



The Strange Story  
of Dr. Kermit Gosnell  
and the National Press

By

Mark A. McGee

[Originally published April 13, 2013]

"Why isn't the national press reporting about the Gosnell trial?"

Several of my friends on Facebook asked that question this week. Here was my quick response to one of them.

"They don't know to handle something like this. Speaking as a 40+ year journalist, I can tell you that the press of today is nothing like the press of the 1960s and early 70s. We had no agenda but to tell the truth about anything and everything. Much of today's press and media have a strong liberal agenda and are committed to promoting their agenda every day in every report. The Gosnell trial should lead newscasts and headlines across this country, but the liberal agendas have caused the liberal media a big problem. They have promoted the abortion agenda for so long that they have no way of reporting honestly on what is clearly a trial about serial killings of the most reprehensible kind. The press and media cannot do their jobs now because they have not done their jobs for decades. They stood by while millions of innocent citizens of this country were 'legally' murdered, so they have blood on their hands. The press and media lost their ability to report objectively and fairly when they fell to subjectivity and unfairness. That is why the press is ignoring the Gosnell story. They created Gosnell and others like him by ignoring their responsibility to report all the news honestly and fairly."

The legal guilt or innocence of Dr. Kermit Gosnell will soon be in the hands of a jury, but the larger question is how we got here in the first place. How can we as a supposedly civilized people question whether the mass slaughter of human beings is a crime? Let me share some historical perspective that may help.

I remember when the debate began. I was a young reporter, talk show host and atheist at the time. Reporting about illegal abortions came up from time to time, but not often enough in a local broadcast market to give it much thought. Abortion was classified as a crime in most states, though legal under certain circumstances in some. The issue of abortion was not something we debated in the newsroom at the time. That was until the case of **Jane Roe**.

It seemed like just another federal lawsuit at the time. Lawyers for Norma McCorvey (alias Jane Roe) filed suit in federal court in 1970 challenging abortion laws in the state of Texas. The case was known as **Roe v. Wade** (Wade was Henry Wade, Dallas County District Attorney at the time). The U.S. District Court in Dallas ruled in favor of Roe based on the 9th Amendment to the Constitution ("*The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people*"). The court relied on a US Supreme Court ruling in a 1965 case known as **Griswold v. Connecticut** where the justices, by a vote of 7-2, invalidated a state law that prohibited the use of contraceptives. They ruled that the US Constitution protected a person's right to privacy, including the right to "marital privacy."

Roe v. Wade headed toward the U.S. Supreme Court on appeal, but the high court waited to hear the arguments of Roe vs. Wade and **Doe v. Bolton** (a similar case) until they decided **Younger v. Harris** (dealing with the jurisdiction of federal courts in certain types of cases). They also were dealing with an abortion rights case in the District of Columbia known as **United States v. Vuitch**. Milan Vuitch was an abortion provider who had been indicted on charges of providing illegal abortions. Vuitch sued in federal court claiming a D.C. abortion law was unconstitutionally vague. Federal District Judge Gerhard Gesell ruled in favor of Vuitch, which was the first time a federal court declared that an abortion law was unconstitutional. That was in 1969. The District of Columbia appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court and the high court narrowly ruled in favor of the District in 1971, though it was not a clear victory for those who opposed abortion rights. Though the justices voted that the District of Columbia's law was not "vague," they treated abortion as a medical procedure, which opened up the appeals from Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton.

Those appeals were scheduled to be heard by the full court at the end of 1971, but were delayed because of the retirements of two Supreme Court justices (Black and Harlan). At the same time, individual states were dealing with pro-abortion legislation. The issue of abortion was becoming a major issue for journalists. It was growing in importance as a news story, so how would we cover it? Like we covered every other story - objectively and fairly.

If you are under the age of 30, you may have never seen an objective and fair newscast, at least not on the national level. There was a time when reporters, anchors, producers, and news managers refrained from allowing anyone outside their immediate family know their personal beliefs about controversial news topics. That included abortion. We were under strict rules not to talk about our personal views on the air or even in the newsroom. Expressing personal views in a public forum used to be a 'fireable' offense.

I was an atheist when the abortion debate began in the 1960s, but became a Christian in 1971. My personal views about abortion changed dramatically, but it didn't change the way I covered news stories concerning abortion. I knew the importance of doing my job the way I had been trained and following the purpose of the people who designed the First Amendment to the Constitution.

The beauty and power of the press (news media) as determined by the founders of our country is that a free press would be a vital part of a free nation. It is (or at least was) the responsibility of journalists to represent the people by holding the government accountable for its actions as servants of the people. When the press no longer covers the news honestly and fairly and, in some cases, promotes its own agenda before the rights of the people to know the truth, the freedom on our country is placed in great jeopardy.

After the Supreme Court upheld *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, it opened a floodgate for legal abortions in every state in our country. As a journalist it meant that abortion was no longer a crime story, but that

didn't mean abortion was no longer a story. Journalists have covered abortion legislation, legal appeals, court trials, protests for and against abortion, bombings of abortion clinics, and assaults, kidnappings and murders of abortion providers.

So, how did we do? The answer is "not well." Instead of discussing the angles and merits of the story, journalists talked about their personal feelings about abortion. It fell on the shoulders of news managers to make sure coverage of abortion-related stories was handled objectively and fairly. Unfortunately, many managers decided against doing abortion stories or allowed their coverage to become unbalanced.

One thing the press has failed miserably at doing is telling the story of aborted children in our country. Tens of millions of babies have been killed since Roe v. Wade in 1973. They were and are the forgotten victims in the abortion story. The road to truth is narrow and must be taken to find it. Trying to avoid the truth or follow another path will not lead one to "the truth." When we close our eyes to truth, truth will close its eyes to us.

It has been a huge mistake to allow personal beliefs and emotions dictate how any news story will be covered. Unbalanced reporting leads to an imbalance in our freedoms. Instead of people knowing what's true or false based on reported evidence, they are "led" to believe what journalists want them to believe based on "sloppy" reporting at the least or "misdirected" reporting at the worst. We have seen both types of reporting of the abortion issue since Roe v. Wade.

It is the combination of sloppiness and misdirection that has led us to this day - to the strange story of Dr. Kermit Gosnell.

Modern journalism often becomes a blend of partial truth and opinion. Anyone who has gone through journalism school should recognize that as the dangerous "mixed opinion" in defamation law. When journalists have no desire to cover a story completely and fairly or are not allowed to do so by management, the nation they supposedly serve is on its way to losing freedoms that are at the core of its ability to function properly. Just weeks before her death, my 91-year-old mother told me that she had never seen our government run this way. I agree and to some degree blame the press.

So, what do we do now? Continue down a path we know leads to death and destruction? Or find the path that leads to life and liberty? While it may seem that our days as a free nation are numbered, the possibility for renewed freedom is still with us. How do we do that? More on that in our next post.

[Originally published April 26, 2013]

While the murder trial of abortion provider Dr. Kermit Gosnell is receiving a little more national media attention than when the trial began, the press is still missing the point of the story. Abortion is not an issue of the cleanliness of the clinic or the safety of the women undergoing the abortion or the qualifications of the people assisting Dr. Gosnell in performing abortions. It is the issue of basic **humanity**.

It hasn't been too difficult to read or watch news reports about Dr. Gosnell's trial because there haven't been that many of them. However, what I have read went into detail about how unsanitary his clinic was and how that affected women who had come to the clinic for abortions. Some reports also included testimony of clinic employees about how many aborted babies were killed by the doctor and assistants when the babies did not die during the "procedure." They seemed surprised that the "fetuses" looked so **human**. Again, journalists are missing the point of the story.

What makes a human "human"? The same thing that makes a dog a "dog" and a cat a "cat". Part of the answer is **DNA** - deoxyribonucleic acid - the genetic code that determines the "kind" of living organism. I don't have to wait until an organism is "born" or "hatched" to know what it is. I can know from looking at the "parent" and by taking a DNA sample from the unborn (unhatched) organism.



Paternity testing is a growing business in our country. Women who have multiple sex partners and get pregnant often want to know which man is the father. As the American Pregnancy Association explains - "Different reasons to establish paternity include the need to collect support financially or emotionally, or simply for the peace of mind that accompanies knowing for sure."

One thing we learn from DNA testing to determine paternity is that the DNA of the unborn child is not identical to the mother's DNA. The unborn's DNA is a combination of the mother's DNA and the father's DNA. Why is that important? Because it proves that the unborn child is not just another "part" of the mother and not a "parasite" in the mother. Those are a couple of the arguments put forward by pro-choice/pro-abortionists. However, modern DNA testing has proven that they're wrong. The DNA of an unborn child proves they are a combination of the DNA of two other "human beings," thus making them a third and separate human being.

The next question is - "when does the unborn become human"? DNA testing can begin as early as 10 weeks with **CVS** (chorionic villus sampling) and as early as 11 weeks with **amniocentesis** (though usually tested between 14 and 20 weeks). A new non-invasive prenatal test known as **SNP Microarray** can be done on a mother as early as 9 weeks pregnant and the test has been confirmed 99.9% accurate using a very small amount of DNA. Those 9, 10 and 11 weeks are still within the **first trimester** of pregnancy when abortions are **legal**.

[Based on what medical science has discovered so far, I believe that more sophisticated DNA testing in the future will confirm that unborn babies are human **from conception** when the DNA of the father joins with the DNA of the mother to begin a new life that is separate of either the mother or father's lives.]

Think about that for a minute. Current DNA testing can determine the identity of the human father of an unborn child at the same time it is legal to kill that child. Medical science has now proven that unborn "fetuses" in the first trimester of pregnancy are **human!** Shouldn't that move **press coverage** of legal abortion into a new arena? Why aren't reporters covering the Gosnell trial reporting about that?

If I see a pregnant dog, my first thought is that the dog will give birth to puppies. I can verify that assumption by drawing a DNA sample from the unborn "organism." If I see a hen sitting on an egg, my first thought is that the "life" inside the egg is a baby chick. To make certain of my assumption I could draw a DNA sample and confirm, but I've seen thousands of eggs hatch at a hatchery and everyone of them had a baby chick inside. If I see a pregnant woman, my first thought is that she will give birth to a human being. I can verify that assumption by drawing a DNA sample from the unborn "organism." I can also verify that through experience having seen human babies born to women.

The scientific community uses words like "embryo" and "fetus" to describe the stages of human growth inside the mother. Why not call it a "baby" or "child"? Isn't that what's growing inside the human mother? a human being? If a human mother gives birth to her "fetus," won't it be a "human" baby? We don't call birthed babies fetuses; we call them **children**. Why is an unborn "child" not human until he/she is born? Would the unborn child be something other than human if allowed to be born?

Some of my co-workers in journalism through the years experienced miscarriages. Each one of the women believed they were the "mother" of the baby. The husbands of the women believed they were the "father" of the baby. They wept as they talked about losing their "child." Was all of that just in their minds? or were they really parents of a human child who had died? DNA tests would determine that the children were in fact "human," though born during the second trimester - still within the legal time for performing an abortion.

One of my friends called me about his pregnant wife going into the emergency room. She was only in the second trimester of her pregnancy. By the time I arrived at the hospital, she had given birth to a little boy. He passed away in her arms. We talked and prayed and cried for more than an hour, each one of us holding the little baby in a small blanket. He was a human being. He weighed less than two pounds, smaller than many aborted babies, but there was no question that what I held in my arms was a human being. Little hands and fingers, feet and toes. Little arms and legs. Little ears, eyes,

nose and mouth. Hair on his head. He was human - as human as you and me. The mother and father named their little baby boy and buried him in a cemetery. Why? Because he was their child - their human child.

My concern as a career journalist is that journalism has failed the very people our Constitution calls us to serve.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." *First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution*, 1791

Journalists do have a high calling as part of the intent of the founders of our country to help preserve freedom through honest reporting of facts. Journalists do not have to "like" the facts of a story, but they must report the facts. While the press and news media in the United States have done a great service to the people through the years, the coverage of abortion is not one of them.

[Originally published May 1, 2013]

The press (news media) is very good at covering big stories. News managers decide what stories are big enough to warrant extended coverage with multiple reporters bringing a wide variety of angles to the stories. Notice the words - "news managers decide." That's a key to understanding why the national press has decided not to cover the Gosnell trial as a BIG story.

I was a news manager for more than 30 years, so I know the process well. Whether extended news coverage is the idea of the news manager or a member of the news team, the news manager has the final say in what's covered and how it's covered. That makes the lack of national media coverage of the murder trial of Dr. Kermit Gosnell all the more difficult to understand. The story has all of the elements of a major story that news managers are looking for each day. It's a high-profile case with lots of viewer/listener/reader interest. It's controversial with high emotional intrigue. The Gosnell trial also gives 24-hour news organizations something to report about across all day parts. The story has many built-in angles that would supply reporters and news producers with plenty of support stories to go along with the primary trial coverage.

One of the most important "angles" to the Gosnell story is the issue of **late term abortion**. How would a news manager and reporter cover that part of the story objectively? By **objectively**, I mean a story that looks at the facts fairly, fully and without injecting personal opinion

into the report. Here are some thoughts about how that can be done, even with a story as controversial as abortion.

One of the major aspects of late term abortion is the issue of **personhood** - when the "unborn" become a human person. The Pro-Choice/Pro-Abortion group has long claimed that an unborn baby is a non-person. That is why they do not believe abortion is murder, because the killing of a non-person is not murder. The Pro-Life/Anti-Abortion group has long claimed that an unborn baby is a person. That is why they believe abortion is murder, because the pre-meditated killing of a person is murder.

I remember this argument in the early days of legal debate in *Roe v. Wade*. Supreme Court Justice **Harry Blackmun** wrote this as part of the Court's **majority opinion** - "If this suggestion of personhood is established, the appellant's case, of course, collapses, for the fetus' right to life would then be guaranteed specifically by the Amendment." The longer quote from Blackmun's majority opinion is:

"The appellee and certain *amici* argue that the fetus is a "person" within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment. In support of this, they outline at length and in detail the well-known facts of fetal development. If this suggestion of personhood is established, the appellant's case, of course, collapses, for the fetus' right to life would then be guaranteed specifically by the Amendment. The appellant conceded as much on reargument." *University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law*

This statement is often referred to as "Blackmun's Hole." Justice Blackmun seemed to be stating that if the personhood of an unborn child could be proven, then the baby would find protection in Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

Blackmun also wrote this about the medical implications of when a person becomes human.

"Texas urges that, apart from the Fourteenth Amendment, life begins at conception and is present throughout pregnancy, and that, therefore, the State has a compelling interest in protecting that life from and after conception. We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins. When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy, and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary, at this point in the development of man's knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer.

It should be sufficient to note briefly the wide divergence of thinking on this most sensitive and difficult question...Substantial problems for precise definition of this view are posed, however, by new embryological data that purport to indicate that conception is a "process" over time, rather than an event, and by new medical techniques such as menstrual extraction, the "morning-after" pill, implantation of embryos, artificial insemination, and even artificial wombs." *University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law*

Notice Blackmun's words - "at this point in the development of man's knowledge." Blackmun mentions "new embryological data" and "new medical techniques" that were part of **man's knowledge** in 1973: "menstrual extraction, the 'morning-after' pill, implantation of embryos, artificial insemination, and even artificial wombs."

What about the last 40 years since Roe v. Wade? At what point are we in 2013, "in the development of man's knowledge"? Medical science has added DNA paternal testing and ultrasound to "the development of man's knowledge." Even as the Supreme Court majority used the available knowledge of man in 1973, shouldn't the Supreme Court of the United States now use the available knowledge of man in 2013 to reconsider the earlier decision? It seems only right that if a majority of Supreme Court Justices used the available science of 1973 to determine the personhood of an unborn child, the current Supreme Court Justices should use the available science of 2013 to determine the personhood of an unborn child. Since much of Roe v. Wade was decided on available medical science, it would seem that the Court would be sensitive to the advancement of science into the issues of pregnancy and personhood.

## **Personhood**

The definition of "personhood" is fairly simple - "The state or fact of being a person." (Dictionary.com) The definition of "person" is even simpler - "human being." (Dictionary.com)



As we reported earlier about paternal DNA testing, unborn children can be proven to be "human" during the **first trimester** of a mother's pregnancy. DNA testing was not available when the Supreme Court heard arguments in *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, but it is available now and has been for many years. So, why hasn't the Supreme Court reconsidered its initial ruling based on evidence that the personhood of an unborn child within the first trimester has been proven scientifically?

Good question, but not one the national press is asking. Since it is the job of the press to cover news factually and fairly, we ask then why news managers and reporters are not covering the aspect of personhood during the Gosnell trial? It seems like a "natural angle" to the story.

I think the answer is obvious - **bias on the part of the press**. What else can it be? The scientific/medical facts are laid out for all to see. An unbiased press would report the facts and follow them through to the point of asking the tough questions news managers, reporters and producers do every day. It's not hard to do. In fact, asking tough questions is one of the best parts of being a journalist. Some of my best memories of being a reporter were turning on the camera and asking tough questions of powerful people. Isn't that what reporters do? or should do?

Why is the press biased about abortion? Some members of the news media have strong, personal beliefs about the right of mothers to choose what happens to their body and they do not want that choice taken away from them. Others have had their journalistic judgment clouded by philosophical arguments that do not belong in the rational, reason-oriented, fact-finding atmosphere of a working newsroom (or what it should be).

"Just the facts" has always been a good philosophy of news gathering and reporting and it's needed in the press and news media coverage of the Gosnell murder trial.

**Fact:** Medical science has advanced tremendously since the Supreme Court's majority ruling in 1973.

**Fact:** DNA paternal testing proves that the unborn are human persons from the first trimester of pregnancy.

**Fact:** The U.S. Constitution and Amendments protect the rights of human persons.

**Fact:** Based on science and legal precedent, the U.S. Constitution and Amendments should then protect the right of unborn human persons.

What will the national press do with these **facts**?

As for **late term abortion** - how can the abortion of a child in the **third trimester** of his/her mother's pregnancy be anything but murder since DNA testing proves the child is a human person as early as the **first trimester**? It can't be anything other than murder. A human child in the first trimester of pregnancy doesn't somehow become a non-person in the third trimester. That's not logical, rational or reasonable. The press needs to cover that vital part of the story - NOW.

It can be done. National news managers, reporters and producers can decide to cover the Gosnell trial if they want. They can decide to cover the trial factually, fully and fairly. They have the training and skills. They can bring to light every issue of importance to the trial. They have the experience. The national press and news media can make a difference in our country - a difference they were meant to make from the founding of our great nation.

[Originally published May 18, 2013]

The decision is in and the coverage - what there was of it - is done. A jury in Philadelphia found Dr. Kermit Gosnell **guilty** on three counts of first-degree murder. He was charged with killing four babies and a patient, but was acquitted of killing the fourth baby. The jury also found Gosnell guilty of involuntary manslaughter in the patient's death. The 41-year-old woman died from an overdose of drugs given to her by members of Gosnell's untrained staff. The jury also found Gosnell guilty for performing illegal, third-term abortions and failing to comply with a state law that requires a 24-hour waiting period before performing an abortion.

Gosnell could have received the death penalty for murdering the babies, but the judge in the case sentenced him to life in prison without the possibility of parole. That means Gosnell will most likely die in prison - at great taxpayer expense for feeding, clothing and housing him for the rest of his life.

Philadelphia District Attorney Seth Williams called the Gosnell case "the most gruesome" he'd ever seen. Williams called Gosnell a "monster" for severing the spinal cords of "living, breathing babies" who could have survived the abortion attempt if they had received proper medical attention.

Members of Gosnell's clinic staff were also involved in the killing of the babies. Nine former staff members have been convicted in the case. Four others pleaded guilty to murder.

The national press gave the Gosnell trial what I call "coverage light." Many of the national television networks gave the trial little coverage and only a slight mention about the guilty verdict and the post-verdict plea deal that saved him from the death penalty. Some network spokespeople called the Gosnell trial a "local story," thus their reasoning for not covering it in depth or regularly. Some local newspapers gave the trial regular coverage. One paper called Gosnell's clinic "rogue," meaning it was outside the normal practice of abortion providers.

Let me share some thoughts with you again as a veteran news person. Even though I spent decades as a news manager I have always been a reporter at heart. I was what some people called "a crusading reporter" because of the types of stories I covered and how passionately I covered them. I believe strongly that a reporter's job is to find the best stories, investigate the stories thoroughly, and tell the stories fairly and completely - not holding back anything that pertains to the story.

I love everything about "getting the story" and getting it right. I know how stories are chosen, how they are researched, how they are discussed and often debated with management, how they are written, how they are produced, and how they are presented. That's why I can tell you that the majority of the national and local press (media) that covered the Gosnell trial sanitized their coverage. By that I mean they were careful to withhold certain aspects of the story, not ask questions which may have led to disturbing findings, and generally

cleaned up their visual and verbal presentation to make the Gosnell story as inoffensive as possible. Shame on them for doing that to any story, but especially one that involved the murders of innocent human victims.

I've already shared how medical science has proven that a "fetus" in the first trimester of pregnancy is a "human person." Did any reporter with the national press bring out that fact during the Gosnell trial? Did any local reporter do that? If they did, I have not seen it or read it anywhere. There's still time to do that if they want. The facts are in plain view if they will just open their eyes to see it.

As I mentioned earlier, I reported about the original abortion case(s) in the late 1960s that led to the Supreme Court's decision in 1973 that legalized abortion. I have followed this story as a journalist for more than 40 years and can tell you that the press and news media do not want to report the truth about abortion. They just don't. A new generation of journalists has been born and trained in the years since Roe v Wade and they have bought into the belief that a mother's "choice" trumps a baby's "life." Thus the terms, Pro-Choice and Pro-Life.

Abortion is the pre-meditated murder of a human being. It's not a "choice" anyone has the right to make. No Supreme Court decision could ever change that fact. People can write words and speak passionately about what they believe, but words and passion cannot change what is true. God created human beings to reproduce human beings - not "fetuses." What abortion providers provide is murder.

That's what I believe.

So, how should Christians who are journalists report about abortion? Factually, fairly and faithfully. How should non-Christians who are journalists report about abortion? Factually, fairly and faithfully. When it comes to journalism we must always be factual, always be fair, and always be faithful to uphold the tenets of journalistic integrity and excellence.

Gosnell will grow old in prison. He will no longer make millions of dollars murdering babies. Journalists (those who gave any coverage to the Gosnell trial) will pat themselves on the back for a job well done and move on to less offensive stories. Most Christians will happily live their lives with little thought about an unborn child being killed by an abortion provider in the U.S. **every 24 seconds**. But what about those murdered babies? What about those unborn children who medical science can now identify as being human during the first trimester of their mother's pregnancy? What about the God Who created the reproductive method that brings human life into this world?

The murdered babies cannot speak for themselves. They can quiver and shake as the abortion providers kill them mercilessly, but they cannot speak for themselves. Someone has to speak for them. It has long been my deep belief that journalists should speak up for the victims in our world who cannot speak for themselves. How sad that the national press, with all its power and pull, will not report the truth

about abortion. The Gosnell case was the perfect opportunity to do that, but the press turned its eye away from the truth and preferred to continue with the lie.

Now, concerning what God thinks about all of this. He's angry - very angry. I know that because He has already spoken clearly about this when He inspired the writers of the Bible to tell the truth about life. God loves babies "from the womb." He is deeply involved in **forming** babies in their mother's womb.

"But You *are* He who took Me out of the womb; You made Me trust *while* on My mother's breasts. I was cast upon You from birth. From My mother's womb You *have been* My God. Be not far from Me, For trouble *is* near; For *there is* none to help."  
Psalm 22:9-11

"Indeed, the darkness shall not hide from You, But the night shines as the day; The darkness and the light *are* both alike *to You*. For You formed my inward parts; You covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise You, for I am fearfully *and* wonderfully made; Marvelous are Your works, And *that* my soul knows very well." Psalm 139:12-14

"Thus says the Lord who made you And formed you from the womb, *who* will help you." Isaiah 44:2(a)

"Thus says the Lord, your Redeemer, And He who formed you from the womb: 'I *am* the Lord, who makes all *things*, Who stretches out the heavens all alone, Who spreads abroad the



earth by Myself." Isaiah 44:24

"And now the Lord says, Who formed Me from the womb to be His Servant, To bring Jacob back to Him, So that Israel is gathered to Him (For I shall be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, And My God shall be My strength)." Isaiah 49:5

God calls the life that grows inside a pregnant woman a "child," not a "thing."

"As you do not know what *is* the way of the wind, Or how the bones *grow* in the womb of her who is with child, So you do not know the works of God who makes everything." Ecclesiastes 11:5

God called prophets by name while they were still in their mother's womb and set them apart for His service.

"Listen, O coastlands, to Me, And take heed, you peoples from afar! The Lord has called Me from the womb; From the matrix of My mother He has made mention of My name." Isaiah 49:1

"Before I formed you in the womb I knew you; Before you were born I sanctified you; I ordained you a prophet to the nations." Jeremiah 1:5

God views babies as His "heritage."

"Behold, children *are* a heritage from the Lord, The fruit of the

womb *is* a reward. Like arrows in the hand of a warrior, So *are* the children of one's youth." Psalm 127:3-4

John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Spirit while still in his mother's womb and leaped for joy when the Virgin Mary came near because of the Child in her womb.

"For he will be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink. He will also be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb." Luke 1:15

"For indeed, as soon as the voice of your greeting sounded in my ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy." Luke 1:44

God is the Giver of life and He alone has the right to control it. The "choice" is God's, not ours.

Copyright © 1990-2015 GraceLife Ministries

"Scripture taken from the New King James Version®. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved."