

got involved. But, Senator Dierks, if you want to find a statesperson, just look at me, you found one. Now, these judgments as to what constitutes being a statesperson are subjective. You have a very strong, moral, ethical or religious belief as to when life begins. If you look at it from a scientific basis there can be developmental stages at which scientists will disagree as to when what we're talking about is considered a full-fledged human being. Yes, there are those who differ. Now, I know there are scientists who will not say that a zygote is a human being. When people were not as wise as they are now in the ways of science, because they could not study and they had to speculate, they thought in the sperm was a little man, a homunculus, and that that little man was what was transferred to the woman and that developed ultimately into a person, and that's what they actually believed, and I believe Thomas Aquinas was one of the strong believers in that concept. What had happened is they saw an effect and they had to postulate the cause. Not having the wherewithal to determine the cause, they used their mind to the best of their ability and said, if I have existing activity (b), it could only exist if it was caused by cause (a). I don't know what cause (a) is so I will use logic and look at the nature of the effect and move from that effect to what the cause must have been. Unfortunately, his logic seemed flawless but his conclusion was wrong. Thomas Aquinas also believed in spontaneous generation that life just sprang into being. They didn't know that flies lay eggs that hatched into maggots. They just knew that at one time there was nothing there but putrid meat or some other substance, then at some point life was there, living things. So they developed a theory of spontaneous generation. That was wrong as we know now, based again on ignorance of how things occur, and this we cannot prove one way or the other. Thomas Aquinas and the church itself believed that a female was given a soul at a later stage of development than a male. Who would point to Thomas Aquinas and say he was not a profound philosopher, he was not a deep thinker, he was not a holy man, because they made him a saint, but he was wrong. According to the teachings of the church today, Thomas Aquinas was wrong. And if somebody were to stand up and proclaim as orthodox Catholic doctrine that a female child receives a soul at a later point in development than a male, then they would be told that they're completely out of line and they are incorrect. So there have always been differing theories and beliefs about what goes into the making of a human being or even how a human being develops. With all the talk of chromosomes and genes and DNA