

One third of my generation is missing. One third of those who would have been born after 1973, are not here today. One third of my generation has been aborted. In 1973, the Supreme Court decided that the right to privacy included the right of a woman to abort her pregnancy. In order to extend this right to abortion, the Supreme Court held that the unborn were not human.

I realize that the topic of abortion is very controversial. Perhaps some of you in the audience are pro-choice, and I would seek to present to you a coherent and logical reasoning in support of the pro-life position. For those of you who are already pro-life, my goal is to equip you with the ability to prove the soundness of the pro-life position. First I will look at the most important question in the abortion debate. Then, I will explore, from both a biological and philosophical perspective, the pro-life position. Last, I will examine some objections to the pro-life position, and why they are not justification for abortion.

The abortion debate is often amazingly complex. The philosophical, moral, and religious issues that are thrown back and forth muddle the real questions. However, I believe that the entire abortion debate can be resolved by taking a trip to the kitchen. Imagine that you are washing dishes and your child comes up behind you and asks, "Daddy or Mommy, can I kill this?" What would be your first response? Something like, "What is it?" If it is a snail or ant, then you probably won't have any problem. However, if it is his younger brother, or baby sister, then your response would change dramatically.

You see, the ultimate question is, "What are the unborn?" If the unborn are not human, then no justification for elective abortion is necessary; but if the unborn are human, then no justification for elective abortion is adequate.

So are the unborn human? I propose that when you as a person were conceived, you were a distinct, self-integrated, whole, human being. We can substantiate this idea in two ways: First let's take a look at the biological aspect, and then we'll look at the philosophical aspect.

Former abortionist Dr. Beverly McMillan states, "The baby is human from the moment of conception. When the one cell it is made of has the characteristic 46 chromosomes of the human species, it is unique from that moment. Eighteen days after conception [the] baby's heart is already beating, often pumping a different blood type than [the mother's]. According to the Journal of the American Medical Association, "Brain waves have been recorded at 40 days. If you touch a little baby's nose at that point it will draw its head back." In half a month after conception, a baby has a heart. After a little over a month, the unborn are thinking.

Furthermore, we can look to the Law of Biogenesis, which states, living things reproduce after their own kind, meaning: dogs reproduce dogs, cats reproduce cats, and humans reproduce humans. If you want to find out what species something is, just look at its parents. Humans cannot reproduce a “clump of cells” or a “potential human,” because a potential X, must be an actual Y. If the unborn aren’t human, then what are they? Biologically, the unborn must be human.

Now, let's address the philosophical aspect. Most people agree that the newborn are completely human; yet, as Stephen Schwarz points out, the unborn differ from the newborn in only four ways, none of which are relevant to its status as a human: Size, Level of development, Environment, and Degree of dependency. If you don't meet these 4 criteria are you less human? Let's take a look:

First, size: The unborn are smaller than the newborn, but does size have anything to do with whether or not you are human? If so, then it would seem men are more human than women because they are generally bigger, and pro-basketball players like Shaquille o' Neil have are the most human of all. Clearly size is not a criterion.

Second, Level of Development: The unborn are less developed than the newborn, but the newborn are less developed than children, and children are less developed than adults. In fact, you don't reach your peak of mental development until age 40, so if level of development is a criterion for being human, then everyone under 40 is still gaining their humanity. Just because you aren't fully developed does not mean you are less human.

Environment: Again, the unborn are located in a different place, but how does location suddenly change you into a non-human? The only difference between a newborn baby, and an unborn baby is 8 inches of birth canal. How does moving 8 inches, suddenly change a blob of tissue into a human?

Last, Degree of Dependency: If viability is what makes one human, then everyone who is dependent on a pace maker, or some form of medication would be declared non-human. Perhaps you heard about the Siamese twins from Egypt who were in the news last year. One of the twins was physically dependent on the other twin; does this fact mean that one of the twins was not human? Dependency is not a criterion for being human.

Philosophically speaking, the unborn are not different from the newborn in any way that would disqualify them from being human. The four differences of size, level of development, environment, and degree of dependency are not criteria for being a human. The unborn are just as human as the newborn.

So from both a biological and philosophical perspective, the unborn are human. How does this fact affect the abortion debate? Let's analyze some of the many objections to the pro-life position.

The primary justification for abortion is the mother's right to choose. A mother should have the right to abort her pregnancy. But does a mother have the right to choose to abort her unborn child? Let me ask the same question in a different context. Does a mother have a right to choose to terminate her newborn baby? We all realize that killing a newborn child is murder, but why is it murder? Because that child is human, and as such, has the same rights as you and I do.

Yet, we must ask the question, what is the difference between the human unborn, and the human already born? This question brings us to another objection. Many people assert that personhood is conferred upon birth. It is questionable why moving 8 inches would suddenly change a blob of tissue into a human. But furthermore, this criterion is wholly arbitrary. In November of 1992, Discover Magazine ran a feature story on fetal surgery where doctors repaired herniated diaphragms and spinal disks on unborn babies 21 to 24 weeks old. They would partially remove these babies from the womb, perform this surgery, and then put them back in the womb. The obvious question is, did these babies become human during the operation outside the womb, and then become non-human because they were put back in the womb? No justification is adequate for taking innocent human life.

The only question that matters in the abortion debate is, what is the unborn? From both a biological and philosophical perspective, the unborn are no less human than you or I. And no objection to the pro-life position is justification for elective abortion, because abortion takes innocent human life.

Every day, according to Planned Parenthood, approximately 3,700 unborn children lose their lives. Imagine the outrage we would feel if terrorists committed another September 11th type attack on America. Now imagine what we would feel if that type of attack happened every day, because it does.

The next time you look at the United States flag, count each of the 50 stars, because each star represents one million unborn babies who have been aborted. The number of abortions since 1973 is rapidly approaching 50 million. One third of my generation is missing. One third of those who would have been born after 1973, are not here today. One third of my generation has been aborted.