Note: This Research Paper analyzes scientific, legal, political, and social issues surrounding abortion. The social issues section only took into account limited cases for the purpose of simply presenting research and evidence. Cases regarding rape and incest, as well as cases regarding religious or moral inclinations, were purposely not included in this research paper. Please understand that this paper analyzes only the act of abortion itself and does not provide feedback for every type of individual case.
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I. Introduction:

A number of “hot button issues” currently exist in American society, one of which is abortion. Today, abortion is loosely understood as the termination of a pregnancy, but there are many other meanings surrounding this definition. Many people believe that it is murder, while others believe that it is a woman’s constitutional right to have the option to get an abortion. As research into the topic increases, more and more scientists are supporting the notion that life begins at conception, as opposed to later on in pregnancy. Despite the Supreme Court’s 7-2 decision in the 1973 *Roe V. Wade* case, in which the justices ruled that women are granted a right to privacy when it comes to abortion under the “Due Process Clause” located in the 14th amendment, the abortion lobby has been fighting a losing battle ever since (United States Supreme Court). Before entering into the legal analysis of abortion, or the moral arguments behind it, or even the societal issues surrounding it, it is important to first address the scientific argument behind this issue.

II. Scientific Analysis- Summary of Research

When debating in the scientific realm, many of the rules that normally govern debates are amended to incorporate the unique scientific style, which is why science is so great at what it does. Science has arguably been the greatest force in human history when it comes to trying to understand what happens in this world and why. From chemistry to biology, physics to technology, and evolutionary biology to medicine,
science has been leading these professional fields to success. Science has been so useful that people desperately want to find “the science of business” and have already created social sciences, such as history and politics, to help understand social professions much more effectively. Science is often one of the first places people turn to when they attempt to understand an issue better, but science has been greatly ignored when it comes to the issue of abortion.

Some pro-choice supporters argue that there is no scientific or medical agreement as to when a human life actually begins. This is partially true, but only when including scientists who have a vested interest in supporting abortion. When those groups of scientists are excluded from the data, there is an overwhelming consensus that life begins at conception. Conception is understood as the moment when an egg is fertilized by a sperm, bringing into existence a zygote, which is a genetically distinct individual. In his textbook *Human Embryology*, Dr. Bradley M. Patten states, “It is the penetration of the ovum by a spermatozoan and the resultant mingling of the nuclear material each bring to the union that constitutes the culmination the process of fertilization and marks the initiation of the life of a new individual” (Patten 43). Landrum B. Shettles, M.D., P.h.D., who was the first scientist to succeed at in vitro fertilization, takes the same stance as Dr. Patten. “The zygote is human life….there is one fact that no one can deny; Human beings begin at conception,” he said (Shettles 40). The term “zygote” is a scientific term used to identify a newly conceived life after the sperm and egg cell meet, but before the embryo begins to divide. Dr. Kieth L. Moore explains this term in more detail in his book on embryology, *The Developing Human: Clinically Oriented Embryology*. 
“Thus a new cell is formed from the union of a male and a female gamete [sperm and egg cells]. The cell, referred to as the zygote, contains a new combination of genetic material, resulting in an individual different from either parent and from anyone else in the world” (Moore 500).

Besides the numerous doctors, scientists, and medical researches who have professed that human life begins at conception, or, in other words, at the formation of a zygote, Princeton University provides an online list of other sources who make the same argument (Princeton.edu). The Westchester Institute for Ethics and the Human Person, for example, conducted a non-biased scientific study for the skeptics denying the validity of the aforementioned studies and doctors. The study concluded that:

“A neutral examination of the factual evidence merely establishes the onset of a new human life at a scientifically well defined ‘moment of conception,’ a conclusion that unequivocally indicates that human embryos from the zygote stage forward are indeed living individuals of the human species—human beings” (Condic 14).

There are scientific findings that support the argument that life does not begin at conception. Take, for example, Franklin Foer’s argument regarding the subject in Fetal Viability on May 25, 1997. Foer argues age is determined based on when the child is born, not when the child is conceived, Yet Foer completely ignores the Chinese way of calculating life at conception, in which a child is considered to be one year old upon birth. Scientific arguments that affirm that life does not begin at conception are very difficult to find, and even amongst scientists and other professionals who have a vested interest in abortion, it is rare. Most scientists and doctors are incapable of finding such
evidence, except for those who have a biased, vested interest in abortion. This is where the pro-choice argument lacks scientific proof; most of the science is vested on the side of truth, that life begins at conception. These numerous sources confidently affirm, with no hint of uncertainty, that life does in fact begin at conception. These sources do not state a theory, nor a hypothesis, nor a religious idea (since every source mentioned is a secular source with the exception of The Westchester Institute, which does have a religious affiliation), but rather a scientific perspective on life. Their conclusions are based on science and medicine, and their findings are undeniably paramount.

Another common argument made by people who are pro-choice is that the fetus is simply a part of the pregnant woman’s body, similar to her tonsils. This is also scientifically inaccurate. Dr. Jerome Lejeune, who discovered the cause of Down Syndrome, affirmed in his studies that the moment the zygote is formed, it has a completely new DNA from its mother (or 1-2 hours after this formation) (Pace). Every cell of the mother’s body, including her tonsils, feet, stomach, etc., have the exact same genetic code. The unborn child also has a genetic code, but the genetic code is distinctly different from his/her mother’s genetic code. Genetics is a science of its own; however, in his book *The Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin emphasized the hereditary nature of variability among members of a species as an important factor in evolution (Darwin 30, 81-82).

This realization by Darwin led to the foundation of genetics. Gregor Mendel took Darwin’s findings a step further when he developed the theory of hereditary in 1865, and in 1902, Walter Sutton and Theodor Boveri declared independently that the behavior of chromosomes during cell formation and fertilization were consistent with Mendel’s
principles of inheritance (Moore 8). With this, the beginning of genetics was underway, and Sir Archibald Garrod, whom many consider the father of medical genetics, soon realized that the zygote contains all the genetic information necessary for leading the development of a new human being (Vichas 76). This finding and consensus was the principle foundation for the continuation of genetics and the basis for the works conducted by James Watson and Francis Crick, Joe Hin Tjio, Albert Levan, Sir Norman Gregg, and many more. Bruce M. Carlson also concluded that at fertilization “the genetics of the future embryo is determined…” (Carlson 32). These findings by Garrod, and those conducted after him, are the basis of modern genetics and completely differ from the claims made by abortion advocates.

Conclusively, the majority of scientific arguments overwhelmingly support the notion that life begins at conception, and without objection (since it is the foundation of the entire study of genetics) that the genes and the Deoxyribonucleicacid (DNA) of a child are formed at conception. These findings are in consensus with the argument that science does not support abortion. As mentioned above, the abortion movement has been losing on all fronts, most significantly in science, but the legal battle has been just as damaging.

III. Legal Analysis- Summary of Research

There has been a constant legal battle in regards to abortion in America. Although the legal battle has been damaging to abortion and its lobby ever since 1973, the system in general still supports – and slightly protects – abortion. Some people
mistakenly believe that because a law has been passed, there is no rational reason to question said law; this is completely inaccurate. In America’s Constitutional Democratic Republic, the citizens have a direct right to question the legality of a law. In fact, many laws have been rescinded because they did not have constitutional or legal basis for existence. Abortion was made legal under the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court Case with a 7-2 vote. The main argument at hand in the court case was in regards to aso-called “constitutional right to privacy.” In his book *The Men in Black*, Mark Levin eloquently states, “So the right to privacy means everything and nothing. It has not constitutional basis and no tangible form. But what is clear that the Supreme Court, by usurping the legislature’s authority to set social policy, has seized from the people the power to make such determinations” (Levin 60). To understand his critique effectively, it is imperative to dive into a deeper analysis of *Roe v. Wade*.

The case of *Roe* was not decided on by legal analysis or any constitutional basis, but rather a political agenda that had been alive in the Supreme Court for almost 20 years. In fact, one of Richard Nixon’s campaign platforms in the 1968 presidential election involved the liberalism of the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Earl Warren. Although Chief Justice Earl Warren and William Brennan (another liberal Supreme Court Justice) had been nominated by Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican, Nixon thought the Court was a “disaster” (Levin 61). This prompted Nixon to appoint so called “conservative justices,” such as Warren Burger, whom he believed would uphold the original intent of the Constitution. However, Nixon had a difficult time getting conservative justices onto the court because the congress, which had a Democratic majority at the time, denied most of his appointees. Nixon had to find new appointees
who would pass the unconstitutional “political litmus test” in the Senate. This forced him
to appointment Harry Blackmun, William Rehnquist, and Democrat Lewis Powell. Only
Justice Rehnquist would turn out to be the true appointee Nixon was searching for.

Blackmun and Burger were old college friends, and during Blackmun’s first term
he voted with Burger almost 90 percent of the time (Epstein). Their friendship deemed
them the nickname “Minnesota Twins,” something Blackmun resented. Thus, Burger
allowed Blackmun to write the opinion in Roe, as to provide an opportunity for Blackmun
to prove his intellectual heft and so called constitutional prowess. The significance of
this is to remember that abortion became a law through political purposes, not based on
evidence or constitutional rights, but adopted by those who had a vested interest in
abortion.

Blackmun had enormous respect for doctors, which he developed as his many
years of counsel for the Mayo Clinic. He personally viewed abortion laws as the “state
meddling with a doctor’s professional judgment” (Savage). Besides this, his wife, about
whom Nixon had been quite prescient, had an effect on the decisions Blackmun made
(Woodward and Armstrong 215). However, it takes more than one justice to vote a case
into legal dictation. There were many other justices who were also predisposed to
dismantle the nation’s abortion laws, such as Lewis Powell, who was another Nixon
appointee. Bob Woodward of the Washington Post notes:

“Powell came quickly to the conclusion that the Constitution did not provide
meaningful guidance. The right to privacy was tenuous; at best it was implied. If there
was no way to find an answer in the Constitution, Powell felt that he would just have to
vote his ‘gut’… When he retired to Washington, he took one of his law clerks to lunch…
the abortion laws, Powell confided, were ‘atrocious’. His would be a strong and unshakable vote to strike them. He needed only a rationale for his vote” (Woodward and Armstrong 272-273).

The facts of Roe are persistent. “Roe” (which was a pseudonym for Norma McCorvey, a pregnant woman from Texas) could not legally obtain an abortion in Texas, where it was a crime to procure an abortion or to attempt to perform an abortion, except “by medical advice for the purpose of saving the life of the mother” (United States Supreme Court 113, 118). The central issue was whether Roe had a constitutional right to abort her baby although her life was not at medical risk. This translated into “a right to privacy” under the Burger Court. This court case became the perfect opportunity to explore how external influences, as well as a justice’s personal shortcomings and prejudices, contribute to judicial activism. Justice Blackmun wrote:

“Our task, of course, is to resolve the issue by constitutional measurement, free of emotion and of predilection. We seek earnestly to do this, and, because we do, we have inquired into, and in this opinion place some emphasis upon, medical and medical-legal history and what that history reveals about man’s attitudes toward the abortion procedure over the centuries” (Blackmun 117)

If this statement is to be upheld as a Supreme Court Case decision, then the evidence and medical history goes against the decision upheld by the court. Blackmun himself states under the “The position of the American Medical Association” section of Roe that “The anti-abortion mood prevalent in this country in the late 19th century was shared by the medical profession. Indeed, the attitude of the profession may have played a
significant role in the enactment of stringent criminal abortion legislation during that period" (Blackmun 141-142). This so-called “mood” Blackmun criticizes was based on imperial and scientific evidence from the 19th and 20th centuries. Blackmun used the libraries of the Mayo Clinic to research the medical opinion, and limited himself to that research alone (Levin 62). Yet even in that overwhelming bias he was unable to procure substantial evidence and was unable to prove his judicial “prowess.” The majority of his opinion is based on emotional stories and medical bias from abortionists, or pro-abortion lobbyist doctors (Blackmun). His use of American and British legal systems to concur his opinion was articulated in an astonishingly lacking 4 pages (Blackmun 137-141).

Blackmun also argued:

“The Constitution does not explicitly mention any right of privacy. In a line of decisions, however, going back perhaps as far as Union Pacific R. Co. v. Botsford, 141 U.S. 250, 251 (1891), the Court has recognized that a right of personal privacy, or a guarantee of certain areas or zones of privacy, does exist under the Constitution… This right of privacy, whether it be founded in the Fourteenth Amendment’s concept of personal liberty and restrictions upon state action, as we feel it is, or, as the District Court determined, in the Ninth Amendment’s reservation of rights to the people, is broad enough to encompass a woman’s decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy. The detriment that the State would impose upon the pregnant woman by denying this choice altogether is apparent. Specific and direct harm medically diagnosable even in early pregnancy may be involved. Maternity, or additional offspring, may force
upon the woman a distressful life and future. Psychological harm may be imminent. Mental and physical health may be taxed by child care. There is also the distress, for all concerned, associated with the unwanted child, and there is the problem of bringing a child into a family already unable, psychologically and otherwise, to care for it. In other cases, as in this one, the additional difficulties and continuing stigma of unwed motherhood may be involved. All these are factors the woman and her responsible physician necessarily will consider in consultation… We, therefore, conclude that the right of personal privacy includes the abortion decision, but that this right is not unqualified, and must be considered against important state interests in regulation” (Blackmun 152-153).

Note how the Justice does not go into any analysis of the Fourteenth and Nineteenth Amendments, yet uses *stare decisis* on a case completely irrelevant to life and death to make his decision. By thwarting the Fourteenth Amendment into any meaning necessary to fit in the argument, it does not allow for a major perspective of the Amendment to be understood. The Fourteenth Amendment clearly states that “no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws” (Constitution 14th Amendment). Using the proper understanding of this amendment, there is clear precedent to protect the life of an unborn child, not to allow an abortion terminate its life. The Supreme Court’s self implied powers are to decide based on constitutionality. If the court was able to create an unjustified “privacy” clause in the Fourteenth Amendment to protect the rights of ending
a pregnancy, then there is undeniable evidence in that same amendment that prohibits them from doing such. It explicitly protects the rights of the unborn, since life is defined at the moment of conception from an overwhelming consensus in science, even stated by the Justices who so prominently supported abortion in this case. Former Governor of Arkansas and Presidential candidate Mike Huckabee has already called for similar action. He said, “As president, we will invoke the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment. We will protect human life” (Hunter 1).

Besides this argument, it is important to clearly identify what history dictates about the role of the Fourteenth Amendment. When the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified, it guaranteed “African Americans citizenship and all its privileges, which were officially adopted into the U.S. Constitution” (History.com Staff 1). This amendment was ratified after the Civil War on June 13, 1866 in an effort to end slavery and racism. It was used to uphold the notion from abolitionists that the African American is a human being and a free man, rather than “chattel” or “property.” This was the fundamental basis for the Fourteenth Amendment, as well as procuring African Americans citizenship, which is a matter of its own. This moral and just amendment has been misunderstood ever since. Yes, the Due Process Clause did not specify that it can only be used for this essence (nor is that a proposition by any respected legal scholar), but it does bring in reason for concern when ambiguous uses of this clause are taken out of context to give the Supreme Court even more self delegated powers that are not outlined in the Constitution. It also causes grave concern when this orchestrated twisting of the Fourteenth Amendment is used to create judicial actions that are explicitly contradictory to the Constitution. The Fourteenth Amendment should be used
properly to create laws that directly follow the intent of the amendment being cited, rather than jumping to ambiguous conclusions. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights were created to stop tyranny, and the Supreme Court completely ignored this fact by establishing precedents in *Roe* from ambiguous concepts, emotional logic, statements lacking of medical and scientific evidence, and a lacking of legal analysis. Blackmun believed, fundamentally, that the right to privacy, wherever it comes from, includes the right to abortion. There is no need to look any further for legal argument amidst the capacious opinion handed down by the court, because it does not exist. The legal arguments are so lacking that the dissenting opinion directly criticized the majority opinions inadequate use of legal analysis.

Justice Rehnquist was one of the two Justices who had a dissenting opinion in this historic court case. He wrote eloquently in the dissenting opinion:

> If the Court means by the term "privacy" no more than that the claim of a person to be free from unwanted state regulation of consensual transactions may be a form of "liberty" protected by the Fourteenth Amendment, there is no doubt that similar claims have been upheld in our earlier decisions on the basis of that liberty. I agree with the statement of Mr. Justice Stewart in his concurring opinion that the "liberty," against deprivation of which without due process the Fourteenth Amendment protects, embraces more than the rights found in the Bill of Rights. But that liberty is not guaranteed absolutely against deprivation, only against deprivation without due process of law. The test traditionally applied in the area of social and economic legislation is whether or not a law such as that challenged has a rational relation to a valid state objective. *Williamson v. Lee*
Optical Co., 348 U.S. 483, 491 (1955). The Due Process Clause of the
Fourteenth Amendment undoubtedly does place a limit, albeit a broad one, on
legislative power to enact laws such as this. If the Texas statute were to prohibit
an abortion even where the mother's life is in jeopardy, I have little doubt that
such a statute would lack a rational relation to a valid state objective under the
test stated in Williamson, supra. But the Court's sweeping invalidation of any
restrictions on abortion during the first trimester is impossible to justify under that
standard, and the conscious weighing of competing factors that the Court's
opinion apparently substitutes for the established test is far more appropriate to a
legislative judgment than to a judicial one” (Blackmun 172-174)

As he points out, the Due Process Clause does place a limit on legislative power, but it
also does not deny a woman from receiving an abortion in a case where the mother's
life is endangered. Overall, neither the Due Process Clause nor the Fourteenth
Amendment gives any explicit justification for terminating a pregnancy or giving citizens
“right to privacy.” Although a right to privacy does exist, and was established in earlier
precedents, how that applies to terminating a pregnancy is still up for debate and has
caused huge battles in state legislatures and courts.

However, Blackmun went further than just finding the right to privacy in the
Fourteenth Amendment as declaratory for abortion; he began to author what reads like
a federal statute, or in other words, a legislative law. He argued that the state's interest
ranged across a spectrum from conception to birth. However, the state's interest at
conception was minimal and increases as the pregnancy progresses, while a woman's
interest was paramount at conception, and the state's interest to protect the growing
fetus would surpass the rights of the mother after the second trimester. Critically, however, Blackmun specifically declared, against imperial medical, genetic, and scientific evidence, that a child was not a “person” and thus could not be given Fourteenth Amendment equal protection rights. Blackmun stated, “We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins. When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy, and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary, at this point, in the development of man’s knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer” (Blackmun 159-162). Blackmun would give deference to the minority in medicine, philosophy, and theology (the people who were “right” in his own perspective) but not to the Constitution, the people, the states, or the other branches of the federal government. He would agree that no consensus could be made by those respective disciplines, yet he would disagree with over half of the majority in those fields, and claim himself that in 19th century medicine, anti-abortion was a shared consensus. Many argued that these statements and beliefs were hypocritical (Levin 66) (Moore 4) (Carlson 2). In Conclusion, the Constitution, nor the Bill of Rights, contain a direct, explicit right to privacy. Privacy, according to these documents alone, is never an absolute right, but is always governed by other rights.

Another one of the main arguments made during Roe v. Wade was the argument of viability, which again was championed by Blackmun (United States Supreme Court 163-164; 164-165). The Supreme Court defined viability as the point when the unborn is “potentially able to live outside the mother’s womb, albeit with artificial aid” (United States Supreme Court 38). The critical issue at hand was when the development of the child’s lungs begins to develop by week nine of fetal development. Why is it during the
child’s lungs? Life in the medical world is defined with a heartbeat. But legally, for a fetus only, it is defined when the lungs are fully formed (25 weeks). This is an excellent example of the law contradicting itself. Now fetuses are able to live outside their mother’s womb after around 20 weeks (Neonatal Death) (Tyson 1). But besides the scientific argument, legally a human dies when their heart stops beating, so why is it that their life does not start when their heart starts beating? When a human is resuscitated their heart is shocked back to functionality, whether their lungs operate or not. So the law is changed to simply create a loophole for abortion to be lawful.

The Ninth Amendment was cited as a constitutional argument for the “reservation of the rights of people,” but “the Supreme Court declined to adopt the Texas district court’s Ninth Amendment rationale, and instead asserted that the ‘right of privacy,’ whether it be found in the Fourteenth Amendment’s concept of personal liberty and restrictions upon state action, as we feel it is, or, as the district court determined, in the Ninth Amendment's reservation of rights to the people, is broad enough to encompass a woman's decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy” (Chase 34, 38). The Ninth Amendment is clear: “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people” (Constitution Ninth Amendment). How is it that a direct, explicit statement from the Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments can be ignored, while a hypothetical concept derived from the Supreme Court can adopt an ambiguous clause in the Fourteenth Amendment? This question is exactly why abortion lobbyists and supporters have been losing ever since the Roe v. Wade case. The laws and theories it was founded on are so vague, ambiguous, and often times inexistent, that the country has to now take logical and rational steps to deal
with abortion. Nevertheless, *Roe* did not put the abortion issue to rest. The decision was constructed out of Justice Blackmun’s own “constitutional and obstetric creativity.” He conceived the notion of three trimesters of pregnancy as a legal concept to create an uncontrolled right to abortion within the first trimester. This “right to abortion” has been challenged by states in their legal and political systems since 1973, and has caused great damage to abortionists and the abortion lobby.

**IV: Political Analysis- Summary of Research**

In American society there has been a distinct separation on the issue of abortion. Those against abortion deemed themselves “pro-life” while those for abortion deemed themselves “pro-choice.” These groups have been battling over rights and legislative power for the last four or five decades, but ever since *Roe v. Wade*, the pro-life stance has been winning, unmatched by the gains seen by the pro-choice movements. In the past two decades, laws like the ones that govern Texas have been passed with consistent frequency as pro-life state legislators have recreated the capabilities of legal abortion in the U.S. For example:

“In 2011, 92 abortion-regulating provisions—a record number—passed in 24 states after Republicans gained new and larger majorities in 2010 in many legislatures across the country. These laws make it harder every year to exercise a right heralded as a crowning achievement of the 20th century women’s movement. In addition to North Dakota, three other states—South Dakota, Mississippi and Arkansas—have just one surgical-abortion clinic in operation. The
number of abortion providers nationwide shrank from 2,908 in 1982 to 1,793 in 2008, the latest year for which data is available. Getting an abortion in America is, in some places, harder today than at any point since it became a constitutionally protected right 40 years ago this month” (Pickert 1)

Part of the reason for this major shift is the increased medical and scientific knowledge about when life begins and about how the fetus usually during late first trimester pregnancy’s can feel pain (Pickert 2-3). Chairmaine Yoest, president and CEO of Americans United for Life explained:

“The cognitive dissonance of having a hospital saving a life of a 24-week-old baby next door to a room where a 23-week-old baby is aborted is very real…The pro-life movement is on the side of science. We are the ones standing with the scientific advances showing not only the reality of life in the womb, but also being able to push back the day of viability” (Farah 1)

In May 2012, a Gallup Poll reported that the number of Americans who identify themselves as “pro-choice” was at an all-time low, at 41%, while there was an increase in the number of Americans who describe themselves as pro-life up to 50% (Saad 1). This increased knowledge has also lead to a shift away from the pro-choice arguments, with a majority of the country now supporting a ban on abortion (Pickert 2). A CNN poll conducted from 2006 until 2015 found that over 51% of people now agree that abortion should only be legal in certain circumstances, those being rape, and when the mother’s life is in danger (CNN/ORC 2). Add onto this the 18% of people who believe it should be illegal in all circumstances, you have a majority of the United Sates believing that the country should partially ban, or completely ban, abortion (CNN/ORC 2).
According to Kate Pickert at *Times Magazine*, another major reason for the shift in support of Pro-Life is that “many young activists are bypassing the legacy feminist organizations that have historically protected access to abortion, weakening the pro-choice establishment at the very moment it needs to coalesce around new strategies to combat pro-life gains and connect with the public” (Pickert 2). Besides this, Picker also touches upon the modern power of the State legislatures. She concluded that:

“The modern era of state restrictions on abortion began in 1992 with the Supreme Court's decision in Planned Parenthood v. Casey. The court upheld *Roe v. Wade* but said states have a right to regulate abortion as long as they don't write laws that impose an "undue burden" on women. Pro-life politicians enacting laws to limit abortion are now testing the limits of the Casey ruling.” (Pickert 2)

This is a significant observation because with the new zoning laws, licensing laws, state board adopted rules of health, laws requiring abortion clinics to comply with architectural zoning regulations for hospitals, and major dominance of pro-life lawyers authoring laws that have heavy regulations in fine print, it has been very difficult for abortion clinics to operate, and many have had to shut down. Over 20 states in the United States have extremely strict abortion laws, some states only having 1 or 2 abortion clinics overall (CBS News 1-21), while over two thirds of the states have fairly strict abortion laws (Guttmacher Institute Map). From the onset of abortion, the abortion advocates have opposed any effort to restrict abortion in any trimesters or to regulate abortion providers and clinics.
The largest abortion provider in the United States is Planned Parenthood, and they have recently come under heavy scrutiny for allegedly selling aborted fetus body parts for embryonic research for hefty sums of money (Torre 1). Planned Parenthood, according to their 2013 and 2014 annual report, stated that abortion was only “3% of all Planned Parenthood services” (Planned Parenthood 16). According to the math behind this manipulated number, the “three percent” figure is composed when all services are counted equally, but there are obvious differences between these services. By Planned Parenthood’s own annual report’s math, a woman who gets an abortion, a pregnancy test, an STD test and some contraceptives has received four services, and only 25 percent of them are abortion. This is similar to performing an abortion and giving a woman some Advil and proclaiming that only half of what you do is providing abortion services, the other half is providing pain management.

For example, imagine that McDonalds only sold water as their beverage, and for each meal they counted the burger, fries, and water as separate services. They would then, by the logic of Planned Parenthood, be able to proclaim that; “McDonalds is not only in the fast food business, but more than 25% of all their services are purely focused on hydrating people around the world.” This is pure organized misrepresentation. It is illogical for Planned Parenthood to compare providing a pregnancy test or condoms or a box of contraceptives as the same or equal to a service such as abortion. Although it is very difficult to track the percentage of abortion services that Planned Parenthood provides, since it is a “non profit” it only has limited obligation to release any information beyond their annual report. Some conservative figures have put the number above 90%, while some more moderate figures have put the figure around 20-40% (Ye 2-3)
Although it is almost impossible, as of now, to truly find the percentage of abortions done by Planned Parenthood, the data shows that Planned Parenthood Federation of America is the largest abortion provider in the United States, with affiliates performing more than 300,000 abortions per year, which is approximately one out of every three in the country (Ye 2) (Hall 1).

The Guttmacher Institute in New York found that despite a nearly 20% decline in the number of abortions in the country between 2000 and 2011, “the number of abortions Planned Parenthood performed during that time increased from 197,070 to 333,964, thereby more than doubling its share of the abortion market from 15 percent in 2000 to 32 percent in 2011, the latest year for which national data are available” (Jones 6 Table 1). This shows that although abortion as a whole is on the decline in the United States, Planned Parenthood remain the center of the abortion fight, providing abortions at every turn it can and manipulating their statistics to hide this evidence. This, however, does not stop the Senate and the Congress from continued investigations.

There have been many scientists and medical doctors who have testified at the United States Senate regarding abortion. The Judiciary subcommittee in the United States Senate has held many testimonies on the subject. These doctors include Dr. Alfred M. Bongioanni, professor of pediatrics and obstetrics at the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Jerome LeJeune, professor of genetics at the University of Descartes in Paris, and Professor Hymie Gordon, of the famous Mayo Clinic that Blackmun so regularly used (Alcorn 53). There were also testimonies by Professor Micheline Matthews-Roth from Harvard University Medical School, and Dr. Watson A. Bowes from the University of Colorado Medical School (Alcorn 53). Landrum Shettles, a prominent
physician, noted that at these Senate hearings, “Pro-abortionists, though invited to do so, failed to produce even a single expert witness who would specifically testify that life begins at any points other than conception or implementation. Only one witness said no one can tell when life begin” (Shettles 113). Conclusively, political propaganda surrounding abortion is growing, but abolitionists are losing at every front despite the fact that they send out misrepresented numbers and ideas. They lack even one medical or scientific professional who can support their claims. The Pro-Choice and abortion lobby has been losing ever since 1973.

V: Societal Issues- Arguments and Responses

There are many social arguments that are put forward by both pro-life and pro-choice supporters. Since the majority of science and genetics does not support the pro-choice arguments, yet the legal system, as of now, defends the side of abortion, we will analyze arguments made by pro-choice supporters. One of the main arguments made by pro-choice supporters concerning social issues is that every child is not a wanted child. They argue that it is unfair to children to bring them into a world where they are not wanted (Alcorn 139). The National Council for Adoption estimates that there are currently over 2 million couples waiting to adopt a child (Adoption Factbook 567, 577). However, there were only 130,000 adoptions in the United States in 2014 (Davenport 1). This argument that there are children who are “unwanted” is wrong. Not just “normal” babies are wanted, either;there are people who specifically request to adopt babies who
suffer from diseases like Down Syndrome and Spina Bifida (Alcorn 139). “Unwanted” is not the condition of a child, but rather the mindset of a parent.

The unwanted child is a real person, regardless of anyone else's feelings toward the child. For years before women achieved rights, they were degraded by the fact that their value in society was judged solely on whether or not they were wanted by men. The same logic can be applied to these children. Just as a woman's value should not be based on whether they are desired or wanted by others, so should a child's. Adoption is a viable alternative to abortion and provides a path for the children to have a normal life rather than denying them the opportunity to live. The argument of a child being unwanted often leads to the argument that abuse is lowered because of abortions.

Another argument made under the social issues umbrella of abortion is that child abuse lowers as abortion rises. The National Center of Child Abuse and Neglect, the United States Department of Health, and the American Humane Institution all researched this argument. From 1973 to 1997 there was a drastic increase in physical abuse cases in the United States, from less than 300,000 a year to over 3.4 million a year (Alcorn 144). When comparing the 3.4 million cases of abuse in 1997 to the 3.3 million in 2010, it shows that since abortion has been on the decline since 2000, so has child abuse (Child Abuse Statistics 1). Besides these statistics, the National Children’s Advocacy Center, in correspondence with the United States Department of Health and Human Services, released a report showing that child abuse in the United States is on a decline (NCAC1). This comes during a time when abortion is also on a decline. Thus, abuse lowers in the United States not when abortion rises, but rather when abortion decreases.
There is a new rise in the number of “botched abortion cases” around the world, and specifically in the United States. One of the most profound individuals in this modern era is Gianna Jenssen (Dareing 1). Her story is beyond powerful as she explains her thankfulness for surviving a botched saline abortion. A saline abortion is a method where saline solution is used to burn the baby alive in the mother’s womb, blinding and suffocating the child alive until it slowly ends the child’s life, and then gets delivered dead. Gianna Jenssen’s mother was undergoing this procedure when something went wrong, and after 18 hours of being burned in her mother’s womb she was delivered alive in an abortion clinic in Los Angeles. As Jenssen testifies in front of the House Judiciary Committee, she mentions how thankful she is that the abortionists had not come in to work on time because they would have ended her life through suffocation, strangulation, surgical death, or leaving her there to die. This powerful testimony shows a woman who was more than thankful for her life, even though she suffers from cerebral palsy due to the saline abortion and the lack of oxygen she received. Powerful stories such as this have silenced the attempt to be proud of abortions on Twitter and Facebook using the hashtag #shoutmyabortion, #shoutyourabortion, and #proudabortion. These testimonies, and what critics deemed “immoral pride for an abortion,” have lead to a direct rise in the support of the anti-abortion movement.

Many critics in the social debate realmcite the hypocrisy of the pro-choice movement by denying people, such as Gianna Jenssen, her right to choose life or death herself. Critics also claim that parents do not have the right to determine if they want their mentally or physically impaired child to be born. These critics often times claim that
“If all the children alive today in adoption centers, foster homes, and even the sick, were polled there would be an overwhelming majority in favor of life, over death by abortion” (Acorn 123). Overall, the defense of abortion, even in arguments based on social issues, is quickly dissolving.

VI: Conclusion

In conclusion, after analyzing and researching scientific, legal, social, and religious information, there is very little evidence in any of these areas that supports the action of abortion. Presently, with the Supreme Court’s ruling in Roe V. Wade still in place, there is a stronger support of abortion in the legal system; however, that, too, is beginning to subside with the growing strictness by state-level governments on abortion laws. Science finds that life begins at conception, and the study of genetics confirms this. When removing all the doctors and scientists who have a vested interest in abortion being legal, there is a major consensus among doctors and scientists that life begins at conception, and that therefore abortion should only be allowed in cases involving rape or the endangerment of the mother’s life. However, the law is much more protective of abortion. In 1973, abortion was legalized throughout the United States in the Supreme Court case of Roe v. Wade; however, on the political front – and now the legal front – abortion and its supporters have been losing ever since. On a social level, opinions regarding abortion have been shifting constantly since 1973. Today, a large portion of the United States has moved toward the pro-life movement and away from the pro-choice movement. A majority of the country now believes that abortion should only be legal in certain cases, those being rape and when the mother’s life is in danger.
Overall, abortion is a very emotional topic, but like every topic it requires an analysis based on reason and imperial evidence rather than just simply emotions. Although abortion is legal in the United State, its supporters have been losing power since 1973, and following this losing trend, as time progresses, abortion will once again be the topic of the decade when it is eventually outlawed across the nation.
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