

Clarifying the Abortion Muddle

"What are, for a spirit, the consequences of abortion?" "It is an existence that is null, and must be commenced over again."¹

"As far as abortion before the entity enters the body, to do away with that growth would be nothing more than choosing to remove a mole or other growth from your body because that is exactly what it is, a growth of the female's body. ... I am not one to say abortion is good or bad. I am saying a female is entitled to choose to do whatever she wishes with the growth in her body. It is her personal body and her choice."²

In an extensive study of the statements from fifty different spirit (discarnate) sources,³ the above two were the only ones that directly addressed the issue of abortion. Possibly this dearth of commentary on such an important topic is due to a reluctance on the part of 19th century communicators and stenographers to report on sexual matters. Perhaps, the lack simply reflects the low level of public concern that was the norm until recent decades. Or, it may demonstrate the indifference to physical demise common to those who are confident of their own immortality.

As controversies go, this might be unique in that it only has one side. Many folks are adamantly anti-abortion, but no one is pro-abortion. No one believes that abortions are nice to have; only that they are sometimes preferable to the alternatives. Also germane is the historically proven fact that no law can stop abortions from taking place. An excellent book on that history is *When Abortion Was a Crime*.⁴

During the first quarter century after the United States was founded, abortion was considered to be up to the woman until she could feel within her the stirring of the fetus. Even during the second trimester, abortion was considered, at worst, a misdemeanor. By the turn of the century, not only were there no laws against the practice, but "advertisements for drugs to induce abortion could be found in virtually every newspaper and even in many church publications."⁵

By 1900, the picture had changed dramatically. Every state had made all abortions illegal, no matter the timing or the purpose, unless the woman's life was in danger. Surprisingly, the religious right had little to do with such a momentous change. The newly formed American Medical Association, striving to secure a heightened status for their members, convinced lawmakers that only doctors (not midwives) should be allowed to determine the proper course of action.

As females were not allowed to attend medical schools, it was entirely up to the male to determine what might be a threat to the woman. "For the rich woman, it might be a threat to her emotional tranquility or even to her lifestyle. The poor woman was often forced to resort to the back alley or the coat hanger."⁶

The 1973 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Roe v. Wade* allowed for abortions without restriction during the first 3 months (trimester) of pregnancy, and with some restrictions, during the second trimester also. This decision was encouraged by a coalition of individuals and organizations, including the AMA (which by then had admitted females into their ranks). The court said that the states could outlaw abortions during the third trimester unless the woman's health was endangered.

Lighting the Fire

It will, no doubt, be a surprise to many of today's anti-abortion campaigners to learn that the resolution of *Roe v. Wade* found favor with such luminaries as Governor Ronald Reagan, Senator Barry Goldwater, and the Rev. Billy Graham. The *Baptist Press* agreed, stating: "Religious liberty, human equality, and justice are advanced by the Supreme Court abortion decision." A year later, the Southern Baptist convention called the decision a "middle ground between the extreme of abortion on demand and the opposite extreme of abortion as murder."⁷

Up until 1979, abortion was of mild concern outside of the Catholic church and those who felt that women who couldn't control their reproductive systems would have more babies. That would mean that there would be more Catholics and fewer feminists threatening men's jobs and "traditional" roles.

Today's abortion firestorm was ignited in 1979 when "Right to Life" was adopted as a rallying cry by religious leaders to camouflage their battles with the IRS. They rightly felt that calls to protect the "unborn" would be more palatable to moderate Christians than pleas to shield their segregated academies from losing tax-exempt status — which was their true goal. Their abortive attempts to maintain racist institutions thus gave birth to division, acrimony, and needless human suffering.⁸

The Rationale

The landmark Supreme Court decision was based on the ability of the fetus to survive outside of the womb. At that time, viability was determined by whether the fetal lungs were developed sufficiently to breathe on their own — a condition that generally occurred after the 6th month.

In 1990, *Parade Magazine* published an article by the famous astronomer Carl Sagan and the science-writer Ann Druyan, in which they suggested that, since the ability of a fetus to survive in the hard, cruel world would vary from year to year depending on the technology and equipment available to sustain it, a better criterion would be the earliest onset of human thinking. They concluded: "Since, on average, fetal thinking occurs even later than fetal lung development, we find *Roe v. Wade* to ... strike a fair balance between the conflicting claims of freedom and of life."⁹

In the ensuing quarter century, a more reasonable attempt at compromise has not surfaced. Unfortunately, there are powerful forces that see no advantage in compromise; forces which are vested in keeping the argument — and the fundraising — going on forever. So, there is no resolution in sight.

The Underlying Lie

Now that the medical professionals have switched sides, religious fundamentalists make up the most vocal, and likely the largest, portion of the anti-abortion crusaders. The key to their arguments is that all fetuses, no matter how recently created, have a "right to life." Being as their compassionate concern does not extend to puppies, piglets, or perch, for an entity to qualify for this right it must be human. This begs the questions: (1) What does it mean to be "human"? and, (2) When is that condition met?

Here is the locus of their deceit. The religious fanatics who have no qualms about proclaiming the laws of God and specifying what is and is not moral, in fact, have no basis for such claims. The decaying documents on which their religions are nominally based do not address the abortion issue. The opinions expressed by priests and profiteers throughout the ensuing millennia are just that — opinions. Those who tell you that

human life begins at conception are not being honest, for they are aware that they do not actually know; they are either just guessing ... or they find such claims profitable.

Heavenly Views

Would it not be wiser to seek the answers among those who are in a better position to understand the true meaning of humanness? Although discarnate spirits are not omniscient, having gone through the birth process numerous times, many have an insight into the matter not available to we incarnate folks. A quotation at the beginning of this article speaks of the triviality of “abortion before the entity enters the body.” Here are statements from a few spirits about when that entrance occurs.

“It felt like I was in a tight box being held against my will when I entered into my body as it was being born.”¹⁰

“The soul is not really integrated into the physical body until after the fourth month of incarnation. It is developing the fetal tissues, but it is not incarnate.”¹¹

“The moment the child takes its first independent breath is when the entity enters the body.”¹²

“There is no rule ... that the reincarnating personality must take over the new form prepared for it either at the point of conception, in the very earliest months of the fetus's growth, or even at the point of birth. The process is gradual ... In the early days of infancy, there is not a steady focus of the personality in the body.”¹³

“The entity, here being the soul, which enters the body, occurs usually very close to the birth time. It can come prior to the birth. It can come very shortly after. Or it can come at the moment of birth. There can even be a two or three week leeway here.”¹⁴

“At some point prior to birth, the soul will carefully touch and join more fully with the impressionable, developing brain of a baby. ... The connection may

be early or late in the mother's pregnancy. ... Even those souls who join the baby early seem to do a lot of traveling outside the mother's womb during her term.”¹⁵

Q. *“What becomes of a spirit if the body he has chosen happens to die before birth?”*

A. *“He chooses another body.”¹⁶*

The lack of perfect agreement reminds us that spirit communicators are humans who have acquired varying degrees of knowledge since they left their bodies. Nevertheless, they mostly agree that the soul does not enter the fetus until long after conception – often until birth or sometime after. And so, we can be fairly confident that an early-stage human fetus is not an ensouled human being in any real sense. That, of course, is not a statement favoring abortion, but it does put the lie to the claim that all abortions are equivalent to murdering human babies.

Positive Approaches

In our contentious times, reaching a reasonable compromise on the issue of abortion does seem a fantasy. Yet, there is much that can be done to reduce the number of abortions that take place each year. Better sex education and easier access to effective birth control are two of the most effective approaches. It is more than ironic that the groups most vocal against abortions are often the ones trying to limit efforts to supply the information and the means that could prevent so many fetal deaths. Planned Parenthood, is now, and from the beginning always has been, far more dedicated to promoting sex education and birth control than providing abortions, yet it is the prime focus of the anti-abortionist's wrath. And then there is the adoption option, which the fundamentalists enthusiastically endorse ... unless, of course, the prospective parents are not pure heterosexuals — a condition that “violates the biblical model of the family unit as ordained by God.”¹⁷

Clearly, this opposition is rooted more in an intolerant religion's fear of pleasure and sexual activity than in compassion for young women and fetuses.



Copyright 2020 Miles Edward Allen

Abortion In American History

From colonial times to the 19th century, the choice was the woman's until "quickening" (when she is first able to feel the fetus stirring within her). An abortion in the first or even second trimester was at worst a misdemeanor. Convictions were rarely sought and almost impossible to obtain, because they depended entirely on the woman's own testimony of whether she had felt a quickening, and because of the jury's distaste for prosecuting a woman for exercising her right to choose. In 1800 there was not, so far as is known, a single statute in the U.S. concerning abortion. Advertisements for drugs to induce abortion could be found in virtually every newspaper and even in many church publications — although the language used was suitably euphemistic, if widely understood.

But by 1900, abortion had been banned at *any* time in pregnancy by every state in the Union, except when necessary to save the woman's life. What happened to bring so striking a reversal? Religion had little to do with it. ... One of the most significant [forces] was the medical profession. Up to the mid-19th century, medicine was an uncertified, unsupervised business. Anyone could hang out a shingle and become a doctor. With the rise of a new, university-educated medical elite, anxious to enhance the status and influence of physicians, the American Medical Association was formed. In its first decade, the AMA began lobbying against abortions performed by anyone [especially midwives] except licensed physicians. ...

Their assault on abortion was motivated not by a concern for the health of the woman but, they claimed, for the welfare of the fetus. You had to be a physician to know when abortion was morally justified, because the question depended on scientific and medical facts understood only by physicians. At the same time, women were effectively excluded from the medical schools, where such arcane knowledge could be acquired. So, as things worked out, women had almost nothing to say about terminating their own pregnancies. It was also up to the physician to decide if the pregnancy posed a threat to the woman and was entirely at his discretion to determine what was and was not a threat. For the rich woman, it might be a threat to her emotional tranquility or even to her lifestyle. The poor woman was often forced to resort to the back alley or the coat hanger.

This was the law until the 1960s, when a coalition of individuals and organizations, the AMA now among them, sought to overturn it and to reinstate the more traditional values that were to be embodied in *Roe v. Wade*.

— Adapted from an article by Carl Sagan and Ann Druyan, *Parade Magazine*, 22 April 1990, p. 8.

¹ Kardec, Alan, *The Spirit's Book*, 1857, p. 188.

² Barham, Martha J. and James Greene, *Bridging Two Worlds*, 1981, p. 68.

³ Allen, Miles Edward, *The Realities of Heaven*, 2015.

⁴ Reagan, Leslie J., *When Abortion Was a Crime: Women, Medicine, and Law in the United States, 1867-1973*, 1997.

⁵ Sagan, Carl and Anne Druyan, "Abortion In American History," *Parade Magazine*, April 22, 1990, p. 8.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Stewart, Katherine, *The Power Worshipers*, 2019, pp. 67-68.

⁸ _____, p. 63.

⁹ Sagan, Carl and Anne Druyan, "Is It Possible To Be Pro-Life And Pro-Choice", *Parade Magazine*, April 22, 1990, pp. 4-8.

¹⁰ Puryear, Anne, *Stephen Lives!*, 1992, p. 189.

¹¹ Ryerson, Kevin and Stephanie Harolde, *Spirit Communication: The Soul's Path*, 1989, p. 249.

¹² Barham, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

¹³ Roberts, Jane, *Seth Speaks: The Eternal Validity of the Soul*, 1972, p. 220.

¹⁴ Boulton, Peter and Jane Boulton, *Psychic Beam to Beyond*, 1983, p. 96.

¹⁵ Newton, Michael, *Journey of Souls*, 1994, p. 266.

¹⁶ Kardec, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

¹⁷ <https://www.gotquestions.org/gay-adoption.html>.