

**News and Current Events :: Bush to meet Pope****Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/8 15:43**

I caught this on our early morning news today, but I note the exact day is not in this report.

Is this common knowledge in the US?

What do y'all make of it?

(<http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1630845,00.html>) <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1630845,00.html>

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/9 12:25

They met today for about 30 minutes.

The meeting was described as 'cordial'.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/6/9 18:56

Interesting...

I would assume that it was just political, but it sure seems like the Catholic "Church" is reaching far out beyond themselves and trying to get roots in everywhere they can. :-)

Jordan

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/10 12:48

Hi Jordan,

I'm amazed that this meeting has not raised more comment on this forum.

Perhaps you can tell me if there is a history of Presidents of the US meeting whoever is the Pope of the day?

I can't remember hearing of it.

One comment that the news presenter made, was that this may have been preparatory for a visit of the Pope to the US.

Now, have any of you over there heard *that* is in the planning?

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/6/10 19:57

Hi Dorcas,

When I googled it, this is all I came up with:

Lyndon Johnson was the first sitting president to have an audience with a pope. He met with Pope Paul VI in the Vatican in 1967." ...

Jordan

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/6/10 20:28

Dorcas,

It appears that both Bushes, Clinton, Ford, and Carter also met with a pope.

Jordan

Re:, on: 2007/6/10 20:34

I think everyone's met with a Pope. I mean, most leaders.

It also seems it happens just before any G-8 meeting, while they're already over there. I read the G-8 headline on the same page as the link you gave, and Poland was mentioned and I knew Mr. Bush went to Poland first, before seeing the Pope. We don't get the type News y'all get over there. But we do have the BBC on NPR. I listen to NPR for most news, because they speak more about what is going on 'globally' and with fewer "commentaries".

It seems, Conservative stations must tell us what was just said or done, because we need some sort of an interpreter of the News. :- (And that coming from a conservative - ha.

Last time they went to Germany before going to see the Pope and then on to the G-8 or something like it. I forget all the past dates & details, but it was the case with this meeting also. Bilderburg {sp?} meetings are sometimes preceded by visits to the Pope or certain other nations by the President or a governmental representative.

Before Mr. Bush left, he met with 18 of our religious leaders. Dr. Dobson being just one of them. Then Dr. Dobson came on his show that Monday and told his audience that he couldn't divulge what they all had spoken about, but he Surprisingly gave a whole week afterwards to prepare his listeners for a war with Iran, Russia, China with Israel and US. Imagine a bunch of 18 religious leaders meeting for a session that they can't tell us about and then let us know they can't tell us what was exchanged between them and the President --- what is that implying from them ?

I think you know my thoughts about Religion joined/Merged in this way with politics ... Dobson and Colson and other Protestant heads, have visited the Pope too and kissed his ring.

When the Pope was in Mexico last month, he went because "the evangelical" Protestants were taking too many folks and the RCC was wanting them back or period.

They've stepped up their "evangelism to 'Christ'" much.

I was raised Catholic - so in all my years I've watched the RCC go from Mass in Latin to sounding identical in methodology and terminology as Protestants ... with just a few added features.

They preach salvation through Christ by grace & faith but the clinchers are still there, of Mary and the Pope mostly.

All of this reminds me of a large number of drops of oil in a bucket of water.

Next morning you wake-up and it's just 'one' big blob of oil.

Che Sera~Sera.

It may not be spelt right ? but isn't that basically what the Bible says ? ;-)

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/6/10 21:19

Hi dorcas...

Quote:

-----Perhaps you can tell me if there is a history of Presidents of the US meeting whoever is the Pope of the day?

I can't remember hearing of it.

All of the modern US presidents have met with the pope. As an influential political and religious leader in Europe, each of the Roman Catholic popes have attempted to exert influence on many world leaders. Of course, the bulk of their influence is for political and social causes. Interestingly, the popes have lost quite a bit of their influence in Europe and the United States. Yet they still hold influence over the local churches, which can thus influence the local and national communities respectively.

I found it interesting that President Bush (http://www.news24.com/News24/World/News/0,,2-10-1462_2127232,00.html) did not refer to the pope as "his Holiness" (as is customary for foreign dignitaries). Whether this was a verbal gaffe or a calculated decision is unknown. I'm actually glad that he didn't stoop to such a colloquial religious tradition.

:-)

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/6/12 0:08

Chris wrote:

Quote:

-----I found it interesting that President Bush did not refer to the pope as "his Holiness" (as is customary for foreign dignitaries). Whether this was a verbal gaffe or a calculated decision is unknown. I'm actually glad that he didn't stoop to such a colloquial religious tradition.

I checked out this site....and it gave me a chuckle. I loved it! Pres. Bush comes across to me as one who is not always given to proper protocol. People who have met him say he is very personable and likeable and I am sure this act will leave some Europeans bent out of shape! Still smiling...;-)

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by awakenwithin (), on: 2007/6/12 2:25

I think I am not sure what I feel about this?

much more prayer needed.

In His LOve

charlene

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/12 5:32

awakenwithin said

Quote:

-----I think I am not sure what I feel about this?

Exactly.

It was news to me a couple of years ago, thanks to GrannieAnnie, that Vatican City has a seat on the UN. Of course it does!

So, it is in the corridors of the United Nations, these arrangements are tentatively explored, before they become formal.

Re:, on: 2007/6/12 8:58

The Pope is a political figure as well as religious... and lets face it, he has tremendous influence on world affairs. Everyone here knows I miss no opportunity to point out the evil that is the RCC... but I am also honest enough to say that Pope s like John Paul II did a lot of good from a humanitarian point of view.

There was a tremendous alliance between Ronald Reagan (perhaps our greatest president since Lincoln)... and Reagan used that alliance to topple the former Soviet Union without firing a shot. Poland was a key piece to the puzzle in that Cold War, and John Paul II had a vested interest in it, since he was from Poland.

Please understand me, I believe with all my heart that the Roman Catholic Church is the whore spoken of in Revelation 17. I dont condone RCC doctrine, practices, etc. It is doctrines of demons. And the RCC has the blood of the martyrs on it's hands... and we're not even in the Tribulation yet.

While I wish our presidents were all born again Christians, and would reject meeting with the Pope... the fact is, it's all politics. It's not religious at all. There is nothing religious about Bush meeting the Pope.

Now, when Billy Graham comes calling, and sits and prays with the president... and doesnt get into policies except to encourage them to do something about abortion... I think thats great. Thats what a believer with those kind of connections ought to be doing.

But the Pope doesnt sit and pray with the president... he has an agenda.

Krispy

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/14 8:21

Krispy said

Quote:

-----but I am also honest enough to say that Popes like John Paul II did a lot of good from a humanitarian point of view.

There was a tremendous alliance between Ronald Reagan (perhaps our greatest president since Lincoln)...

Hey Krispy,

I heard something on the radio today (BBC radio 4, In Our Time with Melvin Bragg), which you may not know - that Reagan used to consult an astrologer while he was President... I don't doubt God appoints authorities and is over all astrologers also.

On abortion, I'll be impressed with the Christian stance when there is an outcry that so many unwed mothers-to-be fall pregnant. I find it disgraceful these women bear the brunt of Christian society's distaste for abortion, without Christian society having much more to say about the male contribution to fornication.

Re:, on: 2007/6/14 9:59

Quote:

-----I heard something on the radio today (BBC radio 4, In Our Time with Melvin Bragg), which you may not know - that Reagan used to consult an astrologer while he was President... I don't doubt God appoints authorities and is over all astrologers also.

I had heard that it was actually his wife, Nancy, that consulted astrologers. I dont know if thats true or not, and from the way the media spins stories who knows what the truth was.

I dont know if Reagan was a born again Christian. His personal writings do indicate that he had a real sense of who God was, and it was definately from a conservative Biblical point of view.

All any of us know is what the media told us... and thats not the most reliable source of information, especially when they are writing about a man that they absolutely hated at the time.

As for what Reagan did for our country... well, let's just say that we need another Ronald Reagan right now.

I joined the Marines during Reagan's second term, and he will always be my commander-in-chief (not in a spiritual sense, obviously)

Clinton was president when I got out. I don't hold him in the same regard (not even close).

Quote:
-----On abortion, I'll be impressed with the Christian stance when there is an outcry that so many unwed mothers-to-be fall pregnant. I find it disgraceful these women bear the brunt of Christian society's distaste for abortion, without Christian society having much more to say about the male contribution to fornication.

Well... obviously you haven't spent much time reading my posts. :-)

Both parties are equally responsible before God for the sins of fornication and murder of the unborn child.

The way the laws are set up in this country, however, please keep in mind that the father (who usually is just a sperm donor), has no say whatsoever in the decision to abort. So ultimately the girl does in fact bear a lot of the responsibility for the abortion.

Krispy

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/6/14 13:59

Dorcas wrote:

Quote:
-----I'll be impressed with the Christian stance when there is an outcry that so many unwed mothers-to-be fall pregnant. I find it disgraceful these women bear the brunt of Christian society's distaste for abortion, without Christian society having much more to say about the male contribution to fornication.

Dorcas, you just don't get it, do you? Somehow, I feel real exasperated with your position on abortion... You will justify it depending on circumstances, like now.

Do you not know the female has greater powers to resist the sexual act than a male? It is the real young who may not have a clue as to what can happen if she hooks up with a fellow. Lady, I have had 12 young people clients who barely knew why they were pregnant; not so with older females. The probability of these girls carrying the child to term rests with the parent of the girl, in most cases, often forcing her to abort against her wishes.

And not all females who abort are single: many are married who for whatever reason think they do not want a baby. These are the tough (EDIT) cases for the counselors.

On this side of the pond there are many who will tell the boys that chastity is for them, too.

Another thing, if a female conceives and the father leaves the mother and child set, the state will work to find the father and force him to pay child support. My DH had pitched many a request from the Dept. of Human Services (I think) for info about a certain absentee father (because he did not know them).

Dorcas, the bottom line is that fornication is sin and that it is equally sinful for both males and females and to kill the innocent child because of the sin of some other people is not Biblical justice. To suggest that all have to be equally fair in order to support a moral position of righteousness is irrelevant to an extreme. Right is right regardless how the 'church' interprets it. God is going to call all men/women to accountability someday. And to be in a position where you failed to speak out because of perceived inconsistencies is missing the mark, IMHO.

Consider: Deliver those who are being taken away to death, And those who are staggering to slaughter, Oh hold them back

ack. If you say, "See, we did not know this," Does He not consider it who weighs the hearts? And does He not know it who keeps your soul? And will He not render to man according to his work? Pro. 24:11-12. NASB

I have had many AB minded clients tell me AB is murder -their words, not mine, and they will admit it is sin but plan to go ahead with it and then after the fact, ask God to forgive them! Lady, people are not as innocent as you would like to believe.

ginnyrose

Re:, on: 2007/6/14 16:16

There is never a valid excuse to take the life of an unborn child. With today's medical advancements abortion "to save the life of the mother" almost never happens. And the number of women getting pregnant from a rape are so insignificant that it doesn't even register... and many of those "rape pregnancies" are young girls lying to mommy and daddy after they were not able to keep from fornicating.

And even if they were raped, committing murder does not fix the problem. I listened to a speech by a young woman whose mother got pregnant for her as a result of being raped. The doctor's "botched" the abortion, and the young woman was born... and today she's a speaker who goes across the country speaking against abortion... as an abortion survivor. Is this young woman any less a human than someone who was conceived in a marriage bed?

99.99% of abortions are due to sin. Period. It's not even open for discussion. The numbers prove what I am saying is true.

There is never any justification for abortion. Don't like it? Too bad. God said it, not me. Take it up with Him.

Krispy

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/6/15 0:06

Krispy,

I could not have said it any better. Thanks! Krispy.

One time I had a client who was pregnant because of rape and she was a trumper. She told me it is wrong to kill a child because of someone else's sin. And brother, I gave her whatever she needed. She was so grateful. There are Christians out there happy to help these victims, if they only make themselves known.

ginnyrose

Re: Bush and the Pope - posted by FreebyWord, on: 2007/6/18 15:36

I was spiritually sickened to see Bush, a proclaimed Christian, bow at the feet of the pope.

Re:, on: 2007/6/18 17:10

Ummm... none of us are in a position to judge another person's salvation. I will say this, however: It is impossible to be an outspoken, bold and uncompromising believer and be in politics. You could never be in politics and win an election because you will be too unpopular with the worldly, godless voters.

Bush may be a Christian, and I hope he is... but he has to "play politics" at every turn. He can't simply slight the pope because he doesn't agree with his doctrine.

Did Bush really bow at the feet of the pope? I didn't bother to see it. I would never bow before anyone. You'll have to put a bullet through my head before I bow to another human being... and at that point I'll be gone. It'll just be a corpse on the ground.

und that they see.

Krispy

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/18 19:23

Hi Krispy and ginnyrose,

Krispy, I don't think you know why I countenance abortion, but there are many reasons.

Those who believe a fertilised ovum has a soul, take it that God is permitted to kill those He doesn't want to come to full maturity, and that doesn't give Man permission to take His example into their own hands. However, for the Calvinists, this is not an inconsistency in the natural terms you described, ginnyrose, as it cannot matter what a person has done by way of sin if they are going to be saved because they are going to be saved. This doesn't rule out the role of those who counsel against abortion, but, it relieves them of the ultimate responsibility when God allows an abortion to proceed anyway.

But, I put it to you both that the anti-abortion lobby have made the assumption that murder is involved. Anyone can find scripture against murder. But these are not the scriptures I would use to justify not being anti-abortion.

I can't justify your statistics, Krispy, but part of my consideration includes that whatever God has ordained for humans, is applicable across humanity; not just the Western world.

So, your unwillingness to terminate pregnancies, in many other conditions might cost the lives of many more people - both women and children in the same family. Wives and mothers. If it was your wife and children, would you - believing as you do - be ok with this, seeing God's higher will in the situation for you personally?

I see therapeutic abortion in completely other terms than I've seen put forward on SI ever. I've not heard you or ginnyrose answer how you could justify letting a woman *and* the baby die, rather than permit a therapeutic abortion. Or, if only one could be saved, why you would choose the baby over the mother?

These are real questions which *formed* both legal and medical opinion - in the light of scripture - over centuries (not just the last four decades).

I use scripture to understand from *new* birth, the parallels drawn by Paul and the Old Testament which apply to natural birth. Therefore, I don't have the *same* problem with the loss of a pregnancy as it seems to cause Christians who have not looked at the issues this way. But, don't let me leave you with the impression that I think therapeutic abortion is a risk-free, advisable procedure, from which there will be no aftermath.

On the contrary, I understand it is a deeply disturbing issue to have to face at all. BUT, that doesn't make it the sin you think it is, nor would it mean I'd be *for* therapeutic abortion in every case where it is sought.

Part of what I think about *all* this, is that the whole of creation is fallen. Getting all worked up about abortion is possibly a waste of Christian energy, when the practical answers are at a different level of intervention.

Basically, I don't believe abortion on its own keeps people out of God's family, just as *not* having an abortion when it would have been one possible solution to an unwanted pregnancy - unwanted for many good reasons - is not going to save *that* person.

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/19 11:56

There is something more I need to say for balance.

Some time ago, Neil wrote 'abortion is disgusting', and that simple statement did more to communicate something to my spirit than anything I had read here to that date. Amen.

But, opinions don't necessarily answer the heart and practicalities of real time issues for those who find themselves considering therapeutic abortion (that is, as opposed to a back-street abortion), and Christian platitudes on the matter don't necessarily speak what God would have a person hear and experience of His love.

ginnyrose,

I have to thank you for your response.

'Dorcas, you just don't get it, do you? Somehow, I feel real exasperated with your position on abortion...You will justify it depending on circumstances, like now.'

As I indicated in my post above, we are working from different scriptures on this, and I work from the ones about creation and spirit.

We *don't* see eye to eye, but I was genuinely floored when you said

Quote:

.....Do you not know the female has greater powers to resist the sexual act than a male?
.....

As if this is either true or the answer for the female in the situation?

It has taken me days to get over my incredulity at this statement / question and begin to formulate a response.

Mainly, I am left with a series of questions, because this is the only way to avoid shooting you down in haste. :-? Even my questions may seem hasty, but I really do hope you will think about them...

Is what you retorically asked me, what might be considered *received wisdom* in your part of the world?

Can you see that the male is usually bigger and stronger, and in putting the responsibility for resisting on to the weaker, smaller party, you are effectively taking that responsibility from the male where it **should rest**, thus **re-enforcing society's denial** about sexual sin in general, and sexual abuse in particular?

Might this be a reason for society's lack patience towards adult *women* who were abused in childhood? (The patience needed for them is monumental. I don't think it comes naturally to *anyone*.)

So, how do you deal with the adult males who were abused in childhood? What excuse do you give the perpetrators of offences against *them*?

Returning, now, to fornication between consenting adults (or at least two sexually mature parties) - that is, *not* girls in the ir early teens - is your assumption that the woman should take control of the situation, not also a re-endorsement of what happened at the Fall, when Adam rebelled against God's word, and later tried to put the blame on Eve?

Are you not, here, saying Eve *should* take the blame? Are you inadvertently repeating her error? God was fully aware. She cannot.

Further, Jesus demonstrated that continence is well within the reach of an average, unmolested male. This is the stand

ard of male human behaviour which Christians seek *from men*.

In other words, male continence is exactly where the responsibility lies and lies only. Joseph fled at the age of eighteen. Amen. Good man.

So, I think that any putting of the general responsibility on the woman, is an interference with God's order, (*totally*).

The female is *supposed* to respond to the male. *That's why* the male is configured the way he is, and given the leadership.

Of course I know a female can say 'no'. But please explain why you are letting off all the males who should have said 'no' to themselves?

Re:, on: 2007/6/19 13:10

Dorcas, I believe life begins at conception. There are verses about God knowing the Psalmist while in his mothers womb, God knitting us together in our mothers womb, John the Baptist leaping in his mothers womb when Mary came to her, John the Baptist being filled with the Holy Spirit in his mothers womb... etc etc.

YOU can not tell me for sure when you believe life begins, but you apparently do not believe it happens at conception.

We differ on that.

However, since you can not prove that it doesnt begin at conception, I say we need to line up on the conservative side. If I'm wrong, so what? If you're wrong... killing is taking place. Killing of innocent life. This is what we call **murder**.

You do not know for sure if you're right or wrong.

Better safe than sorry.

Krispy

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 11:20

Hi Krispy,

Your words stuck to me, and I cried.

BUT, what I want to know from you - apart from your resistance to therapeutic abortion to avoid the consequences of fornication - is whether you are willing to concede medical reason for therapeutic abortion or not?

This is not a trick question. I haven't looked for information on medically justifiable terminations of pregnancy on the web, as I'm sure you are able to do that for yourself.

Also, I'm sure you are not denying health care to pregnant women.

But, I do want to know how you advise women who are pregnant, regarding the tests which are available to detect abnormalities?

And, what you advise the husbands of those who find the only hope of their wife's life being saved, is to end the baby's?

(Sometimes the baby's would end anyway, but not necessarily before the mother's.)

I realise these seem not to be common in our superbly furnished and staffed hospitals, but in countries where there is an average maternal death rate of 15%, these questions must - at least - figure.

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/6/20 13:52

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

There is never any justification for abortion. Dont like it? Too bad. God said it, not me. Take it up with Him.

Slight deviation from the topic at hand, but I think this is a little nieve, Krispy. While I must say that I lean toward being "anti-abortion", I am reminded of the story told by Keith Green, of when Melody fell pregnant, and the child was growing in one of her tubes. To allow the pregnancy to go to term, would mean certain death for the baby, and possibly taking out the mother also.

Beside this, I see no place that God specifically spoke anything about abortion, apart from general comments about murder. There is "never a valid excuse" for putting words into God's mouth, and I am reminded of Eve's insertion into God's commandment, when telling it to the serpent, "...neither shall ye touch it.." Could it be possible that the fact the she survived "touching it" caused her to believe that she'd survive eating it? I realise that this is somatic, and I agree that clumsy morality is no excuse to murder, whether by the proponent or the victim, but we must be careful when referring to what God did or didn't say.

Re:, on: 2007/6/20 15:44

Quote:

-----Slight deviation from the topic at hand, but I think this is a little nieve, Krispy. While I must say that I lean toward being "anti-abortion", I am reminded of the story told by Keith Green, of when Melody fell pregnant, and the child was growing in one of her tubes. To allow the pregnancy to go to term, would mean certain death for the baby, and possibly taking out the mother also.

That is not the same thing.

Quote:

-----Beside this, I see no place that God specifically spoke anything about abortion, apart from general comments about murder.

Well... I say that's quite enough.

Fact is not even 1% of abortions in this country are for medical reasons.... they are for convenience. They are a result of sinful behavior.

Trying to pick at a gnat and ignoring the rhino in your living room is hardly worth the time.

Krispy

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 15:48

Far from being a deviation, this is exactly the kind of situation I feel Christian anti-abortionists need to understand.

Quote:

-----To allow the pregnancy to go to term, would mean certain death for the baby, and possibly taking out the mother also.

In fact, the tube usually ruptures at between 8 and 13 weeks, if (nowadays) a very early scan (possibly for some other medical reason) has not detected it. The bleeding leads to acute unilateral abdominal pain which may be referred as far as one of the shoulders. This is such a classic scenario, that any doctor who misdiagnoses it should get a severe reprimand. If surgery is not prompt enough, the mother will indeed die. And they still do.

Re: Buzh to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 15:56

Krispy said

Quote:

-----That is not the same thing.

But it would be ideal not to *wait until* the tube ruptures - EDIT - thus removing a live fetal sac.

So, are you saying that the 'killing' of 'unborn babies' (as you insist it is) for *medical reasons*, is ok?

Please answer my other questions.

I am not impressed with your percentage argument, precisely because you have made *such* an issue out of the non-medical majority.

Please, where is the line between the abortions *you* can justify and those you do not?

Re:, on: 2007/6/20 17:13

I feel myself getting ever frustrated by this discussion... therefore, I will opt out until such time as I am capable of continuing on without getting a head ache over all the semantics and "what if's".

There was a discussion about something else some time ago... I believe the discussion was about adultery and divorce... and it was amazing all of the perverse scenarios that believers on this very forum could come up with simply by adding the two words "what if..." to the beginning of the scenario. It was as if it were a contest to see how far into the gutter people could take their imaginations and come up with a "what if..." scenario.

That's what is happening here. "What if this...", "what if that..."...

How about 99% of abortion in America, Canada & Europe is for people who do not wish to live with the results of their sin.

But you want to focus on the less than 1%. I think it's silly to do that.

Krispy

Re: Pass the Goody powders., on: 2007/6/20 17:51

I came on this thread because of the TITLE, thinking I had something to post about the Vatican and Israel.

With all the due respects to The Most High GOD, my reaction to all that I've read here is, OMG, and quite loudly in my Spirit at that.

I had a tubal pregnancy but what on earth has that to do with using abortion "as a birth control method" ???

Even Melody and Keith Green did and do major tracts to hand out Against Abortion.

The "saline solution" BURNS THE BABY TO DEATH or near death.

The normal method of suction, tears them up, limbs and pieces at a time.

Need I bring up the late term methods or stabbing a hole in the back of the head and suctioning their brains out in the birth canal ?

When abortion was first sanctioned back before Roe vs Waye, it was being legally performed in N.Y. first. At "that time", a mother could not be more than 8 weeks pregnant.

At "that time" the pro-life people were screaming about "where" this would lead in the "inevitable slippery slope" well, those prognosticators were right!

The slippery slope has slid our (Biblical) ideas of "life" right into the very pits of hell itself.

Just the Saline Solution method alone, reminds of those Baal-ites, that gave their children to be burned and Jesus said, as it was in the day of Noah and Sodom, so shall it be in the days before His return --- which I know we are in. Obviously.

I picked the wrong thread to place anything about the Vatican on that's an understatement.

GOD help us all.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/6/20 17:56

Quote:
-----There was a discussion about something else some time ago... I believe the dicussion was about adultery and divorce... and it was a mazing all of the perverse scenarios that believers on this very forum could come up with simply by adding the two words "what if..." to the beginning of the scenario.

I agree. I think people who are bent on concocting such "what if" scenarios are actually seeking to justify an errant belief which they have already espoused in their mind. We've seen it recently on two different threads in this forum - and there is one going on right now.

The beautiful thing about the Word of God I find is that there are no "what if's" for those who follow God with a clean conscience and seek His righteousness in all avenues. The Holy Ghost speaks clearly, and what He speaks is further corroborated by the testimony and lives of the saints who have gone on before. There's no new radical bendings, no dire extrapolating, no hypothetical allowances. No confusion. Things become confusing only when man begins to pry his own rogue convictions into the equation.

Brother Paul

Re:, on: 2007/6/20 19:07

Has anyone ever watched those PBS/ or TLC programs, I think they were called the "life" series. Through a microscopic lens I watched as thousands of 'seeds' of man traveling towards the fertile egg woman. It's quite an eye opener, the 'seeds' are actually living. They look like 'tadpoles' with a little tail.

If that is not living, what is causing it to move towards it's goal? And when it reaches it's goal it's not easy to get in to the egg. It has to penetrate the egg to get in. So it pushes it's way in and only ONE gets in.

You need to ask yourself, how does it know where to go? There is an amazing attraction between seeds and that egg.

NOTE: is this ok, is anyone offended by this speech? Am I too graphic? I am trying to be as discreet as I possibly can.

Quote:

-----Genesis 7:3 the male and the female; **to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth.**

Quote:
-----Genesis 19:32 Come, let us make our father drink wine, and we will lie with him, **that we may preserve seed of our father.**

Men were viewed as seed bearers, and women were viewed as preservers of the seed. That is, women made sure that the seed remained on the earth, men that is.

Lot's daughters thought they were the last of their kind, therefore to keep men from dying off and leaving the earth uninhabitable, they got their father drunk, thus Moab and Ammon came about.

The purpose of my post is to tell my readers that life begins at the source of where the seed is. God spoke about Abraham's son Isaac as if he was alive, before he came into being, and God said that before Isaac came into being that he was presently in Abraham's loins when Abraham met Melchisedec.

Quote:
-----Hebrews 7:9 And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham.¹⁰ For **he was yet in the loins of his father**, when Melchisedec met him.

My thoughts on abortion are thus, it's murder!! If the woman's life is in danger while giving birth, I don't know. This is a touchy subject because it all depends on circumstances. I may love my wife more than my children, am I selfish in wanting her to live on and my baby to die? In the bible they didn't have such luxuries as we have today. A woman died giving birth, there was no choices, that child was meant to live and his mother was meant to die. I wonder if this verse has anything to do with this.

Quote:
-----1 Timothy 2:15... **she shall be saved in childbearing**, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 19:20

Hi Krispy,

Peace, brother! I'm genuinely sorry if I've caused you undue distress.

When I saw your last post, I went in search of statistics for myself, and think I've realised we are talking from two different cultural backgrounds. Surprise! Surprise! :-)

I couldn't find anything similar for the US, so I guess it really is abortion on demand over there and this is why you are so exercised about it. The aim of therapeutic abortion is to reduce the rate morbidity and death from those pregnancies which pose a risk to the mother.

Some could be carried to term, but would produce a severely deformed, disabled or mentally disabled child, and some carry definite risk to the mother during labour.

Terminations of pregnancy are given to minors under 16 because the risk of complications in the immature body are significant, severe and risk the life of the mother (who is also herself still a child). The next age-group (16 - 18) are also at risk. The safest time to bear a child is the second baby at the age of 24.

Therefore, the decision to terminate a pregnancy is based on statistical evidence gathered previously, of risks of continuing the pregnancy.

Here are the criteria applicable in the UK but not Ireland, and not in the private sector.

There must be agreement between two doctors before an abortion can be carried out.

Note, these are our criteria for ALL therapeutic abortions.

Non Emergency

A - the continuance of the pregnancy would involve risk to the life of the pregnant women greater than if the pregnancy were terminated.

B - the termination is necessary to prevent grave permanent injury to the physical or mental health of the pregnant woman.

C - the pregnancy has NOT exceeded its 24th week and that the continuance of the pregnancy would involve risk, greater than if the pregnancy were terminated, of injury to the physical or mental health of the pregnant woman.

D - the pregnancy has NOT exceeded its 24th week and that the continuance of the pregnancy would involve risk, greater than if the pregnancy were terminated, of injury to the physical or mental health of the existing child(ren) of the family of the pregnant woman

E - there is substantial risk that if the child were born it would suffer from such physical or mental abnormalities as to be seriously handicapped.

Emergency

F - it was necessary to save the life of the woman.

G - it was necessary to prevent grave permanent injury to the physical or mental health of the pregnant woman.

In terms of actual statistics, I came across this online magazine report from England and Wales, dated 19th June, 2007. It's a bit vague.

'More than 200,000 women had abortions last year, the highest number ever, figures show today.

Almost 4,000 of the 201,173 procedures carried out in England and Wales were on girls under 16, the legal age of consent for sex.

The total rose by almost four per cent last year on 2005. The increase is being blamed on a crisis in contraception services.'

From another website, I learned that over 3,500 of these will be Irish women and teenagers, who cannot obtain a legal abortion in Ireland. By which I mean that even a raped 13 year old with the support of her parents, is not eligible.

According to the online publication of the Scottish statistics for last year, the number averaged out to 12.4 (per thousand live births). The only numbers I could find for the US are slightly older, and seemed to be in the region of 335 (per thousand and live births).

This doesn't tell me anything about the incidence of pregnancy for the number of women of childbearing age, so it is difficult to interpret the information.

As far as I could tell, there were no numbers for spontaneous (natural) abortions, included in the above statistics.

Also, you should know that in the UK the policy is to terminate as early as possible, and increasingly, this is done medically not surgically.

In the UK, ultrasound has been developed to a very high level of visual accuracy (I'm sure you have it in the US, also.) so that early scanning can confirm or cast doubt upon other signs of, or concerns about fetal abnormality, thus reducing the need to wait till after 16 weeks to terminate those for whom it is advisable. As a proportion of terminations, this is a comparatively small number.

It seemed to me earlier, that you are so against therapeutic abortion, that you don't accept medical reasons. I hope it's obvious now, that this is why I've been pressing you to consider the implications to families of *not* taking medical reasons into account.

The fact is, that even medical termination is the ending of a potential lifetime, however disabled or incompatible with normality, and in the days before research, there was no such thing. Literally thousands and thousands of women died in childbirth, and still do in many countries around the world. I know someone who has lost at least 15 friends in childbirth.

The FACT is, that some of the young who fall pregnant would die if they tried to carry it on. And at least some of those would bear children if they survived, who would die later.

I think this is why I feel so very strongly about them not becoming pregnant in the first place, and that it is out of order to lay it on the girl not to have a termination, unless the boy is being made to feel equally the pain of impending fatherhood.

Re: Silent Scream!, on: 2007/6/20 19:25

I haven't seen that documentary but saw pictures from it.

What I've seen is Videos like "Silent Scream" and ones like it, that Thank God that people released them, to level our heads on this issue.

Those are the few times that "science and technology" are used for the Good of Mankind.

Paul has once again beautifully worded his post on this previous page.

If you want to know what Babylon is ... we're in it.

It is the deadly merger of, Governance of the people (the 'misuse' of the "rule of law"), 'Religion' and as the Apostle Paul wrote, "what some call SCIENCE" (technological & 'medicine' as it's called). The deadly trinity.

Even Pat Robertson had to retract his praise of China's "population control" which if one would only type in "global Depopulation" into their Search engines, it 'may' just change their views on many of these issues, that go beyond just this infanticide issue.

Lord God open our eyes before we're sucked into this unholy trinity vortex.

1Ti 6:20,21 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace be with thee. Amen.

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 19:31

PaulWest said

Quote:
-----The beautiful thing about the Word of God I find is that there are no "what if's" for those who follow God with a clean conscience and seek His righteousness in all avenues. The Holy Ghost speaks clearly, and what He speaks is further corroborated by the testimony and lives of the saints who have gone on before. There's no new radical bendings, no dire extrapolating, no hypothetical allowances. No confusion. Things become confusing only when man begins to pry his own rogue convictions into the equation.

This discussion has not been about pregnant Christians yet, though I hope Krispy will answer when he has collected his thoughts.

The opinions expressed against abortion, are the imposition of Christian thinking on non-Christians. If a Christian should not be pregnant, (not being married), that is a whole different scenario, which should attract the highest condemnation on one level, and the highest support on another - and therapeutic abortion - except for medical reasons - should not be in their general plan of survival.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/6/20 19:34

Quote:
-----it is out of order to lay it on the girl not to have a termination, unless the boy is being made to feel equally the pain of impending fatherhood.

I pray you are not saying what I think you are trying to say here. This is very frightening, Dorcas...and very wicked.

I am prepared, out of respect for you, to give you the benefit of the doubt. Please help me understand what the above quote means.

Brother Paul

Re:, on: 2007/6/20 19:47

In a major magazine in Canada, the government is encouraging women to have children. I thought, "Ok, abolish these abortion clinics, stop giving women a choice and this country will be populated".

The baby boomers are dying off and there is going to be a major work force shortage in the next 5 years as baby boomers go into retirement and it's going to cause a financial meltdown as these boomers take their money out of investments. The boomers count for a large percentage of the population. You would think the government would agree that we need more people not more abortion clinics. Some one mentioned about likening abortion to baal worship. I agree, I think it's the same thing.

Re: - posted by awakenwithin (), on: 2007/6/20 19:52

Quote:
-----How about 99% of abortion in America, Canada & Europe is for people who do not wish to live with the results of their sin.

Brother I agree with you. This is life. Life we are to be fighting for. Just as I post in another post about the pill. Really it is a matter of life. It doesn't matter how we chose to kill it, it is wrong. Yes 99% is due to sin.

My dear brothers and sisters this not a time to fight on what it's but we need to crying and begging God for mercy on us. We to crying that 200, 000 babies died. Oh My lord help us, how careless we are. Can we not hear the their cry?

My heart is sick, we are to fighting for lives. How I guess praying. Speaking out Voteing.

We must come hating this wicked act. I say again it is wicked. No very wicked. How do we care for life. How much blood is on our hands, in America?

They say very hour a baby is being killed in America, that makes around 200,000 death a year. 45 million.

In His love
charlene

Re: Innocent blood., on: 2007/6/20 20:12

I look how folks use the O.T. when they want to grab a Comforting Psalm or speak for their own personal issues, but not when it comes to Doctrine nearly as much or at all.

We are commanded to cry out in the defense of the innocent and not have innocent blood on our heads for not crying out, or speaking out, of the practices that Kill ANY Innocents, despite their age and ethnic, religious, etc., that differs from ours ... else, we're no different than those 'Elite' that get into genetics to rid the globe of inferior races, religions, etc., in order for the Elite to "save the earth's resources for themselves" the superior race or the ascended masters, etc. that they believe they are.

The slippery slope will end with the ridding the earth of those they call "Useless eaters" and finishing off those "Mono-theists".

It ends with ridding of the earth of you/us, unless you choose to serve them through compromise one day or already have ... then as Hillary and all those in that large same company of 'pure-bloods' (in their own minds) call you ... you can be one of their "Worker Bees" -end quote - and end of the thus called 'the common man'.

Just a little research, but His people haven't the time for it and perish spiritually for the lack of it.

Cry out while you still can, lest 'anyone's' blood be on your own head.

In His Love.

Re:, on: 2007/6/20 20:19

This world has warped ideas about what is moral and what is not. They think that homosexuality is morally good. That all one should send up red flags and cause us to think differently that the government has no idea what is morally sound.

This world believes that a woman who is married owns her body. This is not what the bible teaches. She gave her body up to her husband, and he gave his up to hers. Each one is to tend to their mate's body, he tends to hers, pleasing her. She tends to him, pleasing him. It sounds sexual but it's not. He lost his rights as an individual and she lost her rights as an individual, the two shall become one flesh, thus a different creation.

For example, we know that God is not a man. Yet, God changed the dynamics of Himself and became a man, the man Christ Jesus, hence the "LORD from heaven". As they say, God became fully man and fully God.

If a woman gets pregnant out of wedlock, is it her choice to have an abortion? The same applies to this woman, she no longer has the right as an individual, she has lost her rights as individual as well as the man. The right thing for them to do in the eyes of man is to get hitched.

If she gets raped, is it her right to abort? The same applies, she lost her right. That seed is now top priority.

The bible is plain on giving credence to the seed, and not to the woman.

It's like a sacrificial offering. When Rachel gave birth to Benjamin, she died.

When Christ gave his life on the cross, He birthed the New Testament.

The seed is important. We must treat it as such.

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 20:31

PaulWest said

Quote:

-----I pray you are not saying what I think you are trying to say here.

Paul,

I don't know what you think I'm trying to say. Worse, I have absolutely no idea what you might be thinking which would be so awful.

I've written about this before, and would not repeat everything I've said in other threads, as I may be just a little more me llow than before. However, that is with respect to all those who hold a different opinion from myself.

If what I've said about absent fathers in this scenario in this thread, is not clear to you, please tell me what you assume I'm saying that you don't like, because honestly, I can't guess.

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 20:48

I have a personal plea here, and that is that just one of you anti-abortionists, puts into words what they believe a doctor should do when he knows a pregnancy is going to kill the mother eventually.

Does it depend on whether the baby can be saved if she carries on but she herself dies in the process? You would advise her to go that route?

Or, should both be lovingly nurtured through until both die?

Is this what you believe Christians should do in these circumstances - when it is your daughter, your wife, your sister who will die?

Is it so simple in your minds that there should be no further thought to it - that it would be murder to take the pregnancy, but it is not murder not to save the mother's life?

These are the dilemmas faced by the medical profession which have led to the existence of law permitting therapeutic abortion. This law exists to promote health and well-being.

Please think carefully. The misuse of abortion law by men and women of child-bearing age does not mean the law itself is at fault, does it?

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/6/20 20:57

Quote:

-----absent fathers

Is this the determining factor for whether or not we abort God's creation? *An absent biological father?* Or were you talking about aborting complicated pregnancies where the father was absent? Sister, I asked you to clarify what your quote meant, and you didn't. You instead said you couldn't understand what I didn't understand. Let's see how we can resolve this.

You said that it would be *out of order* to tell a woman *not to have an abortion* if the father wasn't willing to cooperate. I can't imagine what this means...I am afraid to. Are you implying that the decision to murder, abort, terminate a human life should be contingent on the role of the biological father?

Please excuse me for not plumbing the depths of SI to read up on all your previous posts. In truth, your last post left me with a cold chill. Maybe I'm just not understanding you correctly. This wouldn't be uncommon for me!

Thanks for your patience.

Brother Paul

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 21:31

Hi Compliments,

I think you explained very well a great many truths, which I accept. And btw, your description was not too graphic for me.

Of course, I would like to comment further, to explain what I would add from scripture, to show the greater differences which may be admitted.

You said:

Quote:

-----the 'seeds' are actually living. They look like 'tadpoles' with a little tail.

Indeed. Each is one living cell, with its own peculiar function, as is the seed it joins.

But, every other body cell is also living in the same way, and while the form is developing - first outside the womb, then eventually bedded into it but still separate (in fact) - it remains incompatible with spontaneous life outside an incubator, until at least 37 weeks of pregnancy, although week 37, 38 and 39 can have their own difficulties.

As always, there will be exceptions who survived against the odds. But despite appearances and anecdotal evidence, many boys born at 36 weeks or before, succumb to fatal infection.

I acknowledge that God has His chosen ones, who are foretold (like Isaac, Samson, John and Jesus) and others like Noah and Moses, without whom history would have been slightly different at least. And I acknowledge the image of God in man - which is what makes the subject of therapeutic abortion the most difficult, in my view.

But, therapeutic abortion has been developed round the fact of the marred vessel - the pregnancy incompatible with health of the baby or the mother - and the desire to minimise the physical and emotional trauma of mounting the (predictable) rescue of one or other, later, at greater cost of life or loss, and expense.

While you have majored on the foreknowledge of God, I would major on the time factor for His planned people to come into existence. Just as He formed Adam, the formation of a body in the womb is a time-limited process. Eventually, if all goes well enough, the body emerges and is filled with its own spirit, thus becoming a living soul. I do not dispute that if it happens, the prior influences of its mother's overshadowing life - and its father's if he's in the frame - do come into play. Even if the father is dead by the time the child is born, his influence will show in many ways genetically.

contd.

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 22:00

Hi Paul,

I'll interrupt my reply to Compliments to try to clarify. It seems you have not read an earlier part of this thread, where I allude to the lack of pressure on males not to create a situation where therapeutic abortion is sought. Period.

So far, ginnyrose has not answered my questions to her, following her statement (which left me speechless initially) that the male found it harder to control his sexual drive, so the female should be the one to resist it. And Krispy has not answered whether he acknowledges that there is *ever* a case for therapeutic abortion.

I'm not sure what you feel on any of these three points, but as I said earlier also - in a different way - I think the Church has to be much more realistic with all the issues if it is to deliver a loving alternative to non-Christians who don't want to stay pregnant.

You picked up on the phrase 'absent fathers', and really, what I was getting at, was that they get out of this noose far too easily. If boys want to become fathers, they need to find a girl and *marry* her first. It's that simple.

If they don't want fatherhood but nevertheless put *themselves* at risk of it, then I feel 'society' should make a great deal more effort to make them share the burden they have brought *on themselves*.

My meaning is more that it is out of order for the girl to take all the pressure of an unwanted pregnancy alone, and it is verging on inhumane to treat her as if she got pregnant by herself. I want to see the boy there, getting an understanding of the meaning of his indiscretion - for *all of them*.

This is my objective view. I don't believe therapeutic abortion is murder, even though it is deeply disturbing and should be avoided for *that* reason, unless there is medical cause.

I believe also, that if scripture did not repeat the picture of the earthen vessel - the glory of the Lord filling the temple - so often, it would be easier to go for the 'murder' interpretation. But, even God in the Old Testament would not allow certain types of abnormal human into the outer court of the temple. And this made it even more outrageous after Jesus had cleansed the temple one time, that the blind and the lame went to Him *there* and He healed them *there*.

If you're reading between the lines here, I am much more in favour of praying for the form of unborn babies who may be deformed, that they may be delivered in a better state of health than they were conceived. This is another reason I hear more hypocrisy than I care to, in the cries of the anti-abortion lobby, because the way it is portrayed strikes me as legalistic and carnal.

And in case you wonder, I definitely *would* stay with a girl having an abortion, because I think that's what Jesus would do

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 22:08

To Compliments contd.

The law does not recognise a child until it is separated from its mother's womb. It cannot be legally named, or identified without a face and a history of independent breathing and heartbeat.

Although it is one *flesh* with both its parents equally, it is deemed to be part of the mother's body because entirely her strength supports it and her body changes to accomplish this function throughout pregnancy. This is why, I suppose, the law is framed in the US to give the mother all power of decision over it.

Going back to 'living' cells, the human body is made up entirely of living cells and some body fluids like serum (in which blood cells are suspended) and cerebro-spinal fluid (to name but two). Each cell is a microcosm; its own little factory with all the necessary functions of life.

But, remove the source of oxygen, or, remove them from their comfort zone, and they die off.

The body in a womb is not as inanimate as the dust from which Adam was formed, but it is as independently lifeless as the dust was until God breathed into him. The same goes for a baby, whose heart in particular changes configuration if all goes well at birth, and certain fetal vascular structures begin to atrophy if independent life commences outside the womb as it should - classified as a 'live' birth.

Far from a baby being *born already living*, it is born with the potential for life. Some come out and do not breathe.

All that notional potential which was attributed to them in the womb by calling the baby 'alive', is instantly worthless and such a birth is termed 'still'. Low, life-less. This is the fact which those who refer to a fertilised ovum as 'an unborn baby' would rather not consider.

But, God has made us thus.... Jer 18 ...

3 Then I went down to the potter's house, and there he was, making something at the wheel.

4 And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter; so he made it again into another vessel, as it seemed good to the potter to make.

5 Then the word of the LORD came to me, saying:

6 "O house of Israel, can I not do with you as this potter?" says the LORD. "Look, as the clay *is* in the potter's hand, so are you in My hand, O house of Israel!

Even some 'marred' human vessels, are capable of living and being loved by loving parents. But some will make it neither to birth *nor* life.

2 Cor 4:7

But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellence of the power may be of God and not of us.

What Paul said above is not mere poetry. It is a right understanding of the facts.

It's all very well choosing one's own child-bearing outcomes in the light of medical advice, but it is quite another thing to force one's preference on someone else.

A Christian friend of mine was under a lot of pressure from Christian 'friends' to be sterilised after her sixth baby. She even had an appointment to attend. But on the day, she realised her heart wasn't in it, so she cancelled - and went on to have two more children. Now that is pure honesty! Amen.

Above all others, this topic is both private and unavoidably public. If Christians are going to be utterly scriptural, there must be no contraception either, not just no abortion.

Re: ?, on: 2007/6/20 22:38

Linn, two quotes is all that I can extract 'for now' ... hoping that other's who are better versed than I will fill in the 'gap'.

Quote:
-----If you're reading between the lines here, I am much more in favour of praying for the form of unborn babies who may be deformed, that they may be delivered in a better state of health than they were conceived. This is another reason I hear more hypocrisy than I care to, in the cries of the anti-abortion lobby, because the way it is portrayed strikes me as legalistic and carnal.

Linn, if killing deformed babies is not a part of modern day Science and this belief that "quality of life" has not been a modern day reason of extermination (as it is what started Hitler's theory), then show me "where" in The Word of God do you find anywhere that killing the unborn is warranted ? Seeing that we believe this is The Final Word on any beliefs.

If you believe that the O.T. verses against killing any unborn is "legalism" ... then your argument is not with us.

If it is 'not science' --- then what did we do for almost 6000 years under God without abortion ? Was it all just legalism for that long ?

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/20 23:09

Annie,

I think you have misunderstood my 'reading between the lines' - which may be because you took it out of context, as the other bit you quoted.

I meant, I feel we should be PRAYING for deformed babies to be healed - NOT aborting them.

But, Krispy and ginnyrose were generally against the abortion of healthy babies. Neither have yet said what they believe about abortion for medical reasons. I'm waiting.

There was an earlier mention of inconsistencies (by ginnyrose), which is really why I'm trying to find out where they stand. I want to know how they justify their inconsistencies.

Now, on the innocents being the 'unborn', please could you give me a few chapters and verses when you are rested?

Re:, on: 2007/6/21 8:24

Quote:
-----Dorcas said: but it is as independently lifeless as the dust

In that same documentary it showed under the same microscope in a woman's body, cells coming together to form a heartbeat. It's incredible, you see a jolt in the cells, a few seconds later another, like trying to start your car on a winter day. And finally you see the beating of cells, the heart has not been formed, but the beat is there, the beginning stages.

Does the dust have a heartbeat?

Re:, on: 2007/6/21 9:03

Hi Linn, I tried to say above, that I could only take "2" quotes. I should have added the word "seperate" in there, because I was trying to relay that I knew they came from two of your back to back posts.

I didn't mean that 'you' would abort babies 'just' because they are deformed, but that in reference to "Science", that has only been a practice, basically within our lifetime.

Lord knows how many Christians have done more than just "pray for deformed babies". They have intentionally adopted them and sponsor Hospitals and rehab facilities for them. And if the child is theirs, go further than most to give them the very best of loving care.

It would be an assumption to say that Christians don't pray for disabled children.

May I answer your last question with a link for now. It has the verses I looked up in e-sword under "innocent" on this page.

http://www.abortionfacts.com/literature/literature_9410CV.asp

Thanks for your patience.

Love.

annie

Re:, on: 2007/6/21 9:12

Thanks Annie for that link, very helpful!

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/22 11:34

Hi Annie,

I'd like to echo Mike's welcome for you to stay longer online if you can but I understand it's a personal decision weighed against other factors.

Thank you for the link, also. It seems the writers have used 'if' judiciously, perhaps as an acknowledgement of the legal considerations.

Quote:
-----I didn't mean that 'you' would abort babies 'just' because they are deformed, but that in reference to "Science", that has only been a practice, basically within our lifetime.

You've raised several points here, around the matter of how scientific development (in sterile technique, infection control, anaesthesia, as examples), have made surgery safe.

But I would point out that one of the attractions of legalising therapeutic abortion to doctors, was to eliminate the work they did in more major surgery and greater morbidity which they were forced to do when back-street or self-attempted terminations went wrong - such as lost pelvic organs, pelvic infections, loss of fertility and loss of *life*.

These diy attempts, were also an application of 'science'.

In a way, you are implying that screening for fetal abnormality is wrong, but again, that screening was extended to cover situations which families found difficult to cope with, *beginning* with attempts to rule out difficult labours during which the mother's life would be put at risk and there would be *no* hope of the baby's survival.

Even the examination of the abdomen during pregnancy, is a screening technique. Just where should the line be drawn?

Originally, the research done on nutrition in pregnancy was with a group of unmarried mothers who were virtually living on the streets. This was at a time when the legitimacy of a child's existence depended on its parents being married.

While I accept that social change may be taking society further from understanding God's mind on some points such as the importance of marriage, the law on abortion has not been developed outside of deep consultation and consideration with the medical and legal professions.

If I may use the post to make a general apology, it is to all those who think this matter is, or should be, a straightforward *no deal*.

Each person has to be able to live with their own conscience before God with regard to both their thoughts and their actions on this matter.

Re: Bush to meet Pope, on: 2007/6/22 12:10

Compliments asked

Quote:

-----Does the dust have a heartbeat?

In this case, yes. Because body cells all have an internal life cycle. But, it is completely dependent on the mother's life support system.

That was my point in the other post - to try to explain that for all the appearance of being 'alive' in the womb, those body cells of the fetus have no more life in them than one of *your* blood cells or muscle cells, on their own account.

The whole structure, the physical body of the unborn, is not ready to do its own independent life support (breathe, maintain temperature, eat enough), until the very last week of development.

And, even the red blood cells are slightly different, as is the way the heart and some of the blood vessels work until birth has occurred.

In other words, that transition from clay vessel to live human being is the most common (and successful) miracle of creation and it's remarkable it goes so well so much of the time.

Re:, on: 2007/6/22 12:20

Thank you for your opening words Dorcas. They brought tears again. Sorry but I am literally in a car crusher (my only way of describing the entire situation), physically, situationally, and emotionally ... but I know, as you do, that Romans 8:28 is "For" 29.

Don't mean to beat that to death --- but it's literally kept me alive for over 30 years of this "stuff" I've had to face and all by myself at that.

Anyhowzzzz, yes, Medical technology is good for many things, that goes without saying so can I.T. be used presently for much good. And so on, UNTIL it breaks God's Laws.

Like I said earlier, I had a tubal pregnancy 29 years ago ... but in the O.T. or even N.T. days, it would have been just "up to GOD" whether HE wanted me to live longer or not.

I live that way now ... not having the luxury of all the Medical care that is out there.

I don't mind living as they did. It's sort of a good challenge to my faith.

"LORD Bless."
We'll talk more.
Always His Body First ~ Amen!

Re: - posted by FreebyWord, on: 2007/6/22 14:29

Krispy your response to me is ironic. Think about it.

Re:, on: 2007/6/22 15:06

Quote:
-----Krispy your response to me is ironic. Think about it.

... I would think about it... if I knew what you were talking about.

Shed some light for me, cuz I dont remember responding to you about anything. I looked thru thread. Did I miss something? Or did you assume I was responding to you about something when in actuality I was responding to someone else?

Help me out...

Krispy

Re:, on: 2007/6/22 15:18

Maybe referring to no response, therefore that requiring the thinking and being ironic?

I have no idea.