

Legal, but is it moral?

Abortion is an unjustifiable choice

In the time it takes you to read this commentary, eight innocent lives will be ended for the sake of parental convenience. Since 1973, fifteen million lives have been thus terminated under the aegis of our Supreme Court's Roe vs. Wade. The killing is legal, so long as the baby still lives inside the mother, the mother wants the baby killed, and a doctor is willing to do the killing. Advocates of this practice euphemistically call themselves "pro-choice," and they shrink not to use formal fallacy in defence thereof. They say:

The fetus is not a "meaningful" human life: (argumentum ignorantium). They offer no proof that a fetus is

Commentary

not "meaningfully" human; instead they argue that their contention cannot be proven untrue. They must resort to this fallacy because arguments to the effect that a fetus is not "meaningfully" human, can also be used successfully to show that some aged, feeble, and handicapped people are not "meaningfully" human.

Their second fallacy is to ignore biological evidence — increasingly sophisticated and revealing — that shows, with no equivocation: human life begins at conception. At recent U.S. Senate Judiciary subcommittee

hearings devoted to the definition of when life begins, seven of the first eight witnesses agreed upon that point. Dr. Jerome Lejeune, a geneticist preeminent, testified: "To accept the fact that, after fertilization has taken place, a new human has come into being is no longer a matter of taste or of opinion... It is plain experimental evidence" (Life Cycle, Spring, 1982). Fetus is to child, as child is to adult; all are the continuum of human life; all are meaningful.

I have the right to control my own body: (illicit premise). I do not have the right to commit suicide (my own body), neither do I have the right to commit fetuscide (not my own body). With the exception of abortion, juridical precedent has consistently recognized that rights are not autonomous, but related in a hierarchy that is predicated upon one fundamental right: the right to life.

Better aborted than unloved or poor: (appeal to popular passion). This is based upon the myopia that if parents can't love or provide, no one will. Of course, we don't allow parents to terminate their unloved six-month old. To be unwanted or destitute is not justification for killing; if you think so, you erect again the horrific foundation upon which were built the gas ovens of forty years past.

Abortion is necessary because of social injustice: (after this, therefore,

because of this). The polemics of choice deny individual responsibility in favor of collective and vicarious accountability. They would have us believe that by sufficient distribution of the blame, an immoral act will no longer be an immoral act.

It's an agonizing decision that must be made by individuals: (begging the question). Proponents of this fallacy hold that the issue is beyond the purview of other concerned individuals, and that a sufficiently distressing process will exculpate one from moral responsibility. The "decision" is a second chance: a self-flagellation, if you please, that expiates poor judgment. Make no mistake: termination of life is not a decision to be made; rather, it is refusal to accept responsibility for a decision already made.

I'm not advocating abortion, I'm advocating the right to choose: (circumlocution). Such piffle is best disposed of by analogy: "I'm not advocating that men should rape women, I'm simply advocating their right to choose to rape women."

It's legal, therefore it's right: The prophets of choice speak of abortion as "a constitutional right." This is the classic "ad verecundum" (appeal to authority). To the contrary, the 14th Amendment which was enacted to overturn the Supreme Court's Dred Scott debacle and give "legal per-

sonage" to black people says that no state shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law. Dred Scott and Roe vs. Wade have only one difference: biological age instead of skin color. Supreme Courts are not immutable; be reminded that ours once propped up the institution of human chattel and disenfranchisement. Only this time, to correct their injustice, the justices will come to acknowledge that they have committed an atrocity, the likes of which would make a Hitler blush.

Our country needs a constitutional amendment guaranteeing the rights of the unborn. Without it, the abominations will continue our national holocaust: one life every twenty-one seconds.

Rescue those being led away to death;

hold back those staggering toward slaughter.

If you say, "but we knew nothing about this,"

does not he who weighs the heart perceive it?

Does not he who guards your life know it?

Will he not repay each person according to what he has done?

Proverbs 24:11-12, N.I.V.

Timothy Smith is a University graduate student and spokesperson for Eugene Right to Life.

letters

Poor reasoning

I find it odd that some people criticize those against abortion by using the argument: "People shouldn't bother fighting abortion when nuclear weapons might blow us up anyway". This "fight the missiles — not abortion" argument displays completely flawed reasoning.

For one thing, if our country continues aborting 1.5 million children each year plus urging other couples to only have two or fewer children, then we're increasing the chances of nuclear war. As our youth population decreases, our ability to maintain a conventional army diminishes. This means more (much more) reliance on nuclear arms will result.

Another thing: since the Roe vs. Wade ruling legalized abortion, over 15 million children in America have had their lives ended by abortion. How many have been killed by nuclear weapons since 1973? Those against abortion are fighting a practice which is taking life every day, not just a potential threat.

Teresa McNew
Elmira

Questions

For all you "pro-lifers" out there, here's some questions: How can you compare an unborn fetus to a complete human being? Why do you constantly condemn "pro-choicers"? Why not instead use your time to figure out what we would do with the annual 1.5 million new babies and the resulting overpopulation, child abuse, and poverty? If you're so worried about human lives, why not work on the problems of the living? What about the starving in Ethiopia, the orphans in Central America, and the homeless and hungry of the world (including

the USA)?

So, everyone has a right to life? What are you doing to protect the guys on death row? What about the countless animals slaughtered for "the good of mankind"? Doesn't that piece of carcass you gnaw on at dinner time have a right to life? And please don't tell me not to compare an animal life to a human life. A life is a life, regardless of species. And please keep religion out of it; after all, the whole world isn't Christian.

Why don't you spend your time and money used on anti-abortion literature and clinic bombings to educate and supply people with birth control? And when you find loving homes for all the homeless children of the world, let me know. Only then might I consider abolishing abortion an act of humanitarianism. So please, instead of condemning the world, do something to help it.

Debbie Michels

Elimination

One supposed justification for abortion maintains that the birth of a physically or mentally abnormal child places an intolerable burden on the mother. The assumption here is that the value of human life is nothing compared to the mother's convenience. Such an argument clearly resembles that used to justify the murder of non-Aryans in Hitler's Third Reich. Charles E. Rice, Professor of Law at Notre Dame, wrote: "The basic principle of the Supreme Court abortion decision is the principle that underlay the Nazi extermination of the Jews, that an innocent human being can be defined as a non-person and killed if his existence is inconvenient or uncomfortable to others..."

It comes as no surprise,

therefore, that those who would justify the killing of unwanted children would take a similar approach to the problem of the aged and handicapped. John Fletcher, an avid supporter of abortion, wrote, "It is ridiculous to give ethical approval to the ending of subhuman life by abortion while refusing to give approval to the ending of subhuman life by positive euthanasia."

Thus, abortion is but the first step toward the total elimination of all human life which does not fit the standards of a self-appointed few.

Ron Munion
Political Science

A lesson

Perhaps a lesson in human reproduction is due for Tom Viosky ("Quite Simple" ODE, Jan. 23) and the group of "men" I spoke with at the "Death Week" table: A (sperm) plus B (egg) equals fertilization.

That means, boys, it takes two (a man and a woman) to create a fetus. But where is the mention of the male part in reproduction when the topic of abortion comes up? The focus is always on the woman, as if she impregnates herself. She's portrayed as a heretic — a wanton killer who rips the fetus from her womb in an act of brutal murder.

And where is the man? (Perhaps writing letters to the Emerald or standing around the EMU discussing new ways to control women's lives.)

If anti-abortionists want to condemn women as "murderers," they need to look a bit further for the "accomplices." To paraphrase a speaker I once heard: "If abortion is murder, why isn't sex a felony?"

Cheri Snell
Leisure Studies and Services

Involved

"I think women should have the right to decide (what concerns) their lives, and control over their bodies is control over their lives. We don't advocate abortion, we advocate the right to have an abortion," said a National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL) representative in a Jan. 23 Emerald article by Julie Shippen.

The NARAL propels the "pro-choice" group and opposes the "pro-life" group and the anti-abortionists. These people stir active controversy at the University and nationally.

We are fortunate enough to legally push or protest decisions on issues that we feel will affect or have affected our lives. Not one of us who is actively or passively concerned about an issue could honestly advocate a measure forbidding our rights. Furthermore, an important decision made without our being able to voice, object to, and/or change that opinion would be considered extremely unfair! Our freedom of choice is valuable.

I am a product of someone who was pro-choice 21 years ago — pro-choice enough to give me the opportunity to choose for myself. Many people are like me, and I am glad my biological mother did not make the choice of abortion for me.

She went through with her pregnancy and put me up for adoption. I am fortunate my "mother" did not decide to end what was started before I had the chance to begin my life and decide on my own.

So, I agree with those supporting "pro-choice": We should not advocate any measure exercising control over someone's life. Everyone should be given the opportunity to eventually decide what to do with his or

her own life!

Kim Fuller

A directly involved woman

Equal acts?

Regarding Lori Parkman's letter (ODE, Jan. 22):

I can readily identify with your statements. It is exceedingly hypocritical to defend the right to legally abort (kill) innocent children in the womb while condemning others for bombing buildings.

Like wow Lori, how far will those crazy folks at the Emerald go?

After all, bombing buildings and possibly killing innocent adults is, without a doubt, damned comparable to an individual's right to make a (hopefully) intelligent decision concerning a pregnancy's practicality and feasibility.

Someone who throws a bomb or sets fire to a building is certainly no more a criminal than the woman who legally decides not to bring a child into the world due to environmental, financial, or nurturant factors. A great deal of agonizing must surely be done on both sides; to throw or not to throw the bomb? To have or not have the child? Tough decisions both, to be sure.

I'm glad you're so laid back and wouldn't dream of imposing your values and viewpoints on others. But I think you would feel differently if your place of employment were bombed, possibly killing or maiming people you know, or if you were faced with the reality of a pregnancy you couldn't handle.

Abortion may not be the answer, but bombing clinics doesn't even come close. And treating them as equal acts would, at its best, be absurd.

Tim Chauran
Eugene