

---

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 23:30:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Seeker wrote on Mon, 07 November 2005 17:13 While I'm not a fan of abortion I would much rather see a woman remove the "unborn" fetus before it gets to experience life, I'm sick of hearing about mothers drowning their kids in bath tubs, throwing them into rivers beating them to death etc etc.

Giving a child life then ripping it from them is the cruelest of all.

But it is a biological fact that life begins at conception. It's at that moment when your DNA is created and you physically become a distinct living organism. Regardless of when a child is killed after that moment, their life has been taken from them. Philosophical arguments on when sentience begins are immaterial to that physical fact.

I get sick of hearing about people who murder their children too, but I don't think the answer is to kill people at a younger age so we can't hear them scream when it happens. Then we are just making ourselves feel better instead of solving the problem.

Arcane1 wrote on Mon, 07 November 2005 17:22 The problem becomes where is the line of control that the State has over the Individual to be drawn? And how far into the Individual's life does the State have the right to interfere?

The state is obligated to defend people from harm they could otherwise not be protected from. Armies defend from invaders from elsewhere, laws defend people from being attacked by other people. A person becomes a distinct living organism at conception, there is no event later on that makes it come to life again. That gives the state an obligation to defend their life, just like it has to defend anyone else's life.

Even when Roe v Wade legalized unrestricted abortion in the US, it stated the right to live is paramount in this issue:

Roe v Wade The appellee and certain amici argue that the fetus is a "person" within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment. In support of this, they outline at length and in detail the well-known facts of fetal development. If this suggestion of personhood is established, the appellant's case, of course, collapses, for the fetus' right to life would then be guaranteed specifically by the Amendment.

Legally, a person's right to live is considered above another person's right to privacy, or whatever. Even the court that legalized abortion acknowledged this, however they went on to ignore basic biology and declared 'the unborn' to not be human. If you want to talk discrimination and taking away rights, that's blatant age discrimination right there: An unborn child isn't old enough to be 'human' under the law. It's the same reasoning used to justify slavery: "They aren't human, they have no rights".

I would have hoped we could have learned from history about that kind of mindset, but it seems America is doomed to repeat that mistake over and over again.

---