

Fighting Crime? – Part 1

“London, England (LifeNews.com) – A trio of economists have released the results of a new study disproving the supposed link between the legalization of abortion and a reduction in crime. John Donohue and Steven Levitt first introduced the repeatedly-criticized theory in 2001 and another report shows it’s untrue.” ((<http://www.lifenews.com/int692.html>))

“The economists also note that US crime rates fell in the 1990s but that the rates fell not only among younger Americans born after Roe v. Wade, but fell among older Americans as well – indicating abortion likely had no effect on crime.

“Given all this, it seems highly unlikely that the legalization of abortion can, as Donohue and Levitt hypothesized, explain the dramatic drop in crime observed in the US in the 1990s,” the economists write.

The authors also reject the hypothesis that abortion reduced the number of unwanted children who were more likely to commit crimes.

“Prior to the legalization of abortion, unwanted babies did not necessarily become unwanted children,” they wrote.

The authors point to data showing adoption rates in England were significantly higher before abortion was allowed than afterwards – showing many so-called unwanted children were adopted by loving families who wanted them.

“The rate of infants under five who had been adopted at birth decreased from 16 per thousand in the mid-1960s to about 5 per thousand just 10 years later,” they said.

“Rather than just reducing the number of unwanted children, abortion legalization appears to have reduced the number of

unwanted infants who would have ended up (through adoption) being wanted children," they write." ([*ibid*](#))

You know; we didn't need a study to prove that. That apparently rare thing, "common sense" dictates that abortion would not decrease crime, and would actually increase it. How can that be? Let's look at the logic behind abortion and see what is actually there.

The advocates of abortion claim abortion is necessary as the child is unwanted, and therefore would be a burden upon the mother and/or the family into which the child would be born. Moreover, since that child is unwanted, it will not be treated well and will grow up in an environment that would cause it to become a social misfit, and would be more likely to commit crime. The child would be a particular burden upon poor, unwed women who cannot provide properly, and would drag that family further down into poverty. We can even go so far as to say that the child, who is unwanted and not aborted, would themselves be far more likely to become a burden upon society as they, being raised in a poverty-stricken home, would also end up on welfare.

In all the justification given above, and I have read and heard all the above-mentioned justifications, it all starts with "the unwanted child." You know, that's funny, and not in the *ha, ha* sense either; it is funny in that the reason the child exists in the first place is ignored. Last I knew, children didn't just suddenly appear in the womb. No, there is always a cause, and that cause demands the actions of two individuals. Otherwise, children simply don't exist, and cannot exist. A child comes about as a result of a deliberate act committed by two individuals. Generally speaking, this act is freely engaged in, and usually without thought to the consequences. In other words, the child did not ask to be here, yet now it is here, as a result of the deliberate behavior of two other individuals.

So then, according to those who advocate abortion, the proper response to that is to relieve the responsible parties of their deliberate actions, and make the child pay for what its parents did. An analogy to this would be making the victim of a crime, pay for the criminal's actions. It seems to me that this is turning justice on its head.

However, not to be deterred, the advocates of abortion have a rejoinder that goes somewhat like this: 'It's not really a child as it's not viable while in the womb. It requires special conditions to live, and thus is not really a person, particularly under the law.'

Really? I suppose then we have had instances of women giving birth to snakes, turtles, pigs, ducks and the like? No? Why is it that every time, all throughout human history, women always give birth to little humans that look remarkably like their parents? Just why is that?

Perhaps it is because that fertilized egg in the womb is actually a person after all, and has all the processes of life occurring in it from the moment it was fertilized? Or is it that all our biology books, and the decades of biological research are in error? And as for special conditions for life, I would tend to think that needing an adequate amount of water every day is a special condition for life. I think that one ought to be able to subsist on coffee, and anyone who drinks water requires special conditions for life. Silly isn't it? The reality is that determining what special conditions for life are, is very much like beauty – it is in the eye of the beholder. Moreover, if the life of a person you love is at stake, no condition required for them to live is special. On the other hand, if it is someone you hate, well, simply allowing them to breathe air is too much to ask isn't it?

Perhaps it really all boils down to this: we don't want to be held responsible for what we do, and the activities we engage in: no matter the consequences.

Isn't that the logic of criminals? It certainly is utterly selfish isn't it? It is the "I don't give a rip about anyone else, I want what I want, and I don't care who it hurts." attitude.

It seems to me that this kind of attitude fosters and engenders an increase in crime, and not a decrease. It also fosters the abdication of personal responsibility, which is precisely what we have observed since the decision of Roe v. Wade in 1973. Moreover, that attitude of 'I'm not responsible' permeates throughout all society and affects every portion of our life.

Additionally, we do know, whether we consciously admit it or not, that we are making the innocent pay for the crimes of the guilty. You know, we are outraged when a criminal sues the victim of his or her crime because the criminal was injured either on the victim's property, or by the victim, and the criminal wins the lawsuit. But we think nothing of the woman who aborts her child because it is "unwanted," or she "can't afford it." At least when the criminal brings a civil lawsuit, it doesn't result in the death of the victim of their crime. This not to say that I think criminals should be allowed to sue victims of their crime – they shouldn't. It is merely to point out a dichotomy in our thinking. We are outraged by one, but not the other – wonder why?

No, if we really sit down and look at our society and the changes it has undergone since 1973, we can see the outworking of the underlying attitudes and thought processes present in the whole concept of abortion. Common sense dictates that not only would crime not drop as a result of abortion being legalized, but would actually increase. Even if the way crime is reported is changed so that the statistics don't seem so bad, we can still see the degradation of society and the loss of respect for the rights of others.

We all know, whether we are willing to admit it or not, that

abortion is taking an innocent life. We have codified the ability of the guilty to take the life of an innocent, and that taking of life is entirely without consequence under the law. In short, we have said that certain innocent parties have no right to life under the law. Just how do you think that impacts the rest of our rights, since all other rights must have the right to life to be effective?

Think about it: what an oxymoron to say that we can reduce crime by killing innocents.

Wonder what the LORD has to say about that . . .
