



Suggested Responses to Pro-Choice Objections

It's not yet a human being – it's just tissue. *Roe v. Wade* employed this falsehood to justify its decision, even though it is a basic fact of biology that an independent organism begins to exist at the moment of conception. German scientist Oscar Hertwig determined the nature of sexual reproduction through fertilization in 1876. From this moment, there is no scientific debate on the origin of human life and every textbook will present the moment of fertilization as the origin of human life. That said, other people will try to say that even though a human organism exists at conception, it is not developed enough to be considered a human “person.” This distinction essentially means that some human beings would not be considered worthy of protection because of their state of development or capacity – a dangerous distinction that could leave many people subject to arbitrary discrimination.

My body, my choice. This oft-recited mantra of abortion advocates assumes that the conceived child is simply a *part* of the mother's body. Since we know that human life does begin, biologically speaking, at the moment of conception, there is a distinct human organism within the mother's body. It is true that this child can only survive in dependence upon the mother, but this is also true of young children.

Stop pushing your religious views on me. This argument assumes that opposition from abortion stems solely from faith, but it is also a clear precept of the natural law. Abortion is wrong by its very nature because it violates the inherent dignity of the human person as a rational being. Reason itself tells us that all human beings are worthy of respect and protection, without upholding only the rights of the strong against the weak.

What if the mother's life is in danger? In this case, the foreseen but unintended death of the child is not what is chosen directly, for the moral choice is to save the life of the mother, a principle called double effect. This would not be an abortion, because the child is not killed (there is no procedure directly killing the child), even though he may die as a consequence of a necessary treatment to save the life of the mother.

What about cases of rape and incest? The victim of rape or incest has experienced terrible violence. The answer is not to create a second innocent victim of the rapist, the baby. This will not help in the healing process but will actually cause more harm to the mother through the violence of abortion. Multiple studies in the U.S. found that many women who had been encouraged to abort a baby resulting from rape felt they were put through a second act of violence, and that they felt their baby paid with his life for the crime of the rapist. Some mothers who found support to carry their baby to term – whether they opted for adoption or keeping the baby, felt they had turned something horrible into something life-giving. The key is support for both victims: mother and child.

Abortion bans impede needed medical care for miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies. *Miscarriage.* When a miscarriage occurs, a child dies in the womb, making it medically necessary to remove the child for the health of the mother. The medical term often used is a “spontaneous abortion.” Medical treatment provided is

dependent upon the gestational age of the baby. In most cases, a natural “cleansing” of the uterus occurs; however, some require surgical intervention where the uterus is emptied. In all cases of a miscarriage, a child has *already died*, therefore the necessary expulsion is not considered an intentional or deliberate threat to a living baby in the womb.

Ectopic Pregnancy. An ectopic pregnancy occurs outside the uterus, commonly found in the fallopian tubes. Unfortunately, medical technology has not provided a means by which to save the child developing outside the uterus, so the only recourse is to remove the baby in order to save the life of the mother. This is done through a laparoscopic surgical procedure. An abortion procedure is not the same as a medically-necessary intervention when treating an ectopic pregnancy. There will always be an exception to save the life of the mother with any attempted pro-life legislation.

IVF (in vitro fertilization) would be illegal in Nebraska. IVF is the process of fertilization by extracting eggs, retrieving sperm, and then manually combining an egg and sperm in a laboratory dish. The embryo(s) are then transferred to the uterus. The practice of IVF usually involves multiple eggs being fertilized; some of those new embryos are never implanted, but instead are destroyed or preserved. Opponents of abortion-banning legislation contend that the destruction of the embryos would criminalize the practice of IVF. However, the language from the proposed trigger bill LB933 that fell two votes short in the 2022 Nebraska Legislative session would “forbid employing any instrument or procedure upon a pregnant woman with the specific intent of causing or abetting the termination of the life of an unborn child.” Using this wording, the practice of IVF, whereby babies come into being in a lab, would not be illegal. What *would* be illegal is “selective reduction abortion,” which also sometimes happens in IVF – the transference of several embryos into the womb – knowing that some will likely die naturally, but then, in some cases, purposely killing one or more of the embryos that successfully implant in the uterine wall because more than the desired number of babies (i.e., twins, triplets, quads, etc.) resulted from the procedure. An abortion ban like that proposed in LB933 would not prohibit IVF; it would make it illegal to abort successfully implanted embryos. For those embryos not used, pro-life advocates recommend making a donation to the adoption bank, “Snowflakes.”

Women will be economically burdened if they are forced to give birth. Some contend that already poor mothers should not bring more children into the world; it would just increase welfare payouts. However, the baby is not the problem, circumstances are. Killing a baby does nothing to address the social issues causing the poverty. And a poor mother is still poor the day after her child is aborted, only now she’s the mother of a dead baby. A culture of life values the life and wellbeing of mothers and children equally, and would entail the community being willing to make sacrifices for their good. According to National Right to Life Committee, there are more than 3,000 mother-helping centers in the U.S. In Nebraska, there are more than 25 pregnancy Help Centers.

Constitutional freedom demands access to abortion. *Roe v. Wade* used the reasoning of the prior decision on contraception from *Griswold v. Connecticut* that argued there was a right to privacy in the Constitution, although no such right can be found there. This fabricated right became the basis for the argument that the State could not interfere with issues related to human sexuality, which in *Casey v. Planned Parenthood* would become the infamous right to define the meaning of our own existence (created by Justice Anthony Kennedy). *Roe v. Wade* does acknowledge that the State has a vested interest in the birth of new citizens. Abortion harms the common good by depriving the nation of future citizens.

Compiled from various sources by Nebraska Right to Life, July 2022

