Abortion-on-demand violates civil rights because chattel abortion is terminative reaction instead of affirmative action. Aborted infants in America suffer discrimination on the basis on age, sex, size, race, and handicap. Today’s abortion-rights arguments are parallel to nineteenth-century pro-slavery arguments. Former National Right to Life president J.C. Willke summarized legal and historical aspects of the pro-life abolition cause in a table comparing slavery and abortion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLAVERY</th>
<th>ABORTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dred Scott 1857, 7-2 Decision</td>
<td>Roe vs. Wade 1973, 7-2 Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black = Non-person</td>
<td>Unborn Child = Non-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black = Property of Owner</td>
<td>Unborn Child = Property of Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner May Choose to Buy-Sell-Kill</td>
<td>Mother May Choose to Keep or Kill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolitionists Should Not Impose Morality on Slave Owner</td>
<td>Pro-lifers Should Not Impose Morality on Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavery Is Legal</td>
<td>Abortion is Legal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many Southerners had argued that slavery was protected by the United States Constitution; now Roe vs. Wade proponents argue that abortion is protected by the Constitution. Pro-slavery politicians had insisted that privacy rights guaranteed the right to hold slaves; today Pro-Choice activists insist that the right-to-privacy includes the right to have an abortion without notification to parents, spouses, or others who have an interest in the well-being of the mother and her baby.

In his Kansas speech of 1856, Senator Alexander H. Stephens “defended slavery as a form of free choice;” now free choice is the appeal of those who defend abortion. Slave-holders said, “These slaves are my property; they’re not people.” Today, abortion advocates say, “It’s my body; it’s
not a baby.” But the logic of slavery failed, just as the logic of abortion is failing, and chattel abortion is doomed to extinction.

Defining the Abolition of Chattel Abortion

What is chattel abortion? The word “chattel” in legal usage generally means moveable personal property, such as money or goods. The entry for “chattel” in the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) includes a rhetorical usage of the term as “slaves or bondmen.”3 The reference list for this usage has a 1767 citation from Sir William Blackstone’s law lexicon as well as an 1850 citation from abolitionist Harriet Beecher Stowe’s novel Uncle Tom’s Cabin. Pro-life scholars can utilize another definition of “chattel,” a rhetorical usage meaning “aborted babies, or unborn victims of abortion.” This paper uses “chattel” to refer to an unborn child who is treated as a marketable commodity, an item of disposable property, a non-person, or a sub-human being.

Another way of expressing the term chattel abortion is abortion-on-demand. The OED defines that phrase as “abortion on request, irrespective of circumstances.”4 The reference list for the phrase includes a 1964 citation from an article entitled “The Demographic Significance of Legal Abortion in Eastern Europe” which states that “After the decree of June 3, 1956, had established the principle of abortion on demand, the number of legal abortions increased rapidly.”5 Millions more babies have been aborted since the 1956 decree in Hungary. Current events warrant an expanded definition of abortion-on-demand as 1) a violent death sentence, 2) a source of pollution, 3) a dangerous method of birth control, 4) a disempowering deviance, 5) a dismantling of family relations and marital intimacy, and 6) a business for profit, not unlike the slave trade in the nineteenth century.
1) Abortion-on-demand is a violent death sentence. It uses violent means to end the life of sentient individual human beings. It involves cruel and unthinkable punishment, worse than rape, torture, or execution. What could be more cruel than common abortion procedures: the tearing apart of the early fetus with the suction method, the slashing of the growing fetus with the D&C method, the poisoning of the midterm fetus with the skin-burning saline solution method, the head-collapsing brain-extraction of the near-term baby in the partial-birth D&X method, or the infanticide of the full-term child in the hysterotomy method? And what could be more unthinkable than leaving babies to die if they happen to survive late-term abortion procedures?

2) Abortion-on-demand is a source of pollution. It pollutes the earth with aborted children whose broken bodies are burned in incinerators, flushed down sewers, and illegally dumped in landfills or garbage bins. In 1986, a late-term abortionist named P. Scott Ricke was censured by Arizona’s medical board: “Ricke managed to get himself into virtually all the kinds of trouble abortionists get themselves into – facing allegations of abortion malpractice, sexual misconduct, substance abuse, sloppy record-keeping, letting unlicensed staff practice medicine, improper disposal of fetuses, and even obstetric malpractice.” In 1988, an employee at Dr. Ricke’s clinic left a bag of dismembered fetuses in a garbage dumpster at an apartment complex near my neighborhood in Tucson. This scandal prompted me to do research about the sale and disposal of fetal remains. I wrote letters to newspaper editors and politicians, but no one had any direct answers about the disposal of aborted fetuses.

In 1988, a flier appeared in our English department mailboxes at the University of Arizona in Tucson, advertising a pro-choice rally for abortion rights on April 7th. Participants were invited to march in white clothing, after which Carolyn Kizer, a Pulitzer-winning feminist
poet, would be the keynote speaker. The unsigned flier was distributed generally, as if everyone in the English department would agree with the pro-choice stance. I felt strongly impressed that another voice should be heard in the academic forum. I wrote a counter-memo on solar-lights yellow paper, inviting people to wear red, yellow, or blue on April 6\textsuperscript{th}, the day before the rally, as a memorial to aborted children. The reaction of my colleagues and associates to the pro-life flier was mixed. One person heartily agreed with me – a fellow graduate student from Ghana named Yusef. Yusef posted my memo in his office and announced the memorial for aborted children in his freshman composition classes. “In my culture,” he explained, “we believe that immoral acts and abortions pollute the body and spirit of the earth.” On April 6\textsuperscript{th}, 1988, Yusef wore a pure red T-shirt to school because in Ghana red is the color that people wear to mourn the dead.

3) Abortion-on-demand is a dangerous method of birth control. It is always risky: physically, emotionally, mentally, or spiritually. There is no such thing as a safe abortion. In April 1998, Lou Anne Herron was a victim of the unregulated abortion industry in Phoenix, Arizona. The A-Z Women’s Center did multiple ultrasounds because Herron appeared a little too far advanced for Arizona’s law prohibiting abortion after 24 weeks of gestation. After the abortion, Herron couldn’t feel her legs as she rested in the recovery room. When she asked “What’s wrong with me?” a clinic employee replied that nothing was wrong, but a pool of blood was steadily soaking the sheet beneath her.

Witnesses report that John Biskind, the abortionist, refused to check on the patient when informed, because he did not want to interrupt his lunch. He later left the clinic. As Herron’s condition worsened, facility administrator Carol Stuart-Schadoff would not call paramedics immediately. Instead, she called an affiliate twenty minutes away, even though Good Samaritan
hospital was right across the street.

When paramedics finally arrived, Herron was dead. Biskind had punctured her uterus, a frequent complication in late-term abortions. Another woman had died in the clinic in 1995 under similar circumstances, but Biskind’s license had not been revoked. As a result of these deaths and a botched partial-birth abortion in July, the clinic was shut down. In 2001, Biskind was sentenced to five years of prison for manslaughter plus over $12,000 of restitution, and Schadoff was sentenced to four years of probation plus restitution for negligent homicide in Herron’s death.  

4) Abortion-on-demand is a disempowering deviance. It disembowels female power. Chattel abortion diminishes the potential of women. It disables women because it mandates sterility instead of fertility, impotence instead of influence, futility instead of fruition, and desolation instead of fulfillment. The tragic travesty of trading life for death is not empowering for women or anyone else involved in its noxious pessimism. Its proponents claim to be advocates for women or evangelists for earth-friendly population control, yet these twisted pretexts include an allowance for gender selection, the abortion of a female child when a male baby is preferred. The misguided misogyny of China’s one-child policy has produced not only forced abortions and girl-baby infanticides but also a surplus of male offspring who will never marry, with corresponding social imbalances including sex-trade slavery. In Beed, India, the bodies of sex-selected aborted girl babies are being fed to dogs. In Houston, Texas, a Planned Parenthood counselor was only too willing to help an undercover investigator procure an abortion at fives months of pregnancy if an ultrasound revealed a girl child instead of a boy.
Abortion proponents often advocate feminist-friendly agendas, yet these twisted pretexts are a cover-up for abominations

5) Abortion-on-demand is a disastrous dismembering of family love. It dismantles family ties and denigrates family life. It prevents fathers of aborted children from taking responsibility for their sexual behavior. Population-control one-child-only abortions deprive individuals of sisters and brothers, aunts and uncles. So-called “reproductive freedom” is a licentious euphemism for unbridled immorality that uses the blood of unborn children to pay for its permissive promiscuity. It fosters fornication. It breaks down family trust and communication because unwed minors can get abortions without parental notification. It sets a pattern for abuse and family violence because it requires the brutal destruction of the youngest and weakest human beings. It is a mockery of the miracle of complementary DNA strands combining to make a complete new human being.\textsuperscript{12} It makes science an accomplice to discrimination against the disabled as genetic tests are used to kill babies with birth defects such as Down’s Syndrome.\textsuperscript{13} It is a mockery of marital intimacy. The dismemberment of aborted children undermines the bonds of love between couples because it is a grotesque antithesis of their sexual union.\textsuperscript{14}

6) Abortion-on-demand is a lucrative business that exploits women and children for financial gain. It furnishes specimens for eugenic medical experiments, harvesting vulnerable infants to make cures and cosmetics for privileged adults. In 1999, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a resolution (HR 350) urging an inquiry into the sale of fetal body parts harvested from abortions.\textsuperscript{15} The measure was prompted by a two-year investigation in Texas. An undercover investigator named “Kelly” posed as an organ harvester in an abortion clinic. When
assigned to dissect two 24-week old baby twins who were still alive, he refused. He left the room, and when he returned, the twins had been drowned in a bucket of sterile water.

Kelly’s investigation documented that 1) there is a market for the bodies and body parts of babies killed in abortions; 2) university researchers, government agencies, and pharmaceutical companies are buying the bodies of aborted babies from wholesalers; and 3) abortion clinics alter their procedures in order to obtain a marketable product for body-part wholesalers. Body parts from late-term babies who are still alive after abortion procedures are more lucrative because medical researchers prefer live tissue for their experiments.

The investigation further revealed that wholesalers bypass laws against the sale of human bodies by renting space in abortion clinics instead of paying for body parts directly. Purchase orders from abortion clinics such as Planned Parenthood indicate typical prices for fetal organs. Prices vary according to gestational age and the amount of damage from the abortion procedure: brains for $150-999; ears for $75; eyes for $75; spinal cords for $325; livers for $125-150; pituitary glands for $300; and limbs for $150.

Abortion proponents often advocate earth-friendly policies, yet these twisted pretexts are a cover-up for abominations. In 1995, news sources reported that certain clinics in China were providing aborted babies as food for human consumption. Recently a British man was arrested in Thailand for transporting six aborted babies that he planned to sell on the “black magic” market. South Korean customs agents recently seized thousands of aborted baby flesh pills made in China, being marketed as energy boosters, virility enhancers, and health supplements. A soft drink company has recently discontinued use of the HEK-293 fetus stem-cell line to test new flavors. The hideous possibility of abortion by-products in our food supply has not gone
unnoticed. In 2011, State Senator Ralph Shortey of Oklahoma worked to pass a bill that would prohibit “the manufacture or sale of any food in which aborted fetuses were used to develop any of the ingredients.”\textsuperscript{20} These current events seem to be a fulfillment of the human-flesh-as-food theme foreshadowed in the science fiction film “Soylant Green,” released in 1973 a few months after the Roe v. Wade decision.\textsuperscript{21}

Some “Green” advocates and activists now use arguments of environmental sustainability to justify abortion-on-demand and to encourage the funding of abortion providers. Environmental slogans that idealize world peace, green planet ethics, and social justice are antithetical to the realities of the abortion industry, a lucrative enterprise that entails inhumane violence, global pollution, and gross exploitation. No temporal call to environmental stewardship will succeed as long as the immoral pollution of promiscuity and abortion remain unchallenged by people of moral conscience and ethical consciousness.

**Biography of a Pro-Life Professor**

In January 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court legalized elective abortion in the Roe v. Wade decision, over-riding all previous state laws that had protected the sanctity of unborn life. Shortly thereafter, I worked in a booth at the Arizona State Fair, promoting a local community service organization for young adults. In the booth next to us, a pro-life group displayed full-color brochures depicting the violent consequences of common abortion procedures. I immediately became an advocate for unborn babies and an abolitionist against abortion-on-demand.

I was not alone in my abolitionist response to the emerging and expanding abortion industry. In 1976, at a meeting in the Tucson Institute of Religion, church leaders showed Latter-day Saint students a pro-life filmstrip, narrated by President Spencer W. Kimball.\textsuperscript{22} President
Kimball gave a loving but stern warning against the use of abortion to avoid the consequences of promiscuous sexual behavior:

   My dear young people, there are two very important things I need to say to you about abortion. First, abortion is wrong. Abortion is one of the most revolting and sinful practices in this day, when we are witnessing a frightening increase in permissiveness leading to sexual immorality. How could anyone submit to, encourage, or participate in any way in such an evil act? Second, to those who have so sinned, there may be a way back, not easy, but there may be a way. While forgiveness may be possible, the road back is long and difficult. Do not be deceived – wickedness never will lead to happiness. Some of God’s most sacred commandments are violated when a person trifles or interferes with any of the processes of reproduction. (“Very Much Alive,” 1976)

President Kimball spoke eloquently about the future of those who are physically handicapped or mentally disabled, proclaiming that in the resurrection there will be no blindness, no deafness, no birth defects. He pleaded with us to remember the worth of unborn souls in the Lord’s plan of salvation.

Ten years later, I returned to the University of Arizona and began graduate studies in an English Composition doctoral program. I became involved in the pro-life movement after reading a prize-winning essay by an undergraduate student about the hypocrisy of using human fetal tissue for medical research. The essay’s arguments were strong enough to persuade a pro-choice woman in our composition pedagogy class to reconsider her position.

I became involved in pro-life advocacy again after I was hired as an Assistant Professor of English at Brigham Young University in the fall semester of 1991. In opposition to university
and church standards, some professors were promoting a pro-choice agenda through public media outlets, professional academic organizations, and a student club for feminists. When I attended the annual meeting of the Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association, a feminist professor from BYU and some members of the RMMLA Women’s Caucus were distributing flyers to organize pro-choice protests against the State of Utah. They were outraged because, after the 1989 Webster Decision, the Utah state legislature had dared to pass some abortion restrictions prepared by BYU Law School associates Lynn Wardle, Camille Williams, Richard Wilkins, and Mary Ann Wood.

Believing that it is important to present multiple points of view in an academic forum, I acted as I had done at the University of Arizona in Tucson. I wrote and mailed a counter-flyer on solar-lights yellow paper, inviting RMMLA members to wear primary colors as a memorial to aborted children at the upcoming RMMLA conference at Weber State University, in Ogden, Utah. A few colleagues were offended; a few expressed gratitude; others thanked me for presenting an alternative point of view, whether they agreed with me or not.

Call to Abolition

There is no excuse for non-therapeutic elective birth-control chattel abortion. Legal arguments, philosophy proofs, and political slogans cannot justify the extermination of unborn human beings any more than such language could justify the practice of chattel slavery. We as pro-life professors and legal professionals must continue to speak up on behalf of the littlest children, just as abolitionists such as Harriet Beecher Stowe spoke up on behalf of subjugated slaves in nineteenth-century New England.

For the pro-life cause in our generation, Mother Teresa was a champion whose ministry
included advocacy for the “poorest of the poor” and the “least” among us, the littlest children of God. Columnist Cal Thomas of the L.A. Times described her moral courage when she spoke at the National Prayer Breakfast on February 3, 1994. Without apology to the pro-choice President and Vice President, Mother Teresa condemned the violence of elective abortion and invited the United States to send unwanted children to her for adoption. Here are a few pro-life statements from a compilation of Mother Teresa quotations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Please don’t kill the child. I want the child. I am willing to accept any child who would be aborted and give him or her to a married couple who will love the child and be loved by the child. At our children’s home in Calcutta alone, we have saved over 3,000 children from abortion. These children have brought such love and joy to their adoptive parents and have grown up so full of love and joy.”</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“For me, life is the most beautiful gift of God to mankind, therefore people and nations who destroy life by abortion and euthanasia are the poorest. I do not say legal or illegal, but I think that no human hand should be raised to kill life, since life is God’s life in us, even in an unborn child.”</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Every child has been created for greater things, to love and be loved, in the image of God. That’s why people must decide from beforehand if they really want to have a child. Once a child is conceived, there is life, God’s life. That child has a right to live and be cared for. Abortion destroys two lives, the life of the child and the conscience of the mother. It is a child of God, no? Created for greater things, just like you or me.”</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“How can we stress respect for life – from the womb to those who are dying on the streets? We must realize the greatness of life. Every child is a gift from God. I think it is important to realize that we have been created for greater things – to love and be loved. When we destroy love, then who will be there for us? Every single person, young and old, must realize this. When we realize this, then we will be able to share that love. We will be able to accept each other. We will be really free and able for Jesus.” (204)

“I am sure that all people know deep down inside that the little child in the mother’s womb is a human being from the moment of conception, created in the image of God to love and to be loved. Let us pray that nobody will be afraid to protect that little child, to help that little child to be born. Jesus said: ‘If you receive a little child in my name, you receive me.’” (169)

Who will join Mother Teresa, church leaders, and others who have peacefully spoken out to help and protect the littlest children? What does it mean to abolish chattel abortion? According to the OED, an abolitionist is a “person who advocates the abolition of the slave trade and the emancipation of African slaves.” I would add that an abolitionist is a person who advocates the abolition of the abortion trade and upholds the sanctity of unborn human life.

Twenty-first century abolitionists endeavor to destroy the abortion industry by legal means and to stop public funding of the abortion industry. In China abolitionists such as the blind legal activist Chen Guangcheng are exercising their conscience at great cost. Abortion opponent Chai Ling champions the worth and life of unborn women in China through her
organization “All Girls Allowed.” Their efforts may not be rewarded with international peace prizes, but they will see the fruits of their sacrifices in the faces of the babies they have saved.

There are many reasons why doctors, scholars, and faculty members of conscience should be pro-life professors and why all conscientious citizens should work together in peaceful ways to abolish chattel abortion. Dr. James H. Humber’s clear expression of the abortion abolition argument is useful for understanding the high stakes of the pro-life cause:

When African blacks were enslaved and American Indians exterminated, for example, the justifications given for these actions were twofold: either these beings were said to be not fully human (savages), or they were held to be of little worth (uncivilized beings whose rights were able to be ‘superseded’ whenever they came into conflict with our ‘more enlightened and worthy’ desires). If Americans found this kind of reasoning appealing, however, it was only because they could not identify with the life styles of the beings in questions. And when this lack of identification was coupled with a desire to exploit, the morality of slavery and Indian killing was assured. Today, the same kind of thing appears to be happening in the minds of abortion advocates. Of course, there is a difference in that those who defend abortion desire to help rather than to exploit some group. Still, the fact that these people operate from praiseworthy motives does nothing to guarantee the morality of their conclusions. And insofar as proponents of abortion allow their inability to sympathize with a prenatal human being support their desire to kill it. They are just as mistaken in their reasoning as were those who earlier argued for slavery or Indian killing.”
Humber may be giving too much credit to the motives of abortion rights proponents. The lucrative business of exploiting women and the sale of aborted baby body parts for medical research and health/potency pills is not a motive worthy of praise.

In spite of the risks of life, birth is empowerment. We must continue to protect the lives of unborn children and work to outlaw abortion except in cases of emergency. Like those in 19th century New England who worked together to abolish chattel slavery, we must work together for the abolition of chattel abortion.

One of the last orders that George W. Bush signed as President of the United States was the January 2009 National Sanctity of Human Life Day Proclamation. His pro-life record includes the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, the ban on partial-birth abortion, the Unborn Victims of Violence Act, and the blocking of Federal funding for overseas “family planning” abortion programs.

One of the first orders that Barak H. Obama signed as President in 2009 was a reversal of the ban on taxpayer-funded international abortions. His administration also had plans to expand the power to kill innocent lives via the Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA). We cannot print enough worthless monopoly money to solve our national and global economic crisis, but we still have plenty of hard cash in the budget for killing babies at home and abroad?

On the 36th anniversary of Roe v. Wade in 2009, Dr. Alveda King, niece of Martin Luther King, challenged Mr. Obama to include unborn children in his vision of life, liberty, and justice for all. Maybe President Obama will be strong enough to abolish chattel abortion, just as President Lincoln abolished chattel slavery. If not, someday a great President will end the lucrative business of elective abortion. Someday the record will show who really cared about
human rights. Someday, the misguided pro-choice rhetoric will end, and the pro-life record will stand. Hope is here now, not just on the horizon.

Those who care about social justice and racial equality will want to study the statistics for Black Americans and abortion: 31

- A Black unborn baby is 43% more likely to be aborted than is a white baby.
- For every 3 Black babies born, 2 are aborted.
- The number of Black unborn babies dying from abortion in 1983 corresponds to 2% of the total Black population.
- Although Blacks constitute only 12% of the total population, they have 25% of all abortions in [the] U.S.

Drs. Alveda King and La Verne Tolbert have published Life at All Costs, a 2012 anthology of essays by Black pro-life leaders. The online book notice at Xlibris includes a mission statement for the National Black Pro-Life Coalition:

[NBPC] is a network of prolife and pro-family organizations committed to ending abortion by restoring life, family and hope. We promote traditional family values from a biblical worldview with the goal of sustaining healthy family units consisting of both a mother and father. With this model, children are properly nurtured to reach their full potential. Through community events, educational sessions, workshops, conferences, awareness media campaigns, non-violent political action, lobbying and coalition building of prolife and pro-family advocacy groups, we challenge the status quo. Every coalition effort cultivates a collective commitment to principles that uphold the constitutional values of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. 32

The NBPC has also launched a billboard campaign to increase public awareness of the problem of race-based abortion. 33 The pro-life Black coalition’s defense of “liberty and justice for all”
challenges the amoral euphemism of “reproductive justice” now being promulgated by liberal Progressives.

Journalists with great moral courage, such as the Live Action team, are beginning to expose the practices and profits of the elective abortion industry. The taboo on reporting prenatal violence is being lifted by men and women of conscience, who know that the blood of the littlest human beings should not be used to pay for the unprincipled behavior of adults who refuse to take responsibility for the consequences of sexual activity.

Legal experts in legislative organizations, such as Americans United for Life (AUL), continue a patient and methodical quest for the personhood of unborn children and the dignity of womanhood. Academic organizations, such as University Faculty for Life (UFL) persistently uphold the sanctity of life for all of God’s children. The violence of abortion methods is becoming as abhorrent as any other assault or physical abuse. The paradox of those who oppose the death penalty but promote abortion is ending. Peacemakers and pacifists are starting to oppose elective abortion as they realize that more human beings have died in abortion clinics than in all of the modern military wars combined.

Elective abortion, the ultimate example of reverse age discrimination, will become unthinkable. In the nineteenth century, those who said that women were not legal persons could not prevail. Those who said that slaves were not legal persons had to fail. Someday soon the tiny human beings who are not yet born will have protection as legal persons. Medical and technological advances will continue to roll back the frontiers of inner space in defining the genesis of human life. Ultrasound portraits of unborn children will be more eloquent than the most self-indulgent right-to-choose, right-to-kill, right-to-privacy slogans.
Great poets will memorialize the grisly piles of fetal bodies incinerated daily in the land of the free. Some writers have already been grieving for the broken lives of unwed mothers and undone mothers-not-to-be in the land of the brave. When future generations look back on the decades of slaughtered innocents, when they recoil at the hypocrisy of polite exterminations, when they rebuke publicly-funded genocide, when they condemn the press for its cowardly cover-up, when they wonder why nobody said anything, they will find “my poor name” in the rubble of lost libraries, as one who said “To waste the flower of our love and to kill the fruit of our loins is wrong.”

The first family on earth consisted of Adam and his helpmeet Eve. Even before they were able to generate children as mortal beings, Adam and Eve were aware of the sanctity of life and of motherhood: “And Adam called his wife’s name Eve; because she was the mother of all living” (Genesis 3:20). The Hebrew name for Eve (chavvâh) has the same root as the Hebrew word for life, living, and revival (chyh). Adam was Pro-life. Eve was Pro-life. We are the sons and daughters of Life. From the biological covenant of new life and the consequent social covenant of new families comes the need for connection to all those families that preceded us.

---