

ARE THE ARGUMENTS FOR ABORTION RATIONAL?

Democracy is built upon the premise that issues will be openly and freely discussed. There are several issues that are dividing our country at this time. Abortion is one of these issues. It is imperative that all citizens be given both sides of every issue. This issue is no exception. Should we not be rational in making our decisions?

We shall discuss the issue of abortion from a rational standpoint. There are several basic arguments made by those who support abortion. There are three basic questions that are the basis for all arguments for abortion. First, when does life begin? Second, is the zygote, fetus, etc. a separate human being or is it part of the mother until it is born? Third, is the zygote, fetus, etc. human or non-human? Arguments such as: "The mother has the right to control her own body" tend to be based upon the assumption that the fetus is part of the mother's body. Arguments such as: "The fetus is a parasite" tend to argue that imply that the fetus is non-human or in some way it is sub-human (not fully human). Arguments such as: "An abortion may be performed until the point at which the fetus becomes viable" tend to assume that life has not begun until that point.

I shall establish that abortion is morally wrong because it constitutes the murder of an innocent human being. This will be established by demonstrating that the unborn child (zygote, fetus, embryo, etc.) is human, alive, and not part of the mother. This will answer the basic arguments made by most of those who argue in favor of abortion. The arguments will use the following logical format:

Either the zygote, fetus, etc. is human or it is non-human.

It is not non-human because of the tissue, DNA, etc.

Therefore it is human.

Either the zygote, fetus, etc. is alive or it is not alive.

If it has the six characteristics of living organisms, then it is alive.

It has the six characteristics of living organisms.

Therefore, it is alive.

Either it is part of the mother or it is a separate organism.

If it has a different DNA, tissue, etc. than the mother, then it is not part of the mother.

It has a different DNA, tissue, etc. than the mother.

Therefore, it is a separate organism.

If it is alive, human, and a separate organism; then it is murder to kill it.

There are a number of arguments to support the premise that abortion on demand is morally right. Many of these arguments are what logicians call "red herrings" (arguments intended to divert the issue). The only relevant question is: "Is the fetus (zygot, embryo, fetus, etc.) a separate living human being?"

The following series of questions are offered for consideration of the reader: (1) Is the fetus human or non-human? (2) If the fetus is non-human, what is it? (3) If the fetus is human, is it alive? (4) If the fetus is living and is human, is it a part of the mother or a

separate human being? If the fetus is human, is alive, and is separate from the mother; then it is murder to kill it.

The genetic makeup of the fetus proves it is human (the DNA, tissue, etc.) is human. Any medical expert qualified to testify in any court of law would testify the tissue is human. All medical evidence proves the fetus is human. In addition, the genetic makeup of the fetus proves it is not part of the mother. It frequently has a different blood type, about 50% of the time it is a different gender, and it certainly has a different DNA pattern than the mother.

This whole issue revolves on the question of the definition of life itself. How is life defined? The following characteristics are given as a definition of life: (1) reproduction, (2) growth, (3) metabolism, (4) movement, (5) responsiveness, and (6) adaptation. The fetus has all of these characteristics prior to birth. Some life forms are unable to move or at least appear to be unable to move, but many life forms can move. These six characteristics are cumulative characteristics of life. It is generally accepted as “undisputed evidence of life” if all six characteristics are present. If some “thing,” having these six characteristics, were observed by astronauts who landed on Mars, it would be said to be alive by scientists.

The unborn child has inherent abilities to reproduce, with those abilities not being developed or mature. For example, a girl is probably as near to being able to reproduce (chronologically) two months before birth as a boy is two months after he has been born. Even a zygote is able to reproduce because about 1 in every 250 births occur as a result of asexual (mono-zygotic) reproduction or identical twins. All other births occur as a result of sexual reproduction. Mono-zygotic reproduction occurs about 14 days after conception.

Some claim that life begins when the fetus has facial features that look human. This makes the test of something being human being that it looks human. Of course, a person who has been injured in an accident or a fire may not “look human” but he is still human. Still another test that the pro-abortion advocates use for being human is when the fetus begins to be conscious (about 26 weeks). This means that one is not human if he is not conscious. Of course this means that people in a coma are no longer human and we may terminate their lives at will. Still another test of one being a human is when he is able to breathe on his own. This means that one who is unable to breathe on his own is not a person. Most people are unaware that under general anesthesia one’s breathing is stopped and the anesthesiologist actually forces the patient to breathe. Therefore a person under general anesthesia is no longer a human. Still another test of one being a person is whether or not he is able to survive outside his mother’s womb. This means that one is not a person if he is unable to survive without help from another person. This, of course, means that a three day old baby is not a person because he cannot feed himself or care for himself.

The advocates of abortion on demand will not define life precisely. If they ever define life, they will be forced to admit their actions constituted the killing of a living human being.

What about the cases of rape, incest, or deformity of the child? These questions merely “beg the question” because they assume the fetus is not a living human being. Do those, who use these cases to prove abortion on demand should be allowed, claim a ten year old

person who was conceived as a result of rape should be killed? Do they claim a twelve year old should be killed because of his/her deformity? Do they claim that an eleven year old child conceived as a result of incest should be killed? Unless they claim these children should be killed, they admit that these questions are *petitio principii* (begging the question). It is not realistic to claim there are no living humans conceived as a result of rape or incest. This would prove that their argument is a “red herring.” This line of argumentation on cases of rape, incest, or deformity is based upon the unsound premise that an exceptional case establishes a general rule. Try using this line of reasoning the next time you are caught speeding (tell the judge that you may speed because an ambulance may speed.)

The fetus is a living human being who is separate and distinct from his mother. It is murder to kill the fetus, and those who do so are just as guilty as the person who murders a two year old child.

How will those who promote abortion answer these arguments? Usually they do not respond at all, but when they do it has always been to change the subject to the question of the existence of God? Certainly, I can make arguments from the Scriptures to support my claim that abortion is murder but they are no necessary. This does not answer these arguments!

ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS WITH ABORTION

Those who advocate abortion on demand usually claim that the mother has the right to control her own body. In the first section of this paper I noted that the unborn child is biologically separate and distinct from the mother. Therefore the unborn child is not part of the mother and the mother is not “controlling her own body” when she goes to the abortion clinic to have an abortion.

We are told that the unborn child is subhuman in some manner. We ask: “How is the unborn child subhuman?” We need to define the word “human.” If the unborn child is not human, then what is it?

In the 1930’s the German people encountered a similar dilemma. What do we do about a thing that has been declared to be subhuman? The Jews, Gypsies, Slavic people, Christians, etc. were declared to be subhuman. These “subhuman things” were then placed in concentration camps, worked as slaves, and many were killed. But the Nazi party (abbreviation for National Socialist Party) said it was not murder because they were subhuman. Who can believe that? What will later societies say about us in our attitudes toward our own young? Many members of the Nazi party were tried at Nuremburg and punished for the very same things that are now being done in America and many other Western nations.

Those who defend abortion by saying: “A woman has the right to control her own body” have no right to claim a woman is guilty of child abuse for taking illegal drugs while pregnant. They should not support prosecution of a woman, for child abuse, for taking illegal drugs or for drinking alcohol while she is pregnant.

There should not be any penalty for injury of a pregnant woman and causing a miscarriage except for the injuries done to the woman. Those who support abortion claim the unborn child is just a mass of protoplasm and should not support any punishment (either incarceration, monetary damages, or punitive damages).

Some good lawyer should use their own arguments against them, if a person causes a miscarriage or is being prosecuted for child abuse for abusing a fetus. But the Supreme Court of the United States would merely make another irrational declaration similar to the infamous Roe versus Wade decision. I refer to the Roe versus Wade decision: "The Second Dred Scott Decision."

Those who support abortion will neither call the pregnant woman a mother nor the fetus (zygot, embryo, etc.) a child. They must dehumanize the unborn child. How did the Nazi party deal with the Jews, Gypsies, etc.? They gave them names that dehumanized them. This is done in warfare in order to dehumanize the enemy and make it easier to kill them. We dehumanize people of other races by giving them derogatory names. This makes it easier for us to mistreat them. After all, they are subhuman and it is not wrong to mistreat them. Does not the subhuman name we have given them prove we are free of any wrongdoing?

Those who support abortion are guilty of making a number of irrational arguments in their vain attempt to support this practice. If past argumentation is representative of the arguments made by abortion advocates, we should not expect them to make rational arguments in answer to this article.

Conclusion

Unfortunately there are a number of people who have not reasoned properly from the evidence and drawn the proper conclusion that life begins at conception. The unborn child is human, living, and not part of the mother. Therefore, life begins at conception and it is murder to perform (or have) an abortion.

Marion R. Fox