

Position Paper on Abortion
City Reformed Presbyterian Church

Introduction

Abortion has been a divisive issue in our country for more than fifty years, marked by the controversial *Roe v Wade* decision of the Supreme Court in 1973. As part of the more general polarization of our society, two sides have arisen with strong views, known as the “pro-life” and “pro-choice” sides. Both argue that they have the moral upper ground; the pro-life side says that killing babies is never justified without compelling medical need, while the pro-choice side says that people who are against abortion don’t care about the real-world problems of women.

Our church is not neutral on this issue; we are “pro-life.” But we recognize that there are thorny issues that make the issue difficult for some. In this position paper, we outline the main arguments for the pro-life position and how it works out in practice.

This issue can be broken down into three separate topics. The first is the *ethical* category, that is, from an absolute standpoint, what is right and wrong? The second is the *pastoral* category, that is, given a fallen world in which sin happens, how should we help people including and especially people in our own congregation? The last is the *political* category, namely what should we do to influence the political sphere as individuals and as a church? What should be the law, versus what are our own convictions?

While these three topics often connect to each other, in the following we treat them separately.

The Ethics of Abortion

There are two ways to frame the ethical issue. The first is to agree that killing of human life is always wrong, but to argue that before some point in time in the womb, the baby is not a “human life.”¹ The other line of argument is to agree that the baby is indeed alive, but to argue that the desires and needs of the mother always take precedence over the life of the baby, and therefore abortion is justified taking of human life. We consider the first line of argument first, of a cutoff before which a baby in the womb does not count as having human life.

Scientific aspects of the definition of human life

In the *Roe v. Wade* case of 1973, the Supreme Court made the legal cutoff of “viability,” that is, the earliest possible date according to medical professionals at that time at which a baby could survive if born prematurely. In several Supreme Court decisions since then, however, a

¹ It is common on the pro-choice side to call the baby in the womb a “fetus,” but “fetus” is simply the Latin word for “baby.” Using this euphemism biases the debate toward treating it as non-human; in the interest of clarity we use “baby” here throughout, while recognizing that some people argue that the baby in the womb is not yet human life.

cutoff at 24 weeks has been rejected,² and the gestation time at which abortion is allowed has been moved later, so that the *de facto* law of the land in the United States in the year 2022 is that babies can be aborted up to the end of the ninth month of pregnancy. Eight states have also codified this standard.³

From a scientific standpoint, there is no medically significant difference between a baby just born and the same baby a few days earlier in the womb. A baby at late stages in the womb feels pain, reacts to sounds, and interacts with its mother.⁴ There is therefore no scientific sense in treating a late-term baby as non-human.

The earlier cutoff, of “viability,” raises untenable ethical issues, because many people are not viable on their own and require care from others. There is no ethical system we are aware of, certainly not a Christian one, that says that all people who require care from others to stay alive forfeit their humanity. But in going back to read the original Supreme Court *Roe v Wade* decision, the Court did not insist that viability is a clear standard for being human. Rather, they took this as a somewhat arbitrary cutoff based on their perception that there was no widespread agreement on other times for cutoffs. It was this ambiguity in their argument that eventually led to the time being moved to the ninth month in subsequent Court decisions, since one can always argue that someone views a later date as debatable.

There are two medically relevant earlier cutoffs that could be made, namely the date of first heart beat, and the date of the first brain activity. These are somewhat analogous to the cutoffs made at the end of life, where it is common to take the heart stopping or brain activity stopping as signs of death. These thresholds are very early compared to the viability cutoff: the heartbeat starts around 5 weeks gestation,⁵ and an electroencephalogram (brain wave detector) can detect brain wave activity as early as forty-three days (about six weeks) after conception.

Biologically, however, the life of the embryo and the baby with a heartbeat are one continuum which starts at conception.⁶ The embryo has a unique DNA different from its mother

² In *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* in 1992, the Supreme Court ruled that abortion after 24 weeks for reasons of health of the mother could be allowed; later in *Doe v. Bolton* “health” defined to include the following factors: “emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman’s age.” In *Stenberg v. Carhart*, the Supreme Court ruled that partial birth abortion could not be restricted (see <https://embryo.asu.edu/pages/stenberg-v-carhart-2000>); this was later somewhat restricted in *Gonzalez v. Carhart* in 2007.

³ <https://www.dailywire.com/news/these-8-states-allow-abortion-moment-birth-amanda-prestigiacomio>

⁴ Although heartbreaking, it is worth dwelling upon the life and death of a baby in the womb, able to respond to pain and stimulus, because it shows us what is being destroyed if an abortion takes place. For video of such see *The Silent Scream*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gON-8PP6zgQ>. It is common that when a pregnant mother who is undecided on whether to have an abortion, looks at ultrasound pictures of the baby in her womb, it becomes difficult to see the fetus as anything other than a living human being.

⁵ https://www.momjunction.com/articles/fetal-heartbeat_00475982/

⁶ The following is a summary given in a PCA study report about life in the womb: “The genetic structure established at [at the moment of conception] guides the development of this individual in regards to its sex, its physical characteristics, such as skin color, eye color, hair, weight, height, and many other characteristics. The only thing that is added is time and food. The development of this unique being begins at this moment of conception and continues until death.” For the full report, see <https://www.pcahistory.org/rgo/rpccs/docsynod/007.html>

from conception, and the building process of the baby moves continuously from this point all the way through the onset of the heartbeat and brain activity (and it can be argued, is not complete until after puberty).⁷

It is the solemn conviction of City Reformed Presbyterian Church, that life begins at conception. Even if one can make arguments for cutoffs at later points in time, our ethic of life says that if there is ambiguity, we should err on the side of life, and not take ambiguity as an excuse to do what could be ending a human life. The analogy is sometimes made of driving at night on a misty road, and seeing a vague figure in the middle of the road which might be a human child or might not. The ambiguity does not mean that we are ethically justified to keep driving straight; rather, we err on the side of life by pulling aside lest we might kill someone.

With this standard, the ethics of ending the life of an embryo or baby in the womb become the same as any other ending of human life. Some examples include 1) the case where there are two lives at stake, and only one can reasonably be expected to be saved, and a decision must be made to save one; and 2) a life which is rapidly tending toward death and suffering could be relieved by not keeping that life alive artificially.

Note that taking this position means that we also believe that forms of contraception and fertility methods that end the life of an embryo, i.e., a fertilized human egg, are also unethical. Some might argue for another cutoff in this case, of “implantation,” the time at which the fertilized egg connects to the placenta. However, as discussed above, biologically the life of the embryo is a continuum from conception. In the spirit of erring on the side of life where there is ambiguity, we believe that Christians should avoid contraception methods and fertility methods that destroy fertilized human ova. Ignorance of how these methods work is also not an excuse for using them; Christians have a moral obligation to ask questions and read about how these methods work. Some versions of the pill are believed to prevent implantation of a fertilized egg.⁸

Scriptural aspects of the definition of human life

All of the above considerations assume that we are concerned with protecting human life. This takes us to the foundations of morality, which for Christians take us to the Scriptures as God’s revelation of his will. This does not mean that the ethical argument can be made *only* from Scripture, but for Christians, the Scriptures are our starting point.

The most helpful place to begin the discussion of life is at the beginning, when God created life on this earth. One of the first things God did was to speak life into existence (Genesis 1-2). God created human beings in his own “image” (Genesis 1:26). Human life is therefore very precious in a way unlike any other creature. Not only was mankind made in the image of God,

⁷A neurologist friend has said that actually we are not fully formed until age 25, because only then is the frontal lobe finally hardened (a lobe of the brain responsible for decision making), and therefore we should not marry before then!

⁸ See, e.g., <https://www.hli.org/resources/abortifacient-brief-birth-control-pill/> and <https://www.theatlantic.com/sexes/archive/2012/12/the-pill-contraceptive-or-abortifacient/266725/>

but God gave dominion to them over all the animals and all of creation. Mankind was to both use and steward this creation that they might be fruitful and multiply (Genesis 1:28-30).

God made explicit the standard that the unjustified taking of human life is sin, and that justice demands a life for a life in the covenant of Noah:

“Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image.” (Genesis 9:6)

This same principle was repeated by God in the sixth commandment given to Moses (Exodus 20:13). Since every human is made in the image of God, therefore every human, regardless of age or stage or ability, is endowed with the dignity and worth of the one who created them.

The Westminster Larger Catechism, written in the 1600’s, which is one of the doctrinal standards of our denomination, expounds the sixth commandment as follows (emphasis added):

Question 135: What are the duties required in the sixth commandment?

Answer: The duties required in the sixth commandment are all careful studies and lawful endeavors to preserve the life of ourselves and others by resisting all thoughts and purposes, subduing all passions, and avoiding all occasions, temptations, and practices, which tend to the unjust taking away the life of any...comforting and succoring the distressed, *and protecting and defending the innocent.*

To not murder is not to simply avoid the killing of an innocent person, but also to preserve human life in all its capacities. We preserve and value life because we were created in the image and likeness of one who also preserves and values life. To protect life is therefore our created design.

Above, we mentioned the ethical argument that even if a baby in the womb is human, the needs and desires of the woman always outweigh those of the baby. Our perception is that this argument is trending toward the majority view of the pro-choice side in our day. The scientific case discussed above makes it very hard to argue that there is a reasonable cutoff at which the baby is not human. Therefore an increasing number of ethicists are arguing that even if we accept that babies in the womb are human, we should simply value the more important life over the lesser.⁹

Against this, the Scriptures tell us that God cares particularly for those who Jesus labels “the least of these:”

Then the righteous will answer him, saying, ‘Lord, when did we see you hungry and feed you, or thirsty and give you drink? And when did we see you a stranger and welcome you, or naked and clothe you? And when did we see you sick or in prison and visit you?’ And the King will answer them, ‘Truly, I say to you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brothers, you did it to me.’” (Matthew 25:37-40)

⁹ E.g., <https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/news-item/whose-rights-are-the-most-right-the-dilemma-of-autonomy-in-a-society-on-abortion-women-and-human-life/>

Jesus specifically singled out children among those he cares about: “Let the children come to me.” (Matthew 19:14). Throughout scripture there is an ongoing theme that God is against the proud, but for the humble, the weak, the poor, the hungry, the needy, and the helpless.

While Scripture does not address abortion directly, as the modern methods available today were not in existence then, it does address a very similar issue at length, namely infanticide. In the days of the Scriptures, infanticide functioned in society in a very similar way as abortion does today: women would carry a baby term and then immediately discard it or give it as a sacrifice to their gods (this was common for “temple prostitutes,” who were a major part of pagan religions.) The Scriptures make it clear that this is an abomination, for example,

“You shall not worship the LORD your God in that way, for every abominable thing that the LORD hates they have done for their gods, for they even burn their sons and their daughters in the fire to their gods.” (Deut. 12:31)

“They built the high places of Baal in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, to offer up their sons and daughters to Molech, though I did not command them, nor did it enter into my mind, that they should do this abomination.” (Jeremiah 32:35)

It is well documented that in the Roman Empire, people often discarded newborns in the garbage piles of cities, and the early church was known for going to these places to find, restore and raise these babies.¹⁰

While the Bible does not give an exact cutoff of when human life begins, it clearly talks of human life being morally responsible even in the womb, before birth. The Psalmist said,

“Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me,” (Psalm 51:5)

and the Gospels record that Jesus and John perceived each other’s presence while still in the womb. Elizabeth said,

“For behold, when the sound of your greeting came to my ears, the baby in my womb leaped for joy.” (Luke 1:44)

The Scriptures, and the subsequent historical tradition of the early church down to the 20th century, overwhelmingly favor that we protect life in the womb as valuable and made in the image of God. As Christians we cannot embrace an ethic that pits the life and needs of a mother against the life of her baby; we must be fully pro-life and seek to prevent harm to both and give care to both.

Pastoral Issues of Abortion

All of the above can be overwhelming to some readers, because it amounts to the “law” of God’s perfect standard, which convicts our consciences. Statistics and Session’s own knowledge of people in our church indicates that it is very likely that about 10% of the women in

¹⁰ See, e.g., <https://earlychurchhistory.org/medicine/infanticide-in-the-ancient-world/>

our church have had abortions.¹¹ Many others have used contraception or fertility methods without inquiring whether they destroy fertilized ova. We therefore need to recognize that the issue of abortion is not a problem of some other people “out there,” but a general one for our society and our church community.

The good news of the gospel is a story of resurrection, the reversal of death, the permanent made impermanent. Jesus died for all of our sins; as the Westminster Confession says,

“As there is no sin so small, but it deserves damnation; so there is no sin so great, that it can bring damnation upon those, who truly repent.” (WCF 15.4)

The words of Romans 8:1 hold true, “There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus.”

One of the hardest things for many women who have had abortions is sorting out what they chose to do versus what they felt they had to do. Some women get abortions fully knowing what is involved, but a great many, in our personal experience, are pressured enormously by the father, by family, and friends into getting an abortion. The pro-life movement often says that there are two victims in an abortion: the baby, and the woman. A pregnant woman’s body changes to protect the baby at all costs, and therefore the act of abortion is necessarily an act of violence against the woman. Various medical problems can occur such as pelvic infection, blood clots, endometriosis, major hemorrhage, uterine perforation, and menstrual disturbances. Lastly pathological pregnancies can follow abortions, resulting in premature deliveries, ectopic pregnancies, spontaneous abortions and stillborn births. Psychologically, women who have abortions can suffer from suppressed grieving. When a woman with an intended pregnancy has a natural miscarriage, her family and friends typically draw around her in sharing grief, while after a woman has had an abortion, which is the same thing but with added unnaturalness, people may say that she should rejoice that her problem is solved, or she may have no one to talk to about it.

Pastorally, this means that all of us can minister to women who have had abortions in two ways. First, we can allow them to grieve, and be there to grieve with them.¹² Second, we can affirm the Gospel that says that not only are our sins forgiven, but also any sense of shame at sins done against us is also removed by the Cross of Christ:

“For it stands in Scripture: ‘Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone, a cornerstone chosen and precious, and whoever believes in him will not be put to shame.’” (1 Peter 2:6)

¹¹ For general statistics, see https://www.abort73.com/abortion_facts/us_abortion_statistics/

¹² One issue that can cause anxiety for women who have had abortions is whether they have prevented the baby from going to heaven. While we can never make absolute pronouncements about the salvation of anyone, we can say that God is able to save the soul of anyone, including the unborn, infants, and the mentally disabled; the Westminster Confession states, “Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who works when, and where, and how he pleases. So also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word.” (Chapter 10.3) While the normal means of salvation is by faith in Christ through the proclamation of the Gospel, faith through hearing is an instrument used by God; it is Jesus who saves and who changes hearts. In addition, the Bible tells us that God favors the weak and those rejected by this world, in his unmerited grace.

It is also the case that some women, perhaps especially women who are members of close-knit Christian communities, choose abortion over what they perceive as the shame of an out-of-wedlock pregnancy.¹³ We must be careful here in how we talk about sexual sin. The Scriptures, and our church, teach clearly that sex is to be reserved for those who are married, and that it is sinful to have sex outside of marriage. However, two wrongs never make a right, and hiding our sin through other sins hurts our souls even further.

To work against this, we need to be a community that is *gracious* not only in regard to sexual sin but in regard to all sin. We can firmly teach that certain things are sinful, and that it is always best to not sin, while at the same time recognizing that we all sin and demonstrating confession, repentance, and acceptance of those who sin.

In general, the pressure many women feel toward abortion is a part of the general *alienation* in our culture. Many people, including women with unplanned pregnancies, feel that there is no one to whom they can turn in a crisis, that they must solve all their problems on their own, and that they will receive only judgment from others, not compassion, if they fail in their careers or ability to manage life. This alienation is fundamentally *unjust* toward women with unplanned pregnancies; it says, “There is no helper or rescuer for you; you must kill your baby before we will help you.”

To work against this in the church, we need to be a community in which people feel deeply the *friendship* of other Christians in the church, with people they can turn to in a crisis with the confidence of receiving perhaps rebuke but never condemnation, and physical help in whatever is needed, even when repentance is incomplete.

Some in our church may want to directly volunteer to help with a crisis pregnancy center (our church has a partnership with the Women’s Choice Network¹⁴ of Pittsburgh) to directly aid women with crisis pregnancies.

Finally, we can help to create a culture in which adoption is celebrated. Some advocates for abortion argue that placing a child for adoption is a terrible thing, an evil. But in Scripture, adoption is the basis of how every one of us is connected to God—none of us are natural-born children of God except Jesus:

“But when the fullness of time had come, God sent forth his Son, born of woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons.”
(Galatians 4:4-5)

Sometimes even the language we use can contribute to making adoption seem negative, such as “putting up” a child for adoption which sounds like putting up something for sale. Better language is to “place” a child for adoption. An adopted child is a covenantally joined family member, as we are with God.

¹³ <https://www.christianexaminer.com/news/how-many-churchgoing-women-have-had-abortions-more-than-you-think.html>

¹⁴ <https://imissedmyperiod.com>

The Politics of Abortion

The issue of abortion cannot be separated from politics in our society. In some ways abortion has become a “shibboleth” of what side you stand on in our polarized society. By being pro-life, we will invariably be associated with the Republican party, because the Democratic party has taken the firm position to support the legality of abortion up to the moment of childbirth.¹⁵

There are several different issues to be worked out in regard to the politics of abortion. One general issue is whether speaking about abortion is “bringing religion into politics.” This should be unproblematic for Christians. Politics is all about making laws about what is right and wrong, and deciding what is right and wrong comes from the area of ethics, which in turn is informed by religion. For this reason it is fundamentally impossible to have an utter separation of government and religion, even when there is not an “established” (government-funded) church.

In saying this, we don’t mean that everything that Christians believe is wrong should be reflected in the laws of the land. The Bible gives Christians much leeway to decide individually about debatable matters.¹⁶ But where there is broad consensus in a society that something is a severe evil and injustice, the government of that society has the right to use the authority given to it by God to make laws. The New Testament says, “Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God” (Romans 13:1). Every government, not just the US government, is held accountable by God to establish laws and practices that thwart evil and create justice. Christians should not allow the American language of “separation of church and state” to keep us from lobbying the government to do what is just and right.

Indeed, the language of some on the pro-choice side is to invoke explicitly Christian themes of social justice and opposing evil. To people on this side of the debate, to not allow abortion is to oppress women and to not care about the poor. Those making this argument agree that ethical and religious virtues of justice and morality should play a role in government, but they feel that the legality of abortion is a net good which helps the poor. Instead of casting the debate as between a religious side and a non-religious side, we do better to see it as a debate between two different religious approaches to law and justice.

There are several premises implicit in seeing abortion as a net good for society. The first is the belief that the sexual revolution is permanent, that human behavior in this area deeply

¹⁵ See <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/4132/text?r=1&s=3>, especially point 3.9 which forbids any restriction on abortions *after* viability for any reason deemed good for health of the mother (which very is broadly interpreted by the courts—see footnote 2 above). This bill was passed by 100% of Democratic senators. (<https://www.truthandaction.org/100-democratic-senators-vote-for-abortion-9-months-pregnancy/>)

¹⁶ Eg., Romans 14:1. The Westminster Confession used by the PCA says, “God alone is Lord of the conscience and has left it free from any doctrines or commandments of men which are in any respect contrary to the Word of God, or which, in regard to matters of faith and worship, are not governed by the Word of God. Therefore, the rights of private judgment in all matters that respect religion are universal and inalienable. No religious constitution should be supported by the civil power further than may be necessary for protection and security equal and common to all others.” (Chapter 20, Section 2).

connected to our bodies is impossible to change, and therefore unplanned pregnancies will always be rampant. The second implicit premise is that government and private help for women with crisis pregnancies will never be enough; we must always have abortion as a backup to keep women out of poverty. (Pro-life advocates are sometimes accused of not being sufficiently pro-life in not supporting more government expenditure for the poor, but pro-choice advocates have not to our knowledge ever stated a threshold of government spending for the poor which would be sufficient for them to agree to end legal abortion; instead, abortion is presented as a permanent human right.) A third premise is that abortion does not really harm women much, although the evidence, as we discussed above, is to the contrary.

While it is undoubtably true that some pro-life advocates do not care sufficiently about helping the poor, it does not follow that using abortion as a means to reduce the number of poor people is just or that it actually helps them. Indeed, most of the arguments made for ending the life of a baby in the womb to help a woman could also be made for ending the life of a two-year old, or for that matter, for the government simply coming in to kill off the poor directly. The history of the pro-abortion movement is explicitly rooted in the movements of the early 20th century to solve poverty by genocide.¹⁷ Although no one in the pro-choice movement speaks that way now, it is still *de facto* the case that abortion is highly racially unequal, with much higher rate of abortions in the Black population.¹⁸ We cannot escape the fact that for whatever reason, even if for the best intentions, we have a system that selectively kills Black babies.

Because we live in a society with multiple and fractured world views, political compromise is often necessary to build consensus for any law. That means that it is often expedient to accept part of what we want rather than to hold out for a pure form. For example, a ban on abortion after a heartbeat is detected could be easier to obtain than a ban on abortion and abortifacients after the moment of conception, and this would still be a step in the right direction.

City Reformed and politics. Our church has some unique issues in regard to this topic. While we identity as a “pro-life” church, we also have made it an explicit part of our church’s founding vision to not be a “politicized” church, either to the left or to the right. There are several reasons for this. First, even when we may all agree that something is an evil, determining the exact political solution to end that evil is filled with pragmatic difficulties, and the leaders of the church are not (nor should they be) trained as experts in social and political matters. Second, the calling of the Church is always to proclaim the Gospel as its main focus, and not to get sidetracked onto secondary matters. Third, our particular mission field of the city and university communities means that it is more likely than in many communities that we will not have consensus on a lot of political topics. What binds us together is greater than what we disagree on.

As practical outworkings of this, City Reformed will not engage in political advocacy on specific laws or candidates, even while we reserve the right to (and indeed are called to) speak out on general issues of ethics and justice. We will not bind the consciences of our members by dictating their political actions on abortion legislation, voting, and other political issues. We also ask that everyone in the church extend the same grace toward other members. As brothers and

¹⁷ See, e.g., <https://www.amazon.com/Negro-Project-Diabolical-Duplicitous-Disastrous/dp/1480918628/>

¹⁸ See the statistics webpage cited in footnote 11, above. The rate of abortion for Black women is about 3.6 times higher than for White women.

sisters in Christ, we should feel free to discuss and debate political matters, without impugning the motives of the others, including when members make decisions to support flawed political parties and candidates, on either side of the political aisle, as a lesser of evils.

Concluding applications

While every Christian cannot do everything, almost everyone in the church can and ought to play some role in the fight to preserve life. Below is a list of actions any of us can take.

1. Pray for the protection of unborn children, for their parents, and for the preservation of life. Pray against the practice of abortion and laws that allow abortion in America and other parts of the world.
2. Contact one of many crisis pregnancy organizations such as Women's Choice Network and ask how you can get involved to help.
3. Educate yourself regarding abortion and contraception, understanding the issues and the arguments that are made on both sides. The Gospel Coalition has a good online resource for this.¹⁹
4. You may choose to protest abortion by standing outside of clinics or government building in protest. While it is your right to protest, all protest should be peaceful and non-aggressive. "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, declares the Lord." (Romans 12:19)
5. You may write your government leaders at the local and federal level concerning your protest of abortion laws. Consider how the way you vote will impact abortion legislation.
6. Speak both grace and truth to friends about abortion. As discussed above, consider how you can contribute to making City Reformed a community of grace in which anyone in crisis feels they have someone to turn to. The language of the PCA paper cited above is helpful here:

That we remind all Christians of their duty to show compassionate love and understanding to families in distress as a result of pregnancies, and to offer these families sympathetic counsel and help for physical needs where required. This duty is especially incumbent upon us as we minister to persons contemplating abortion. Further, that Presbyteries and congregations give every assistance to Christian groups whose purpose is to help pregnant women to have full term pregnancy rather than resorting to abort.²⁰

7. Consider the possibility of fostering a child or adoption, which provide alternatives to abortion.

¹⁹ <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/blogs/justin-taylor/free-training-session-in-pro-life-apologetics/>

²⁰ <https://www.pcahistory.org/rgo/rpcs/docsynod/007.html>