

Biblical Ethics and Modern Science

by Wayne Jackson

Copyright ©2008 Christian Courier Publications

Released: July, 2008

In an increasingly complex world with technology and information growing at a mindnumbing pace, one of the most challenging questions we face in our era continues to be, “Is *it* right or wrong?”

In this special report, Wayne Jackson addresses some of difficult ethical questions humanity has never before had to face by applying timeless biblical principles that will never be out of date or displaced by technological advances.

Contents

Introduction.	2
The Man Who Would Be God	3
Defining Right and Wrong	6
The Sanctity of Life.	8
Divine Design.	16
The Family Unit	17
Gender Issues.	21
Human Free Will	24
Conclusion.	32

BIBLICAL ETHICS AND MODERN SCIENCE

Introduction

Is there any controversy about the fact that these are frightening times?

So much is happening so quickly. Scientists talk of cloning people and redesigning the human body. Suicide has become a common way of non-life. The trivialization of human life (e.g., the practice of abortion) burdens the heart of every sensitive person. Some authorities suggest that society can no longer afford to sustain the incompetent and the elderly.

Are there answers to ethical questions?

Yes, but they are not to be found in the scientific journals, much less in the meaningless babblings of the popular media. How tragic it is that so much current opinion is formed by listening to status-seeking journalists who rarely seem to entertain an original thought, and who appear to delight in immorality more than responsible ethics.

Some thirty years ago I published a series of articles in the *Christian Courier* titled, "Ancient Ethics In A Modern World." Those essays explored biblical solutions to modern problems, and they have been graciously received across the years and widely used by others. We have been gratified by their popularity.

In 1994 the articles were revised, supplemented, and published in a small book under the title, *Biblical Ethics and Modern Science*. For a long time I have wanted to add to the material and make it available in a format that could enjoy greater circulation. This special report is the result. May God be glorified by the effort.

Wayne Jackson

The Man Who Would Be God

Charles Dickens began his famous novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*, with the following words: "It was the best of times; it was the worst of times."

That descriptive is not altogether inappropriate for our own era.

Certainly these are wonderful times. Within a few hours, one can fly from the West Coast to the East Coast. One can pick up the phone and talk with loved ones on the distant side of the globe. E-mail spans the earth in seconds. In many ways it is an exciting time to be alive.

Medical scientists have made tremendous strides in health technology. Open heart surgery is routine. Physicians are accomplishing phenomenal results with laser surgery. Laproscopic surgery now allows work on internal organs with minimal invasion of the body cavity. A number of horrible diseases have been virtually eliminated. Civilized nations are generally the healthiest and wealthiest they have ever been. Truly, this is a remarkable period in the history of humanity.

Prospects for the future should be the brightest ever—but are they?

The truth is, there are ominous clouds on the horizon. Human achievements are accelerating phenomenally in areas of technology—it is said that we have accumulated more new data in the last century than in all the combined history of the earth previously.

But morally and spiritually, humanity is as evil as it ever has been—if not worse. Increased learning and skill, combined with moral bankruptcy, prepares the way for a volatile environment.

It is an undeniable fact that man is becoming increasingly ambitious to be his own God. The words of the infidel poet, William Ernest Henley, in his infamous composition, *Invictus*, reflect the attitude of many in contemporary society—"I am the master of my fate: I am the captain of my soul."

Evolutionary scientist, the late Dr. George Gaylord Simpson, concluded one of his books by saying that man is "his own master. He can and must decide and manage his own destiny."

Such a philosophy, if widely accepted, will be disastrous.

As the human family aimlessly drifts further away from a sense of responsibility to the Creator, what will man, progressively wise and wicked, become? What egotistical plans will he attempt to implement? The possibilities are staggering.

In their intriguing book, ***Who Should Play God?*** (1977), authors Ted Howard and Jeremy Rifkin reveal some of the bizarre enterprises being planned and pursued by certain scientists of our era.

Scientists are already experimenting with the process of cloning. Cloning is the procedure which attempts to actually replicate a living creature apart of the normal method of sexual reproduction. It has to do with the transfer of genetic information from one cell to another.

Some scientists boast that in the not-distant future they will be able to make “Xerox” copies of human beings in the laboratory. The procedure has already been accomplished with some organisms.

Corporations are attempting to manufacture and patent new forms of biological life.

Scientists speculate that within a few years people will be able to order babies from a baby depository. Human eggs and sperm from a reproduction bank will be joined, cultivated in an artificial womb, and delivered to the parents on a given day. Some have suggested that human embryos could be placed inside cows and brought to term in that fashion.

Genetic engineers are talking about the possibility of significantly increasing the size of the human brain so as to produce super-genius beings who, presumably, will provide us with international leadership. The plan is not altogether different from Hitler’s ambitions during World War II.

A major American company has already experimented with attempting to change the human digestive tract so that people could eat and digest hay like cows.

A scientist has argued that there is no reason why humans and plants could not be genetically mated so that skin, like leaves, could perform photosynthesis (the manufacture of food from sunlight).

One may think these ideas are downright crazy—like the script of a Frankenstein movie—yet some scientists are very serious about these enterprises.

Man is increasingly ambitious to be his own God.

What should be the Christian’s attitude toward such experimental projects as the foregoing? How can we know what is right and wrong?

To what extent could one be involved in controversial experimentation? How do we determine what to oppose with our influence? These are not easy questions to answer.

Does the Bible shed light any on these perplexing issues?

The Relevance of the Bible

There are those who suggest that the Scriptures cannot possibly address the problems of the modern world of high technology. The question is posed: “The Bible was written in an ancient environment; how can it possibly be relevant today?”

Others contend that while the Bible is a book of religion, it is not a volume dealing with science. They would argue, therefore, that we must look to the scientists for the answers to modern difficulties. The Scriptures, they allege, should not enter into this controversy.

Both of these views are wrong.

The Bible is a book for all times. It is universally applicable and perpetually relevant. “The grass withers, and the flower falls, but the Word of the Lord abides forever” (1 Peter 1:24, 25).

Of course the Scriptures were not designed to be a technical treatise on the various scientific disciplines; however, whenever the Bible touches upon a fact of the natural world, it is always infallibly accurate.

Moreover, whenever science trespasses into an area where ethics are applicable, the Word of God must be brought to bear on the matter. Natural laws regulating inorganic and organic materials were never intended to be wantonly exploited independent of the revealed will of the Creator. The God of the Bible is also the God of nature.

Furthermore, one thing is for certain. Science can supply no answers as to the “oughtness” or “ought-notness” of any endeavor. Science has no basis upon which to make these kinds of decisions.

The Bible—from the eternal God—is a book for all ages.

Having said that, we must recognize, in approaching this area of concern, that there are many specifics of modern technology concerning which the Bible is silent—in terms of explicit information.

For example, the Scriptures do not mention such practices as inoculations, blood transfusions, birth control, genetic engineering, transsexual surgery, artificial insemination, cloning, psychosurgery, etc.

How, then, can the conscientious follower of Christ determine the ethics of these controversial things?

Here is the answer.

The Word of God must be carefully studied for principles that will be applicable to any activity. The Bible is a book containing numerous timeless truths that are able to serve as a guide for an infinite variety of specific problems. But this requires the diligent labor of devout students.

The purpose of this presentation, therefore, will be to direct attention to some of the basic principles of biblical morality. In light of these divine truths, we will consider several of the views being advocated (both in theory and in practice) by prominent members of the world scientific community.

The average person probably is only vaguely aware of some of the grotesque things being perpetrated in the name of "science." The reader will be shocked and appalled by some of these revelations. Hopefully, however, it will be to the goal that we may be better informed, and thus motivated to boldly speak forth God's truth on these crucial issues.

Defining Right and Wrong

Preliminary to a discussion of the application of biblical morality to contemporary situations, some fundamental facts must be noted.

First, it must be observed that if any human action is to be judged as either "right" or "wrong," there must be some standard to which one can appeal in drawing a moral conclusion.

Actually, there are but three general philosophies by which moral choices can be made.

Nihilism

Nihilism is the notion that: "there is no God," hence there can be no rational justification for ethical norms.

French atheist Jean Paul Sartre wrote:

"Everything is indeed permitted if God does not exist, and man is in consequence forlorn, for he cannot find anything to depend upon either within or outside himself Nor, on the other hand, if God does not exist, are we provided with any values or commands that could legitimize our behavior" (Marsak 1961, 485).

Who can live by such a senseless ideology? Nobody. Not even the atheist. Even he cries, "Wrong!"; when an evil is perpetrated upon him.

Relativism

Relativism alleges that all moral judgments depend upon the present circumstances. There is no ultimate right or wrong; rather, the rightness or wrongness of a situation is to be determined by the contingencies of the moment.

This notion, of course, makes moral decisions purely subjective. Every man becomes a lawmaker, and moral chaos will be the order of the day.

That infamous document, *Humanist Manifestos II*, alleges that ethics “is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction” (1973, 17).

That is a woefully contradictory statement. If ethics is autonomous, i.e., man is a law-unto-himself, then he could never be in a situation where his conduct would be unethical.

Both nihilism and relativism are indefensible systems of thought.

Absolutism

Absolutism is the idea that there is an ultimate standard of morality. This criterion of measuring human conduct is based upon the very nature of the Creator himself.

Since morality is grounded in the unchanging nature of God (see Malachi 3:6; 1 Peter 1:15), it is absolute—not cultural, relative, or situational. It is always wrong to murder, lie, commit adultery, etc.

Second, the absolute will of God has been made known. The Creator has not left humanity to speculate as to the nature of moral conduct. Rather, he has spoken (Hebrews 1:1), and his mind has been made known in objective, biblical revelation (see 1 Corinthians 2:11ff; 2 Timothy 3:16-17).

Third, though God has spoken to man by means of divine revelation, one must be aware that humanity’s moral and spiritual education was gradual. God’s revelatory process was progressive and adapted to man as he spiritually developed in times of antiquity.

As revelation was given in progressive stages, the Creator’s toleration for human weakness was demonstrated more clearly in the Old Testament period of history than is allowed now under the New Testament regime.

Accordingly, in bygone ages Jehovah tolerated and even regulated certain acts which are not permitted in the Christian era. This does not mean that God vacillates in his morality; it simply recognizes that he dealt with man as he was in that “infantile” state.

For further consideration of this concept: see Matthew 19:8; Acts 14:16; 17:30-31.

Today, the New Testament stands as the Lord’s final and ultimate standard of morality.

Fourth, though the New Testament is the “law of Christ” (Romans 8:2; 1 Corinthians 9:21; Galatians 6:2), it is not a code book in the sense that each aspect of human behavior is regulated with a specific “you shall,” or “you shall not,” injunction. There are both negative and positive

commands in the New Testament, but they do not spell out how one should act under every conceivable circumstance.

The inspired document contains many timeless principles which challenge us to make responsible decisions which will honor our Maker and exhibit benevolence toward our earthly fellows.

The Lord has honored us by allowing us to study his will and grow toward making mature decisions. We need to accept this charge in a dignified and spiritual way.

Fifth, the New Testament approach to ethics deals with more than mere actions. It addresses motives as well. To amputate an ear, as Peter once did (Matthew 26:51), obviously is wrong. To remove an ear afflicted with a malignancy, in order to save a life, would be justified.

What is the difference? In this case, motive.

The New Testament goes to the heart of motive when it condemns both lust (Matthew 5:28) and hate (1 John 3:15) as being the equivalents of adultery and murder. This principle will be quite valuable as we discuss ethical considerations that relate to certain medical practices.

For example, there is a vast difference between attempting to correct a genetic malfunction (e.g., sickle cell anemia), and employing genetic engineering to create a new, super-type human.

The Sanctity of Life

We are now ready to call attention to some of the principles that must be acknowledged if one is to function morally in this complex world of modern technology.

First, we must consider the origin of life itself.

Is human life a mere freak accident of nature? Or is it a gift from the Eternal Living God?

Contrary to the unscientific assertions of evolutionists, biological life was not spontaneously generated a couple of billion years ago in some primordial slime pit.

Many scientists, even militant evolutionists, have conceded that the odds against the accidental origin of life are insurmountable.

In his book, *Communications with Extraterrestrial Intelligence* (1973, 46), Carl Sagan confessed that the chance of life spontaneously appearing on the earth was on the order of 1 in 102,000,000,000. (That figure represents a 1 followed by 102 billion zeros.) It postulates a circumstance which will never happen—no matter how much time is involved.

Life is not an accident.

In science there is a well-established principle—the law of biogenesis. It affirms that: “life comes only from life.” It was scientifically demonstrated by Louis Pasteur and others. It is as settled as the law of gravity, and is wholly at variance with the evolutionary speculation regarding life’s genesis.

Nor can it be demonstrated that human beings have evolved from some earlier, more-primitive form of life (which a Creator jump-started, as per the hybrid dogma of theistic evolution).

There is a vast chasm—intellectually, socially, emotionally, etc.—between human beings and animals (see the author’s article, “Is Man a Naked Ape?”).

Why do we consume cattle, swine, and poultry as foodstuffs, but not each other? Because we are not animals! The ideology of evolution is without supporting evidence. Its advocates are motivated by a desire to be free from divine restraint.

The correct view of humanity’s beginning is as follows: “Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul” (Genesis 2:7). Life is thus from God.

Since it is acknowledged that biological life has not existed upon the earth forever, and since we know that life can come only from preexisting life, it logically follows that there is an eternal life-source beyond this material realm.

In his discourse to the philosophers of Athens, Paul declared that it is God who “gives to all life, and breath, and all things” (Acts 17:25). Again the apostle wrote that it is God “who gives life to all things” (1 Timothy 6:13).

Here is the point. Human life, as a gift from God, is sacred. Only the Creator has the right, consistent with his plan for the family of man, to authorize the termination of the life of a human being.

Shockingly, civilized countries are becoming increasingly arrogant in their desire to control and manipulate—even to eliminate—human lives.

Consider the following examples.

Aborting The Unborn

Some have estimated that there are approximately 88 million abortions performed throughout the world each year (though the precise statistics are impossible to determine). In the United States, between 1 and 2 million infants are innocent victims of abortion annually, though the trend appears to have moved downward in the past decade.

America kills more babies each year than she has lost in 200 years of wars all combined. During the controversial Vietnam war, 58,665 American soldiers died; this country's medical profession takes the lives of that many unborn children in less than a month!

Baby eagles are protected by law; baby humans are not!

The claim is made, though, by the pro-abortion forces, that the fetus is not a "person." That is a semantical dodge. Both biblical and scientific evidence contradict this viewpoint. Consider these points.

Biblical Evidence

The Old Testament considers the life of the unborn child as intrinsically valuable as that of the mother. Moses wrote:

"And if men strive together, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart, and yet no harm follow; he shall surely be fined, according as the woman's husband shall lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine. But if any harm follow, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth." (Exodus 21:22-23, ASV).

The word "fruit" in Hebrew is *yeled*, which means a "child." Compare Genesis 21:8 where the word is used to describe Isaac as an infant.

The passage thus suggests that if two fighting men injure a pregnant woman, so that she gives birth prematurely, if any harm follows (either to mother or child), the perpetrators shall be judged proportionate to the damage done.

As one scholar has noted: "The unborn fetus is viewed in this passage as just as much a human being as its mother" (The Bible Knowledge Commentary - Old Testament, p. 141).

The inspired prophet David surely considered himself to be a "person" in his mother's womb. "For you [God] did form my inward parts: You covered me in my mother's womb" (Psalm 139:13).

Observe the personal pronouns. The "entity" growing within the mother's body is: living, human, and innocent. Can any of these traits logically be denied? They cannot!

The Greek word *brephos* is found several times in the New Testament. It is defined as follows: "an unborn child, embryo, fetus ... new born child, infant, babe" (J.H. Thayer, Greek Lexicon, p. 105).

John the Baptizer, as a *brephos*, leaped in his mother's womb (Luke 1:41).

Jesus, as a *brephos*, was laid in the manger (Luke 2:14,16).

The same term is used of both. The difference between the pre-born and the newborn is time and location, not worth.

James characterizes physical death as the separation of the spirit from the body. The body, apart from the spirit, is dead (James 2:26).

Here is the divine equation: body - spirit = death; body + spirit = life.

If there is a new living creature from the moment of conception (as everyone concedes), it necessarily follows that the spirit is present from that point onward: body + spirit = a person.

Personhood thus begins at the point of conception.

Scientific Testimony

In addition to these biblical arguments, which argue for the existence of a human being from conception onward, until abortion became legal (*Roe v. Wade*, 1973), and a “new ethic” was adopted in this country, the testimony of science was unequivocally in support of the proposition that human personhood begins at conception.

Even though he is a rabid evolutionist, and a pro-abortionist, Dr. Ashley Montagu, in his book, ***Human Heredity***, admitted:

“The health of the infant and child begins at conception Once the conception has been brought about the care of the infant and child begins with caring for the human being developing in the womb” (1960, 91).

Theodosius Dobzhansky, another prominent evolutionist, wrote: “A human being begins his existence when a spermatozoon fertilizes an egg cell” (1955, 10).

Even the late Isaac Asimov, a confirmed atheist, declared that “the human being ... begins life as a fertilized ovum, produced by the union of an egg cell of the mother and a sperm cell of the father” (1962, 20).

Quotations of this nature could be multiplied many times over.

Even the popular organization Planned Parenthood, one of the most avid proponents of abortion in today’s world, issued a pamphlet more than four decades ago in which it was affirmed:

“An abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun. It is dangerous to your life and health. It may make you sterile so that when you want a child you cannot have it. Birth control merely postpones the beginning of life.”

Planned Parenthood has changed—radically—but this truth has not.

In 1950, the International Code of Medical Ethics stated: "A doctor must always bear in mind the importance of preserving human life from the time of conception until death."

Why is it different today?

Because society has degenerated. We have become a bloody nation.

Jehovah does not look kindly upon those who rip up "woman with child" (2 Kings 15:16; Amos 1:13). There is an implication here regarding the child, as well as the woman.

Abortion, then, is the deliberate destruction of an innocent, human life. The Scriptures clearly reveal the disposition of Jehovah towards those who "shed innocent blood" (Proverbs 6:16-19).

It is utterly reprehensible for a Christian to suggest, as some have done, that the Bible "is not completely clear" on the matter of abortion (Vanderpool 1993, 15). Abortion is one of the easier moral issues to analyze.

Rape and Incest

But what of the ethics of terminating the life of the child who was conceived as the result of rape or incest? Some who opposed abortion as a general rule, nonetheless would allow it in cases such as these.

The issue, however, is not how the pregnancy was initiated. Rape and incest are horrible—there is no question about that.

The real issue is this. Are we dealing with a person within the womb?

If so—and we absolutely affirm this to be the case—then the infant's right to life must be respected.

Would anyone argue that it is moral to kill a newborn child simply because it was conceived through rape or incest? If not, why? The baby was not responsible for the manner of its conception. Two wrongs do not make a right!

Before leaving this area, however, we must mention this.

Occasionally (though rarely), a circumstance will arise where a continued pregnancy would result in the death of the mother, or the child—possibly even both. In such a case, a decision has to be made as to which life will be saved. If an abortion is performed, this is not comparable to arbitrarily taking the life of a healthy child from a healthy mother for convenience sake.

If one happens upon two persons who are struggling in the water beside a capsized boat, and he can rescue only one of them, does the fact that he chooses one, in deference to the other,

mean that he has murdered the victim who drowns? The answer is too obvious to need comment.

We might mention, however, that Dr. C. Everett Koop, former Surgeon General, once said that in some thirty-five years of medical practice, he never encountered a case where an abortion was necessary to save the mother's life.

Human Experimentation

As far back as the 1940s, scientists have been experimenting with the fertilization of human eggs in test tubes. In those days, the embryos only lived a short while before they died.

In 1961, Dr. Daniele Petrucci, an Italian biologist, fertilized a human egg which grew outside the body for 59 days. He claimed that a heartbeat was discernible. He destroyed the little creature, he said, because it became enlarged and deformed. He claimed it was a "monstrosity."

In 1966, a team of Russian scientists announced that they had succeeded in keeping more than 250 human babies alive in test tubes for periods of up to six months.

It is estimated that there are thousands of frozen embryos now in the United States. A number of scientists are experimenting with the development of an artificial "womb"—a pressurized tank of steel and glass in which a child could be brought to term independent of a mother's body. Thus far the fetuses, under such conditions, have survived only a few hours.

In 1978, Drs. Patrick Steptoe and Robert Edwards in England achieved world wide fame for the development of a test tube baby, Louise Brown. An egg was taken from the mother, fertilized by the father's sperm in a glass dish, and then transferred back into her body.

To accomplish this, however, a number of eggs had been fertilized. Those not used in the experiment were destroyed. Brothers and sisters—killed without mercy.

What shall we say about such practices?

Several aspects of the controversy must be considered.

First, any procedure that sacrifices human life is immoral. One simply may not, from an ethical vantage point, fertilize several eggs, retain an ideal specimen, and dispose the rest—without violating the principle of the sanctity of life.

When scientists experimentally fertilize eggs with the plan that they will destroy those which do not turn out well, they have adopted a brutish ideology which is in direct opposition to the will of God.

Second, even if it were possible to achieve in vitro fertilization in a perfectly safe way for a husband and wife who cannot conceive a child in the normal fashion, that would not argue for the validity of the practice in general. God has designed a normal, healthy, biological procedure for the conception of children. And arbitrary efforts to bypass his method are attempts to capriciously “play God.”

Third, efforts to “grow” children (in an artificial womb) apart from the gestation process, for convenience sake, fail to take many unknown physical and psychological benefits into consideration, that the infant enjoys while developing in his or her mother’s body.

Some of these things are only beginning to be understood. It is difficult to see how anyone, who has any respect at all for the Creator and his marvelous design for the human body, could be a party to such bizarre experimentation (see our book, ***The Human Body—Accident or Design?*** Expanded Edition, 2000).

Suicide

A discussion of the sanctity of human life would certainly be incomplete without some consideration of the growing practice of suicide and suicide-assistance, commonly known as euthanasia.

Many are familiar with the notorious work of Dr. Jack Kevorkian, commonly known as “Dr. Death,” or “Jack the Dripper”—an allusion to his suicide machine.

There are two issues here.

First, does one have the right, even if he or she is terminally ill, to take his or her own life?

Second, is it ever ethical for human beings to decide when other people are no longer fit to live, simply because they have some mental or physical condition which retards or eliminates their productivity in society?

Suicide has become a common practice in the world of moral confusion. From the youth to the elderly, suicide is now considered by many to be an ethical option as an escape from the rigors of life.

Each year 300,000 suicides are attempted—30,000 of these succeed. Teen suicide has more than tripled since the 1950s. More than 5,000 young people commit suicide annually. Suicide is the second leading cause of death for those between the ages of 13 and 21.

Too, more of the elderly are electing to die by their own hands. Between 1981 and 1986, while the suicide rate was rising 5% nationally, in the over-65 group, it was escalating a staggering 25%.

The Bible, both Old and New Testaments, contains laws and principles which condemn the practice of suicide. There are several cases of suicide mentioned in the Scriptures, and all are viewed unfavorably (cf. 1 Samuel 31:4, 5; 2 Samuel 17:23; 1 Kings 16:18; Matthew 27:5). Clearly, the Bible condemns suicide.

Self-destruction violates a number of biblical concepts.

It asserts that man is autonomous, i.e., a law to himself. Seneca, the Greek Stoic, defended suicide on the ground that man is lord of his own being. The Bible does not sanction this idea. God made us; not we ourselves (Psalm 100:3). All souls are therefore his (Ezekiel 18:3), and only God has the right to determine when life is to end. He has not granted us that option.

Suicide is an act of self-murder, and murder is immoral.

Suicide robs God of service that is rightfully due the Creator (Ecclesiastes 12:13).

Suicide is an act of supreme selfishness. Those who deliberately end their lives are thinking primarily of themselves (though sometimes the rationalization is offered, "I am a burden to others.") One has the responsibility to continue living and attempting to do good as long as he is rational.

Human existence is not about giving up; it is about fighting back and being a blessing to others, even under the most adverse circumstances.

Euthanasia

The story is told of a minister who was given a phone invitation to speak on a lecture forum on the theme of euthanasia. When he arrived he dutifully lectured on "Youth-in-Asia," though expressing some perplexity as to the relevance of the topic!

The dubious humor is that he apparently was totally unfamiliar with the term. Some appear to be significantly out-of-touch with crucial modern issues.

The word "euthanasia" means "good death." It has become a euphemism for the extermination of certain unproductive peoples whom society supposedly cannot afford to support. Increasingly there is a clamoring for the deaths of the elderly, the handicapped, the weak, the imperfect, etc.

Nobel laureate Francis Crick, the co-discoverer of DNA, has argued that

"no newborn infant should be declared human until it has passed certain tests regarding its genetic endowment and ... if it fails these tests it forfeits the right to live" (Howard and Rifkin, 81).

In 1974, Dr. Robert Cooke of the University of Wisconsin, testifying before a senate subcommittee, stated that an estimated 2,000 infants a year are dying in America because treatment needed for them has been stopped (Marx 1975, 9).

Dr. Glanville Williams, in his book, *The Sanctity of Life and the Criminal Law*, strongly advocates the legalization of both “humanitarian infanticide” and “euthanasia for handicapped children.”

Joseph Fletcher, prominent defender of situation ethics, has argued that we are “morally obligated” to end the lives of those who are terminally ill.

Dr. William Gaylin, professor of psychiatry and law at Columbia University, declared:

“It used to be easy to know what we wanted for our children, now the best for our children might mean deciding which ones to kill. We’ve always wanted the best for our grandparents, and now that might mean killing them.” (Marx, 3).

Euthanasia is not good death; it is bad death, because it violates the biblical principle of the sacredness of human life. No one has the arbitrary right to end his own life, or take that of another, merely because that person is ill or in some other way nonproductive.

What have we become when the value of human life is measured in dollars and cents?

Divine Design

Humanity is the offspring of God (Acts 17:29). Intellectually and spiritually, humankind was created in the image of the divine Godhead (Genesis 1:26-27; cf. Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10).

Physically, the first man was formed from the dust of the ground by a direct act of God (Genesis 2:7), and his wife was fashioned from flesh and bone removed from his side (Genesis 2:21-23).

Mankind, as designed by Jehovah, thus was “fearfully and wonderfully made” (Psalm 139:14; cf. 94:9). As he originally came forth from the Maker, as one of the “wonderous works of him who is perfect in knowledge” (Job 37:16), man was, together with the rest of the creation, “very good” (Genesis 1:31).

But there is more to the story.

Adam and Eve (along with their posterity) were given the right of freedom of choice. Regrettably, the first family chose to ignore the Lord’s commands and so fell into transgression (Romans 5:14; 1 Timothy 2:14).

With the introduction of human sinfulness came death and all of its attendant evils (see Genesis 3:22; Romans 5:12; 8:18ff); man has thus degenerated both spiritually and physically. Con-

trast, for example, the great ages of the patriarchs (Genesis 5), with man's current three-score-and-ten (Psalm 90:10).

The fact that we are heir to a great variety of afflictions, as a consequence of the original fall, does not, of course, suggest that attempts to maintain good health are sinful. It is not morally wrong, for example, to use doctors and medicine—in spite of the fact that some cultists, like Mary Baker Eddy's "Christian Science" movement, so claim.

Christ himself acknowledged the principle that the sick need a physician (Luke 5:31). The Bible mentions the employment of certain medicines (Jeremiah 8:22; 51:8; 2 Kings 20:1-7; Isaiah 1:6; Luke 10:34; 1 Timothy 5:23). And Paul commends Luke, a traveling companion, as "the beloved physician" (Colossians 4:14).

It is not morally wrong to utilize substances from either plants or animals to medically benefit humanity. Quinine is manufactured from cinchona bark, penicillin is obtained from mold, and diphtheria antitoxin is made from the blood serum of horses or sheep.

Neither surgery, inoculations, blood transfusions, organ transplants, nor artificial organs are morally objectionable. (Note: the "Jehovah's Witnesses" will let a child die rather than administer a blood transfusion.)

Having said that, this word of caution must be stated. When man is viewed as a mere animal with which to experiment, something has gone awry.

When human beings are seen as bundles of evolutionary mistakes to be corrected by modern Dr. Frankenstein-like scientists, society is in trouble.

When those who are ambitious to "play God" propose to redesign the "human machine," a moral barrier has been breached. Such attempts are violations of the dignity of man; they are efforts at usurping the creative prerogatives of Almighty God.

The Family Unit

It is not without great significance that the family unit is coexistent with humanity. Man did not live one day upon this earth apart from the family unit.

It is obvious, therefore, that the home is an essential ingredient for the welfare of the human race.

When God sent his own Son into the world, Christ became a part of a home (Matthew 1:24-25; Luke 2:50). Jesus strongly emphasized the divine origin and purpose of the family (Matthew 19:4ff), and he frequently drew teaching illustrations from family circumstances (cf. Matthew 21:28-29; Luke 15:11ff).

While it certainly is true that there are numerous physical aspects of marriage and the home, the ultimate thrust of the home is spiritual. It was designed as an earthly arrangement to enhance our heavenward journey.

Perhaps it is the home's spiritual nature that has invoked the vicious attacks of humanism against this institution in recent years.

The benefits of the family unit are many.

First, the home provides for intimate companionship; generally, it is not good to be alone (Genesis 2:18), and man and woman complement one another (1 Corinthians 11:11-12).

Second, within the confines of the heterosexual, monogamous home, Jehovah has provided a moral means of satisfying the sexual appetites of the flesh (Proverbs 5:15ff; 1 Corinthians 7:2).

Third, the family is designed to stabilize social relationships and promote community and international solidarity. No society can long survive where the home is destroyed.

Fourth, the home is the avenue by which children may legitimately be brought into the world. Moses records: "And the man knew [i.e., had sexual union with] his wife; and she conceived." (Genesis 4:1). According to the divine design, marriage is to precede the bearing of children (1 Timothy 5:14), whereas today, that chronological order frequently is reversed—or else the marriage aspect is ignored altogether.

Fifth, the family unit was planned to provide a warm atmosphere of love and trust (cf. Proverbs 15:17; 17:1), which creates an ideal climate for spiritual growth.

This is why the home absolutely must be a moral and religious training center (cf. Deuteronomy 6:4-9; Ephesians 6:1-4). To ignore this truth is, in reality, to miss the real meaning of the divinely planned family.

And it is for this very reason that all philosophical, societal, and scientific attempts to circumvent the home, God's family arrangement, are wrong and hence must be resisted.

Let us consider how this principle might be applied in our current society.

Cloning

Headlines recently shouted: "CLONING: Where Do We Draw the Line?" Following then were these words: "Researchers duplicate a human embryo, provoking cries that technology has gone too far" (*TIME* 1993, 65).

What once was considered science fiction, is being seriously attempted today.

The word “clone” derives from the Greek term *klon*, a “sprout or twig,” and it refers to a method of reproduction apart from the normal mating procedure (which occurs in most organisms).

The process has already been experimentally accomplished in plants (e.g., carrots), and in 1952, Drs. Robert Briggs and Thomas King of the Institute for Cancer Research in Philadelphia cloned a leopard frog.

Cloning, in its most sophisticated form, would theoretically involve the removal of the nucleus of any body cell (which contains all the heredity information for the entire organism). That nucleus would be transferred to an unfertilized egg cell (whose nucleus had been removed).

It is thus suggested that this organism would develop into a person identical to the individual from whom the initial body cell had been taken.

A recent experiment in human cloning was not after that order; it was a far simpler process.

In October of 1993 at a meeting of the American Fertility Society in Montreal, Jerry Hall, a scientist who is the director of the in vitro fertilization [the combining of sperm and egg in a petri dish to produce a human conception] laboratory at George Washington University, announced that he and his colleague, Dr. Robert Stillman, had replicated a human embryo.

Starting with 17 microscopic embryos that ranged from the two-cell to eight-cell stage (that’s 17 tiny humans), they divided these little beings into 48 others. Here is what happened, as described in the **TIME** magazine article (67).

1. As a part of a fertility treatment, eggs were removed from a woman and fertilized in a petri dish. Some of these eggs were fertilized by more than one sperm—an abnormal condition.
2. One such abnormal cell divided in two as the first step in development.
3. The coating was removed with an enzyme, and the two cells were separated.
4. Using a novel technique, artificial zona coatings were added, allowing development to proceed.
5. The cells continued to divide, forming genetically identical embryos. Development stopped after six days, partly because the embryo was abnormal.

Could this procedure conceivably produce a new human being that would be an exact replica of the parent cell?

That is highly unlikely, but at this point we simply do not know, for the boundaries of some biological laws have not been fully explored.

A human embryo can be frozen, later thawed, implanted in a woman's body, and subsequently find fruition in the birth of a healthy child. However, an adult human cannot be frozen, thawed, and revived to life. There are biological barriers which simply cannot be crossed. So, the perfection of the human cloning process is far from complete.

Be that as it is, certainly there are serious ethical problems with this current procedure.

Reflect upon the following factors.

It is a violation of biblical ethics to produce human beings (even in embryonic form) for experimental purposes. Human beings have basic rights, and it is evil to deprive our fellows of these rights, no matter what their level of maturation.

Consider this case. Between 1932 and 1972, the United States Public Health Service, working at various times with the Alabama State Department of Health, and other agencies, deliberately withheld treatment from more than 400 black men who were suffering from syphilis.

These men were not informed that they had syphilis. They were duped into cooperating with a health program they believed was helping them. Government doctors told them they had "bad blood." The experiment has since been described as "science gone mad" (Jones 1981).

Was this experimentation upon persons who were uninformed, and who had not consented to the procedure, moral or immoral? The answer is patently clear. It was grossly immoral, and so is the experimentation that is being perpetrated upon unborn infants today.

Some would argue, of course, that the cases of the black men in Alabama, and human embryos, are not parallel since the Alabama men were "people" and human embryos supposedly are not.

And so this brings us back to this basic question.

Does the human person begin at the point of conception?

If the answer is yes, and most certainly it is, then all experiments which fail to respect the life and rights of the unborn child are unethical. Human rights are not determined by size and age.

Processes which involve creating several embryos, selecting the fittest for experimentation, and then destroying the rest, are calloused violations of the principle of the sanctity of human life. This is standard practice in the in vitro fertilization procedure, and, as indicated above, the same disrespect for human life would be demonstrated in the cloning of a human embryo.

It is the divine plan that human beings be conceived to become a part of a family relationship wherein the Creator can be served. All efforts which by-pass this goal reflect an ignorance of, or rebellion to, the divine plan for man.

A number of prominent scholars in the scientific community, many of which have no regard for the testimony of the Bible, see serious moral problems associated with the attempt at cloning humans.

Dr. Gunther Stent, a professor of molecular biology at the University of California at Berkeley, some twenty years ago, declared that “the idea of cloning humans is morally and aesthetically completely unacceptable” (1974).

According to the article in **TIME** magazine, when the news of the recent experiments at George Washington University was announced, a cry went up around the world from leading scientists. Dr. Jean-Francois Mattei of Timone Hospital in Marseilles, France commented: “This is not research. It’s aberrant, showing a lack of a sense of reality and respect for people.” Note Dr. Mattei’s use of the word “people” in referring to these embryos.

Professor Hans-Bernhard Wuermeling, a medical ethicist at the University of Erlangen, called the practice of cloning for the purpose of obtain human parts (as some are suggesting as a possible use of cloning) “a form of slavery.”

Rudolf Dressler of Germany said: “The Americans do not have our scruples.”

If Hall and Stillman had conducted their experiment in Great Britain, they could be facing up to 10 years in prison. In Japan all research on human cloning is against the law.

What has happened to America’s sense of morality? When we should be the moral leaders of the world, we are woefully lagging behind. “Righteousness exalts a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people” (Proverbs 14:34).

Gender Issues

There has been a concerted effort in recent years to blur the distinction between the sexes. This is evident in the unisexual movement and in society’s increasing acceptance of the homosexual life-style.

Along with this, there is now the growing practice of surgically altering people to the gender of their choice. Almost weekly one can read of “sex-change” operations. The increasingly bizarre television talk-shows parade an endless spectacle of “shes” who used to be “hes” and vice versa.

While it can be admitted that sometimes a person who has been born with a sexual abnormality might solicit a surgical correction of his or her problem, most of the cases attracting the public’s attention are simply attempts of homosexuals to accommodate their bodies to the perverted and wicked lifestyles they have chosen to pursue.

In addition, other radical ideas are being suggested.

Joseph Fletcher, prominent advocate of situation ethics, contends that the day is coming

“when a uterus can be implanted in a human male’s body—his abdomen has spaces—and gestation started by artificial fertilization and egg transfer. Hypogonadism could be used to stimulate milk from the man’s rudimentary breasts—men too have mammary glands. If surgery could not construct a cervical canal the delivery could be effected by a Caesarean section and the male or transsexualized mother could nurse his own baby” (1988, 45).

It is difficult to find verbal expression to describe the irrationality inherent in such a suggestion.

The fact is, any attempt to alter the design of the human body to accommodate an arbitrary gender change is a perversion of the Creator’s plan for the distinctive sexes—male and female.

Surrogate Parents

Another growing phenomenon, which violates several biblical principles associated with the divine plan for marriage and the home, is that of artificial insemination by a donor and surrogate parenthood.

Here is the scenario that is frequently involved. A woman who is sterile will allow an egg from another woman (the donor) to be fertilized by her husband’s sperm in a Petri dish. The fertilized egg will then be transplanted into the sterile woman’s uterus so that she may carry the child to term.

In a similar situation, a sterile man may allow his wife to be inseminated artificially by a donor’s sperm so that they may have a “natural” child, as opposed to strict adoption.

Surely this is an inordinate practice which ignores the true function of human reproduction.

It is imperative that it be understood that human reproduction is not an accident of nature, as the evolutionary theory contends.

Rather, it was designed by God (Genesis 1:27), and it was never intended to be an end within itself. It is part of a larger plan that may not be ignored with impunity.

Human beings have no purpose on this earth other than to glorify and serve their Maker (Isaiah 43:7; Ecclesiastes 12:13). This is where our greatest happiness is to be found.

Sexual reproduction, within the legitimate family unit, was fashioned to serve this goal. Any human activity or experimentation which ignores this divine appointment is morally unacceptable.

Millions are ignorant of this holy purpose and so ignore the laws regarding reproduction.

Parental responsibility begins at conception, and it does not conclude until the child is reared to a level of independent maturity (and there are some senses in which it never ends).

A significant portion of that rearing is the obligation to train one's children for God's service. The Law of Moses enjoined upon parents the serious responsibility of educating children to obey Jehovah. It was to be a sober and steadfast chore (Deuteronomy 6:7-9; cf. Proverbs 22:6). Similarly, the New Testament places parents under obligation to nurture their children in the discipline and admonition of the Lord (Ephesians 6:4).

The procreation of children is not a function that morally can be done independent of the will of God (cf. Psalm 127:3). No one has the right to surrender his or her reproductive powers.

With these principles in view, we affirm the following. It is not ethical for one to surrender his or her reproductive power to an arrangement beyond his or her own family unit. This involves an abdication of parental responsibility.

Would it be moral for one to produce a child for the purpose of selling it? If so, would the immorality be in the act of relinquishing parental duty, or would the breach of ethics be merely in the economics of the arrangement?

May a man and woman make a determination (consistent with sound ethics) that they will conceive and bear a child to simply give away? Are women who "rent" their wombs for the bearing of children on behalf of others practicing responsible ethics. They are not!

No person has the moral right to irresponsibly employ those reproductive privileges that were granted exclusively within the monogamous, heterosexual marital relationship.

If a husband and wife cannot have a child as the result of their personal reproductive abilities (and this would not deny them medical assistance in their respective cases if needed), they may adopt a child who would be homeless otherwise.

Someone is likely to raise this question. If a girl bears a child out of wedlock, and gives it up for adoption, would she not be surrendering her reproductive responsibility? And yet, don't we frequently recommend such?

If she simply cannot care for her child, she may be forced to permit adoption. Under such circumstances, however, she must attempt to find a Christian home in which to place her baby; she has a spiritual responsibility to the new life she has brought into the world.

We cannot conclude this section without commenting upon this societal aberration. It is a tragic commentary upon our national and local governments that in some places it is now permissible for a lesbian to have herself impregnated so that she and her companion-in-fornication can have a child to raise.

Governmental authorities who allow this kind of vile influence to invade a child's life have absolutely no regard for the revelation of God's will regarding the home. Such persons are child-abusers as much as those who literally molest youngsters. Eventually, the Judge of the earth will deal with a nation that is so bereft of basic moral principles.

Human Free Will

Human beings are creatures who have been made in the image of God (Genesis 1:26). This does not mean that we are in the Lord's physical image, of course, for God is spirit (John 4:24), and he does not possess flesh and blood (Luke 24:39). Man exists in the spiritual image of the Creator.

An element of this image involves human volition—man and woman are beings endowed with free will. Unlike animals, who operate on instinct, people make decisions. That is a sacred trust which must ever be preserved.

In the paradise of Eden, Adam and Eve were charged with the responsibility of choosing whether to obey Jehovah's commands or not (Genesis 2:15-17). Unfortunately, the wrong choice was made.

Later in Hebrew history, Joshua challenged the people of Israel:

“Choose you this day whom you will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were beyond the River, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land you dwell; but as for me and my house, we will serve Jehovah” (Joshua 24:15).

As a youngster's mental capacity matures, he develops responsibility, or literally, the ability to respond. Accordingly, he must be taught to respond to moral and spiritual instruction; he must learn to “refuse the evil, and choose the good” (cf. Isaiah 7:16).

Some theologians assert that man, as a result of Adam's original apostasy, has lost his freedom of choice.

But this is not true. The New Testament Scriptures constantly indicate that people are capable of exercising willpower. Jesus urged sinful people to “come” unto him (see Matthew 11:28; 23:37; John 7:17; Revelation 22:17)—a charge having no meaning whatever if they did not possess the ability to respond.

Men and women do have the power to make moral decisions.

We said all of that to suggest this: any attempt to alter man's ability to make rational choices, upon the basis of spiritual and moral persuasion, is at variance with the Mind of God.

All efforts which are aimed at mechanically or chemically controlling human beings—turning them, practically speaking, into physical robots—are perversions of Jehovah’s purpose for man kind.

If God Almighty himself did not “program” people to carry out his will, independent of their own judgment, certainly no man has the right to attempt such an enterprise.

The “Twisted Molecule” Concept

Increasingly, some scientists are suggesting that all human thought and behavior are to be explained solely on the basis of physical processes. Nothing, it is alleged, can really be characterized as “moral” or “immoral.”

It is unthinkable to speak of “sin” or “evil.” All unacceptable societal behavior is supposed to have a genetic or physical basis. Dr. Ralph Gerard, a prominent neurophysiologist, says: “There can be no twisted thought without a twisted molecule” (Restak 1975, 92).

In terms of pseudo-science, the new kid on the block is called “sociobiology.” Introduced by Edward Wilson in his massive volume, ***Sociobiology: The New Synthesis***, this theory contends that virtually all human activity is the consequence of a “genetic determinism” which makes us act in accordance with our remote “evolutionary past” (Howard and Rifkin, 149).

In his book, ***The Naked Ape***, English zoologist Desmond Morris wrote that man’s

“impulses have been with him for millions of years, his new ones only a few thousand at the most—and there is no hope of quickly shrugging off the accumulated genetic legacy of his whole evolutionary past” (9).

Eugene Linden contends that Darwin’s theory of evolution provides “the basis for a paradigm that might explain both human psychology and human behavior” (1981, 217).

The practical aspects of this philosophy are shocking indeed. Here is but one example.

In 1924, Richard Loeb and Nathan Leopold, 18 and 19 years of age respectively, conceived the idea they could commit a perfect crime. These sons of millionaire businessmen were both college graduates with illustrious futures before them. They had, however, in their educational pursuits imbibed the evolutionary concept of man’s existence—with all of its revolting consequences.

Especially had Leopold become intoxicated with the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche. Nietzsche was a radical promulgator of Darwinism who argued there is a “master class,” who should do as it pleases, even eliminating the weak from society.

One afternoon in a Chicago neighborhood, Leopold and Loeb lured 14-year-old Bobby Franks into an automobile; there, for the sheer thrill of it, they murdered him by bashing in his skull with a chisel.

They were subsequently apprehended and Chicago was launched into one of the most emotionally charged trials of the century. The foxy Clarence Darrow was secured as attorney for the defense.

Darrow's main line of defense was that these young men were not to blame for their conduct. "Infinite forces," he suggested, had been "at work" producing them ages before they were born. Darrow argued that man is the product of evolutionary formation—he has clawed his way up through the ages. Thus, he contended, these young murderers were not to be held responsible for their atrocity (Weinberg 1957, 55).

The crafty lawyer saved the lads from the electric chair—each received prison sentences.

On the basis of these foregoing theories, it is argued if we wish to change human conduct, we must change the genes, or in some other way regulate unacceptable activity.

How shall we respond to this notion?

First, as we observed earlier, any theory of human behavior that is based upon the assumption that man evolved from a lower form of life is patently false.

There is no scientific evidence for the evolutionary view of:

1. The origin of the universe. Evolutionists allege that the universe is either eternal, or that it created itself. Neither view is scientifically feasible.
2. The origin of life. Evolution asserts that life was spontaneously generated several billion years ago. Science (the law of biogenesis) affirms that life only comes from preexisting life.
3. The great variety of living creatures. Evolution contends that by means of genetic mutations, and natural selection, all living organisms have developed from an original primitive life-source. But genetic mutations and natural selection are both negative phenomena; they may eliminate, but they cannot create. Hence, these explanations cannot possibly present a rational basis for the forward progress that evolution theory demands.

The fact is, the whole history of life upon this planet is a story of degeneration—not evolutionary development.

Second, the logical consequences of biological determinism are impossible to live with, and even those who theoretically espouse the dogma will not consistently stay with it.

Consider these important points.

If determinism is true, there is no such thing as human responsibility. This is a necessary corollary of the theory. In spite of this, determinists speak, write, and act as though human accountability exists. Consistency is a rare jewel indeed among these people.

If man is not responsible for his actions, such terms as “good” and “evil” are meaningless.

If man is not accountable, no one should ever be punished for robbery, rape, child abuse, murder, etc. Do we punish a machine that maims or kills a person?

If a drunk driver runs down and kills a child, why do we prosecute only the man—not the man and the automobile—if both the man and his car are but machines?

How can we be expected to be persuaded by the doctrine of determinism, since apparently determinists were “genetically programmed” to teach their ideas, and these may not be true at all?

Determinists will not stand with their doctrine. If this writer copied Edward Wilson’s book advocating sociobiology, and had it published under his name, he would quickly find out whether the distinguished professor believed I was responsible for the action, or whether my genetic background is!

Man, the Machine

Many scientists subscribe to the view that man is virtually a genetic machine (with no soul made in the image of God), and that aberrant human conduct is thus the result of some “part” or “cog” that has gone awry. They do not scruple to imagine that they are “gods” who, by some “mechanical” operation, can fix the problem.

Man has progressively explored or “conquered” certain areas of his material environment (e.g., the atom, space, etc.). Many believe, therefore, that we are on the threshold of having the technical means of controlling of our personal behavior.

B. F. Skinner of Harvard University has declared: “Science is steadily increasing our power to influence, change, mold—in a word, control—human behavior.” Skinner is a determinist who argues that man really does not possess free-will. “Caprice,” he says, “is only another name for behavior for which we have not yet found a cause.”

Dr. Robert Morrison, who served as medical director of the Rockefeller Foundation, predicted that the time is coming when science “will make possible the control of human behavior with a high degree of precision.”

Robert Coughlan boldly asserts that: “Expert scientists owe it to humanity to take charge of events and arrange things so that people behave in ways that will be for their own good” (Life, March 15, 1963, p. 82).

Who appointed the “expert scientists” to play God? And who will determine what is the “good”?

The Genetic “Bank”

Some scientists believe that we should get control of human behavior on the most fundamental level—in the genes themselves.

H. J. Muller, a Nobel prize-winning geneticist, suggested that the improvement of human behavior requires

“as a prerequisite the reorientation of human attitudes in regard to reproduction. What is needed is ... the provision for ... [babies] of the best genetic equipment that is available. This means a replacement of our long-ingrained proprietary attitude that takes it for granted that the children one brings up should carry one’s own genetic material” (Ibid., p. 94).

Dr. Muller contends that the superior genetic material should be placed in “germ-cell banks,” and conception would occur by means of “controlled implantation.” He would manipulate human behavior by the genetic sifting and elimination process.

Of course the “deposit” of those well-behaved eggs and sperm into the First National Germ-Cell Bank would violate those principles regulating the responsible use of one’s reproductive powers, discussed in an earlier section of this work.

Transistorized Humans

Several years ago, scientists developed a procedure known as ESB (electrical stimulation of the brain). Small electrodes were implanted in the brains of animals and, under the influence of electrical stimulation, the animals’ behavior could be regulated. Cats and monkeys performed like battery-operated toys.

Not only were scientists able to control motor activity (e.g., the movement of limbs, etc.), but they were able to isolate the very emotional centers of the brain and so provoke rage, fear, craving, etc. Under directed stimulation a cat can be induced to shrink in panic at the sight of a mouse. “Tabby” could be made to eat herself to death, or starve, simply by means of ESB.

What does all of this have to do with us?

As you read these lines do not forget this—most scientists are dyed-in-the-wool evolutionists. To them, human beings are but highly evolved animals. What will work with an animal will, therefore, work with man.

To them, man is merely a machine of flesh, bone, and blood.

Robert Coughlan made this very point in an article titled, "Behavior by Electronics."

"[S]ince man represents the highest stage of evolutionary development and contains in its [sic] own brain the lesser forms of brain in a rising hierarchy capped by his great cerebral cortex, it is reasonably certain that human responses to ESB would be much the same as the responses observed in animals" (1963, 104).

Believe it or not, some scientists, like C. R. Schaffer, an electrical engineer, suggested that electrical sockets could be implanted in an infant's head a few months after birth. The youngster could then be programmed to carry out certain functions. Schaffer suggested that this would be a very economical source of labor—much cheaper than building a mechanical robot of the kind used in some industries today.

This sounds like science fiction, but these men are deadly serious.

For example, it is speculated that criminals could be subjected to ESB, thus destroying or controlling those areas of the brain that are responsible for aggression, sexual perversion, etc. Of course the assumption is—and it is as false as can be—that all human behavior is mechanically precipitated.

What ever happened to the idea that human conduct can be influenced by moral persuasion? Which is nobler—a change of conduct resulting from a higher ideal, or being zapped with electricity?

Chemical Control

Another form of conduct control is by means of mind-altering chemicals. It is well known that the "power" of the brain is due to an electrochemical process. The brain's electrical energy is created by chemical reactions within the cells.

It is thus argued that if ESB can accomplish behavior enhancement, chemicals (if the correct kinds and proportions can be determined) ought to be as effective—if not more so.

According to Dr. Glenn Seaborg, a nuclear chemist who served as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, it is projected that these psycho-chemicals will be employed in the future to "change and maintain human personality at any desired level."

We must remind ourselves of the basic assumption upon which many of these gentlemen operate. As we mentioned earlier, Dr. Ralph Gerard coined a saying which has become rather well-known. "There can be no twisted thought without a twisted molecule."

If that were true—which certainly it is not—it is only reasonable to conclude that if chemical reactions twist a molecule, then chemical reactions can set it straight.

This entire line of reasoning, of course, ignores the very nature of man as set forth in the Holy Scriptures.

The chemicals that are used to control human behavior are found in various categories. There are euphorants which so affect the recipient that he becomes "witlessly optimistic" about everything.

The depressants take the patient down to a state of lethargy.

Cataplexogenics prevent the subject from using his motor skills; he is conscious but inactive.

The disinhibitors weaken the controls that normally keep behavior on an even level (alcohol comes in this category).

A drug type that distorts one's sense of time is called a chronoleptogenic; the victim cannot identify the timeframe in which relationships occur.

Finally, confusants cause the patient to lose all track of rationality; everything becomes strange and bewildering.

These chemicals do exist. They do alter "state-of-mind." And they are designed to provide a solution to human behavior that is out of harmony with societal normalcy (whatever that is).

Psychosurgery

Psychosurgery is a procedure that involves the destruction of certain parts of the brain in order to change one's state of mind and thus alter behavior.

Craig Ellison wrote:

"The most predominate use of psychosurgery has been to control pathological aggression or violent and uncontrollable behavior among children, epileptics, institutionalized prisoners, and mentally ill people" (1979).

Psychosurgery was more popular in the past than it now is. From the late 1940s to the mid-1950s, some 70,000 cases of psychosurgery were performed in the United States. In the 1950s it was common to perform an operation called a lobotomy, during which certain connections in

the brain were severed. In some cases, though, the procedure caused loss of memory, apathy about life, and even death.

We are not suggesting that it is impossible for a person to have behavioral problems that are the result of an organic or chemical imbalance.

Brain damage, tumors, genetic factors, etc., can cause erratic behavior. There are cases where chemical and metabolic disturbances in the brain precipitate abnormal and unacceptable conduct. Some metabolic disorders (e.g., too little sugar in the blood) can affect the way a mind functions. No informed Christian is opposed to surgical or chemical treatment for an illness, if that is clearly indicated as the best method to pursue for the welfare of the patient.

To assume, however, that all (or even most) behavioral problems are organic in origin, and that a mechanical “fix” is always the solution, is an egregious error. The reality probably is, too often people look to a quick drug fix, rather than yielding their minds to him who is able to correct unacceptable conduct and heal emotional scars.

Most conduct difficulties are “soul” related, and in such cases only the remedy of the Word of God will produce a lasting effect.

Just because a man murders or steals does not mean he has a “twisted gene”—it is the theory that is twisted. This dogma discourages self-esteem and quenches the confidence people need to work toward the solutions to their problems.

Some Important Conclusions

Here are some facts many need to realize.

1. Most people are perfectly normal.
2. Human beings, upon reaching a level of maturity whereby they become morally responsible, do wrong things. As a consequence of environmental influence, people transgress the religious and moral laws of God (Romans 4:15; 1 John 3:4). This rebellion against the Creator brings many dire consequences.
3. In the realm of morality, which has to do with man’s relationship to his fellows, sin manifests itself in many ways, involving both attitudes and actions, e.g., hatred, lying, lust, murder, stealing, etc.
4. Such inappropriate forms of evil can be corrected when one is motivated by a recognition that the Creator of the universe is not pleased with these behavioral patterns, and that this type of conduct is destructive to the person who yields to it. In biblical parlance, this recognition and resolve is called repentance—which involves a change of mind, resulting in a change of lifestyle.

5. Attempts to deny that people have ability to change their lives under the benevolent persuasion of the message of Jesus Christ are perverted.

Any methodology that robs man of his personal ability to alter his conduct by substituting an artificial “fix” is wrong and must be avoided by the person wanting to do God’s will.

Conclusion

When we began this presentation, we called attention to several facts of vital importance—essential to making proper ethical decisions.

First, the fact of God’s existence, as the moral Ruler of the universe, must be conceded. If there is no God, hence, no standard of truth, we are in a moral maze.

Second, man was especially created by God. He stands in the rational, moral, volitional, etc., image of his Creator. Yes, by the misuse of his powers of volition, man made a wrong choice and rebelled against God. However, he has the power to change, and he is thus expected to strive toward the ethical life.

Third, Jehovah has communicated his will to man through a series of inspired documents. Human beings have the responsibility to study these writings to ascertain their integrity. Once convinced that the Bible is from God (and the evidence is overwhelming—see the author’s book, *The Bible on Trial*), each person is obligated to search out the religious and moral instruction whereby the noble life can be pursued.

Fourth, even though the Scriptures contain the guidelines for making correct ethical decisions, the instruction, from the nature of the case, cannot always be explicit. If the Bible is to be a perpetual and universal textbook for conduct, its teaching must be set forth largely in principles that will be applicable under all circumstances. The devout person will study the holy volume to identify these principles.

Fifth, some of the principles that assist in making moral decisions are:

Life, as a gift from God, is sacred.

Any procedure, therefore, that flaunts the sanctity of human life is immoral—whether that life is yet in the womb, reflected in a vigorous person, or is wasting away under the ravages of age.

Men and women were fearfully and wonderfully designed by him who is all-wise.

Though it is not unethical to try to correct the defects that have developed as a result of man’s progressive weakness, attempts to redesign the human body, to move it higher on an alleged evolutionary tree, are evil.

Human beings have basic rights which must always be respected.

People must not be employed as experimental subjects without their knowledge and consent. Every person, from conception onward, possesses these rights.

The family is the basic unit of society.

Human reproduction, apart from the family structure, is forbidden. Children cannot be raised like laboratory crops for experimental purposes.

Parents are responsible for their offspring.

Both male and female contributors to the conception of a child have an accountability to that child to provide physical, emotional, social, and spiritual support as the offspring develops toward maturity. No person, under normal circumstances, can surrender his or her reproductive powers to others for the implementation of those sacred responsibilities.

We are morally accountable for our behavior.

No person's mental and moral sensitivity should be removed as a means of controlling his conduct.

Let every person, therefore, who is interested in his own welfare, and that of society as a whole, diligently set himself for a propagation and defense of biblical morality in a time of technical confusion and crisis.

References

- Asimov, Isaac. 1962. ***The Genetic Code***. New York, NY: Orion Press.
- Coughlan, Robert. 1963. Behavior by Electronics. ***Life***, March 8.
- Darrow, Clarence. 1957. ***Attorney for the Damned***. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Dobzhansky, Theodosius. 1955. ***Evolution, Genetics, and Man***. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Ellison, Craig. 1979. ***Christianity Today***, January 19.
- Fletcher, Joseph. 1988. ***The Ethics of Genetic Control: Ending Reproductive Roulette***. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Howard, Ted, and Jeremy Rifkin. 1977. ***Who Should Play God?*** New York, NY: Delacorte Press.
- Jackson, Wayne. ***Is Man a Naked Ape?***
- Jackson, Wayne. 2000. ***The Human Body—Accident or Design?*** Stockton, CA: Christian Courier Publications.
- Jackson, Wayne. 2008. ***The Bible on Trial***. Stockton, CA: Christian Courier Publications.
- Kurtz, Paul, and Edwin H. Wilson. 1973. ***Humanist Manifesto II***.
- Jones, James H. 1981. ***BAD BLOOD – The scandalous story of the Tuskegee experiment—when government doctors played God and science went mad***. The Free Press.
- Linden, Eugene. 1981. ***Apes, Men, and Language***. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Marsak, Leonard M. 1961. ***French Philosophers from Descartes to Sartre***. New York, NY: Meridian Books.
- Marx, Paul. 1975. ***Death Without Dignity: Killing for Mercy***. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Montagu, Ashley. 1960. ***Human Heredity***. New York, NY: Mentor.
- Morris, Desmond. 1967. ***The Naked Ape: A Zoologist's Study of the Human Animal***. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Planned Parenthood. 1964. ***Plan Your Children***.
- Restak, Richard. 1975. ***Psychology Today***, September.

Sagan, Carl, ed. 1973. ***Communication with Extraterrestrial Intelligence***.

Stent, Gunther. 1974. ***Nature***, April 26.

Thayer, J. H. 1958. ***A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament***. Edinburgh, Scotland: T. & T. Clark.

The Bible Knowledge Commentary – Old Testament.

TIME. 1993. CLONING: Where do we draw the line? November 8.

Vanderpool, David. 1993. ***The Christian Chronicle***, November.

Williams, Glanville. 1957. ***The Sanctity of Life and the Criminal Law***. New York, NY: Knopf.

Wilson, Edward O. 1975. ***Sociobiology: The New Synthesis***. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

World Medical Association Bulletin. 1950. Vol. 2:5. January.