

ROE V. WADE: A BAD DECISION YIELDS TERRIBLE CONSEQUENCES

by

Raymond J. Adamek, Ph.D.
Emeritus Professor of Sociology

Supreme Court Sets U.S. Abortion Policy.

On January 22, 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court promulgated *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, which gave us the most permissive abortion policy in the world, permitting abortion for virtually any reason throughout the nine months of pregnancy.¹ Subsequent Supreme Court decisions upheld these rulings.

Roe v. Wade is a Faulty Legal Decision Based Upon Deception and Poor Jurisprudence.

Deception Both *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* were brought before the Supreme Court as a result of the efforts of activist pro-choice lawyers who exploited their clients' situations to attack existing abortion laws in Texas and Georgia. Deception played a role in moving these cases through the courts.

1. Norma McCorvey, the Roe of *Roe v. Wade*, initially told her lawyers she had been gang-raped, whereas she had been impregnated by her boyfriend.
2. McCorvey's lawyers led her to believe she could get her abortion if she let them take her case. Given the amount of time needed to move cases through the courts, this was highly unlikely, and McCorvey gave birth to her child, placing it for adoption.
3. Sandra Cano, the Doe of *Doe v. Bolton*, was not even seeking an abortion, but only wanted help gaining custody of some of her children. Yet, she was described in the case as "An indigent, married, pregnant woman who desired but had been refused an abortion."²
4. Neither McCorvey nor Cano ever appeared in court, but simply signed documents placed before them by their lawyers. Both subsequently joined the pro-life movement.

Poor Jurisprudence Both pro-choice and pro-life lawyers tend to agree that *Roe v. Wade* was poorly decided. It is characterized by double standards, a failure to address basic issues, self-contradictions, and faulty facts. Some examples follow.

- *Double Standards* The Court based a woman's right to abortion on the "right to privacy," a right which is mentioned nowhere in the Constitution. On the other hand, it denied the unborn's right to life because it stated that although the 14th Amendment protected a "person's" right to life, in "nearly all" instances where the word "person" appears in the Constitution, it "has application only postnatally."³
- *Failure to Address Basic Issues* While the Court could have heard extended arguments as to why the unborn should be considered a "person," it did not, in spite of the fact that it recognized the centrality of this issue. The Court noted that if the

personhood of the unborn was established, the pro-choice case “of course, collapses, for the fetus’ right to life is then guaranteed by the [14th] Amendment.”⁴

- Ignoring the scientific facts of modern biology and genetics, the Court also chose not to decide the basic issue of when human life begins, stating, “We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins.”⁵ Thus, it allowed the woman’s rights to prevail over that of an undefined entity.
- *Self-Contradiction* The Court said, “... we do not agree that by adopting one theory of life [i.e., life begins at conception], Texas may override the rights of the pregnant woman.”⁶ But in effect, the Court adopted another theory of life [life begins only at birth] to override the rights of the unborn.

In another contradiction, Justice Burger wrote in his concurring decision, “Plainly, the Court today rejects any claim that the Constitution requires abortion on demand.”⁷ Yet, this is exactly the policy which flows from *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, and the Court’s subsequent abortion decisions.

Faulty Medical Facts Considering only short-term outcomes, the Court concluded that first trimester abortions are safer than childbirth for the mother. (Note, however, that it permitted abortions in the second and third trimesters, also). It is doubtful that this was true then, and it is certainly not true today. Studies of the long-term consequences of legal abortion indicate that it is 2 to 4 times more dangerous for the mother than childbirth.

Faulty Historical Facts Relying heavily on the subsequently debunked work of Cyril Means and others, the Court accepted the notion that early English Common Law and early American law freely permitted abortion.⁸ They did not. The Court also accepted the idea that the main reason states began passing anti-abortion laws in the 19th century was to protect the mother from dangerous abortion procedures. Given the state of medicine at that time, however, abortion was a relatively safe procedure. Actually, a major reason for the passage of early anti-abortion laws was the increased understanding of the early physiology of reproduction, and the fact that the life of an individual human being begins at fertilization.

Faulty Social Science Although the Court does not look to public opinion to guide its decisions, it certainly misread the public’s mind in regard to abortion. For example, it stated, “There has always been strong support for the view that life does not begin until live birth.”⁹ Yet, in 11 national polls between January 1973 and August, 2003, an average of only 12% of the public thought life does not begin until birth. Moreover, a careful reading of the polls since 1973 makes it clear that a majority of the public has never agreed with the Court’s policy of abortion on demand throughout the nine months of pregnancy.¹⁰ The social and political turmoil which followed the Court’s decision and continues to this day also indicates it did not have a good sense of the public’s will.

Consequences of *Roe v. Wade* and Supporting Decisions

Vast Increase in Total Abortions The most comprehensive study of the incidence of abortion determined that in 1966, the last year before our abortion laws began to change, the total (legal plus illegal) number of induced abortions occurring in the U.S. was about 125,000.¹¹ Since permissive laws began to be passed in 1967 therefore, induced abortions have increased

10 to 12 fold. From January 1, 1973 through December 31, 2009, over 51 million legal abortions have been performed, a rate of 3,765 per day over this 37 year period. Not only are we killing many more unborn human beings than we used to, but a much higher proportion of women are being subjected to the hazards of abortion.

Reduction of Individual Rights The rights of the human being in the womb have been negated, as well as the right of a father to have a say in the fate of his unborn offspring, even if he is married to the mother and willing to support their child. Court decisions flowing from Roe v. Wade have also seriously abridged parents' rights to have a say in their minor daughter's life-changing decision to have an abortion, and in some cases, even to know that their daughter has decided to have an abortion. While Roe v. Wade has given women the right to treat her unborn child as property, to be disposed of at will, it has never been used as a legal basis for establishing any other new rights for women. Indeed, rather than empowering women, in many cases legalized abortion has made it more difficult for them to realize their desires. Today the irresponsible male is free to say, "I don't want this child. You are free to abort it. If you choose not to, don't expect me to support it." Thus, "it's the woman's choice" quickly becomes "it's the woman's problem." Finally, the right of doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and other professionals not to participate in the abortion culture is constantly under attack by the "pro-choice" movement.

Legal Abortion Harms Women. Far from being of benefit to a woman's "reproductive health," legal abortion harms women. We have had abortion on demand in this country for over 36 years. Many studies have demonstrated that induced abortion is associated with an increase in the incidence of breast cancer, ectopic pregnancy, suicide, substance abuse, depression, other psychological problems, and premature births in subsequent pregnancies, creating problems not only for the woman, but for her wanted children.

Child Abuse and Child Poverty. Legal abortion was supposed to reduce the incidence of child abuse, since fewer unwanted children would be born. Yet government data show that between 1977 and 1998, when our policy of abortion on demand was in effect, the child population grew by 8.8% while child abuse rose by 259%.¹²

Legal abortion was also supposed to reduce child poverty, since fewer unaffordable children would be born. Yet government data from 1973 through 2000 show no direct relationship between these two variables.¹³ Comparing the number of abortions in a given year with the percent of children below the poverty level in the following year shows the expected pattern fails to turn up 62% of the time. That is, child poverty does not tend to decrease when abortions increase. Rather, abortions and child poverty generally increase and decrease together.

Abortion as Birth Control. Despite assertions by pro-choice advocates that women would seek abortions only in the most difficult circumstances, and that they would not use it as birth control, two surveys suggest the opposite. These large-scale surveys were conducted in 1987 and 2004 at 11 large abortion clinics across the country. Their results were quite similar. The primary reasons women give for having abortions are social reasons – that is, they use abortion as back-up birth control. Less than 7% of the women mention physical reasons such as the woman's health, the unborn's health, rape or incest as the primary reason for

obtaining an abortion. Furthermore, some 46% of abortions are repeat abortions.¹⁴ Data from the state of Ohio for 2008 indicate that 20% of Ohio residents having abortions in that year were having their third or higher order abortion.¹⁵

Government of Men, Not of Laws. Although not the only example of a disturbing current trend in our society, *Roe v. Wade* is a prime example of the rule of men rather than of laws. Usurping the legislative power of the people's duly elected state and federal law makers, seven unelected men on the Supreme Court struck down the abortion laws of all 50 states and, legislating from the bench, dictated what our abortion policy would be. In doing so they declared that abortion, something that had been considered a terrible crime in law for over 100 years, was now a constitutionally guaranteed right, and that the unborn's right to life did not exist. When we allow individual men to grant and take away rights so cavalierly, the rights of all are in jeopardy.

It is time to return to a government of laws, not of men, and to allow our duly elected representatives to restore our unborn brothers' and sisters' right to life.

References

1. *Roe v. Wade*, *United States Supreme Court Reports*, 35 L Ed 2d, pp. 147-200. *Doe v. Bolton*, *United States Supreme Court Reports*, 35 L Ed 2d, pp. 201-222.
2. *Doe v. Bolton*, 35 L Ed 2d, p. 212.
3. *Roe v. Wade*, op. cit., p. 179.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 179.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 181.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 182.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
8. See James C. Mohr, *Abortion In America*, N.Y. Oxford University Press, 1978.
9. *Roe v. Wade*, op. cit. p. 181.
10. Raymond J. Adamek, *Thirty-Plus Years of Abortion Polls: What Have We Learned?* New York: Ad Hoc Committee in Defense of Life, 2002.
11. Cynthia McKnight, *Life Without Roe*, Washington, D.C.: The Horatio Storer Foundation, 1992.
12. U.S. Census Bureau, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 103rd through 121st editions, Washington, D.C.: 1982 through 2003.
13. *Ibid.*, 110th edition (1990) and 123rd edition (2003).
14. Sonya B. Gamble, et al. "Abortion Surveillance – United States, 2005," *MMWR Surveillance Summaries*, (November 28, 2008) 57 (SS13): 1-32 (On line).
15. *Induced Abortions in Ohio, 2008*, Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Health, October, 2009.

Updated 1/30/10