The Science Conversation

There are only four differences between a preborn and a newborn, and none of those differences justify killing unborn children. Here are 4 great conversations based on science using the acronym **SLED**.

The first step is to clarify the issue and ask a very important question. Is the unborn a member a of the human family? If that is true, killing the unborn to benefit others is a serious moral wrong.

If the unborn are not human, killing them for any reason requires no more justification than having a toenail removed. The true debate is in fact about one question: What is the unborn? Some people may argue, and they do that killing a fetus is morally different than killing a four-year-old.

Let us go back to human development shall we. Human development begins at fertilization. We can say that embryos are less developed than newborns and toddlers. It doesn't change the fact that there is no difference in the embryo that I once was and the adult that I am today that would justify killing me at the earliest stage of development.

Size: The unborn is smaller than the toddler, but toddlers are smaller than adults. The unborn is clearly smaller than a born human. It's hard to reason how a difference in size, though, disqualifies someone from being a person. A human being's value is not based on their size. She's still equally a person even though she differs in that characteristic. In the same way, the unborn is smaller than a four-year-old.

Level of development: The unborn is also less developed than a born human being. A four-year-old girl can't bear children because her reproductive system is less developed than a fourteen-year-old girl. That doesn't disqualify her from personhood. She is still as equally valuable as a child-bearing teen. The unborn is also less developed than the four-year-old. Therefore, we can't disqualify her from personhood for the same reason we can't disqualify the four-year-old. Both are merely less developed than older human beings.

Environment: The unborn is located in a different environment than a born human. How does your location, though, affect your value? It doesn't does it? Can changing your environment alter your status as a person? Where you are has no bearing on who you are. An astronaut who spacewalks in orbit is in a radically different environment than a person on the planet. No one could reasonably deny his personhood simply because he's in a different location. Scuba divers who swim under water and spelunkers who crawl through caves are equally as valuable as humans who ride in hot-air balloons. If changing your environment can't change your fundamental status, then being inside or outside a uterus can't be relevant either. How could a

7-inch journey through the birth canal magically transform a value-less human into a valuable person? Nothing has changed except their location.

Degree of dependency: The unborn is dependent upon the mother's body for nutrition and a proper environment. It's hard to see, though, how depending upon another person disqualifies you from being a person. Newborns and toddlers still depend upon their parents to provide nutrition and a safe environment. Indeed, some third-world countries require children to be breast fed because formula is not available. Imagine you alone witnessed a toddler fall into a swimming pool. Would you be justified in declaring him not valuable simply because he depended on you for his survival? Of course not! Since the unborn depends on his mother in the same way, it's not reasonable to disqualify his value either.

What about Abortion to Save the Mother's Life?

Come back next week and I will help provide some light to that question and other hard ones.

*information provided by the film, <a href="https://wretched.givecloud.co/product/life-is-best/l

Thank you for downloading this document. Join the Pregnancy Resource Center as we turn our culture towards a culture that values life at www.youmakeherbrave.com Families need your voice.