

# Born to Win

## Life and Light

by: Ronald L. Dart

There was a time when I thought the anti-abortion people were just a little too cute in calling themselves “pro-life”. I don’t think that any longer. I’ve come to the conclusion that it was precisely the right term to use. At least it’s the right term for Christians to use because the real issue is much bigger than abortion (if that’s possible).

To some degree the issue is clouded by the terminology. For example, “choice” is not the opposite of “life”, as in “pro-choice” versus “pro-life”. The opposite of life...is death. There’s a passage where God tell Moses to pass on the Israel a statement about this. You’ll find it in Deuteronomy 30.

<sup>19</sup> This day I call the heavens and the earth as witnesses against you that I have set before you life and death, blessings and curses. Now choose life, so that you and your children may live

I think that it’s important that the words “and your children” were included here because it’s always the children who suffer first. So this choice of life has first to do with children.

You know, I think it may turn out that Roe v. Wade was only the opening salvo in a much bigger war. Now there’s an absurdity begging to be noticed in the expression “pro-choice” and let me see if I can clarify the issue before we go on. The one side of the abortion debate wants the choice of life or death to belong to the woman carrying the child. This lies very close to the position of the people who are opposed to abortion on moral grounds but don’t want the State intruding into the decision. “Let’s keep the government out of the homes, out of the bedrooms, and out of the hospitals.”

Now there’s a part of me that likes that proposal. But the problem is, it’s not an all or nothing proposition with the State. For example, suppose you decide to leave your kids (say they’re 10 and 11). You leave them at home alone, in bed; they’re already asleep, while you go to a night club. You have made a choice. Now suppose the kids come to mischief. Either of their own making or of somebody else’s making because you went off and left them. The State will hold you strictly accountable for child neglect, child abandonment, and a whole range of criminal penalties. There was one pair of parent who got in a lot of trouble (I don’t remember the outcome to it) because they went off on vacation and left their kids home alone.

Suppose you decide not to feed your kids, to pen them up like animals and starve them. Now that would never happen would it? Oh, yeah. It has happened. Will the State hold you accountable if it finds out? Of course, it will! And it should.

All right, now let's come back to our question. Why is a child one week before birth less worthy of the state's protection than another child one week after birth? The only difference between them is that the one is not breathing on his own yet and the other is. Are there any other differences between them? I think you'd have to really do a medical type of examination to even tell the difference between them.

Why is it that parents are free to *choose* to dispose of inconvenient kids? I was talking to a pro-choice lady. A very dedicated, Christian, pro-choice lady, and I asked the question, "Do you believe that a mother and her doctor should have the right to terminate the life of a child that has been born if that child is in a wretched state? In other words: the child has actually been born, it's breathing on its own, it's in the hospital, and they're taking care of it. Should they have the right to make a decision to kill that child in the first... say... 48 hours of its life?" She, much to my shock and surprise, said... nothing. She refused to answer the question. She changed the subject, and I had fully expected her to say, "No." This would have given me the chance to go back and say, "Well, what's the difference between this child and one who hasn't quite been born yet or one that's going to be born tomorrow? Are we going to kill it today?"

Now what business does the State have in forcing parents to care for kids? Well, somebody has to see to it that kids are taken care of, and that's one of the responsibilities of the State. Now, what started me thinking down this line was an article a friend sent me. It was last December, when syndicated columnist Mark Steyn had the birth of Jesus on his mind. He wrote:

The birth of a child. On the one hand, what could be more powerless than a newborn babe? On the other, without a newborn babe, man is ultimately powerless. For, without new life, there can be no civilization, no society, no nothing. Even if it's superstitious mumbo-jumbo, the decision to root Christ's divinity in the miracle of His birth expresses a profound — and rational — truth about "eternal life" here on earth.

Now this is a profound observation. Without a newborn babe, without new life, he says, there can be "*nothing*". For a long time now, Mark Steyn has been pointing out the aging of the European population. And in this article he went on to say this:

[H]ere's something new that took hold in the year 2007: a radical anti-humanism, long present just below the surface, bobbed up and became explicit and respectable. In Britain, the Optimum Population Trust said that "the biggest cause of climate change is climate changers — in other words, human beings," and Professor John Guillebaud called on Britons to voluntarily reduce the number of children they have.

Now, if you think that's a little odd, last week, in the *Medical Journal of Australia*, a professor named Barry Walters went further than that. I'm quoting Mark Steyn here, he says:

To hell with this wimp-o pantywaist "voluntary" child-reduction. Professor Walters wants a "carbon tax" on babies, with, conversely, "carbon credits" for those who undergo sterilization procedures. So that'd be great news for the female eco-activists recently profiled in London's *Daily Mail* boasting about how they'd had their tubes tied and babies aborted in order to save the planet.

Killing babies. Tying tubes. No babies being born. Why? To save the planet.

“Every person who is born,” says Toni Vernelli, “produces more rubbish, more pollution, more greenhouse gases, and adds to the problem of overpopulation.” We are the pollution, and sterilization is the solution. The best way to bequeath a more sustainable environment to our children is not to have any.

That last bit is Mark Steyn’s summary, but it’s ultimately valid as the summary of the argument. The best way to bequeath a more sustainable environment to our children is not to have any children. He went one with a lot more about this, he said Oxford University Press has published a book by Professor David Benatar of the University of Cape Town called, “*Better Never to Have Been: The Harm of Coming Into Existence*”

Now that can almost leave you speechless. What’s the point of existence, what’s the point of a planet if there’s no one living on it?

The author “argues for the ‘anti-natal’ view—that it is always wrong to have children... Anti-natalism also implies that it would be better if humanity became extinct.” As does Alan Weisman’s *The World Without Us* — which *Publishers Weekly* hails as “an enthralling tour of the world... anticipating, often poetically, what a planet without us would be like.” It’s a good thing it “anticipates” it poetically, because, once it happens, there will be no more poetry.

Lest you think the above are “extremists,” consider how deeply invested the “mainstream” is in a total fiction. At the recent climate jamboree in Bali, the Reverend Al Gore told the assembled faithful: “My own country the United States is principally responsible for obstructing progress here.” Really? “*The American Thinker*” website ran the numbers. In the seven years between the signing of Kyoto [You know about the Kyoto treaty that we’ve heard so much about in political news.] in 1997 and 2004, here’s what happened:

- Emissions worldwide increased 18.0%.
- Emissions from countries that signed the treaty increased 21.1%.
- Emissions from non-signers increased 10.0%.
- Emissions from the U.S. increased 6.6%.

Now, Mark Steyn comes to an interesting conclusion on this. He says:

It’s hard not to conclude a form of mental illness has gripped the world’s elites. If you’re one of that dwindling band of westerners who’ll be celebrating the birth of a child, “homeless” or otherwise, next week, make the most of it. A year or two on, and the eco-professors will propose banning nativity scenes because they set a bad example.

So, are we dealing with a mental illness here...or something else. A West Australian medical

expert (in fact, the one that Mark Steyn quoted) wants families to pay a \$5000+ “baby levy” at birth and an annual carbon tax of up to \$800 per child. Now you do realize that if you have two kids, to get them up and out of your home is going to cost you something like \$25,000.

Writing in the *Medical Journal of Australia*, associate professor Barry Walters said that every couple with more than two children should be taxed to pay for enough trees to offset the carbon emissions generated by each child over their lifetime. Actually, the Australian Family Association spokeswoman Angela Conway says, “I think self-important professors with silly ideas should have to pay carbon tax for all the hot air they create.” And that was about the best word on this that I’ve found.

All this stuff goes way beyond *Roe v. Wade* and abortion. The opposite of pro-life is indeed anti-life, as strange...as insane as that idea may seem. Where is all this coming from? Is it, as Mark Steyn suggests, a form of mental illness that has gripped the world’s elite? Or is it the bitter fruits of education? As children are taken from the home and brought up in a godless school system? Is society becoming not merely secular, but anti-Christian, anti-Judaism, anti-life? In fact, I think “secular” may not be the right term for this at all.

“Secular” means not religious, sacred, or spiritual. It is a neutral idea. But this isn’t neutral. “Secular” doesn’t go far enough, because the spirit at work in the world is anti-religious. No, no it’s not anti-religious, it’s anti-Christian. And as I wrote those notes on this page, I said to myself, “What am I saying? Am I talking about the Antichrist?”

The only author in the Bible who talks about “antichrist” is John. No one else ever mentions it, but John is profoundly concerned about it. He wrote in his first epistle, 1 John 4:

<sup>1</sup> Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.

Now here is how we know the spirit of God.

<sup>2</sup> Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God:

<sup>3</sup> and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

Now what John was seeing in his day was very different than what we’re seeing today, and yet the spirit behind it appears to be the same. Jesus, you know, came into this world as a babe, alive, breathing, crying, sucking at his mother’s breast, and totally vulnerable. And the spirit of antichrist in the person of one King Herod killed all the babies around Bethlehem, trying to destroy the Christ-child. When you think about it, it should come as no surprise that the spirit of *anti-Christ* would be *anti-life*. And we know that this spirit has been at work from the start. Paul wrote to the Ephesians:

**Ephesians 2**

- <sup>1</sup> As for you, you were dead in your transgressions and sins,
- <sup>2</sup> in which you used to live when you followed the ways of this world and of the ruler of the kingdom of the air, the spirit who is now at work in those who are disobedient.

It's John who introduces us the the idea of antichrist. It is John who produces the most articulate explanation of the issues of life and of death, but it was Paul who spoke of a spirit that was "at work" in the world. John wrote:

### **John 1**

- <sup>1</sup> In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.
- <sup>2</sup> The same was in the beginning with God.
- <sup>3</sup> All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.
- <sup>4</sup> In him was life; and the life was the light of men.
- <sup>5</sup> And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.

Now, Hebrew thought seems to like parallel structures, especially in poetry, and John seems to have been something of a poet. Two opposites are placed in parallel in this short section. They are "life" and "death"; "light" and "darkness". Thus John equates "life" and "light" on the one hand and "darkness" and "death" on the other. Now, you could easily miss this combination if you aren't paying attention as you read through the Bible, particularly the New Testament, with its allusions to light and darkness, life and death; realizing that, again and again, they're talking about the same thing. And there's a singular passage in John. It's the mantra of all Christian people, it seems. That one to which we all turn. It is the night when a man named Nicodemus came to see Jesus. And in this passage, Jesus presents this theme that John speaks of so often.

### **John 3**

- <sup>16</sup> For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.
- <sup>17</sup> For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.
- <sup>18</sup> He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

Then in verse 19 (where sometimes people don't read quite this far):

- <sup>19</sup> And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.
- <sup>20</sup> For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd.
- <sup>21</sup> But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.

Light equals life and *vice versa* in John's world. The verdict is that life and light came into the world and men preferred darkness and death to it. In 1 John 1:

<sup>1</sup> That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life;  
<sup>2</sup> (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;)

The light appeared in the person of Jesus and from that time forward the spirit of the adversary has tried to stamp it out. Trying to kill the baby Jesus, but also opposed to life of every kind. Trying to get rid of it; trying to put it away. Why? Well, John will go on. Remember, he uses life and light as synonyms.

### **1 John 1**

<sup>5</sup> This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.

He might as well have said that God is life and in him is no death.

It's a hard transition to make, in a way, in your mind. But it's something we have to grapple with. This is the verdict, said John. That light has come into the world but men loved darkness instead of light. Why? Because their deeds were evil. And life has come into the world, and it seems, as you look around, that they love death better than life. Or that the desire to preserve life, to protect life, to promote life, seems to just be disappearing from among us.

I couldn't help wondering a little bit, when Hillary Clinton proposed a \$5,000 bond for every new child born into this world. I thought, "You know, that's really not a bad idea." Because our population has been declining and you don't have to spend \$5,000 to get a \$5,000 bond. That's a bond that matures in 20 years, a zero-coupon thing. So, I don't know how much that would cost, but it would not be all that bad. And it would really give some encouragement to people to have children. Our population is going into decline, it seems. I couldn't help wondering, why did she drop that so fast? She dropped it before anybody on the Republican side could even object to it. I think it got dropped because people on her own side of the aisle objected to it. It runs contrary to the idea that we must control population and keep the number of people in this world down.

I've found it really interesting, reading Luke's Gospel, the prophecy of John the Baptist, where Luke says:

### **Luke 1**

<sup>78</sup> [...] through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us,  
<sup>79</sup> to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.

So once again, the connection between darkness and death, light and life is drawn for us. And, in

fact, it is a powerful thing all the way through the New Testament.

## **Luke 2**

*KJV*

<sup>25</sup> And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel: and the Holy Ghost was upon him.

<sup>26</sup> And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ.

<sup>27</sup> And he came by the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law,

<sup>28</sup> then took he him up in his arms, and blessed God, and said,

<sup>29</sup> Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word:

<sup>30</sup> for mine eyes have seen thy salvation,

<sup>31</sup> which thou hast prepared before the face of all people;

<sup>32</sup> a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.

So, consequently, he also equates those people who are delivered from sitting in the shadow of death and the darkness who now have life in Christ. Men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil.

John goes on in another place, chapter 5:21.

<sup>21</sup> For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.

Jesus: for us, the source of life. Later in John 11, just before he raised Lazarus from the dead, he said:

<sup>25</sup> [...] I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live:

<sup>26</sup> and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die[.]

Paul, writing to the Colossians, said:

## **Colossians 3**

<sup>4</sup> When Christ, who is your life, appears, then you also will appear with him in glory.

<sup>5</sup> Put to death, therefore, whatever belongs to your earthly nature: sexual immorality, impurity, lust, evil desires and greed[.]

And so it is that we find the spirit of antichrist in our world today at war with life. And it is that spirit that Mark Steyn calls "a kind of mental illness." It's worse than that. It's demonic. The

spirit that Mark Steyn sees is obsessed with death and destruction. It sees the end of humankind and is willing to see it happen if it will preserve the Earth. And you think, “Why on Earth would that be the case?” This whole thing has an insanity about it. “Don’t bring any more children into the world. Let’s all die off because it would be better for the planet.”

It’s odd, in a strange way, that this Earth was the domain of one called Lucifer before he fell. Humankind is God’s answer to his fall. I suppose we should not be surprised that he wants us all dead, and his planet preserved. But he knows, and now we know, that this planet also will die when the Solar System dies. Small wonder that he’s a little bit crazy, and the source of that “mental illness” that Mark Steyn saw and lamented.

In the end, we will win...if we don’t give up on life and light.

*Christian Educational Ministries*  
P.O. Box 560 ❖ Whitehouse, Texas 75791  
Phone: 1-888-BIBLE-44 ❖ Fax: (903) 839-9311  
❖ [www.borntowin.net](http://www.borntowin.net) ❖