

CHAPTER 5

SOMETHING OLD, SOMETHING NEW

Are our old scientific studies obsolete and useless? Are our new scientific studies relevant and useful? Must we reject the old? Must we rely primarily only on the new? What is the balance here?

Some old studies need to be replaced by newer, more accurate, more detailed, more relevant studies. That is obvious. What serious students of this or any other issue have to keep in mind, however, is that certain older studies are classics and do not need repeating.

What is also obvious is that some new studies may prove to be inaccurate and will not stand the test of time.

Let us use a medical example. If a pregnant woman contracts Rubella or German Measles in her first trimester, there is a chance that her baby will be born with a fetal abnormality. In the early 1960s, there was an extensive rubella epidemic in the U.S. Many pregnant women were infected and there was a tragic harvest of fetal abnormality. Many studies were done at that time. This book includes a report on a summary of the results obtained from that rather extensive research through an article in the *Lancet*. Note that there have been no major studies on this since that time. Why not?

One reason has been that there has not been another rubella epidemic, and, with rubella vaccine, the chance for another one is not too likely. The other and quite relevant reason is that the studies done back then were thorough, well done, and came up with definitive answers. In the light of this, there is little stimulus to repeat all of those studies. Therefore, the *Lancet* article from 1964 stands as a classic. It is an “old” study, but unless there are major medical changes in this field, the studies are as valid today, as when they were first made.

What about knowledge of fetal development? When Hamblin published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* in October of 1964, a study showing that brain waves had been recorded forty days after fertilization, it was a scientific breakthrough. We note a second study twenty years later in the *New England Journal of Medicine* confirming this information. Since that time, the threshold has not been pushed back any further. Is there need then to do repeat studies to re-discover what has already been discovered and to re-report on what has already been reported? Apparently, fetal researchers do not think so, as we find no further studies of this nature in the literature. Accordingly, we print these two studies mentioned, along with other well-researched studies on fetal development, which are “old,” but factual. The reader will note that most of the information and studies in this book on fetal development are classics (i.e., old) and will remain our guides unless and until proven false.

When something new occurs, there is a flurry of excitement, and dozens, sometimes hundreds, of studies are done exploring that area. One example in recent years has been the French abortion pill, RU 486. Another has been the relationship of abortion to breast cancer. Another has been research on stem cells and on cloning. We can be confident that new studies in these areas will continue until the evidence is firm and definitive conclusions can be drawn. These demonstrate the

value of new studies where new information is needed. The evidence is explored, and the newest facts gleaned from the research continue to be reported.

Conclusion:

The reader of *Love Them Both* will find many new facts between the covers, many new interpretations of previously reported facts and, in a few places, questioning of old assumptions. The reader will also find a significant number of questions and answers from previous editions of this book's predecessors, *Handbook on Abortion*, *Abortion: Questions & Answers*, and the first edition of this book. Some of these facts were analyzed and reported on earlier and remain unchallenged. Hence, we offer you some known facts along with some fascinating new information. We hope all of it will be of value to you.

[Next Chapter](#)

[Previous Chapter](#)

[Contents Page](#)