda who actively participated in the genocide but refused to do any killing on the Sabbath day.

Green Cochoa cited the following: Children conceived in a loving family with a reasonable hope of a stable future are what society needs. There are enough sociopathic, personality disordered individuals at large"

I say: If God doesn't play God, neither should we. If the Lord, who knows the future from the beginning did not abort Hitler, Stalin, Idi Amin, or Bin Laden, neither should try to outsmart the All knowing God.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/28/11 10:20 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Kland said: "So, would you say anything that is not "breathing", with your assumption that breathing means inhaling oxygen through their lungs, is not alive?"

Fish ain't alive.

Intestinal worms ain't alive.

Trees ain't alive.

Then, there's grasshoppers which don't have "blood".

Someone who stops breathing, can be "killed" and not be considered murdered.

I say: Excellent response! Thanks for the posting.

Re: Abortion & The SDA Church - 02/28/11 10:35 PM

Posted by: [Nic Samojluk](#)

Originally Posted By: Green Cochoa

Kland,

I won't here try to argue with your logic. Your logic is sound, and many others will agree with you. If logic and common sense were all that were required to arrive at truth, perhaps the Bible would be unnecessary.

I'm simply seeking to live by the Bible's own definitions. They are not always as intuitive as one might think. In order to understand the Bible, it is important to set aside preconceived ideas. Mrs. White also makes this principle clear in her writings.

Kland, if you can answer this one question from the Bible, and the Bible only, I think it has a direct bearing on the definitions which are so important for this topic:

"At what point in time does an individual become a living SOUL?"

Corollary questions would be: What is a soul? Who has a soul? and When?

Does an ovum have a soul? Do souls pre-exist conception? Are they up in heaven just waiting for a body to occupy? Can they be reincarnated into an animal, a fish, or another human? Do animals have souls? Are there different "kinds" of souls, or differing levels of definitions (i.e. senses) of the word "soul?" Does a blastocyst have a soul? A fetus? A corpse?

Those are questions that the Bible should be able to answer, right? After all, it is the Bible that gives us so many soul-related messages, such as "the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

Blessings,

Green Cochoa.

The term soul has many connotations in the Bible. Instead of asking whether a conceptus has a soul, I would rather ask: Is the unborn a human being? We are not living in Old Testament times, which means that we need to talk in terms which make sense today. We do not use the term soul today to denote a person or a human being. This is why there are so many translations of the Bible. Every translator attempts at rendering old language in terms