

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Calvary Baptist Theological Journal* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_cbtj.php

A Biblical View of Artificial Insemination

LARRY R THORNTON ThD
Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary

Artificial insemination is becoming a popular subject and practice in America. The purpose of this study is to set forth information about artificial insemination and biblical guidelines for it so that Christians might know what to believe about it and how to counsel regarding it.

It is important for a Christian to understand the social problems relating to and caused by artificial insemination. Such problems include marital problems as well as legal problems. A Christian must also consider the biblical answers for the ethical issues. The biblical answers regarding the ethical questions raised by artificial insemination include considering the biblical view of stewardship, of parenthood, of sexual relations, of honesty and of living by faith.

Two Types of Artificial Insemination

Artificial insemination is the medical answer to one of marriage's most painful problems—infertility. Martha Stout writes:

Fifteen percent of the American population of child-bearing age—one couple in seven—experience an infertility problem. This percentage, which continues to climb, translates into 10,000,000 people in the United States alone. Contrary to the popular belief that infertility is primarily a female problem, there's a male problem in 35 percent of infertility cases; in 35 percent, there is a female problem; and in the remaining 30 percent, there is a combination ("Infertility" pp 59, 105).

Infertility may be caused by congenital deformity of the genital organs, accidents, diseases, lack of density or motility of the husband's sperm and psychological causes leading to impotence, premature ejaculation or failure to ejaculate in spite of normal relations. Barrenness has been removed by artificial insemination which is the fertilization of the egg of the female by means other than intercourse.

There are two types of artificial insemination: artificial insemination by husband (AIH) which is sometimes called homologous insemination and artificial insemination by donor (AID) which is referred to as "semi-adoption," therapeutic insemination or heterologous insemination (*The Ethics of Sex*, Thielicke, pp 248-249). AIH and AID will be used hereafter.

AIH consists of collecting the husband's sperm and injecting it into his wife. AID consists of the doctor usually taking a sperm donation from an undergraduate or medical student who has physical characteristics like the husband's and injecting it into the woman. AIH has less controversy surrounding it because it does not destroy the personal and sexual aspects of the marriage.

Artificial reproduction goes back at least to the fourteenth century; however, the first recorded experiment was made in 1784 by the Italian scientist, Spallanzani, who witnessed the birth of three puppies sixty-two days after he had injected seminal fluid from a dog of the same breed into a female dog (*A Marriage Manual*, Stone and Stone, p 177). The first artificial insemination with humans was done in 1785 in London by Dr John Hunter.

Today in the United States of America there are an estimated 200,000 people because of artificial insemination and 20,000 births a year because of it ("Artificial Insemination" Hefley, p 22). Gish and Wilson point out, "Some 10 years ago a poll showed that only about 3% of Americans had even heard of artificial insemination. The facts now are that approximately 1% of all children born in the United States are the result of it" (*Manipulating Life*, p 141).

The popularity of artificial insemination may be seen from the following facts from Hefley's article: (1) The Shelton Clinic near Los Angeles has been serving women in this way for almost 40 years. The Tyler Clinic in Westwood, California has been utilizing a sperm bank for a quarter of a century. (2) In 1960 Dr Winifred Finegold in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania was doing about two AID's a day. By 1970 he was doing ten a day ("Artificial Insemination" p 23).

This article endeavors to summarize the reasons for deciding on artificial insemination, religious opinions about it, social problems caused by it, and biblical answers for the ethical issues.

Reasons for Deciding on Artificial Insemination

The reasons for deciding on artificial insemination are many and varied. One of the greatest reasons today is the scarcity of children to adopt because of abortion and more unwed mothers who are keeping their children.

A second reason is the physical or psychological problems of either mate. The husband may have a low sperm count, be unable to have normal sex relations, be infertile because of birth, disease or accident, or carry a genetic disease which should not be passed on to a descendent. The wife may have obstructions at the entrance of the vagina or the cervix which make it impossible for the sperm to enter the uterus (*A Marriage Manual*, Stone and Stone, p 179).

Thirdly, it is because of the man's vasectomy or prostate surgery.

A fourth reason for deciding on artificial insemination is the number of single women who are deciding to become mothers before menopause. J Kerby Anderson declares, "About 9 percent of those seeking AID in this country are single women" (*Genetic Engineering*, p 32).

Several other reasons were discovered by the Wistar Institute in a follow-up study of thirty-eight couples who had children by means of AID:

(1) the wife's urgent desire to experience pregnancy, (2) dissatisfaction with adoption agencies, (3) benefits it is thought the child will derive from maternal heredity even though paternal heredity will not be from his "father," (4) the belief that they will have a closer relationship with the infant than would be possible in adoption, and (5) the desire to conceal infertility (*Successful Marriage*, Landis and Landis, p 47).

Religious Opinions

There exists a confusing diversity of opinion with respect to artificial insemination among religious groups, schools and leaders.

The position of the Roman Catholic Church was declared to the world in 1957 by Pope Pius XII who viewed the "conjugal act as having a natural and God-given design that joins the love-giving dimension with the life-giving dimension. On this basis he excluded both contraception and artificial insemination, and, a fortiori, in vitro fertilization and embryo transfer" ("The Ethics" Nelson, p 22). Roman Catholic moral theologians permit "imperfect artificial insemination" which is the use of a syringe to introduce the semen as far as possible into the uterine canal by the couple themselves (*Dictionary*, Preston, p 17). All other forms of artificial insemination (AIH and AID) have been condemned because of masturbation and other reasons. However, Father Francis F Filas, S J, chairman of the Department of Theology at Loyola University, declares that Catholic authorities are considering that stimulation of a husband to provide semen for his wife may not be wrong because it is for a worthy purpose ("Artificial Insemination" Hefley, p 23).

Jewish leaders differ on this. Rabbi David Graubert, director of the Bet Din ecclesiastical court for Conservative Judaism in the Midwest is more concerned about the commitment of the husband and wife to one another and to the child than about AID ("Artificial Insemination" Hefley, p 64).

Protestants are also divided on the issue of artificial

insemination. James Hefley writes that the Lutheran Church of America in May, 1970, concluded that "the decision rests with the persons who are involved." Eight years earlier the United Presbyterian Church approved sperm donation ("Artificial Insemination" p 64).

Joseph Fletcher, professor emeritus of Episcopal Theological School (affiliated with Harvard University), holds that artificial methods of reproduction are inherently superior. He argues that "artificial" technology is in fact "natural" for if it was "against nature" the technology simply would not work. He sees no reason to leave man's destiny to "blind chance" ("The Ethics" Nelson, p 22). Charles R Smith, a Grace Brethren professor at Grace Theological Seminary asserts, "The use of the husband's sperm in this process does not raise any serious ethical considerations" ("The Manipulation" p 5).

Jay E Adams, an evangelical Presbyterian who is a popular Christian writer and visiting lecturer at Westminster Theological Seminary of Philadelphia, rejects artificial insemination because of masturbation (he calls it sin), the possibility of artificial insemination being adultery, the great temptation put to those involved and the doubts regarding the rightness of the process (*Matters of Concern*, pp 3-4). Yet, John Bettler also a professor at Westminster Seminary and the director of the Christian Counseling and Educational Foundation in Philadelphia teaches that AIH is acceptable and AID must nearly always be rejected (99 44/100% of the time) ("Lecture notes" pp 14-19).

Another seminary professor, Norman L Geisler, who teaches at Dallas Theological Seminary and was formerly at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, concludes,

Hence, artificial insemination by mutual consent of married couples does not appear to be a moral evil. Indeed, it could in some cases be a great good. Whatever one can do to promote and preserve complete and whole human personhood should be done even if it sometimes involves abortion or artificial insemination. On the other hand, when either of these violate personal consent and/or the intrinsic value of personhood, it will be wrong (*Ethics*, pp 229-231).

Baptists are not unified in their position on artificial insemination. Commenting on AID which is fully understood and consented to by the couple involved is Dr Wallace Denton, director of the Marriage Counseling Center at Purdue University and a former member of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention: "I don't see any moral dimensions to it at all. It depends on the personal preference of the couple" ("Artificial Insemination" Hefley, p 64). V Elving Anderson, Director of the

Dight Institute for Human Genetics of the University of Minnesota and a Baptist General Conference layman writes,

Artificial insemination using donor sperm is now used in families where the husband is infertile or carries harmful genes that would affect children. It is sometimes objected that this constitutes adultery, but this argument cannot be defended from the Bible. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus stresses the idea that lustful desire is the essential point of adultery. Furthermore, the Levirate law of marriage (in which a near kinsman of a deceased man is obligated to father an heir for the widow) is in essence a provision for donor insemination ("The Control" p 100).

In contrast to these Baptists, E Robert Jordan, the pastor of Calvary Baptist Church of Lansdale, Pennsylvania and the president of Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary (independent Baptist) finds no fault with AIH but declares AID to be adultery. He warns of the possibility of incest in ignorance by some children of the same donor and of the legal complications ("Artificial Insemination" p 1). So the Baptists along with the Protestants, Jews and Catholics have various opinions concerning artificial insemination.

Social Problems

No social problems seem to be caused by AIH. The use of AID has and will lead to a number of serious social problems. Among the social problems caused by AID are marital problems, children who are born into single-parent relationships, human eugenic programs, doctors who are not thoroughly trained in ethics, incest in ignorance, legal problems and the need for laws, and surrogate mothering and test-tube babies.

Marital problems. Many husbands view the need to resort to AID as a blow to their manhood. It can develop into feelings of failure and inferiority within the marriage. Thieliicke writes, "Even though it need not be so, the possibility is nevertheless there that the father may react in an emotionally hostile way to a child which to him appears to be a constant reminder of his own weakness (*The Ethics of Sex*, p 262).

The man may feel that he is living a lie when he accepts congratulations on his wife's pregnancy. Because the procedure is kept secret, there is an illicit aura about it and it reinforces feelings

*Parents may feel they are living a lie,
bearing feelings of guilt and fear.*

of guilt. Even the AID mother may struggle with feelings of guilt and fear because of efforts to conceal the fact to friends, relatives and the child (*Genetic Engineering*, J Kerby Anderson, p 33). Perhaps for these reasons, few couples ever repeat an AID birth ("Would You Pay" B L Anderson, p 50).

Although there have been divorces among couples resorting to AID, it is much lower than the national average. Dr SJ Behrman of the University of Michigan Center for Research in Reproductive Biology says that he has never received a negative letter from AID recipients. He knows of only one divorce among 600 AID couples ("Artificial Insemination" Hefley, p 23). Studies by Dr Sheldon Payne of AID couples over a 30-year period show only about 10 percent having been divorced, in comparison to a rate of over 50 percent among all California couples ("Artificial Insemination" Hefley, p 23). This low divorce rate among AID couples may be attributed to the maturity of the couples who have thought out the procedure and to the screening by the doctors.

Children of single-parent relationships. There are already many children being reared in single-parent homes because of death, divorce and desertion. To this number may be added those children who are being born to single parents. J Kerby Anderson states, "About 9 percent of those seeking AID are single women. Therefore, about fifteen hundred children are being born into single-parent relationships each year" (*Genetic Engineering*, p 32). Among singles who are seeking to have children are lesbians, transsexuals and homosexuals. These last two groups are accomplishing this by surrogate mothers. These children may have some problems with normal emotional and sexual adjustments.

Human eugenic programs. Fears are being raised in some circles of society by utopian planners who are sounding like George Bernard Shaw's *Back to Methuselah*, J B S Haldane's *Daedalus*, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, and HF Muller's *Out of the Night (A Marriage Manual)*, Stone and Stone, pp 184-185). "Donor babies and sperm banks raise Orwellian specters of state nurseries" ("Artificial Insemination" Hefley, p 23). Many critics see similarities between the concepts of some scientists in control of sperm and ova banks and Nazi Germany's attempt to develop a "master race."

Such an example is Robert Graham, an eccentric multi-millionaire, who stores sperm from Nobel prize winners and other high-IQ participants at his Repository for Germinal Choice in order to fertilize women from Mensa (an Organization for those with high-IQ's) (*Genetic Engineering*, J Anderson, p 35). Yet John Bettler asserts, "Geniuses do not bear geniuses. The children tend

toward the middle intellectually" ("Lecture notes" p 18). Sperm banks are located in 12 cities in the United States and ova banks at various universities (*Manipulating Life*, Gish and Wilson, p 144).

Many people are deeply concerned with where sperm banks and other laboratory experiments with life may lead. Christian moralists are likely to regard these experiments as improper because they threaten the life of the family out of which the reproduction of persons should come.

Doctors without thorough training in ethics. In the *Dictionary of Christian Ethics*, Ronald Preston notes the opposition to AID by the Dutch doctor, A Schellen, in *Artificial Insemination in the Human*. Yet, Preston points out the unpreparedness of many doctors "to take upon themselves the immense psychological and pastoral responsibility involved in AID" (p 18). Even if doctors have received training in ethics regarding artificial insemination, they may not be sensitive to a Christian's moral approach. Also genetic screening is far from exhaustive among doctors. Many take only oral histories from the donors and less than one-third of the doctors take blood tests for communicable diseases (*Genetic Engineering*, J Anderson, p 30).

Incest in ignorance. The practice of keeping the sperm donors anonymous increases the possibility of accidental incest. English doctors at one time limited the semen donations of a man so that he would not father more than 100 children (*The Ethics of Sex*, Thielicke, p 250). The average sperm-bank donor in the United States is used for up to six pregnancies and some for as many as fifty pregnancies (*Genetic Engineering*, J Anderson, p 29). The possibility for inbreeding between half brothers and half sisters later in life is great, especially where the communities are smaller.

Legal problems and the need for laws. Most states do not have laws to be applied to cases regarding artificial insemination. Presently in the United States only fifteen states have enacted legislation to protect the rights of an AID child. J Kerby Anderson writes,

There are three important reasons why a child conceived through AID must legally be declared the child of the couple. First, there must be certainty of child support in the event of desertion or divorce. Second, there must be clear lines of legal inheritance. Third, there must be legal precedents to establish that AID does not constitute adultery. In occasional cases, courts have ruled that AID constituted sufficient grounds for divorce due to adultery (*Genetic Engineering*, p 31).

Laws are desperately needed according to Dr S J Behrman "to get us all—doctor, donor, patient, and child—out from under the

cloud" ("Artificial Insemination" p 63).

Surrogate mothering and test-tube babies. Artificial reproductive technology has been developed to meet the demand for children. The permissive society with its approval of abortions and the rearing of children by their unwed mothers (70%) has created this demand. America seems to be slipping morally in its choices into immoral consequences. With the acceptance of AID by many Americans has come surrogate mothering by artificial insemination and in vitro fertilization which produces test-tube babies.

The ethical questions regarding these two methods go far beyond any ethical questions regarding AID. There is the commercialization of the human body and the children who are born, the deaths of 95% of all test-tube babies sometime during the process and the impersonalization of human beings ("So What's Wrong" Mawyer, p 129). Thousands of couples are opting for artificial reproduction with little consideration of the social, emotional and ethical problems accompanying it.

Biblical Answers for Ethical Issues

Many ethical questions arise when a Christian is confronted with the subject of artificial insemination. Is it right to go against "nature" and "play God" as some people describe it? Does artificial insemination violate the unity of a marriage? Is masturbation ever not sinful? Is AID adultery? Can a couple who has experienced AID avoid deceit and lying? Can a couple accept the procedure of artificial insemination without any doubt about the rightness of it? Answers to these questions regarding artificial insemination may be discovered by considering the biblical view of stewardship, of parenthood, of sexual relations, of honesty and of living by faith.

Biblical view of stewardship. Objectors to artificial insemination have asked the question: Is it right for human beings to "play God"? This question implies "that the natural order of creation gives to us the will of God for that creation and that when we interfere with, attempt to change, or propose to augment that creation, we are usurping the prerogative that belongs to God alone" ("Biological Control" Bube, p 225).

The problem with this viewpoint is the failure to recognize man's responsibilities before God and the effects of sin upon the "natural" world. In Genesis 1:28, God tells man who has been created in His image to "subdue" the earth and have "dominion" over every living thing in it. H C Leupold explains, "'Subdue,' the new word in the account of man's dominion, is *kabhah*, and it differs from 'have dominion' (*radhah*) in that its root implies 'to

knead' or 'to tread,' whereas the latter is the stronger according to parallel roots, meaning 'to stomp down'" (*Exposition of Genesis*, Vol I, Leupold, p 95).

"The term subdue implies a degree of sovereignty, control and direction over nature. This call to rule is a call to advance civilization and regulate natural forces" (*Paradise to Prison*, Davis, p 81). Robert P Lightner of Dallas Theological Seminary states, "The command to 'subdue' the earth was a command to gain knowledge of, to master and to bring the elements of creation into usefulness for mankind" ("The Master's Mandate", p 10). Henry M Morris concurs,

Here is the primeval commission to man authorizing both science and technology as man's basic enterprises relative to the earth. "Science" is man's disciplined study and understanding of the phenomena of his world. "Technology" is the implementation of this knowledge in the effective ordering and development of the earth and its resources, for the greater good of all earth's inhabitants (including such fields of human service as engineering, agriculture, medicine, and a host of other practical technologies. This rule embraces all productive human activities (*The Genesis Record*, p 77).

So it is proper for man to exercise this God-given responsibility of control over nature even though his control is limited compared to Adam's before he sinned. Charles R Smith of Grace Theological Seminary asserts, "It is fitting and proper for man to attempt to correct physical and genetic defects—whether by surgery or other means which are consistent with the dignity and sanctity of human life (Gen 9:6; Jas 3:9)" ("The Manipulation", p 4). Thus, in man's faithful exercise of his stewardship, artificial insemination would not be unbiblical as long as biblical principles and patterns are obeyed.

Biblical view of parenthood. God created man and woman with the power and command to produce children within marriage (Gen 1:28; 2:18-25; 4:1-2). Genesis 2:24 says, "and they shall be one flesh." Rabbi David Graubart holds that the Hebrew word for "one flesh" (*basar*) used in Genesis 2:24 to describe the union of Adam and Eve, is better translated "one personality" ("Artificial Insemination" Hefley, p 64). Wayne Mack writes, "Marriage is a total commitment and a total sharing of the total person with another person until death" (*Deep Unity*, p 4). Helmut Thielicke remarks,

Marriage is total commitment and total sharing until death.

Every human fellowship bears its purpose within itself. The divine commission given to marriage in creation is to the effect that both are created for each other (as a polar unity, Gen 1:27) as 'one flesh' (Gen 2:23-24) and that in this oneness they are to satisfy the command, "Be fruitful and multiply." The personal unity of man, wife and child would therefore be ruptured by any isolation of the biological act of procreation (*The Ethics of Sex*, p 251).

To this agree the words of Bruce Anderson,

But the Bible teaches that marriage embraces the wholeness of two people—body, spirit and mind. Children are part of that unity, the expression of those two individuals and their commitment to one another. Bringing in a third party—a sperm doctor or surrogate mother—rips apart the fabric of the union. The covenant of parenthood is destroyed in order to make parents ("Would You Pay", p 51).

The pattern approved by God throughout the Bible is parents producing children in the context of their marriage (Gen 1:27-28; 4:1-2; 9:1; Prov 27:3-5; Eph 5:21-6:4; Heb 13:4).

Some Christian writers endeavor to support departures from God's pattern for producing children by quoting Gen 16:2 and Deut 25:5-10. In Genesis 16:2 Sarah encouraged Abraham to go in to Hagar so that she could obtain children through her. This should not be used to support AID, surrogate mothering or in vitro fertilization by donor because there is no indication of God's approval of the act. Also the product of that union created problems for that family and its descendents. It also was the result of a polygamous relationship allowed by a pagan culture. It certainly cannot be used to support AID since there was no separation of the procreative and unitive aspects of sexual intercourse.

Deuteronomy 25:5-10 records the provision of the levirate marriage of the kinsman-redeemer, whose responsibility was to impregnate his deceased brother's wife if there was no heir. Norman Geisler uses this passage to support AID. He says, "In fact, artificial insemination has the advantage of evading the adulterous and polygamous problems of the kinsman-redeemer way of raising up seed to the barren" (*Ethics*, p 229).

He is mistaken in his interpretation of the kinsman-redeemer procedure. It is not the nature of the Holy God to give revelation to conflict with other moral commands. It was not adulterous or polygamous, because an unmarried brother was to perform the responsibility by marrying (*le'ishsha*) the childless sister-in-law. Therefore the child born of this union to carry on the deceased brother's line of inheritance was the product of the married couple

(Ruth 4:5-6, 10, 13). Neither of these two passages (Gen 16:2 and Deut 25:5-10) support AID, surrogate mothering or in vitro fertilization by donor.

Biblical view of sexual relations. The Word of God sets moral sexual relations in the context of marriage (Ex 20:14; Heb 13:4) and condemns sexual relations outside of it. Within marriage, the Bible does not restrict sexual activity unless it is selfish or abusive (I Cor 6:19; 7:3-5; Heb 13:4). Two ethical questions with sexual connotation are raised regarding the rightness of artificial insemination—masturbation and adultery.

Masturbation is the self-stimulation of the genital organ by manual or other artificial means to attain sexual gratification. It is used in obtaining the semen from the husband or donor. There does not appear to be any direct reference to it in the Bible.

Christian writers and leaders differ about it. M O Vincent, Charlie Shedd and Herbert J Miles view it as a "gift of God" which helps people maintain self-control and avoid immoral sexual intercourse. James Hefley and Letha Scanzoni see it as morally neutral. James Dobson believes that it is not much of an issue with God "since it isn't even mentioned in the Bible" ("But What About Right Now" Landrum, pp 38-42).

Norman Geisler says, "We argued above that autosexuality is wrong only if it leads to sin such as lust or an enslaving habit. In fact, if the act were performed for unselfish reasons, then it could be considered, on that ground, right to do so" (*Ethics*, p 228). Thus, it is the opinion of Geisler and others that AID is acceptable if masturbation is done out of love to provide a child for a childless couple.

However, masturbation is an unacceptable practice for Christians for the following reasons: (1) Fantasizing and lustful thinking is almost always involved with masturbation and the Lord Jesus condemned such thoughts (Matt 5:27-28). (2) It is clearly wrong since it is a perversion of the sexual act (I Cor 7:3-4) and defrauds a wife. (3) In I Corinthians 7:9, Paul writes, "If they do not have self-control, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn." The alternatives are only two: self-control or marriage. (4) In I Corinthians 6:12, Paul says "All things are lawful for me, but I will not be mastered by anything." So even if there were no biblical principles to apply to this problem other than this one, it would be a violation of this one to be mastered by masturbation. (5) Guilt is nearly universal after masturbation unless one has been brainwashed by humanistic thinking. This guilt must be confessed and forgiven for the Christian to grow in the Lord (I Jn 1:9; Rom 14:23).

Therefore, AID should not be acceptable to Christians. As Jay Adams says, "The donor is required to masturbate in order to provide the semen necessary for the act. Masturbation, I have shown elsewhere, is sin" (*Matters of Concern*, p 3, cf *The Christian Counselor's Manual*, pp 399-402). It is the writer's view that AIH is acceptable for Christians because sexual activity within marriage devoid of selfishness and abuse can provide sperm for the procedure (I Cor 7:3-5; Heb 13:4).

AID has been called adultery. Advocates of AID point out that the action of adultery is not involved with it. Also since there is mutual consent of the husband and wife in AID, it is not an illicit act of adultery. Yet, one of the major factors in adultery is the attitude. The Bible passage which defines the extent of adultery is Matthew 5:27-28. Jesus says, "You have heard that it was said 'You shall not commit adultery'; but I say to you, that everyone who looks on a woman to lust for her has committed adultery with her already in his heart."

J Kerby Anderson declares, "There is no such attitude discernible in AID" (*Genetic Engineering*, p 39). This certainly is questionable because nearly all masturbation is accompanied with fantasizing and lustful thinking. It may involve the fantasizing of the donor or the recipient or both. A recipient could not be sure that she has not caused another to commit adultery in the mind to provide her with a child. Jay Adams writes,

Even if fantasies of what the donor (or donee) might be like could be altogether avoided by both parties (a doubtful supposition), still the result of a sexual act (semen obtained by masturbation) has been interposed between the husband and wife. That it thus breaks the intimate oneness that they are called to maintain seems almost certain (*Matters of Concern*, p 4).

AID separates between the unitive aspects of becoming "one flesh" (Gen 2:24) and the procreative aspect (Gen 1:28) and reduces procreation to a biological act. Therefore, it is very doubtful whether AID could be performed without adultery of the mind and it is certain it separates the unitive aspect of becoming "one flesh" from the procreative aspect. AID must be rejected for these reasons.

Biblical view of honesty. The Bible forbids lying. Proverbs warns, "Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord, ... A false witness will not go unpunished" (12:22; 19:5). Ephesians 4:15 and 4:25 read, "But speaking the truth in love... Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor, for we are members one of another." With the procedure of AID, the wife and husband have their names put on the birth certificate as the parents even though the man is not the father. Parents also are

A Christian can never consent if there is any doubt about rightness.

deceitful about the origination of the child to relatives and friends. Even the child is lied to by the parents to keep AID a secret. This certainly is not acceptable Christian conduct.

Biblical view of living by faith. A Christian has not only been saved from his sin by faith in the finished work of Jesus Christ, but he is to walk by faith (Rom 1:17; Eph 2:8; Gal 2:20). Faith involves a persuasion that results in reliance on God and a receptiveness to His direction in the Word of God and in His providential workings. Romans 14:23 contains the words for a believer, "for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Therefore, a Christian living by faith could never consent to AID if there is any doubt about its rightness. There certainly are questions raised regarding possible marital problems, the possibility of incest in ignorance, masturbation, adultery of the mind, lying, and the harming or destroying of the "one flesh" aspect.

Conclusion

Artificial insemination is becoming a popular subject and practice in America among infertile couples because of the lack of children to adopt due to abortion and the rearing of their children by unwed mothers. AIH is as acceptable morally to Christians as most practices of modern medicine. However, AID is not acceptable morally because of the possibility of marital problems, the possibility of incest in ignorance, maturbation, the possibility of adultery of the mind, lying and doubts about the rightness of the procedure.

For Further Study

- Adams, Jay E. "Artificial Insemination" *Matters of Concern to Christian Counselors*, Phillipsburg, NJ, 1978
- _____, *The Christian Counselor's Manual*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973
- Alexander, Mrs A F. "No Artificial Insemination For Us" *Christian Life*, October, 1978
- Anderson, Bruce L. "Would You Pay Another Woman to Have Your Baby?" *Christian Life*, January, 1981
- Anderson, J Kerby. "Artificial Insemination" *Genetic Engineering*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publ House, 1982
- Anderson, V Elving. "The Control of Man's Genetic Future" *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, Vol 18, No 4, December, 1966
- Bettler, John. "Artificial Insemination" Lecture notes on Difficult Ethical Problems, Summer Institute of Pastoral Studies, Christian Counseling and Educational Foundation, 1980
- Brinker, Betty. "Yes' to Artificial Insemination" *Christian Life*, November, 1978
- Bube, Richard H. "Biological Control of Human Life" *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, December, 1982
- Davis, John J. *Paradise to Prison*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975
- Geisler, Norman L. *Ethics: Alternatives and Issues*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publ House, 1971
- Gish, Duane T and Clifford Wilson. "Artificial Insemination" *Manipulating Life: Where Does It Stop?* San Diego: Master Books, 1981

- Hefley, James, "Artificial Insemination: Sacred or Sinful?" *Christian Life*, May, 1978
- Jordan, E Robert, "Artificial Insemination" Mimeographed notes presented at the 1983 Pastor and Preacher Boy Conference at Camp Calvary, Bernville, Pa
- Landis, Judson T and Mary G Landis, *Building a Successful Marriage*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968
- Landum, Phil, "But What About Right Now?" *Campus Life*, March, 1972
- Leupold, H C, *Exposition of Genesis*, Vol I, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1942
- Lightner, Robert P, "The Master's Mandate" *The Baptist Bulletin*, January, 1972
- Mack, Wayne A, *How to Develop Deep Unity in the Marriage Relationship*, Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publ Co, 1979
- Mawyer, Martin, "So What's Wrong with Test-Tube Babies?" *Moody Monthly*, September, 1982
- Morris, Henry M, *The Genesis Record*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976
- Nelson, Robert M, "The Ethics of In Vitro Fertilization and Embryo Transfer" *Christian Medical Society Journal*, Vol XIV, No 1, 1983
- Preston, Ronald, "Artificial Insemination" *Dictionary of Christian Ethics*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967
- Sharpe, William D, "Artificial Insemination" *Medicine and the Ministry*, New York: Appleton Century, 1966
- Singewald, Martin L, "Artificial Insemination" *Baker's Dictionary of Christian Ethics*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973
- Smith, Charles R, "The Manipulation of Human Reproduction" *Spire*, Summer, 1981, Winona Lake, Ind: Grace Theol Seminary
- Stone, Hannah and Abraham Stone, *A Marriage Manual*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1965
- Stout, Martha, "Infertility: When Motherhood Is Impossible" *Today's Christian Woman*, Spring, 1983
- Thielicke, Helmut, *The Ethics of Sex*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964

Faith involves a persuasion that results in reliance on God and the principles of His Word.