

**Is implantation the medically accepted start of pregnancy?**

No, but that's what others would like for you to believe. The medically accepted start of pregnancy is at fertilization or just after but prior to implantation (which happens a few days later)

Most of the leading medical dictionaries list the timeframe of fertilization as the beginning of pregnancy .

For example, Medical dictionaries such as Stedman's (28th edition) and Mosby's (7th edition), two of the most popular medical dictionaries, define conception as fertilization and not implantation.[1]

Those who are involved in abortion, in vitro fertilization IVF, or embryonic/stem cell research favor the definitions with soften the implications of the work they do.

**If a new life can be formed in a Petri dish, and a Petri dish cannot be pregnant, then can't it be said that a woman isn't pregnant at fertilization?**

No. Petri dishes, while capable of holding newly created life, are not capable of reproducing themselves, nor do they carry their own offspring.



A Petri dish holding a tiny human is no more pregnant than an incubator holding a premature baby is. Machines, glass, plastic are objects and not beings. The word "pregnancy", in the biological

and medical sense, is restricted to living beings.

A pregnancy which originates from fertilization in a Petri dish (IVF) skips the normal fertilization "phase". This does not mean that implantation marks the start of all pregnancies, it only means that this particular method of achieving pregnancy skips fertilization inside of a woman. It's the exception to the rule, not the rule itself.

**Does an embryo have to be in the womb for a woman to be pregnant?**

No. Ectopic pregnancies, which involve fertilized eggs that have implanted in the wrong place, exist outside of the womb. Even though the location of the offspring is outside of the womb, it is still considered a pregnancy. This only goes to illustrate that pregnancy need not occur in the womb.

**If pregnancy can only be detected as early as implantation, does this mean that pregnancy starts at implantation?**

To illustrate how flawed this idea is, let us apply it to cancer. No credible physician will tell a cancer patient that they did not have cancer prior to a positive diagnosis. Instead, they say things like "we caught it early" or "we caught it too late". But they would never say "you never had cancer until we could diagnose it."

Yet, when it comes to the state of pregnancy, this is exactly what some OB/GYNs and medical organizations are promoting. In their twisted view, pregnancy only starts at the earliest possible moment of diagnosis -- implantation.

A diagnosis of pregnancy at implantation is simply that – the discovery of an existing but previously undiagnosable condition. A positive diagnosis isn't the beginning of a condition, nor does it cause a condition, it's merely the confirmation or discovery of it. After

all, pregnancy tests do not cause pregnancy and cancer tests do not cause cancer -- they only confirm the presence or absence of these conditions.

The earliest point at which pregnancy can be reliably detected does not define when pregnancy begins - it's only the point in time at which detection is possible.

**The literature I've read said Plan B isn't an abortion pill, so how can you claim it is an abortifacient?**

The literature often says two things:

A. Plan B isn't "the" abortion pill RU-486. This is a true statement but one use to obfuscate the way Plan B can work -- it has nothing to do with the issue at hand other than to try and confuse people into thinking that Plan B pill doesn't cause abortions.

B. It claims that Plan B cannot interfere with an established/existing pregnancy. That's untrue, since it can prevent implantation of an existing pregnancy. They can only say this by unscientific definition of pregnancy which begins with implantation. The fact is, pregnancy begins with fertilization and the prevention of implantation is an abortion. (Plan B is thought to be capable of preventing implantation.)

**Isn't pregnancy a medical condition, and therefore, not subject to the common understanding of pregnancy?**

No. Pregnancy is the natural state of carrying young inside a woman. This isn't a disease or syndrome, but a natural state of being. It takes place in a biological being and also takes up space within such a being.

In a nutshell, when a new human takes up space within a woman, she is pregnant -- carrying her

[or another's] young insider her body. Medical definitions which stray from this understanding stray from science and the long standing medically accepted definition of pregnancy -- and common sense.

### **Doesn't conception mean implantation?**

No. Though it is often misused to mean implantation, the historical and current medical definition of conception is fertilization. Most major medical dictionaries list fertilization as the definition of conception.

### **How can you say pregnancy begins at implantation since 50% of fertilized eggs fail to implant?**

Miscarriages (unintentional abortion) do not define when pregnancy begins -- they only define when one ends. Miscarriages happen during all phases of pregnancy, and should not be used as a basis for defining when pregnancy begins.

### **Does preventing implantation meet the medical definition of abortion?**

Yes. Preventing implantation meets the definition of abortion (see below)

### **Does In Vitro Fertilization IVF cause abortions?**

Yes, embryos which fail to implant or which die outside of a woman are aborted. Consider the definition of abortion [2]:

a-bor-tion (-bôrshn) n.

1. The expulsion of an embryo or fetus before it is viable.
2. A miscarriage.
3. An aborted organism.
4. Cessation of normal growth, especially of an organ or other body part, before full development or maturation.

5. The arrest of an action or process before its completion.

### **Why do some claim that contraception leads to abortion?**

Aside from the fact that many types are believed to cause abortions themselves, there is plenty of correlation between contraception usage and abortion.

If contraception truly lead to a decrease in abortion, abortion would be rare. Yet, the widespread availability of contraception has not caused abortion to disappear or become rare. Rather, they have created a dependency on abortion as a backup method of birth control.

Fear of pregnancy keeps many people from engaging in sex. Contraception allays this fear, giving a false sense of security. Essentially, the widespread availability of contraception has led to the increase of people who are having sexual relations but are not ready to have children. Quite often, the results of contraception failure is abortion.

Combined with the various failure rates of contraception, the increase in the number of couples engaging in sexual relations has led to a drastic number of unplanned pregnancies. Finally, statistics show that 54% of women who have abortions were using contraception. [3]

[1] Sources: Mosby's Medical dictionary 7th ed, 2006 and Stedman's Medical Dictionary, 28th Edition, 2006

[2] The American Heritage® Stedman's Medical Dictionary, Copyright © 2002, 2001, 1995 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company

[3] Jones RK, Darroch JE and Henshaw SK, Contraceptive use among U.S. women having abortions in 2000-2001, Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 2002, 34(6):294-303.

## **No Room for Contraception**

Website: [www.NoRoomforContraception.com](http://www.NoRoomforContraception.com)  
Email: [info@nrfc.net](mailto:info@nrfc.net) • Phone: (202) 470-6854  
Skype: [noroomforcontraception](https://www.skype.com/name/noroomforcontraception)

© 2006 No Room for Contraception  
No part of this document may be copied, electronically distributed, or reproduced or reprinted without permission.

## **PREGNANCY, CONTRACEPTION, AND ABORTION: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS...**

