

**The Bible reveals that there are only two types of law used by nations to make judgments.** Being pro-choice on abortion often hinges upon whether or not these two types of law are correctly understood. Sadly, most Christians do not know how to distinguish between these two kinds of law. Even lawyers that profess to be Christian often ignore the differences.

**The first type of law is against things that are evil in and of themselves.** Because it is always bad to do them, criminal justice textbooks call these *mala in se* crimes, which means, "bad in itself." What makes *mala in se* violations immoral? The answer is that these criminal acts rebel against the unchanging, immutable, righteous character of God.

God's character is the same yesterday, today, and forever. No circumstance or goal can change God's character or His sense of morality. In God's view, *mala in se* crimes such as larceny, rape, and murder are always wrong regardless of the type of government, circumstances, election campaign, or benefit surrounding them.

**The second type of law is against things that are not evil.** Why would anybody create a second type of law against things not intrinsically evil? The answer: "As an effort to try to attain a specific goal or effect."

When someone uses law to regulate an action that has some valid use, the statute creates what textbooks call *mala prohibita* crime. Such imposed regulations may have little or no moral force behind them. This is why they may be rightly changed to make the act totally legal again.

Many laws in the bible fall under this second category. For example, it is not evil in itself to wear clothing made from mixed fibers, but God regulated such by law for Israelites (Leviticus 19:19). God created such regulations to achieve a goal or effect, which was to illustrate doctrinal truth to Jews through symbolic gestures.

Speed limits and drug regulations are also examples of *mala prohibita* crimes. For example, certain drugs have legitimate uses, but lawmakers may put regulations or restrictions on their use in an attempt to create a specific result. Again, regulatory prohibitions are only used on things that are not evil in themselves because the thing has at least one legitimate use.

Is there a morally legitimate situation in which larceny, rape, or murder can be performed or regulated? No, they are *mala in se* crimes and as such are always evil. Abortion - an act having the express intent to kill a child and no desire to help it survive - is also always evil, regardless of the situation. Abortion is a *mala in se* act.

**Remember, when a legal system looks at something as having at least one morally legitimate purpose, it is not completely outlawed, but civil leaders may choose to regulate it.** However, when public leaders wrongly misplace "murder with intent" under *mala prohibita* regulations, such murders are being immorally grouped into the same category as parking tickets and demolition permits.

Mislabeled abortion, a *mala in se* crime of murder, as being a *mala prohibita* act under regulatory law will ultimately do two things: pervert public understanding of

morality and undermine the personhood of pre-born children. Do you doubt this? Then discern if the following pro-choice laws teach that abortion is a *mala in se* act or a *mala prohibita* act - that abortion is always evil or merely something to regulate?

- If the mother waits 24 hours, then it's okay for her to choose abortion.
- If the mother reads literature on abortion procedures and after effects, then it's okay for her to choose abortion.
- If the mother has her parent's permission, then she can choose abortion.
- If the baby is given a sedative, then the mother can choose abortion.
- If an ultrasound has been provided to the mother, then she can choose abortion.
- It is okay for a mother to choose abortion if the father is a criminal (For example, the father's crime was rape or incest).
- It is legal for a mother to choose abortion if her baby is birthed no farther than its bellybutton (The so-called PBA ban).
- If a state law allows abortion, then it is okay for a mother to choose abortion.

Nobody should do evil, even the lesser of two evils, in hope that some good may come from it. Yet, many Christians support *mala prohibita* laws against abortion by saying that they would rather do something that will be accepted, even if it is clearly pro-choice, than to risk failure when it comes to saving any babies.

In contrast, people in the Bible faced threats of impending doom and failure for standing upon God's righteousness. Holding onto moral absolutes in the face of certain doom made real heroes in the bible and it allowed God's blessing.

Is saving more lives by all means possible an absolute moral command in the bible? The correct answer is, "No."

This is one reason why it is always wrong for a vigilante to bomb abortion clinics. Likewise, we should not legitimize through regulations anything fundamentally evil.

Consider the fact that physical security specialists and safety officers mitigate risks, but they are not expected to eliminate all risk at all cost. This is why Jesus equated offering one's own life to save other lives as being an act of love, not a response to a mandate to save lives by any means possible (John 15:13). The corollary to the self-sacrifice that Jesus spoke of, however, is that you should never offer up someone else's life, including a pre-born baby, through regulatory laws in hopes of saving other lives. One reason is because love endorses or legislates no harm towards an innocent neighbor (Romans 13:10).

It would have kept many lives from being snuffed out by ruthless dictators, but Jesus did not compromise His righteous principles to accept the throne over all the kingdoms of the world when Satan made his liberal offer (Matthew 4:8-10). Likewise, Noah and his sons did not kidnap anyone and tie them up in the ark to save lives (Genesis 7:13). These examples follow the biblical ban against committing or merely compromising over *mala in se* acts, even when the goal is to save lives. Such examples should reinforce the principle that it is always wrong to do something immoral in hopes that some good may come of it.

**QUESTION:** Should Christians do anything that goes against the moral character of God if they think some good could come from it?

**ANSWER 1:** It is far better to only do things that are morally right, even if doing right may bring negative repercussions. Do right and risk the consequences.

- ✓ "For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well doing, than for evil doing." (1 Peter 3:17)

**ANSWER 2:** Doing a little evil when it appears necessary to help a good cause will eventually lead to damnation and failure.

- ✓ "And not rather, (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say,) Let us do evil, that good may come? whose damnation is just." (Romans 3:8)

**WARNING:** Judging the morality of a decision upon immediate or expected results is not biblical.

A scenario often given to defend compromising may sound like this, "If a house full of kids was on fire, wouldn't you try to save as many as possible?" What we have been doing through bad legislation, however, is like giving the match to the pyromaniac and helping him strike the match; then we pat ourselves on the back as heroes because we pulled a few children out of the fire.

Newt recently signed a personhood pledge that he would defend all innocent human life and the unalienable personhood of every American from conception until natural death. But Newt subsequently defended legislation that authorized killing a child if its father was a criminal (incest or rape). God is not moved to deliver us from liberalism while we compromise on His righteous, absolute, moral values.



**Why Is Newt  
Not 100%  
Pro-Life Yet?**

