

WHAT ABOUT ABORTION?

By Marion R. Fox

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 the citizen be given both sides of every issue. This issue is no exception.

There are a number of arguments to support the premise that abortion on demand is morally right. All of these arguments are merely what logicians call “red herrings” (arguments intended to divert the issue). The only relevant question is: “Is the fetus (zygot, embryo, 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?

The genetic makeup of the fetus proves it is human - the DNA, 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 and certainly has a different DNA pattern.

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 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 10 year old person who was conceived as a result of rape should be killed? Do they claim a 12 year old should be killed because of his/her deformity? Do they claim that an 11 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 can speed because an ambulance can speed.)

The fetus is a living human being who is separate and distinct from his/her 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? That 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 our first article we 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.

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.

Dr. Marion R. Fox
4004 SE Twisted Trail Rd.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73150-1910

mrfox@prodigy.net