



Media Spotlight

A BIBLICAL ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS & SECULAR MEDIA

SPECIAL REPORT

ABORTION SOME COGENT ARGUMENTS

by Albert James Dager

What's wrong with abortion? After all, a consensus of American opinion shows that a significant percentage of people believe that a woman should have the right to choose whether or not to carry her baby to term. Especially in extreme cases where pregnancy is the result of rape or incest, or if the child is determined to be at risk of being born with severe disabilities. And who's to say when a child in the womb is really a live human being?

The fact is that, of the millions of abortions performed each year in the United States alone, only a small fraction approaching one percent are the result of the above concerns. The vast majority of abortions are performed for the sake of convenience.¹ But this fact aside, there is an argument against abortion and for the recognition of the fetus as human life that has been supported by virtually every culture since man's appearance on earth. And from the start, American jurisprudence has recognized that the unborn child is a living human being.

Virtually every state in the union has statutes that treat the unborn child as a human being worthy of the right to life. For example, if a person murders a pregnant woman and her child dies in the process, that person can be charged with double homicide. If a person accidentally kills an unborn child, that person can be charged with manslaughter, even if the mother is unharmed. Even if, in the line of duty, a medical professional through negligence, causes the death of an unborn child, that medical professional can be sued by the parents for malpractice based on the loss of their son or daughter.

Recent news reports have confirmed that United States jurisprudence recognizes the unborn child as a human being worthy of protection under the law. In one instance, a woman was charged with mur-

der for self-aborting her 14-week-old fetus. And in San Francisco a woman was charged with murder on grounds she recklessly ingested illegal drugs that led to her unborn child's death. She was acquitted on the judge's interpretation of a 1970 California law against fetal murder on the basis that the judge felt there was insufficient evidence that the Legislature intended the law to be used in such a circumstance.

Regardless of the outcome from that particular case, the fact remains that these laws are still on the books and in force.

These are just two of many such cases. History shows that American jurisprudence has always recognized that human life exists in the womb. And there are no time limits from conception to birth to determine whether or not a child is protected by laws against destruction of a fetus. Only recently have some states begun to apply these laws only to those cases where the child has passed into the second trimester. This itself infers that, until recently—and only after strong lobbying by pro-abortion forces, all U.S. law has been predicated upon the belief that life begins at conception.

Now a child can be aborted at any time up to birth. All that is needed is a doctor's certification that the abortion is for the mother's physical or mental health.²

In view of these facts, is it not hypocritical of the medical profession, the legal profession, the feminist lobbies and government in general to grant exemption from these laws for doctors who perform abortions? And what of those mothers who consent to the destruction of their babies? Why does the law exempt them from prosecution for fetal murder when a woman who attempts self-abortion, or even through negligence kills her unborn child, faces prosecution for murder?

Thanks to more liberal legislation, medical doctors and the women whose children they abort are exempt from these laws. Yet if a woman self-aborts or otherwise causes the death of her unborn child she is liable for prosecution. The medical profession, which recognizes the multi-billion dollar benefit to abortion practitioners, has successfully lobbied government officials to enact laws that, in view of all prior existing laws, legalize murder if done at the hands of a medical doctor.

How can almost every law of the land dealing with unborn children call the killing of an unborn child murder or manslaughter if that child isn't recognized as a living human being—if, as the feminists and abortionists insist, it is only tissue matter that has no life on the simple reasoning that it is not viable outside the womb? Well, many people are not viable without artificial support systems. Does that nullify *their* humanity?

If the government wishes to grant exemption for abortionists and say that the unborn child is not a human being, then it must strike down all the hundreds of other statutes that declare that it is a human being. And once that happens, then it remains only for the social engineers to determine any other factors that would disqualify a person as a human being.

Suppose it is determined that those with diminished mental faculties are no longer considered human—even those who suffer from brain injuries. Will the state revise its laws to allow for their destruction at the hands of the medical profession?

This isn't as far-fetched as some may think. Writers of futurist fiction have envisioned such a world for many years. And in many countries genocide has been the norm against certain ethnic groups for the simple reason that they were not considered human.

At one time, blacks were not recognized as human beings. This was the rationale behind the slave trade that brought black Africans to the United States. They were transported in slave ships that held them confined in the same manner that livestock is confined when shipped to the slaughter houses. In Nazi Germany, only the Aryan race was considered human, and we know the consequences of that thinking. The treatment of Jews and other non-Aryans was similar to that of animals. And the Nazi genetic experiments remain a source for horror stories even today.

