

The Abortion Delusion

by Samuel Hall
Christian Educational Consortium

This Essay Took Second Place in the 2011 Annual Kentucky Right to Life Essay Contest

“Can I kill this?” A curious six year old has spotted a small, colorful beetle. He looks in anxious anticipation towards his mother as he prepares to end the animal’s fragile existence with one downward stroke of his foot. “No!” exclaims the mother, surprised at her son’s murderous intentions towards the helpless creature. To this mother, the taking of an innocent life – even that of a seemingly worthless animal such as the common beetle – is cruel and unnecessary. Many would even go so far as to condemn this violent act as wicked, pricking the moral code that resides within every person on this planet. Notwithstanding, this kind of killing goes on every day in hospitals across America. Millions of babies are slaughtered because they are “in the way”, much like the helpless beetle. Yet the life of a beetle is spared, and not that of the human child. Laws have been made protecting the lives of insects such as the praying mantis, yet in the same building laws are created encouraging the right for women to choose whether or not to take the life of their child. Abortion is a twisted, morally evil practice that is protected by verbal smoke screens and facades. Do we really care about the lives of insects more than we do those of humans?

To justify the act of abortion, it is contested that the baby, while in the womb, is not really a person – just a blob of cellular mass. It has no rights, and is therefore expendable. Is this really true, however? For starters, look at any good biology textbook, and it will confirm that at the point of fertilization, this entity, whatever it is, becomes a living and separate being. But is this life, as Professor Peter Singer of Princeton University puts it, “...not self-aware or capable of grasping that they exist over time...are not persons”. or is it just the opposite? Once again, biologically, the genetic signature of the fetus is undeniably human, and if unaltered, will undoubtedly grow into a larger human. Therefore, scientifically, there really is no dispute as to

whether the fetus is human or not. The real question lies in whether the being is, as Singer describes, a “person” or not. Scientifically, there is no question whether the baby is a “person” or not – to science, a human is always the same whether it is a fetus or a grown man. The size of one’s body or the development of one’s mind does not make them somehow less qualified to participate in the human race. The argument that a baby is not a “person” then, is just a smoke screen for those who need an excuse to kill their babies. Hiding behind this may make them feel better, but it does not change the truth.

Smoke screens continue to abound even within abortion’s cornerstone arguments. “It is a woman’s choice what she decides to do with her own body” is one of the most popular arguments for abortion rights, That is, until a woman decides to strangle the person next to her. Obviously, there are limits, both moral and institutional, laid upon women demanding them to control what they do with their bodies. Therefore, if abortion really is the killing of innocent, helpless children, women cannot excuse it by saying they are entitled to do what they please with their bodies. However, this claim that is also faulty in another way. An unborn child is a separate and distinct being from its mother. A simple DNA test would prove this. In that light, the claim that the woman is simply doing what is right for her own body is false. A child is unique, not just an expugnable element of the mother’s body.

In the case of incidents like rape, however, many mothers will make the legitimate case that they will be emotionally traumatized to carry the baby. In light of all that has been aforementioned though, should the baby be denied life just because the father was a rapist? Even though the mother may be left in a severely injured mental condition, does the

committing of a murder make it alright? Two wrongs never make a right, especially when people's lives are at stake. And although the forced mother does have some reason for being in distress, the baby should not be the one to pay for it.

These weak arguments beg the question, why does government still allow for abortion with all the evidence against it? Because it is easier. The opening example is brought to mind; wouldn't it be easier for the mother of the six year old to just say "yes" to the child, letting him end the bug's miserable existence instead of all the contrary emotions that would be drawn out by the command "no"? Right now, the easy path, abortion, is being taken because it requires no self-control and any moral regrets can be shielded by smoke screens. To break free of this horrible practice, people must begin to act like the mother in the example and say "no" to themselves, dealing with the consequences, but all the while knowing the right decision was made.