

## The “who knows?” argument for adoption over abortion

Letter to the Editor  
*Halifax Chronicle Herald*, Saturday 15 October 2011

Mark Mercer  
Department of Philosophy  
Saint Mary’s University  
Halifax, NS B3H 3C3  
(902) 420-5825  
[mark.mercer@smu.ca](mailto:mark.mercer@smu.ca)

A girl or woman thinking to have an abortion should instead give her baby up for adoption, says Leo Nasager (“How much potential lost?”, Letters, 11 October), for, who knows?, the baby might grow up to be like Steve Jobs. Well, who knows?, the baby might just as well grow up to be a thief, a bully, or a murderer.

Let’s follow Nasager’s logic to where it ends. A girl or woman thinking to use contraception to avoid pregnancy should instead be open to the possibility of conception, for, who knows?, the child she could conceive might grow up to be like Steve Jobs. A girl or woman thinking to abstain from procreative sex should reconsider, for, who knows?, the child she could conceive might grow up to be like Steve Jobs. Girls and women not thinking about sex at the moment should find a mate, for, who knows?, the children they could conceive might grow up to be like Steve Jobs.

Nasager thinks a noble motive for giving a child up for adoption is the thought that the future adult’s labours might benefit humanity. What a burden to put on the adopting couple and their new child! Surely if one is to give a child up for adoption, the only sound motive is that it will right here and now benefit the person or family seeking to adopt.

While there might be a good argument against abortion (though I doubt there is), the “who knows?” argument for adoption certainly isn’t it.