
Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 07:43:24 GMT

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

Arcane1Well, to be pragmatically antagonistic, we could call it a biomass that hasn't achieved any real form yet. Yes it has the potential of form, but it has not reached any state above potential. The sex is not even determined yet, the heart has not beaten and the nervous system has yet to fire a neuron.

Yet it will develop eventually into a fully grown human being. Unless some extremely rare act of nature changes the chemical makeup of the being and transforms it into another form of life, we know that it will emerge as a human being, just as we know a bird's embryo in an egg will eventually develop into a fully grown adult bird.

It isn't just a random biomass that can transform into anything; it's a human biomass on every level upon which you observe it, be it genetic, chemical, or even atomic, in its earliest stages of development.

Quote:Hydra 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.

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)).

That is a point that I seriously appreciate. Realistically, any argument that did that, I would ignore, as I don't consider a position like that worth arguing against. On the contrary, there hasn't been the slightest hint of that yet, which says a lot about the participants.

Not to be a grammarian (if that's the right word (or even a word at all...)), but the words seem a little jumbled, so I can't quite understand what you're trying to say here.

In an attempt to clarify: are you saying my point about the woman being held partially responsible was invalid, or did you appreciate what I said about the man being equally responsible?

Quote:There is such a thing as culpability in law. That the woman be made to shoulder all the burden ultimately is not an appropriate result for a single bad act according to the body of Civil and Criminal Law in the US.

-If I give you a loaded gun, and you go kill someone, you will go to jail and possibly get the death sentence. I, for supplying you the weapon will also be charged, and most likely with a close to as heavy a punishment as a participant.

-If I supply you with alcohol, and you leave my home and cause an accident with fatalities, again, you will be prosecuted and potentially convicted and sentenced to life in prison or death for murder. I, as the supplier, would also be charged and be held responsible, convicted and sentenced.

-If you are building a structure, and choose to use Company X as a supplier of a critical component, and it fails, killing occupants, ultimately the designer that chose Company X's product, Company X and its owners will be held liable.

-In a divorce settlement, where kids are involved, the Father is basically sentenced to a degree of support for the child(ren) over a period of time.

And there are thousands of other examples of shared responsibility. Why then in the situation of creating life is the Sperm Donor allowed to escape/avoid culpability? At most the SD is held to a minimal financial degree, leaving the other person 99% responsible.

That doesn't make legal sense to me, and is further proof of the misogynistic nature of this country's legal system. In the case of the divorce and settlement of support, while the laws mandate non-custodial responsibility, there are minimal resources to actually enforce this. Again, leaving the woman lacking support or recourse much of the time.

I'm not saying that the man should get away with it. Any man who walks out on an accidental pregnancy is a downright despicable and pathetic human scumbag.

Both the man and the woman should share an equal amount of responsibility in raising the child; whether this is legally mandatable, I do not know. I do know that whatever settlement that may be decided in the courts must be abided by, whether it's financial support provided by the father, visiting time for both parents with the child, etc. Should either parent fall back on his/her court-mandated responsibilities, the opposing party has the right to take them to trial once again.

So, like I said, I'm not sure if there is a specific law mandating male participation, or even female participation for that matter, in the raising of a child, but I do know that whatever agreement both the mother and father come to in a trial must be upheld. Now, I'm not able to give any examples, but common sense tells me that there must have been at least once case in the history of the United States where both the mother and father shared a court-mandated equal responsibility of raising a child.

What we must note about cases like these is that very rarely are any two cases alike. I'm sure that in many cases, what you have said is quite true--the man walked out and shouldered the mother with the sole responsibility of raising the child alone. Yet I'm also sure that there have even been cases where it was not the father but the mother who walked out on the father and child; granted, such a case is probably much more rare, but I don't doubt that it can happen or has happened. There have been many cases where one parent was trying to protect the child from another parent; if the father of a child has a violent drinking problem, would we want to mandate that he take an active role in raising the child when his presence has nothing but detrimental effects?

(Damn I can type a lot...)

Quote:OK, the whole "boyfriend" issue is beyond the scope of this conversation I'm afraid. Any girl that is allowed to fall into that trap has her parents to thank as much as the guy that she's in the back seat with. I have a 16 year old daughter, that knocks guys eyes out when she walks down the hall according to my Son that is also 16 and at the same school with her. She knows better because she has been taught better.

I think it is relevant, because that is one particularly common case involving the decision for a woman to get an abortion.

A girl thinks she's in love with her boyfriend, who convinces her to have sex with him; she falls pregnant, and the boyfriend runs off; faced with raising a baby as a teenage mom, she has the

option of aborting the unborn baby.

It's an all-too-familiar and extremely unfortunate and sad case that happens too often in this country.

Now, there may be many factors that were affecting her decision to have sex (be it a combination of pressure to have sex and a lack of discipline, etc.), just as a murderer's troubled childhood or unstable mental state affect his decision to kill; it was their ultimate decision to follow through with their acts, though.

The murderer chose to kill; the girl and the guy chose to have sex. Sure, there may be underlying factors affecting them, but they were the ones who made it.

(I think I'm repeating myself; been up since 4:30 this morning; I need some sleep....)

Quote:As for the "inconvenience" issue. There are a number of cultures that still keep a bucket of water next to the birth bed, and if the newborn is a female, then it goes in head first. The liability of a female in those cultures is perceived as so high that a female is disaster. The Eskimo, Chinese (rural), Indian and much of the Indonesian areas. The inability to work to support the family and the potentially bankrupting dowry are the primary reasons to my understanding. Not to open up another stinky can of worms, but such cultures have little legitimacy in today's world, while being fundamentally dangerous at the same time.

It's just plain wrong to kill people simply because, according to those cultures, they are too high a liability.

According to the Sudanese government, Christians are too high a liability to their country, so they've been on an extermination crusade for the past few decades; over the years, they've killed at least two million Christians.

According to the Nazi party, Jews, gypsies, the elderly, etc. were too high a liability in their society, so they proceeded to start a world war to exterminate all of their kind.

According to the current networks of Islamic terrorism, the existence of the United States and her allies are too high a liability to the world, so they have declared all-out war on our nation.

It is my fervent belief that each and every human being has value and worth; no one on this Earth was created simply to be thrown away like yesterday's garbage.

A child is the most precious and valuable being on the planet with a natural right to exist; they are not to be cast aside simply because a few might be "inconveniences" to their parents.

I'm starting to get into a discussion about cultures and religion and stuff like that, now, so that's as far as I'll go with that.

Quote:Whether it should be considered primary over the Mother's interests, needs and desires/will at that stage of development is the issue that we again end up at.

It most definitely should be considered primary over the mother's interests, needs, desires, and will. Unless a person commits a heinous crime, no right, interest, or need supercedes his right to live.

Side note: Ugh... you'll have to excuse me if I repeated myself too many times over (I'm sure I did)--just skip over those parts; I've been up for 22 hours....