

Thoughts on Abortion
James Gregory Maynard
December 2012

It is a curious, yet deeply interesting findings of Steve Levitt, Economist (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Impact_of_Legalized_Abortion_on_Crime), that correlates the declining crime rates beginning in 1992 and dropping sharply in 1995, with the passage of Roe v Wade 18 years earlier. He and co-author John Donohue, after extensive research into the data surrounding the period of decline, found that the legalization of abortions likely accounted for nearly 50% of the reduction in crime. Levitt postulates in the movie Freakonomics that unwanted children lead to bad parenting, resulting in dysfunctional kids unable to fit into the normal social fabric, resulting in far too many of them turning to crime. Hence, one can perhaps conclude that preventing the unwanted child the opportunity to become a bane on society by aborting him or her has social merit.

While the academic progressives who promote abortions and support government funding for such, especially for the poor, all under the mantel of freedom of a woman to control her body—The Choice -, I wonder whether there has always been an unspoken objective of their cause related to social engineering—crime prevention by abortion. Surely these high social and psychological academics fully understand the environmental impact of parenting on the direction a child's life will tend to take. Given Levitt and Donohue's findings, these academicians must surely be pleased to learn that there has been a pleasant effect on the crime rate for these sacrifices.

Also interesting, is that many of these same proponents of abortion and its added benefit of reducing the crime rate are ardent critics of the death penalty for convicted killers—those who were fortunate to evade the abortionists scalpel and vacuum, entering the world to reap innocent citizens lives.

However, unlike the unborn defenseless child, the criminal has had the opportunity to make his or her way in life and through their own choices landed in the situation they are in. Then, standing before a jury of his or her peers, that person is allowed to rigorously defend their right to live. They can participate in a court system that by nearly every measure is about as fair as it can get. A court system, I might add, that is a great financial expense to society.

So, shall we conclude that part of the calculus of the abortion debate should be honestly and forthrightly stated to be?

1. That it is more cost effective to end the life of a potential criminal before he or she is born, than to put them through a long drawn out expense of futile

education then, ultimately, expensive court proceedings while a criminal sits on death row.

2. That it is quite appropriate to terminate a life before it has had an opportunity to prove its merits to society, yet an abomination, a barbaric act, to put to death a heinous and brutal murderer, who has been given an opportunity to prove their merit to society and fatally failed.

This leaves me with one final question: That is, whether the ending of the life of the potential criminal in the womb or the death row inmate are the same, differing only on the point of their life's timeline it occurs? In the context of crime prevention it would seem so.