
Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 03:17:29 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 16:26 This proves the bottom line issue here that the emotional aspects here far outweigh most people's logical abilities. You start using the words, human, embryo, life, fetus, baby and so on and people's emotional strings start getting plucked. If not, then they are emotionless and don't count. Agreed?

I don't think emotion has much to do with it anyway. Let's call those embryos what they are--developing humans. It isn't bringing emotion into the discussion to call them by their true nature. They are human lives in the earliest stages of development. We all were once that tiny bundle of cells in a woman's womb. We're all humans now, and we were human then.

I can't possibly think of any other way to describe them other than human.

If it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it must be a duck; I'm not going to try calling it a hummingbird or an eagle as it would be simply factually incorrect to do so.

Quote: A lot of this comes down to the reality that it takes "two to tango" as it was put. That is true. Now for the rest of the story: After the music stops, ONE is left with the weight of the responsibility. One is left not being able to work to support themselves and the baby, one is left with the 20+ year responsibility of teaching and training and raising that life that started during that 90 seconds of bliss. Only one is left with the overall life changing responsibilities that range from diapers to school to driving a car to college tuition.

That's all true, and it's all sad. No one here is trying to vindicate the man responsible for getting her pregnant. He is just as responsible for getting the woman pregnant as she is.

That alone doesn't vindicate the woman from fault, though. She should have thought about all that before choosing to have sex (or make a baby (since that's what sex is biologically for)).

Quote: So now look at the issue that even though it takes two to screw, only one gets pregnant. Only one has the long term responsibility by mandate. Only one has their life _permanently_ changed completely. Even if the sperm donor is made to pay \$ on a regular basis that isn't much compared to 2am feedings and a 24x7 x20 year job.

So does a woman still not have the right to abort that child? Or at least be able to have that option? (please don't mix into this those that use abortion as post-birth control, that is a whole different issue of irresponsibility)...

(next post)

You can legally mandate that the sperm donor support the child financially, but there is no way to mandate parenting skills or abilities. This means that again the woman is left with 100% of the responsibility. That is just wrong.

I understand the options of adoption, but unfortunately there isn't place here for that is the abortion issue is a yes or no question and adoption, etc., is an unacceptable burden that is again placed on the woman.

She made a mistake, a dire mistake, and now she has to live with the consequences.

Sorry babe; tough luck; you shouldn't have done that; hope you learned something; now own up to what you did and take care of the child you made.

The same should apply to the man, too.

Of course, nothing can really stop him from leaving, besides being labelled a coward and downright dispicable human being.

It's too bad if that happens, but it happens; sorry if this sounds too rough, but the girl should have thought about that before having sex before getting married.

There is no guarantee that a boyfriend who she thinks loves her will stay around forever. Like I said before, if he's not ready to commit to marriage, how could he possibly be ready to commit to raising a child? So for what possible reason should the woman make a go at making a child by having sex with him? She should have weighed the consequences before making such a decision.

Now that she has a child to deal with, she should not have the right to kill it off simply because it has become an inconvenience to her, as J_Ball said earlier.

If parents were allowed to kill their children for being inconveniences, I sure as hell wouldn't be here to bore you all with all this typing.

Quote:As for the "parasite" issue. Please don't take that too far out of context. While a fetus is a life, is it indeed a conscious being? That is an argument that has raged across many lines. Is an embryo that does not have a formed brain an actual "human being" without having a consciousness? Without a consciousness, is it still considered killing? Here is where the biology and logic start to get really stretched with the emotional aspect.

Whether it is conscious or unconscious is irrelevant; it is still a human life. A human doesn't need to be conscious to be labelled "human". Terry Schiavo was a human; Terry Wallace is a human. Both were unconscious for a long period of time, but both were still considered "human."

There is nothing emotional about it, yet everything logical and biological about it; a developing human is just that--human. Just because it may be at the stage before a functioning brain or a consciousness develops does not change its inherent nature of being a human.

Like I said, we were all once that small in our mothers' womb at some point in our lives. If we weren't human, what were we, and why do we consider ourselves human now if we didn't start out as humans?
