
Subject: Abortion [split]

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 06 Nov 2005 23:41:12 GMT

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

Seeker wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005 18:21 My personal views in regards to Nodbugger is that he petitioned for members of this board to come to ours and do likewise, it seems only fair that we can return the favour.

In regards to Saddam, as I pointed out over at zgeek, if you kill Saddam he will become a martyr to the cause.

The hardcore fundamentalists will forever use him as a shining example of western abuse to the muslim world as they continue to recruit young foolish men and women to do Allahs bidding.

Stand him up to the world and prove he is guilty of murdering not only his own people but many other muslims from the region then you no longer have a powerful weapon against the west, you have a scum bag that even Muslims would despise.

As you see, we didn't jump to go assist him on your forums because we, well, agree with you about Nodbugger. There's really no need for this many people to come over here for this one stupid topic.

I guess I can agree with that. That would stop a few, but that would probably also endanger the prosecutor, jurors, and the judge's life considering that they'd feel that he was falsely accused and charged.

Edit: About that thread with Nodbugger quotes: "So women have the right to choose who lives and who dies? What fucking sense does that make? Once that sperm hits that egg it is no longer a womans body. she is just a hotel for 9 months. " <--- I completely agree. A woman has no right to kill the child because she is too irresponsible with her body. Give the baby up for adoption, the least you could do is let the child live not let the child die because the mother is a whore.

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

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 00:44:21 GMT

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

Jball: So, a woman who has premarital sex is a whore?

What about a man who has premarital sex?

Do you not agree that if a woman should have to carry a child for 9 months, the father should have an equal responsibility to maintain?

The final question is, how to go about doing this?

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

Posted by [swahbuckler](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 00:45:57 GMT

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

what if the pregnancy is as a result of rape, abuse etc?

If the child is likely to be born disabled?

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 01:12:16 GMT

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

Ryan3k wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005 18:44Jball: So, a woman who has premarital sex is a whore?

What about a man who has premarital sex?

Do you not agree that if a woman should have to carry a child for 9 months, the father should have an equal responsibility to maintain?

The final question is, how to go about doing this?

I was just being mean-spirited when I said that. It doesn't qualify her as a "whore", but it does make her irresponsible.

Yes, the father should share equal responsibility. If there was a law governing this, he should pay for clothing for the pregnant mother, or at least pay a certain amount of month for living expenses that a pregnant woman has.

While rape and abuse is a horrible thing, I still don't see how the appropriate action is to kill the child. I understand that every day of the pregnancy is another reminder of that horrible experience, but in the bigger picture, this could very well change someone's life for the better if the mother was to put the child up for adoption.

Just because someone's disabled doesn't mean that they can't be happy. Disabled people can often times be the most happy of people because they're thankful for what they have and often times don't take things for granted. Mentally retarded kids are children forever, they're always laughing and playing. Sure, it may be a hassle to take care of, but the child's still a person, and to take away their right to life is wrong, no matter what the circumstances are.

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 01:21:59 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005 16:11

Too late, he did that quite a while ago. One thing that we learned is that it's pointless to argue with him. He's delusional to the point that he can never be wrong. It's saddening, really.

It's kinda funny; we have Nodbugger for the conservative side of the spectrum, and we have

SuperFlyingLiberalTool for the liberal side of the spectrum.

SeekerIn regards to Saddam, as I pointed out over at zgeek, if you kill Saddam he will become a martyr to the cause.

The hardcore fundamentalists will forever use him as a shining example of western abuse to the muslim world as they continue to recruit young foolish men and women to do Allahs bidding.

Stand him up to the world and prove he is guilty of murdering not only his own people but many other muslims from the region then you no longer have a powerful weapon against the west, you have a scum bag that even Muslims would despise.

Saddam's already a martyr in their eyes; any conviction he receives they will view as a false conclusion that the United States elicited from the judge.

They view him as an innocent prisoner unjustly held by the United States on holy muslim land. Any proof you show them about all the atrocities he has committed in the past they will view as falsified lies fabricated by the American propaganda machine.

Saddam will be eternally innocent in their eyes; no trial will change that.

swahbucklerIf the child is likely to be born disabled?

My sister was born disabled, yet she has touched more lives than ever possible with the way she has overcome all the crap she has in all the years of her life.

Why should the possibility of disability be a reason to end a life before it has a chance to live?

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

Posted by [swahbuckler](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 01:30:51 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 07 November 2005 01:12Ryan3k wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005

18:44Jball: So, a woman who has premarital sex is a whore?

What about a man who has premarital sex?

Do you not agree that if a woman should have to carry a child for 9 months, the father should have an equal responsibility to maintain?

The final question is, how to go about doing this?

I was just being mean-spirited when I said that. It doesn't qualify her as a "whore", but it does make her irresponsible.

Yes, the father should share equal responsibility. If there was a law governing this, he should pay for clothing for the pregnant mother, or at least pay a certain amount of month for living expenses that a pregnant woman has.

While rape and abuse is a horrible thing, I still don't see how the appropriate action is to kill the child. I understand that every day of the pregnancy is another reminder of that horrible experience, but in the bigger picture, this could very well change someone's life for the better if the mother was to put the child up for adoption.

Just because someone's disabled doesn't mean that they can't be happy. Disabled people can often times be the most happy of people because they're thankful for what they have and often times don't take things for granted. Mentally retarded kids are children forever, they're always laughing and playing. Sure, it may be a hassle to take care of, but the child's still a person, and to take away their right to life is wrong, no matter what the circumstances are.

Whilst I don't endorse abortion, I do believe the woman has a right to make that choice as it is her body after all. The foetus is not a child.

I am trying to draw other examples of abortion, other than the woman is a whore.

What about if carrying a baby, is detrimental to the womans health?

Abortion is not something that should be outlawed.

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 01:41:53 GMT

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

swahbuckler wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005 20:30 Whilst I don't endorse abortion, I do believe the woman has a right to make that choice as it is her body after all. The foetus is not a child.

I am trying to draw other examples of abortion, other than the woman is a whore.

Hard drugs like cocaine and heroine are still illegal in the United States; we tell everyone that they cannot use those drugs. Using the argument of "a woman has a right to do what she wants with her body," though, these drugs must be legalized and drinking age laws must be repealed as they remove the right people have to do what they want with their own bodies.

We say she cannot take drugs or drink before the age of twenty-one, so does she really have the right to do what she wants with her body?

Quote:What about if carrying a baby, is detrimental to the womans health?

Abortion is not something that should be outlawed.

Depends on just how detrimental.

If carrying the child is life-threatening for whatever reason, or if the doctors are afraid the mother could possibly die when the child is born, then, and only then, should abortion be allowed. When extenuating medical conditions threaten the life of the mother and/or the child, I can accept abortion as being an option for the parents to consider.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 01:49:21 GMT

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

Hydra wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005 20:41 Depends on just how detrimental.

If carrying the child is life-threatening for whatever reason, or if the doctors are afraid the mother could possibly die when the child is born, then, and only then, should abortion be allowed. When extenuating medical conditions threaten the life of the mother and/or the child, I can accept abortion as being an option for the parents to consider.

Exactly. Only if this is the only way to save the life of the mother.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 02:32:19 GMT

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

The only two reasons for abortion that I support are

1) The mother's life is in danger. It's sad, but if it had to come down to a choice of one or both, I'd say let the mother live.

2) Rape. As much as there is no physical danger for the mother, the mental strain relating to giving birth to the son/daughter of a man who raped you, and being constantly reminded everytime you looked at the kid, could be just as fatal.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 02:48:20 GMT

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

Though, if she puts the child up for adoption, she wouldn't have to see the child every day.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 03:12:39 GMT

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

true, but remember that there is still the 9 months prior to the birth that still need to be completed.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 03:45:37 GMT

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

Yes, and it really all does depend on the mental capacity of the mother, but I just still can't let go the idea of a child being killed simply because the mother can't deal with a memory. I'm not female, and I haven't been raped, so I can't say that I'd know how it feels, but I just still can't

imagine that killing a child is going to make the situation any better. It's all about the bigger picture. Let the woman/girl be the bigger person and be strong and show that she can beat this issue and deliver a child, and if necessary, give it up for adoption so that a loving family can give the child the love that it deserves. It's not the child's fault for the girl/woman getting raped (not her fault either), but the mother can still live her life past that incident, while to kill the child, it has no chance to live.

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 03:48:51 GMT

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

That is why the first and most important thing that girl needs is support, comfort, counselling, and help; her first rational reaction should never be to get an abortion, because an abortion can be equally devastating on both physical and psychological levels.

She needs help and support from her parents and spiritual leaders first and foremost; only then should they even consider abortion (it should go without saying that a teenager should get parental and doctoral approval prior to receiving an abortion; not everyone can get an abortion for medical reasons, I'm sure; if done incorrectly, the abortion could end up taking the lives of both the child and the mother).

To sum it up:

Abortion for medical reasons--acceptable, but all measures should be taken to save both mother's and child's lives, leaving abortion as an absolute last resort; I think most parents would agree with me.

Abortion in response to a rape--no definite answer as each case must be approached individually. Getting an abortion or giving birth and then putting the child up for adoption are extremely, and possibly equally, psychologically and physically devastating decisions.

Despite the child's painful conception, that girl is its mother, and nothing can change that. She must make the choice whether to let her child live or die. The only other people who can even fathom making such a decision are judges deciding murder trials.

This kid hasn't even had a chance to live yet, let alone commit any crime other than simply existing. How can a teenage girl possibly be able to make that kind of a decision?

If I haven't made it obvious enough, I personally support the choice to allow the child to live and have the mother either put it up for adoption or embark on raising it herself, because at least the child will have the potential to live a good life; no one can know what kind of life it would have led if it wasn't allowed to live in the first place.

Of course, my personal (and inexperienced) opinion on whether a girl should abort or adopt is irrelevant since the law is only concerned with whether the choice to abort should be allowed in the first place. It is my belief that not only is that child a human being and have a right to live, but that the psychological and physical damage done to the mother are far too great to allow it to exist as a viable option for someone caught in such a hellacious situation.

EDIT: About the memory thing: she is going to remember being raped and becoming pregnant no

matter what. Killing the product of that rape won't erase the memory and will in fact give the girl an equally devastating memory of killing an innocent human being.

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

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 03:55:55 GMT

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

Here's a point that anyone that thinks that they have a right to make this decision for someone (a woman's) well being:

If it was your body, would you appreciate the decision being made for you?

Let's see a poll put up on that one. I know that someone trying to tell me what to do with my body is going to have a tough go at it.

Anyone disagree?

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 04:17:26 GMT

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

It's murder. Depending on your belief (such as mine), it's not "your body", it's simply on "loan".

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

Posted by [Dundasbro](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 04:35:31 GMT

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

I personally believe that it should be the womans choice, it is her body after all. But I can accept the views of the conservatives in this forum also and i would have to say you make a good point. It's been so long since i've experienced a lucid conservative argument... It's actually kinda nice...

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 05:14:16 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005 22:55Here's a point that anyone that thinks that they have a right to make this decision for someone (a woman's) well being:

If it was your body, would you appreciate the decision being made for you?

Let's see a poll put up on that one. I know that someone trying to tell me what to do with my body is going to have a tough go at it.

Anyone disagree?

The government has already decided that I can't drink alcohol until I'm 21; the government has already decided that I can't smoke crack; the government has already decided that I can't drive 85 mph in a 55 mph speed limit; the government has already decided that I can't bring a fully-automatic M249 machine gun with me to school for show-and-tell.

No, I don't appreciate those decisions already being made for me, but they have for everyone's well-being. If I drive 30 miles over the speed limit drunk and high on crack with a fully loaded machine gun in my back seat just waiting to discharge, chances are I'm about to very seriously hurt myself or someone else.

That's why we have laws in the first place--to keep people from infringing on the rights of others to do whatever the hell they want (provided "whatever the hell they want" doesn't mean they infringe on the rights of others).

By giving a woman the ability to abort, she is in essence receiving the ability to destroy another human life. Doesn't that human have a natural right to live, though? Isn't the right simply to exist outlined in just about every founding document upon which this country was built?

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 05:16:13 GMT

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

Hydra wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005 23:14 Arcane1 wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005 22:55 Here's a point that anyone that thinks that they have a right to make this decision for someone (a woman's) well being:

If it was your body, would you appreciate the decision being made for you?

Let's see a poll put up on that one. I know that someone trying to tell me what to do with my body is going to have a tough go at it.

Anyone disagree?

The government has already decided that I can't drink alcohol until I'm 21; the government has already decided that I can't smoke crack; the government has already decided that I can't drive 85 mph in a 55 mph speed limit; the government has already decided that I can't bring a fully-automatic M249 machine gun with me to school for show-and-tell.

No, I don't appreciate those decisions already being made for me, but they have for everyone's well-being. If I drive 30 miles over the speed limit drunk and high on crack with a fully loaded machine gun in my back seat just waiting to discharge, chances are I'm about to very seriously hurt myself or someone else.

That's why we have laws in the first place--to keep people from infringing on the rights of others to do whatever the hell they want (provided "whatever the hell they want" doesn't mean they infringe on the rights of others).

By giving a woman the ability to abort, she is in essence receiving the ability to destroy another human life. Doesn't that human have a natural right to live, though? Isn't the right simply to exist outlined in just about every founding document upon which this country was built?

I like that response better than mine.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 05:16:41 GMT

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

Yes well, not all conservatives are close-minded. Much like liberals, it's mostly the radicals you hear about.

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

Posted by [Dundasbro](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 05:57:16 GMT

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

This argument is all based on whether you count an unborn baby to be a person yet or not. It's all about opinion

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 06:32:03 GMT

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

Even if one concedes that it's a matter of opinion if a child is human or not, how can we allow abortion to be legal? Instead of taking the side of caution, until we can know for sure if they are people or not, we're taking the side of reckless endangerment.

If in 10, 20 or whatever amount of years, scientists provide undeniable proof that an unborn child is a human, courts will have no choice but to outlaw abortion period, as it would be murder. What then do we say if we look back at decades of what was a mass slaughter of the innocent? "Oops, sorry for the genocide! Hope we didn't need those millions of people!"

What if it gets outlawed now until science figures it out? If in 10, 20, or whatever amount of years, scientists provide incontrovertible proof that an unborn child is not a human, courts will have no choice but to allow abortion. Then when we look back at decades of the restriction, what will we say? "Seems a little silly now, but the issue is solved."

It doesn't seem like much of a debate to me. Err on the side of caution, or potentially let millions of innocent people get brutally murdered...

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 08:40:44 GMT

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

I honestly cannot fathom anything else an unborn child can possibly be other than a living person.

It's a human life any way you logically look at it.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 15:17:05 GMT

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

Think of what could have been. Have we aborted the scientist who was destined to find the cure for AIDS?

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

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 16:17:46 GMT

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

I really doubt it.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 17:00:07 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Sun, 06 November 2005 22:45 Yes, and it really all does depend on the mental capacity of the mother, but I just still can't let go the idea of a child being killed simply because the mother can't deal with a memory. I'm not female, and I haven't been raped, so I can't say that I'd know how it feels, but I just still can't imagine that killing a child is going to make the situation any better. It's all about the bigger picture. Let the woman/girl be the bigger person and be strong and show that she can beat this issue and deliver a child, and if necessary, give it up for adoption so that a loving family can give the child the love that it deserves. It's not the child's fault for the girl/woman getting raped (not her fault either), but the mother can still live her life past that incident, while to kill the child, it has no chance to live.

And I agree. All I'm saying (and perhaps I could have been clearer) is that if there was that mental anguish caused by the rape to an extreme point, then I wouldn't oppose an abortion.

I'm not suggesting that there should be an automatic choice for the abortion route, as some people can get over it. But, if the right circumstances occur, it would be an acceptable act.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 17:38:01 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Mon, 07 November 2005 08:17 Think of what could have been. Have we aborted the scientist who was destined to find the cure for AIDS?

Yeah, you're right. In fact, what about the billions of sperm that die every minute to masturbation or sodomy or condoms... and all the unfertilized eggs bled out in menstrual periods. This is an OUTRAGE! There are enough sperm cells in one ejaculate the re-populate the earth. Entire civilizations of people have been wiped away on a kleenex! This is an OUTRAGE!

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 18:26:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You're right! Why didn't I see it before? Afterall, sperm and egg cells are genetically distinct from the person they came from, just like a newly conceived embryo!

Oh... wait... no they're not... A newly conceived zygote is genetically unique, but a sperm and egg cell aren't... I totally forgot about that thing called science, and its discoveries about DNA. If only I'd used my head before jumping to a conclusion that was proven wrong 50 years ago. Sorry folks, false alarm.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Seeker](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 22:13:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 22:22:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The concept of abortion, and the practice more so, is an assault against life. That is indeed a reality.

The concept of the State having the right to control a person is more of an assault in my opinion.

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 Founding Fathers did not intend for the State to have the type of powers that are had now. The Patriot Act would cause them to spin in their graves.

For Men, who have never and will never experience the trials that a Woman goes through to be

the ones making the Laws is not right. It is a method of enslavement taking the rights of an Individual away. Typically, Governments do not handle that responsibility well and historically have abused it terribly.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 23:04:47 GMT

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

Killing an unborn child is murder. Mothers who kill their own children by drowning them and such are arrested and prosecuted, so what makes this any difference? Simply because there are people who consider a fetus to be less than human? It's against the law to kill a black person, yet people still refuse to believe that they are human. Same goes for homosexuals. You can't kill a homosexual even though there are plenty of people who claim that they're not human (such as my uncle).

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 WadeThe 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.

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 23:42:42 GMT

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

Seeker wrote on Mon, 07 November 2005 17:13While 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.

How are the two practices different? You've basically proven my point for me.

Abortion is akin to infanticide. Mothers who abuse and kill their children should be arrested and prosecuted as J_Ball said. Why do you want to legalize one form of murder over another?

Arcane1The concept of abortion, and the practice more so, is an assault against life. That is indeed a reality.

The concept of the State having the right to control a person is more of an assault in my opinion.

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?

So you concede that abortion is akin to murder, then you say you're more concerned with how intrusive government has become into the lives of its citizens.

To me, that sounds like you're trying to imply that the government shouldn't have the right to outlaw certain kinds of murder.

Please tell me I read wrong....

Quote: The Founding Fathers did not intend for the State to have the type of powers that are had now. The Patriot Act would cause them to spin in their graves. As would Social Security, Medicare, the income tax, affirmative action policies, the controversy over "Under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance, many current forms of gun control, and the legalized practice of abortion.

Right now, we're focusing on abortion; let's take this one issue at a time.

Quote: For Men, who have never and will never experience the trials that a Woman goes through to be the ones making the Laws is not right. It is a method of enslavement taking the rights of an Individual away. Typically, Governments do not handle that responsibility well and historically have abused it terribly.

That would be true if women weren't allowed to vote; could not run for federal offices such as the House of Representatives or the Senate; could not be appointed to major executive offices; could not be appointed to federal judgeships; and could not participate in their state and local governments.

Each is the case, however, so whatever "enslavement" of women you think men have does not exist in reality.

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

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2005 23:49:56 GMT

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

Quote: 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.

That fails to explain identical twins, triplets, etc. Identical twins are created when the fertilized egg splits in two and develops into two separate people. How can a fertilized egg be an individual when the possibility exists that it will become two or more? It makes far more sense to say that life begins when the central nervous system begins developing- before that exists, there is no consciousness, there is no thought. That is scientific fact; anything further than that is religious belief and does not belong in legislation.

When a person becomes brain dead, they are no longer alive. Therefore, before the brain becomes functional, a person is not yet alive.

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 00:09:00 GMT

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

Anything further than that is religious belief? A newly conceived zygote is a living organism with a distinct genetic code. That's biology, not religion. It's philosophy and religion that clouds the issue by saying "when does sentience begin?". Science says physical life begins at conception, religions are all over the map on where life begins.

I hold to that in part because of identical twins, triplets, etc. Despite that the zygote divided from one into two, or more, it's physical existence, its genetic identity, still began when that egg got fertilized by that sperm. Not before and not after.

When a person becomes brain dead, their body dies too as there is nothing left to tell it to keep functioning (yes, I know, unless artificial means are used to force the body to continue). Before we can detect brain activity in a fetus, its body is very much alive and growing.

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

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 00:25:37 GMT

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

Here's how I see this ::

This situation is a lot like how I hear certain people on this forum argue that if guns are outlawed, than criminals will still find a way to get guns, so doing so is pointless.

If abortion is outlawed, women who still want abortions will still find a way to get them, by the same logic. And, probably to greater risk to their personal health. So, isn't it pointless?

So, if by opposing abortion you are for the conservation of life, then by this same gun control logic, if it were outlawed, abortion would still be rampant. However, the womens' lives would be in greater danger due to the unprofessional and illegal nature of the abortions (back-alley). You'll probably say they deserve it. And they probably do, but still. Life is life, right?

Solution: Legalize murder. Boom, problem solved. YAY! Murders attributed to guns? LEGAL! Abortion of fetuses? LEGAL!

And it all works out.

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 00:42:04 GMT

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

Ryan3k wrote on Mon, 07 November 2005 19:25 This situation is a lot like how I hear certain people on this forum argue that if guns are outlawed, than criminals will still find a way to get guns, so doing so is pointless.

If abortion is outlawed, women who still want abortions will still find a way to get them, by the same logic. And, probably to greater risk to their personal health. So, isn't it pointless?

Let's just go ahead and get rid of all laws since they'll just be broken anyway. Who needs this orderly society, anyway?

Quote:Solution: Legalize murder.

It already is if you're a black former NFL player and you live in southern California.

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

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 00:56:09 GMT

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

Nukelt15 wrote on Mon, 07 November 2005 17:49Quote: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.

That fails to explain identical twins, triplets, etc. Identical twins are created when the fertilized egg splits in two and develops into two separate people. How can a fertilized egg be an individual when the possibility exists that it will become two or more? It makes far more sense to say that life begins when the central nervous system begins developing- before that exists, there is no consciousness, there is no thought. That is scientific fact; anything further than that is religious belief and does not belong in legislation.

When a person becomes brain dead, they are no longer alive. Therefore, before the brain becomes functional, a person is not yet alive.

Being a living being, and being an entity that is capable of existing out of the womb are two different issues. Until a certain degree of maturity is accomplished, the zygote cum fetus is little more biologically than a parasite, feeding off of the Mother. By that definition, the Mother should have the right to terminate the relationship on her terms.

Yet some call that Murder. Murder of a living being is the charge.

How can a parasite be considered a living being? How can the life of that parasite become more important than the wishes of the host?

Can we draw a parallel to the person who is "brain dead" or "clinically dead" and yet maintains life functions with the assistance of machines? Technically that person becomes a parasite themselves, the organ that is supporting them being the hospital and framework of machines. Is unhooking the machines that support life committing murder?

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 01:38:08 GMT

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

"Arcane1"

How can a parasite be considered a living being? How can the life of that parasite become more important than the wishes of the host?

Not more important than the wishes of the host, just as important.

Also, don't confuse a parasite with something that is without life. If that is how you must perceive a child before it is born, of course.

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 01:43:58 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Mon, 07 November 2005 19:56 Being a living being, and being an entity that is capable of existing out of the womb are two different issues. Until a certain degree of maturity is accomplished, the zygote cum fetus is little more biologically than a parasite, feeding off of the Mother. By that definition, the Mother should have the right to terminate the relationship on her terms.

Yes, being a living being and being able to exist out of a womb are two different issues. Being completely self sufficient means nothing in the debate on whether something is alive. No one is self sufficient, as we all need to eat. Having to eat doesn't make an adult not a person. It's really a non-issue in what constitutes life.

A parasite latches onto a host and forcefully sucks out nutrients it needs to live. A fetus doesn't do this. The mother's body is designed to support and nourish it. The fetus can't sink its 'fangs' into the mother's body and suck out food. The mother's body has to send food to the fetus, or it dies. Like a new born baby is dependant on a caregiver, so is a preborn baby. If the baby was a parasite, the mother's immune system would attack it as a foreign invader, yet her body actually creates defense mechanisms to ensure its survival while it is still vulnerable to things like parasites and infections. The relationship is closer to being symbiotic than it is parasitic.

Even if we were to accept the idea that a fetus is a parasite, a parasite is still a living organism, and in this case its genetic code is that of a living human. Regardless if it was a parasite, its still a human. It is just at a stage in life where it's parasitic. It still has the right to live, as it is human genetically and humans have the right to life.

When it comes to the mother having a right to terminate the relationship, that's just ridiculous. Did the baby force itself into the mother? Of course not, the baby's parents forced it to exist in the first place, or in the case of rape, one of its parents forced it to be there. The baby never asked to be there to begin with and can't be held responsible for being there now. By allowing an abortion for this reason, you are punishing a child for the actions of a parent or parents. If anyone has a right to terminate the relationship its the fetus, as it was forced into the arrangement to begin with.

You might as well argue a slave master has the right to kill a slave if they no longer want to feed the slave. That argument would miss the whole point that slaves shouldn't be denied their freedom to begin with.

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

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 13:33:35 GMT

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

Thanks to Aircraftkiller for originally posting this...

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 13:52:52 GMT

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

Because, OMG, if you are "pro-choice," then you absolutely MUST give a shit about endangered species!!

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 14:28:20 GMT

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

The comic has nothing to do with endangered species.

The point of the comic (at least in the context of this thread) is when "life begins".

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 15:47:03 GMT

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

Doitle wrote on Tue, 08 November 2005 07:33

Thanks to Aircraftkiller for originally posting this...

He was right, this is the best political comic ever.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 22:45:02 GMT

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

And it would even fit the argument if the non-hippie was giving birth to the condor.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 22:47:36 GMT

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

it's not about giving birth, it's about when life starts.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 23:00:19 GMT

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

Yeah, DUH, but the cartoon is directly implying hypocrisy between a pro-choice and pro-environment stand.

Such an implication is, however, logically flawed in that the non-hippie is not giving birth to the condor eggs.

As far as "when life begins," I believe it begins in higher organisms when the brain develops and begins to function. Environmentalists don't protect the eggs of endangered species because it would be wrong for them to die, necessarily, but because the eggs will eventually become endangered species to refurbish the population that has been minimized by inbred Republican hunters. I do not deny that either a human embryo nor a condor egg will become a fully developed organism. The underlying principles behind abortion and protecting species, are however, entirely different.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2005 23:38:39 GMT

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

Quote: the population that has been minimized by human expansion into their habitats, deforestation, and overpopulation of other species.

Fixed.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 00:24:45 GMT

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

SFE, Hydra is going to have a field day with your last post.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 00:28:55 GMT

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

See I... PERSONALLY... would think you'd be LESS likely to kill something you gave birth to than

something some other creature gave birth to. That's just me though.

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

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 00:33:38 GMT

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

warrantoThe comic has nothing to do with endangered species.

The point of the comic (at least in the context of this thread) is when "life begins".

You missed my point, which was that the comic is just a stereotype, so it has no value in this discussion. It depicts the "liberal" as an ugly, haggardly-dressed and kempt hypocrite, while the "conservative" is clean-shaven, well-dressed, and handsome (comparatively).

If someone wants to point out a "paradox" in beliefs and add something to this discussion of actual worth, you can do without a childish and prejudiced cartoon.

...Like how I described earlier in this thread how many conservatives don't believe in gun control, yet would support the illegalization of abortion.

Meaning,

If you illegalize guns, criminals will still get guns.

THEREFORE,

If you illegalize abortion, women will still get abortions.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 01:00:47 GMT

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

That last point is actually readily demonstrated in African countries where abortion is illegal so women just get abortions in back allies instead of the hospital. As a result, many die from poor operations.

I personally don't want that to happen in America.

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 01:36:08 GMT

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

While we're at it, let's legalize robbery. After all, even though its illegal people still do it, and because it is illegal its not safe and people get killed trying to do it.

If it were legal than people wouldn't need to take bystanders hostage when they rob banks. They wouldn't need to get into gun battles with police, since the police wouldn't be able to stop them. Store employees wouldn't have to worry about getting shot by the robbers, the thieves wouldn't have to worry about getting shot by police, and police wouldn't have to worry about getting shot in the course of their duty. If everyone could just walk into a bank and say "Give me all your money!" then society would be a much safer place. Wouldn't that be wonderful?

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

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 02:42:01 GMT

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

Ryan3k wrote on Tue, 08 November 2005 18:

If someone wants to point out a "paradox" in beliefs and add something to this discussion of actual worth, you can do without a childish and prejudiced cartoon.

...Like how I described earlier in this thread how many conservatives don't believe in gun control, yet would support the illegalization of abortion.

Meaning,

If you illegalize guns, criminals will still get guns.

THEREFORE,

If you illegalize abortion, women will still get abortions.

If you are against Gun Control you are AGAINST Illegalizing guns. You didn't exactly prove anything in relation to abortion but you just defeated the liberal cause in response to their stance on gun control.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 02:45:38 GMT

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

No, because a funny little thing called everyone having assault rifles to keep themselves from getting robbed would happen.

Shootings would skyrocket, and at the end of the day everyone would be much less safe.

So let's not do that.

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

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 02:47:48 GMT

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

I know I can't afford to just have an assault rifle laying around. Can you? That's like everyone buying extra cars just to have in case their primary car dies.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 02:56:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You could if robbery was legitimate.

BTW, I meant to be rebutting Neosaber. You just posted between me clicking "post" and "submit". Whatever, no harm done.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 02:58:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh alright SFE. I thought your post was in relation to mine. I can stop battling now lol.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 03:03:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

At this point I'm in favor of legalizing abortion but place heavy taxes on it and supplement it with educating all these morons about birth control and reminding them that having a baby isn't like creating yourself a new friend.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 03:22:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

...That's actually a pretty good idea. I hadn't thought about that.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 03:37:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Tue, 08 November 2005 21:45No, because a funny little thing called everyone having assault rifles to keep themselves from getting robbed would happen.

Shootings would skyrocket, and at the end of the day everyone would be much less safe.

So let's not do that.

Wait... so you mean by legalizing crimes to prevent people from getting hurt while carrying them out, we only end up making things worse? But you said that abortion being legal helps people...

The point of my statement was, of course, that things become illegal in the first place because they harm people. Advocating they be made legal so those who suffer from the crimes won't suffer is idiotic, as it just makes the situation worse. It applies to robbery and it applies to abortion as well.

When abortion was legalized in the US, people started having abortions by the millions. This was a huge increase of what happened when it was illegal. That's over a million humans killed every year, and over a million women who risk abortion related complications (including death) in the US alone.

But don't take my word for it, here's what one of the founders of NARAL has to say:

Dr. Bernard Nathanson We persuaded the media that the cause of permissive abortion was a liberal enlightened, sophisticated one. Knowing that if a true poll were taken, we would be soundly defeated, we simply fabricated the results of fictional polls. We announced to the media that we had taken polls and that 60% of Americans were in favour of permissive abortion. This is the tactic of the self-fulfilling lie. Few people care to be in the minority. We aroused enough sympathy to sell our program of permissive abortion by fabricating the number of illegal abortions done annually in the U.S. The actual figure was approaching 100,000 but the figure we gave to the media repeatedly was 1,000,000. Repeating the big lie often enough convinces the public. The number of women dying from illegal abortions was around 200-250 annually. The figure we constantly fed to the media was 10,000. These false figures took root in the consciousness of Americans convincing many that we needed to crack the abortion law. Another myth we fed to the public through the media was that legalising abortion would only mean that the abortions taking place illegally would then be done legally. In fact, of course, abortion is now being used as a primary method of birth control in the U.S. and the annual number of abortions has increased by 1500% since legalisation.

Got that here: <http://www.aboutabortions.com/Confess.html>

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

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 22:35:00 GMT

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

My Apologies to All: I got inundated yesterday and today... and haven't read through to reply. Just printed out the posts and will get back at it tonite.

-Arcane1

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [johny roberts](#) on Wed, 09 Nov 2005 23:11:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello all saw several topics of interest all ready..

On abortion should be legal. If it was legal then Nodbugger would have been prevented from ever living....

On Sadam ... Everyone needs a trial its the way of the world.

Peace out all old members and new Zgeek members.....

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 02:58:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Y'all shouldn't respond so much while I'm doing my homework.

SuperFlyingLiberalToolYeah, DUH, but the cartoon is directly implying hypocrisy between a pro-choice and pro-environment stand.

Such an implication is, however, logically flawed in that the non-hippie is not giving birth to the condor eggs.

The hippie is trying to protect the eggs because they are the eggs of an endangered species; the non-hippie is hungry and eats the eggs that were going to be discarded anyway.

By the commonly held definition of life that pro-choicers use (of whom we can assume the hippie is a part), those eggs are not yet alive, yet the hippie is trying to defend them as if they were living condors.

The cartoon correctly argues that such a stance is hypocritical.

How is that "logically flawed?"

Quote:As far as "when life begins," I believe it begins in higher organisms when the brain develops and begins to function.

Too bad science doesn't agree with you.

Quote:Environmentalists don't protect the eggs of endangered species because it would be wrong for them to die, necessarily, but because the eggs will eventually become endangered species to refurbish the population that has been minimized by inbred Republican hunters.

Yet another shining example of hypocrisy coming from you.

You give yourself such high praise in not using personal insults, then you say something like that... tsk tsk tsk.

Quote:I do not deny that either a human embryo nor a condor egg will become a fully developed organism. The underlying principles behind abortion and protecting species, are however, entirely different.

So you're okay with killing babies as long as they're human babies.

Gotcha.

Ryan3k You missed my point, which was that the comic is just a stereotype, so it has no value in this discussion. It depicts the "liberal" as an ugly, haggardly-dressed and kempt hypocrite, while the "conservative" is clean-shaven, well-dressed, and handsome (comparatively).

If someone wants to point out a "paradox" in beliefs and add something to this discussion of actual worth, you can do without a childish and prejudiced cartoon.

You apparently missed your own point:

Quote:...Like how I described earlier in this thread how many conservatives don't believe in gun control, yet would support the illegalization of abortion.

You just stereotyped most conservatives here as being against gun control while chastizing that cartoon for stereotyping most hippies as being pro-choice.

Let's face the facts, though:

-Most people who oppose most forms of gun control are more conservative in thought. Note how I never said you were wrong in saying many conservatives here oppose most forms of gun control--the problem is that you broke your own rule and stereotyped all of us as being anti-gun control (as well as anti-abortion).

-Most pro-choicers are liberal in thought. There is not one single pro-choice lobbyist group out there that supports conservative politicians that I can think of; nearly all of them support liberal candidates in elections (I probably could have left out the "nearly" as it would be a true stereotype, but I'm gonna leave it in as an escape hatch if someone comes up with a website called "BabyKillersforBush.com" or something).

-Most hippies are dirty and unshaven; I know a few, and they're not all that pleasant to be around smell/sight-wise.

-Most hippies share liberal political beliefs. Haven't met a conservative hippy yet; probably one-of-his-kind if he actually exists.

The cartoon is obviously a caricature of the pro-life and pro-choice crowd, which will of course use the stereotypical images of both to represent them; otherwise, their identifications would not have been as easily conveyed to the cartoon's observer.

Though many stereotypes are untrue and unfair to many groups, they get their beginnings from many cases true to their definitions. Sad but true.

SuperFlyingLiberalTool That last point is actually readily demonstrated in African countries where abortion is illegal so women just get abortions in back allies instead of the hospital. As a result, many die from poor operations.

I personally don't want that to happen in America.

You're going to attribute abortion operation mishaps in Africa solely to its illegality?
Do you think those women would receive even half-decent operations if abortion was legal? They can barely receive a simple vaccination that doesn't somehow result in health complications!
Healthcare in Africa sucks!
Legalizing abortion doesn't automatically mean those women receiving them now will suddenly get better healthcare as those people doing the back-alley abortions will be the same people performing the legal practice; they'll just be allowed to do it by the government for a cheaper price.

And abortion's illegality is a single factor among a myriad of others forcing those women to seek those abortions in the first place.

If you're going to try to use a real-life example, try to become a little more informed on what is actually happening with it.

Quote:No, because a funny little thing called everyone having assault rifles to keep themselves from getting robbed would happen.

Shootings would skyrocket, and at the end of the day everyone would be much less safe.

So let's not do that.

God, I hope you don't think Neosaber was actually being serious....

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

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 06:33:49 GMT

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

Wow. Not too sure where to catch up from, but I know that I'm going to stay away from the Hippie and whether or not the eggs should be eaten.

Historically, when abortion was illegal there was a serious problem with "back alley" doctors, and a high rate of harm or death to the women that resorted to them. Does that justify legalizing abortion? No, I don't think so at all. I liked the idea of taxation/education in conjunction with abortion, but I'm not sure the it would fly past the ACLU. I was friends with a Judge in downstate IL that decided that a woman that had becme pregnant 3 times, and had killed one of the children and hurt another shoudl have the Norplant long term birth control implanted. She was barely of functional IQ, and lived in a trailer park near a less than nice bar. Seems that she had a habit of frequenting the bar and winding up pregnant, repeatedly. The ACLU got involved and after the whole thing was over it was deemed that her right to get pregnant was primary. Go figure.

One of the things that I have learned is that in issues like this the law is often not broad enough to encompass the issue very well. Making legal decisions with set parameters is one thing, dealing with Humans and their individual needs is quite another. The ability of any law to cover the needs of many is suspect at best, and the more intimate the matter is the more difficult the decisions become. Abortion is probably the epitome of this issue facing the US right now. We aren't so much deciding whether or not abortion should be legal, we are deciding whether it is or is not acceptable morally. Inherent to that is that ultimately there will be those that decide and those

that are imposed upon. We all know that it is wrong to speed, and that going 80 in a 65 zone is illegal. How many people believe that it is "wrong"? We all know that murder is illegal, but there are times when it is "right" like in self-defense, but wrong in "cold blood". Of course there are those that will argue that murder is wrong under any conditions.

All of the logical and rational discussion has covered aspects that I certainly have left off of my daily thinking, as I operate more in the emotional based realm than the logical and haven't argued this issue in many years (10+). Certainly not trying to sound condescending, I am pretty awed by the arguments.

What I would ask is to consider it emotionally. Consider the issue not as a legal question, but as a first person question that could apply to you, your girlfriend, your wife, sister or friend. If it was your sister, that was in her senior year and did a stupid thing, would you want her to have to not graduate? Would you want your parents to have to start raising kids again? Don't think of this as a legal issue, think of it as a human issue. It is easy from a detached perspective to say that "This is right, this is wrong..." but when you are in the position things change. Rather like the saying that "there are no atheists on a battlefield", we all learn the other aspects of the issue when we step in them.

It is late for me, and my reality has been inundated by client issues, so I am off to sleep. I appreciate all of your comments. Oh, and one thing, is there a Mod that can split this thread off or at least change the title? Sheesh, that one is getting old.

-Arcane1

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 06:38:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryan3k wrote on Tue, 08 November 2005 19:33warrantoThe comic has nothing to do with endangered species.

The point of the comic (at least in the context of this thread) is when "life begins".

You missed my point, which was that the comic is just a stereotype, so it has no value in this discussion. It depicts the "liberal" as an ugly, haggardly-dressed and kempt hypocrite, while the "conservative" is clean-shaven, well-dressed, and handsome (comparatively).

Regardless of the depiction of the groups in the comic, I say again that's not what the comic was about.

It's about the hypocrisy (in the context of the thread) relating to saying that doing <whatever> to the unborn eggs of an endangered species is worse than doing <whatever> to human "eggs". A

sort of "Save the birds, leave the eggs alone...women have a choice, it's not a human yet!"

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 08:09:39 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 01:33Historically, when abortion was illegal there was a serious problem with "back alley" doctors, and a high rate of harm or death to the women that resorted to them.

I've been trying to research the rate the last few days, and so far what I've found says the death rate was very low. One of the founders of NARAL now says out of 100,000 estimated illegal abortions a year, 200-250 women are believed to have died from complications due to abortions. He added that numbers indicating higher rates at that time were a complete fabrication created by the original founders of the pro-choice movement in America. They thought the ends justified the means.

Arcane1 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 01:33What I would ask is to consider it emotionally. Consider the issue not as a legal question, but as a first person question that could apply to you, your girlfriend, your wife, sister or friend. If it was your sister, that was in her senior year and did a stupid thing, would you want her to have to not graduate? Would you want your parents to have to start raising kids again? Don't think of this as a legal issue, think of it as a human issue. It is easy from a detached perspective to say that "This is right, this is wrong..." but when you are in the position things change. Rather like the saying that "there are no atheists on a battlefield", we all learn the other aspects of the issue when we step in them.

Personally, I consider myself to be along the lines of a cold-hearted, emotionless monster, but I'll give it a shot.

Maybe I'm the wrong person to answer that hypothetical since I know my mom well enough to know that if my teenage sister somehow got pregnant, she would raise the child without question. Abortion would never even enter into her mind as a possibility. She'd never allow her grandchild to be killed for being an inconvenience.

After all, how would anyone feel if they were that unborn child, just given life only to be killed on the basis of being an inconvenience. To have people actually think that little of you, that you have nothing to contribute to society that would outweigh the inconvenience of your life...

And then how would a child feel during the actual abortion? They are ripped to pieces after all, without even an anesthetic. For a person's last moments in life to be spent being torn limb from limb, attempting to scream from the agony, yet unable to get enough air in their throat to make a sound... I'd certainly never want to go through that. I've literally had nightmares on that one. We'd never even subject a genocidal tyrant to that kind of execution, yet we frequently allow it to be done to someone whose only 'crime' was for their existence to be an inconvenience to another.

And that is what this scenario is, getting rid of a person for being an inconvenience. I used to worry that if society kept doing that, then it wouldn't be too long before someone had a modest

proposal and actually meant it. I say I used to worry, because it has actually happened in the form of embryonic stem cell research. People sometimes blow off the 'slippery slope' argument, but we have such a perfect modern example its scary.

In the end, no matter how hard it is on the parents, or family, etc, it doesn't even come close to the suffering the child goes through. For the sake of abortion providers, karma better not be real, otherwise they are in for some serious pain.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Kytten9](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 09:10:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

abortion is wrong in my eyes. I know of several circumstances however that would not justify abortion, but have it become the lesser of two evils:

1/ health issues, choosing between the mother and the child.

2/ multiple births (i.e ivf treatment that has resulted in 8 fertilized eggs, but having to have 1 or more aborted to save the pregnancy and the lives of 6 or 7 babies, rather than leaving it to nature and losing all 8 of them)

3/ religion: In England alot of Asian cultures believe in blood laws, i.e the father has the right to kill a disobedient child...alot of Asian girls are at risk of their own fathers judgment and punishment if they have sex with the wrong person, so having a child to said person would have the same effect.

4/ rape: yes it could be a blessing, but the chances of the pregnancy succeeding anyway is minimal, the woman has to relive a trauma for 9 months....It's not right and it's not fair to her or the child.

5/ Financial problems: this is from personal experience. A friend of mine who already has a 2 yr old baby girl fell pregnant again and the father up and left at the first sign of trouble, she was no longer with the father of her first child, could barely get by on what money she had for her first child, it would have been irresponsible to have another, and I will tell you it's bullshit to disagree with this reason because you cannot wait 9 months to give up a baby, your financial life would have nosedived 6 months before that and both the mother, unborn child and 2 year old would be living in squaller, It bit her in the ass 12mths later when she realized the child she had aborted would have been 3mths old....

While I respect your opinions, I seriously doubt anyone who isn't female would have a clearer or more valid perspective on this. You don't have a uterus so you cannot understand the pressures of being a woman, same said as I cannot fully appreciate the pressures of being a guy.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 14:21:26 GMT

NeoSaber wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 02:09

I've been trying to research the rate the last few days, and so far what I've found says the death rate was very low. One of the founders of NARAL now says out of 100,000 estimated illegal abortions a year, 200-250 women are believed to have died from complications due to abortions. He added that numbers indicating higher rates at that time were a complete fabrication created by the original founders of the pro-choice movement in America. They thought the ends justified the means.

I will have to admit that aside from anecdotal evidence I don't have any actual numbers on that issue. Kudos to you for digging. One detail that I know of is that severe complications and suffering permanent damage from botched abortions were an issue, again I don't have any real numbers.

NeoSaber wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 02:09

Personally, I consider myself to be along the lines of a cold-hearted, emotionless monster, but I'll give it a shot.

Maybe I'm the wrong person to answer that hypothetical since I know my mom well enough to know that if my teenage sister somehow got pregnant, she would raise the child without question. Abortion would never even enter into her mind as a possibility. She'd never allow her grandchild to be killed for being an inconvenience.

Cold hearted or not, all I asked is that the suit be tried on, and that was certainly a fair go at it.

The issue with being able to know or predict people's reactions in situations I'll take you to task on though. There are few people in the world that surprise us as much by their actions as our family. You'd have to assume that your (hypothetical) sister would even tell her family beforehand and not make the decision alone. There are so many variables that predicting is tough. Look at how families often behave after a death and the whole matter of property/cash issues arise to see how absolutely nutty people get. This issue isn't too far from that emotionally and I have seen people do far differently than what I would have expected faced with a surprise pregnancy.

Kytten9 While I respect your opinions, I seriously doubt anyone who isn't female would have a clearer or more valid perspective on this. You don't have a uterus so you cannot understand the pressures of being a woman, same said as I cannot fully appreciate the pressures of being a guy. Here is a perspective that I was getting at earlier regarding a mostly Male legislature making the law. Granted Women can vote, etc., etc., but they are far under represented in any legal body. If we used the population as a standard, 50% or more of the lawmakers should be female, and half of the Presidents should have been Female. Clearly that isn't so.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 15:02:33 GMT

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

Just one point (didn't read all neather but found Crimson's point intresting): putting high taxes on abortion will make it a privilege (spelling?) for the rich while it is more than probable that it's the

less rich people who are less informed about birth control, who might not having the money to do birth control (the pill and condoms still cost money) and who are most "touched" by an unwanted baby: think of getting a baby when you have barely enough money from your job to feed yourself. Also think of the fact that you will probably need to give up your job because of the baby (someone needs to take care of it) when you're isolated.

So although it seemed quite a good solution to me at first read, I think that it will have a rather pervers effect this way. Your solution would work if all people had the same income though.

My personal opinion is that it should be possible in some cases but that people thinking of getting an abortion should be assisted in their choice by professional people so that they don't regret it afterwards.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 15:21:35 GMT

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

Kytten9 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 04:105 Financial problems: this is from personal experience. A friend of mine who already has a 2 yr old baby girl fell pregnant again and the father up and left at the first sign of trouble, she was no longer with the father of her first child, could barely get by on what money she had for her first child, it would have been irresponsible to have another, and I will tell you it's bullshit to disagree with this reason because you cannot wait 9 months to give up a baby, your financial life would have nosedived 6 months before that and both the mother, unborn child and 2 year old would be living in squaller, It bit her in the ass 12mths later when she realized the child she had aborted would have been 3mths old....

This I do have problem with. I also have absolutely NO sympathy whatsoever for the predicament the woman is in. SHE chose to have sex, why should someone (or, if you believe it, the potential of someone) have to suffer for her stupidity?

If you don't want to become pregnant, DON'T HAVE SEX.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Kytten9](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 16:26:25 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 10:21Kytten9 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 04:105 Financial problems: this is from personal experience. A friend of mine who already has a 2 yr old baby girl fell pregnant again and the father up and left at the first sign of trouble, she was no longer with the father of her first child, could barely get by on what money she had for her first child, it would have been irresponsible to have another, and I will tell you it's bullshit to disagree with this reason because you cannot wait 9 months to give up a baby, your financial life would have nosedived 6 months before that and both the mother, unborn child and 2 year old would be living in squaller, It bit her in the ass 12mths later when she realized the child she had aborted

would have been 3mths old....

This I do have problem with. I also have absolutely NO sympathy whatsoever for the predicament the woman is in. SHE chose to have sex, why should someone (or, if you believe it, the potential of someone) have to suffer for her stupidity?

If you don't want to become pregnant, DON'T HAVE SEX.

remind me to throw that comment in your face if you ever fuck up and complain and trust me, even parents that planned to have their babies complain, resent and even dwell on the times they didn't have kids.

But then again it wouldn't matter to you would it? Men can walk away when women get pregnant, they don't lose anything in doing so either, where as the women have no life, lose their figure, have problems from that day forth with bladder control, lose reputation coz she is a "whore", that's why you have no sympathy, because it cannot happen to you and will not happen to you, you can just sit idly by on the sidelines, like most men do. Ignorance is bliss isn't it?!

I do sympathize with her, she didn't ask the father of her first child to suddenly wake up one day and decide he no longer wanted to have a child or a girlfriend, women do stupid things when they feel low, so women become promiscuous(have sex alot) , some binge eat, some commit suicide, all because men decide they don't want responsibility.

[/male hate rant] I'm sorry, I'm hoping the guy I'm currently dating changes my mind about men, but I doubt it!

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 16:41:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hey, even you admit

Quote: it would have been irresponsible to have another

So, if that was the case, my point stands. If you don't want a kid (or in this case, can't support a kid),

Quote:could barely get by on what money she had for her first child

don't go around having sex.

Quote:remind me to throw that comment in your face if you ever fuck up and complain

I hope you would. It may knock some sense into me.

Simply put, if you are not prepared to handle the concequences of what MAY occur, don't do what

you were planning on doing.

Quote:that's why you have no sympathy, because it cannot happen to you and will not happen to you, you can just sit idly by on the sidelines, like most men do. Ignorance is bliss isn't it?!

I can take the stuff before this as a rant, however this is just a plain insult to me.

I have no sympathy because she got herself into the situation of being pregnant when she couldn't even support herself with the "money she had from her first kid."

While I know it will not happen to me (for different reasons that I'm sure your thinking of), that does not mean I'm ignorant of anything.

Doing something simply because you're depressed is no excuse to do it. Having been through a depression I know this quite well.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 16:56:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you ever had sex, you'll know it's not so easy to just "not do it" when you have a partner . And yes, even the pill is only 96-98 % sure...

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 17:20:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

multiple contraceptives. The Male or Female should not be the only one with protection. The Pill and a Condom will reduce the chances significantly. As for the man that woman had sex with. He is the worst kind of person and cannot be called a Dad or a "Man" even. He is a little boy with no regard to anyone but himself. I'm sorry for your friend, but it is still HALF of her fault. It is no reason to deny a child of their life.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 20:32:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Arcane1 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 09:21The issue with being able to know or predict people's reactions in situations I'll take you to task on though. There are few people in the world that surprise us as much by their actions as our family. You'd have to assume that your (hypothetical) sister would even tell her family beforehand and not make the decision alone. There are so many variables that predicting is tough. Look at how families often behave after a death and the whole matter of property/cash issues arise to see how absolutely nutty people get.

This issue isn't too far from that emotionally and I have seen people do far differently than what I would have expected faced with a surprise pregnancy.

Wouldn't that be one more reason to outlaw abortion though? If my sister somehow got pregnant, and I have a hard time believing she'd do something stupid but for the sake of the hypothetical I continue, and she was confused and didn't know what to do, or didn't know if she could even turn to her parents, then shouldn't we eliminate abortion as a possibility. If someone is upset and confused, it's a terrible crime to burden them with deciding whether to kill their child. They need some support, emotionally, financially, etc to get through the life altering event. Leaving abortion legal for this reason is like giving guns to people suicidally depressed and then asking them to decide for themselves. A person doesn't have to be suicidal to know that's wrong.

When people become emotionally involved in something, because it happens to them, they often aren't thinking clearly as they can't see things from a detached perspective. They get tied up in what's in front of them and miss the obvious. Laws can help act as a guide in these cases as you have it written, "This is wrong, no matter how right you think it feels at the moment."

Granted, as a man I can't understand entirely what a pregnant woman goes through. However, I'm the oldest of 4 children. My first brother was born when I was 5, my sister when I was 10, and my second brother when I was 16. I've been able to observe my parents' reactions to pregnancy several times, at different points in my life.

If I recall correctly, both my sister and second brother were 'unexpected' pregnancies. Especially my second brother, as my mom was in her early 40's at that point and never thought she'd have another child. Financially speaking, at both times my family wasn't doing well. Yes, we had a home, but that was about it. No medical insurance, no savings, couldn't even afford a monthly cable bill at one point. My father didn't really have steady employment during those times, at one point he was employed by a construction company that pretty much fell apart, and then had a job that once it was going well, the owner decided to close the business and retire. My parents were somewhat estranged from their parents, and didn't have many people to turn to when they needed help.

Health wise, these pregnancies were equally troubling for my mother. She'd suffered severe postpartum psychosis after my first brother was born, and it was likely more children would cause her to relapse. I doubt she wanted to risk having a break down and killing her kids or something. She did have a relapse after my sister was born, although it ended up being no where near as bad as what had happened the first time.

Despite all that, my mother would never even consider an abortion. My father stood by her through everything, I doubt the thought of leaving us ever entered his mind. Parents teach their kids by example, yet my father's parents had divorced when he was a kid, so he never had a father in his life to serve as an example of fatherhood. As a matter of fact, his only example in life was that men leave, yet he refused to follow that example. When my parents were first married, my mother's parents practically disowned her (although they did make amends eventually), as they disapproved of my father so much. They literally let my parents live on the street, despite them asking for help, when they couldn't afford an apartment. My father's mother died of cancer when I was very young, and like I said, my father barely knew his own father. They didn't have many people they could turn to for help, they were faced with the 'bad times', but they didn't go

against their principles to take the 'easy way' out.

It's my mother who really hammered it into my head that abortion is immoral, and never should be allowed under any circumstance. She is unrelenting in that, even when I posed a hypothetical like "what would I do if I was married and my wife's life was in danger?". So, despite being a man, my perspective on abortion is greatly influenced by what my mother has said and done in her life. I may never be able to experience what it means to be a pregnant woman, but my mother has and she tells me all the time (and I mean all the time, as if I didn't understand it yet) that abortion is immoral and wrong no matter the circumstances. She's stood by that even when things got bad for her, and despite the death threats she used to get from some 'pro-choice' people when she did volunteer work for pro-life groups.

Kytten9 While I respect your opinions, I seriously doubt anyone who isn't female would have a clearer or more valid perspective on this. You don't have a uterus so you cannot understand the pressures of being a woman, same said as I cannot fully appreciate the pressures of being a guy.

Interesting perspective I ran across the other day:

Men are Responsible for the Abortion Problem

To quote a part:

Quote:Wantonly destroying one's children is not a choice that most women make enthusiastically. In fact, most women who have had abortions say that they would choose to keep their babies if they felt that they could do so. Women who find themselves in the crisis pregnancy feel that for practical reasons they have no choice but abortion. And, in nearly all cases, men are at fault.

Letting women have abortions because they've been abandoned isn't a solution to the problem, it only makes the situation worse. Men think they can make women get abortions, or just abandon them in part because things like abortion are legal. Society needs to help people, not let them destroy themselves or others.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 23:04:54 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 09:02: Just one point (didn't read all neather but found Crimson's point intresting): putting high taxes on abortion will make it a privilege (spelling?) for the rich while it is more than probable that it's the less rich people who are less informed about birth control, who might not having the money to do birth control (the pill and condoms still cost money) and who are most "touched" by an unwanted baby: think of getting a baby when you have bearily enough money from your job to feed yourself. Also think of the fact that you will probably need to give up your job because of the baby (someone needs to take care of it) when you're isolated.

So although it seemed quite a good solution to me at first read, I think that it will have a rather pervers effect this way. Your solution would work if all people had the same income though.

My personal opinion is that it should be possible in some cases but that people thinking of getting

an abortion should be assisted in their choice by professional people so that they don't regret it afterwards.

Abortion, like much of the health care system in the US is far more attainable by the rich/priveleged. There are a number of stats showing that those with money to afford private insurance and options are far more able to recieve higher quality health care.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 23:10:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NeoSaber wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 14:32

Letting women have abortions because they've been abandoned isn't a solution to the problem, it only makes the situation worse. Men think they can make women get abortions, or just abandon them in part because things like abortion are legal. Society needs to help people, not let them destroy themselves or others.

You have clearly been raised in a competent and coherent family where there was not only verbage of morality but the lifestyle. No doubt that if there were more of that we wouldn't be having this debate.

Unfortunately, morality and decency cannot be mandated or legislated. Making the men that are responsible for the behaviors is not only difficult, but nearly impossible. Using the lack of child support collections as an example makes it clear that the idea of what makes a Father can't be institutionalized.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 10 Nov 2005 23:36:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Warrants are placed on deadbeat fathers. Notice I didn't say "dads".

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 00:16:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Arcane1 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 18:10Unfortunately, morality and decency cannot be mandated or legislated. Making the men that are responsible for the behaviors is not only difficult, but nearly impossible. Using the lack of child support collections as an example makes it clear that the idea of what makes a Father can't be institutionalized.

Laws can be used to greatly encourage people though, and I don't just mean punishing people for their mistakes. The law in America pretty much strips fathers of their rights. A woman can get an

abortion without even having to tell her husband. It doesn't even reach the level of debating if a father should have to give consent, he's doesn't even have a right to know about it to begin with. When laws start taking away a father's rights, then men are going to be prompted to ignore their responsibility as well. After all, if you're going to be punished when you don't do anything wrong, why should you do what's right to begin with?

That's the kind of 'morality' that can be put into laws. Give people rights with their responsibilities and they won't be as quick to ignore those responsibilities. Rights and responsibilities go hand in hand. Taking away one removes the point of the other. Sure, there will probably always be people who do the wrong thing anyway, but at least then the law doesn't promote the irresponsibility it seeks to avoid.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Kytten9](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 00:26:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 11:41

I can take the stuff before this as a rant, however this is just a plain insult to me.

I have no sympathy because she got herself into the situation of being pregnant when she couldn't even support herself with the "money she had from her first kid."

While I know it will not happen to me (for different reasons that I'm sure you're thinking of), that does not mean I'm ignorant of anything.

Doing something simply because you're depressed is no excuse to do it. Having been through a depression I know this quite well.

I don't see how it is an insult to you Warranto, Have you had sex yet? Have you had kids yet? Ever been abused both physically, mentally and more by your own partner?

How old are you exactly?

I have a child, I have a history I wish I could take back or change things to, I have experiences I never ever wish to re-live in my life time. I too have had depression, I don't give a fuck what you say, I did some fucked up shit while depressed, I ate and I hurt myself and I even tried to take my own life. If you have experienced anywhere near what I have in my life time, then tell me I am insulting you, I don't think I am, you were/are being quite ignorant about a subject you don't even have the slightest insight to. That was what I meant. Like I said my friend HAD a boyfriend with her first child and he decided to leave her.....are you suggesting that she lock herself away and never have sex again? the guy who fathered the second child was her boyfriend too, he up and left, It isn't HER fault that this came to pass, but namely his too. That was what I was getting at about your ignorance, you pointed your finger at her straight away, because she's a "whore" for sleeping around, I bet the guy is a hero though, because I notice you didn't once mention his responsibility in this whole situation.

I wasn't trying to be insulting, I was merely pointing out how quick men are to shrug off

responsibility, not just for their own actions, but for the actions of their fellow males. You proved my point, thanks!

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 02:08:33 GMT

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

Have I ever had sex? No.

Have I ever had a partner? No.

How old am I? 23

Quote:Like I said my friend HAD a boyfriend with her first child and he decided to leave her.....are you suggesting that she lock herself away and never have sex again? the guy who fathered the second child was her boyfriend too, he up and left, It isn't HER fault that this came to pass, but namely his too. That was what I was getting at about your ignorance, you pointed your finger at her straight away, because she's a "whore" for sleeping around, I bet the guy is a hero though, because I notice you didn't once mention his responsibility in this whole situation.

Nice boyfriend, no commitment made by anyone here. SHE chose to have sex, to my knowledge no mention of rape was made. Where did I ever mention that it was her fault the guy was a deadbeat and left? Oh yes, nowhere. Nice try, but making things up to make me look bad doesn't quite work.

Did I ever once mention that she was a ""whore" for sleeping around"? That's right, nowhere. Nice try, but making things up to make me look bad doesn't quite work.

Why didn't I mention the guy? Oh, I don't know. Perhaps because I assumed it would be automatic that the blame would be his fault as well. Afterall, it takes two to create a child. I guess you're just too thick headed to understand something as "complicated" as that (see, I can throw insults too! It doesn't make the argument any more vaild though)

I laugh at the thought that I would think this guy to be a hero. You are just pathetic.

Quote:I wasn't trying to be insulting, I was merely pointing out how quick men are to shrug off responsibility, not just for their own actions, but for the actions of their fellow males. You proved my point, thanks!

Yes, not trying to be insulting by specifying ME in your comments:

Quote:But then again it wouldn't matter to you would it?

Quote:lose reputation coz she is a "whore", that's why you have no sympathy, because it cannot happen to you and will not happen to you, you can just sit idly by on the sidelines, like most men do. Ignorance is bliss isn't it?!

And you are trying to suggest that there was no intent to insult?

Once again, tell me where I supported the guy in his actions, and how I am shrugging off my own, and his, responsibility. No point was proven.

Pathetic.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 03:12:51 GMT

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

Warranto is right here. He is not assuming anything, just telling you like it is. Two people had sex. Two people made a baby. One left the other. He is a deadbeat, but she is still partially to blame. it takes two to tango.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 03:53:08 GMT

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

Kytten, you're being far too hostile toward Warranto. He doesn't usually mean anything to be taken personally insulting; he certainly didn't mean for you to take his responses personally before you started attacking him.

Besides, his point is valid. You sound like you're saying it wasn't the girl's fault for becoming pregnant; well, it's a little hard to let the car in the garage when the door remains tightly shut, and as Warranto said, you never mentioned anything about rape or forceful sex.

We can only assume she willfully had sex with her boyfriend.

Now, what does she think sex was made for in the beginning? To have a little good time with her boyfriend, or to make babies?

If she didn't mean to have a kid, well, she needs to realize the true purpose for sex is to have kids and accept the fact that she is just as responsible for her kid's existence as her boyfriend.

If she did mean to have a kid with her boyfriend, what made her think he'd stay around forever?

You never said they were engaged or anything; whatever happened to waiting until after you're married to have a child? A guy who isn't ready to commit to marriage sure as hell ain't ready to commit to raising a child, a far more important commitment.

Now, I'm not saying that her friends and family should just abandon her for making a mistake; it's their job to help her in her time of need, as I'm sure you did. True help can only come about, though, once she realizes the mistakes she has made and chooses not to make them again. Otherwise, the cycle will continue until she's had enough kids that she finally gets it.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 05:35:52 GMT

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

Clare, what the fuck are you smoking? How can killing a child at any point and time whether or not someone's in financial hardship be acceptable? So if you have 5 kids, in financial hardship, is it okay to kill one of your children to make the load easier on you? This is the same idea. To have an innocent child pay for the stupidity of a person is just pointless and stupid. The male is responsible for this too, and it's unfortunate for your friend to have been put in that situation, but guess what, she DIDN'T have to consent to sex which led to her being pregnant. The guy didn't just say to your friend, "haha, now you're pregnant." She had equal part in this too, and as a mother, you're supposed to take care of your child no matter what. You wouldn't kill Aurora if you ran into some financial trouble. You love and protect her, but why should the fact that the child is in the womb make the situation any different?

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 21:10:23 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 17:36 Warrants are placed on deadbeat fathers. Notice I didn't say "dads".

A dissertation that I did in school (granted, almost 20 years ago) showed that only Michigan had a better than 50% collection rate of court ordered child support through it's "Friends of the Court" program. Illinois had a pathetic 20ish % rate of current collections and most states were close to as bad.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 21:26:08 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 23:35 Clare, what the fuck are you smoking? How can killing a child at any point and time whether or not someone's in financial hardship be acceptable? So if you have 5 kids, in financial hardship, is it okay to kill one of your children to make the load easier on you? This is the same idea. To have an innocent child pay for the stupidity of a person is just pointless and stupid. The male is responsible for this too, and it's unfortunate for your friend to have been put in that situation, but guess what, she DIDN'T have to consent to sex which led to her being pregnant. The guy didn't just say to your friend, "haha, now you're pregnant." She had equal part in this too, and as a mother, you're supposed to take care of your child no matter what. You wouldn't kill Aurora if you ran into some financial trouble. You love and protect her, but why should the fact that the child is in the womb make the situation any different?

Not having the history here, I can only assume that "Clare" is Kytten. Based on that:

Warranto was not over the line in my opinion or read. Kytten's posts were not either until the assault began out of what she perceived as an attack. 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?

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. I have 2 16 year olds, and one that I have raised from that zygote stage, only the first 6 with his Mother. (and BTW, she never has paid support).

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)

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 21:56:23 GMT

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

My logic presides over my emotions. My logic tells me that the "parasite" is human. Now, according to the law, it's illegal to kill another human. Now here's really where my logic kicks in, if the embryo/unborn child/parasite/fetus/etc... is human, and killing another human is illegal, that should make abortion legal. Should it not? Of course, it should.

It takes two to tango, correct, and as I've repeatedly said, the guy shouldn't be able to get away with this, and it should be a crime to do so. Regardless, that shouldn't make it legal to murder a child.

Of course, she doesn't have the right to kill a child. There are welfare programs, there are charities, there are organizations. She also shouldn't have that option readily available. It's MURDER, and in every civilized part of the world, murder is illegal.

Also, on the note of calling an embryo/fetus/zygote/human/baby/life a parasite, think of it this way: Shouldn't a newborn be considered a parasite as well? It lives off of its mother. Sure, it doesn't necessarily "attach" itself to it, but without breastmilk (or supplements), the child would surely die, so therefore it's dependant on its "host". Why is this a human and not a parasite? Surely both are clearly parasites, or both are clearly human. Which is it?

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 22:09:12 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 15:26j_ball430 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 23:35Clare, what the fuck are you smoking? How can killing a child at any point and time whether or not someone's in financial hardship be acceptable? So if you have 5 kids, in financial hardship,

is it okay to kill one of your children to make the load easier on you? This is the same idea. To have an innocent child pay for the stupidity of a person is just pointless and stupid. The male is responsible for this too, and it's unfortunate for your friend to have been put in that situation, but guess what, she DIDN'T have to consent to sex which led to her being pregnant. The guy didn't just say to your friend, "haha, now you're pregnant." She had equal part in this too, and as a mother, you're supposed to take care of your child no matter what. You wouldn't kill Aurora if you ran into some financial trouble. You love and protect her, but why should the fact that the child is in the womb make the situation any different?

Not having the history here, I can only assume that "Clare" is Kytten. Based on that: Warranto was not over the line in my opinion or read. Kytten's posts were not either until the assault began out of what she perceived as an attack. 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?

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. I have 2 16 year olds, and one that I have raised from that zygote stage, only the first 6 with his Mother. (and BTW, she never has paid support).

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)

My Grandmother spent her life volunteering at the DA Blodgett For Children. These people find homes for these children. My mother was an adopted baby from the D A Blodgett. If she was aborted, I wouldn't be here. There is always another way.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 22:13:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 15:56 My logic presides over my emotions. My logic tells me that the "parasite" is human. Now, according to the law, it's illegal to kill another human. Now here's really where my logic kicks in, if the embryo/unborn child/parasite/fetus/etc... is human, and killing another human is illegal, that should make abortion legal. Should it not? Of course, it should.

It takes two to tango, correct, and as I've repeatedly said, the guy shouldn't be able to get away

with this, and it should be a crime to do so. Regardless, that shouldn't make it legal to murder a child.

Of course, she doesn't have the right to kill a child. There are welfare programs, there are charities, there are organizations. She also shouldn't have that option readily available. It's MURDER, and in every civilized part of the world, murder is illegal.

Also, on the note of calling an embryo/fetus/zygote/human/baby/life a parasite, think of it this way: Shouldn't a newborn be considered a parasite as well? It lives off of its mother. Sure, it doesn't necessarily "attach" itself to it, but without breastmilk (or supplements), the child would surely die, so therefore it's dependant on is "host". Why is this a human and not a parasite? Surely both are clearly parasites, or both are clearly human. Which is it?

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.

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.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 22:16:58 GMT

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

gbull wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 16:09
Arcane1 wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 15:26
j_ball430 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 23:35
Clare, what the fuck are you smoking? How can killing a child at any point and time whether or not someone's in financial hardship be acceptable? So if you have 5 kids, in financial hardship, is it okay to kill one of your children to make the load easier on you? This is the same idea. To have an innocent child pay for the stupidity of a person is just pointless and stupid. The male is responsible for this too, and it's unfortunate for your friend to have been put in that situation, but guess what, she DIDN'T have to consent to sex which led to her being pregnant. The guy didn't just say to your friend, "haha, now you're pregnant." She had equal part in this too, and as a mother, you're supposed to take care of your child no matter what. You wouldn't kill Aurora if you ran into some financial trouble. You love and protect her, but why should the fact that the child is in the womb make the situation any different?

Not having the history here, I can only assume that "Clare" is Kytten. Based on that: Warranto was not over the line in my opinion or read. Kytten's posts were not either until the assault began out of what she perceived as an attack. 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?

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. I have 2 16 year olds, and one that I have raised from that zygote stage, only the first 6 with his Mother. (and BTW, she never has paid support).

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)

My Grandmother spent her life volunteering at the DA Blodgett For Children. These people find homes for these children. My mother was an adopted baby from the D A Blodgett. If she was aborted, I wouldn't be here. There is always another way.

Some philosophies would say that is not true. There is the idea that your "soul" would have been brought into the world through another body. I am not negating your point, not at all, because your life experiences would be so different and all the other nature vs. nurture argument.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 23:20:16 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 16:13As 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. Okay, so let me "stretch" it even farther. What if someone's sleeping? They, for that time being, have no consciousness. Thus, does this make it legal for someone to enter another's house and shoot them while they're asleep, and it not technically be "killing"?

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 16:26This 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?

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 04:24:03 GMT

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

William Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet
What's in a name? That which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet

Regardless of what people want to label the unborn child, it still remains the same. It's a child. It's not some random organism that decides to become human. From the moment of conception, the zygote is human. The zygote isn't going to decide to turn into a dog, or a cat, or a elephant. It's human, and nothing changes that fact. It's just a pathetic excuse to accept abortion by labeling the child not human simply so that nobody has to deal with killing an innocent child. Congratulations, you're hypocrites. You bitch at Bush for covering up his "war for oil" by saying it's a "war on terrorism", yet you disguise the child as a "parasite" or twist it some way so that it's not human, so

you can get away with murder.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 13:39:58 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 17:20

Okay, so let me "stretch" it even farther. What if someone's sleeping? They, for that time being, have no consciousness. Thus, does this make it legal for someone to enter another's house and shoot them while they're asleep, and it not technically be "killing"?

A developing fetus, without a developed cerebral cortex that has yet to experience stimulation sensation and thus "sentience" cannot be compared to a post-sentient human that is rendered unconscious or sleeping.

Hydra wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 21:17

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.

Well, 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.

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.

HydraShe 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 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.

HydraThere 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.

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.

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.

HydraWhether 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?

Agreed, the label of "human" sticks validly. I don't think that was ever in question. 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.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 14:58:11 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Sat, 12 November 2005 07:39The sex is not even determined yet
As we all know, a male carries an X and a Y chromosome. The female carries two X's. From what I think I remember learning, sperm cells only carry an X or a Y chromosome, not both. If I'm correct, then the sex is determined, but science hasn't taken us far enough to be able to determine the sex of the child before a certain point.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 04:58:33 GMT

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

Actually, all fetuses start out female. It is only later in the process that the male aspects are brought out via hormonal changes.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 05:13:54 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Sat, 12 November 2005 22:58 Actually, all fetuses start out female. It is only later in the process that the male aspects are brought out via hormonal changes.

They may all start out female, but the changes are due to the Male gamete, correct?

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

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

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

Arcane1 Well, 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 haneous 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....

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 16:28:21 GMT

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

Im grinning broadly at Hydra's multi-threaded and tangled logic.

And yes, I agree with all of it.

So let's cut to the bottom of the matter here, shall we? Because I think that we've pretty well proven that there are as many opinions and feelings about the issue as there are people to have them and feelings to feel them with. Im going to assume that we all agree on that point until someone argues it. What we end up with is a situation where there are an unlimited number of variables, which are compounded by an unlimited number of emotions by an unimaginable array of people and situations...

Basically, what we have is an equation that is a variable number of variables, (or v^x) with two constants, those being the existance of a fetus and a woman carrying the fetus. No other variable, such as sperm donor, health, etc. are able to be figured in really as they most all are based on Human Behaviors.

So here is the bottom line question:

How is it that one law, or one set of rules made by a governing body can set the standards for all situations that may arise? How is it that a governing body that is removed from the situation entirely be allowed to tell any and all future citizens how to operate appropriately? Even if there was a "true" majority decision on what is "right" or "wrong", how can that standard be Appropriately applied to ALL future people that can be potentially affected? Certainly there are no other rules or laws that apply so broadly without individual consideration and having such immediacy and privacy issues. Certainly this is a case where the law does not allow for appeals after the fact, which is the basic guarantee against human fallibility in the legal system. What I see it boiling down to is how could I, or You, or Anyone else have the Right to make that decision arbitrarilary, across the board and without appeal for every person that will possibly be faced with such a decision?

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 18:04:09 GMT

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

And with that, my head explodes, and the thread with it.

So... how 'bout them Dawgs?

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 18:28:01 GMT

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

Okay, I'm just going to fucking say this, and this is going to be the last thing I put towards this debate:

Abortion is murder. Murder is against the law. That is why the government should have a say in it or not. I don't give a fuck if it has to do with a woman's body or what bullshit struggle she's in. Regardless of the circumstances, it's MURDER. Only exception is if sacrificing one life will save another (a.k.a. medical purposes), if one life isn't sacrificed, then both would be lost.

If a man fails to assist a woman, that's his fault for being an asshole. I don't agree with him abandoning the woman nor do I think he's worth of the title "man". Regardless of that fact, him abandoning the woman and child isn't murder, abortion is, so this fact has absolutely no bearing on the argument, it's just indirect bullshit thrown in.

Also, on the subject of inconveniences, a lot of things are inconvenient, but guess what, we don't get rid of them. I bet you, at times, were an inconvenience to your parents. I bet I was, and I'm sure there's very few people whom they were not an inconvenience to their parents at some point in time. Regardless of that fact, they didn't kill you. Children are not at fault, here. It's the parents. To kill the child because two people can't control their hormones is a ridiculous idea, and anybody who condones it has a screw loose.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 19:58:47 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Sun, 13 November 2005 11:28 So here is the bottom line question: How is it that one law, or one set of rules made by a governing body can set the standards for all situations that may arise? How is it that a governing body that is removed from the situation entirely be allowed to tell any and all future citizens how to operate appropriately? Even if there was a "true" majority decision on what is "right" or "wrong", how can that standard be Appropriately applied to ALL future people that can be potentially affected? Certainly there are no other rules or laws that apply so broadly without individual consideration and having such immediacy and privacy issues. Certainly this is a case where the law does not allow for appeals after the fact, which is the basic guarantee against human fallibility in the legal system. What I see it boiling down to is how could I, or You, or Anyone else have the Right to make that decision

arbitrarily, across the board and without appeal for every person that will possibly be faced with such a decision?

There are a wide range of opinions and beliefs about the issue but they all boil down to just that: opinions and beliefs. Laws need to be made on the basis of what we know, or don't know about something not on what we believe or don't believe about something. We need hard facts about an issue to come to a satisfactory result. If we don't have objective information on which to proceed then we have to proceed with extreme caution. Science helps provide those facts. The fact of abortion is that a human life is ended by it. That's basic biology, proven as well as anything can be proven. From conception, an organism is a biological member of its species. It doesn't get much more clear than that.

By keeping it simple, a governing body can set a standard for all to obey. Science already shows that abortion kills a human being, who is physically incapable of committing any crime. Laws already say that killing a human being who has done no wrong is murder. Therefore abortion is murder. That's as plain and simple as one could get. Both standards were in place many years before issues like 'Roe v Wade' came before a court, or a legislature. Those standards hold true now, and will hold true forever. Court's can decide how finer details apply to individual cases over time, but the basic standard is there for all. Without it, you have no justice or order in society, it all falls into anarchy.

Governing bodies put laws in place as much to guide people as to maintain order. Murder is murder, and murder is wrong no matter how right it may feel at the time, or how much it doesn't seem like murder. When faced with a situation, there's a clear standard in place to guide you. Personally, there are some anti-war protesters I think should be shot. However, murder is murder, so I wouldn't do it.

In direct response to "What gives the government the right to interfere", its their purpose. A governing body, at least one elected by the society it governs, is mandated with objectively looking at a situation. A government has to look at all aspects without being involved in a situation and use that objectivity, that "detached perspective" to figure out what the standard should be.

If life and death decisions are left in the hands of people who are "emotionally involved" in the situation then we'd have chaos, for example: a suicidal person would be handed a gun and told to choose. Objective perspectives are what we need to make laws. Objectivity is what gives the government the right to get involved when it comes to issues where people's lives hang in the balance. Issues like abortion are decided in such short time frames, since pregnancy only lasts 9 months, that the objective view has to be taken. The decision is too great to leave to the subjective, emotional responses of people caught up in what's happening. If the government has any say at all in society, its at times like this.

Saying that may make me a heartless monster, but its the truth.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 20:17:46 GMT

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

Quote:A developing fetus, without a developed cerebral cortex that has yet to experience stimulation sensation and thus "sentience" cannot be compared to a post-sentient human that is rendered unconscious or sleeping.

This line of thought requires that you assume spontaneous generation for life and consciousness. I say this because your intellect, your being, and your very existence are owed to the clump of cellular matter that forms a body and from there forms a consciousness.

Do you or do you not agree with this? If not, explain why your logic seems to be unable to sustain itself.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 20:39:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NeoSaber wrote on Sun, 13 November 2005 13:58 Saying that may make me a heartless monster, but its the truth.

Keep in mind that I certainly am not going to make that judgement. Nor do I think that anyone that would is correct. They simply lack the ability to respect another's reality.

Subject: Re: I need some good Conservative/Republican types
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 15 Nov 2005 22:59:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi Yeah, DUH, but the cartoon is directly implying hypocrisy between a pro-choice and pro-environment stand.

Such an implication is, however, logically flawed in that the non-hippie is not giving birth to the condor eggs.

Hyd-umbass <-- How's that for a witty name change? The hippie is trying to protect the eggs because they are the eggs of an endangered species; the non-hippie is hungry and eats the eggs that were going to be discarded anyway.

By the commonly held definition of life that pro-choicers use (of whom we can assume the hippie is a part), those eggs are not yet alive, yet the hippie is trying to defend them as if they were living condors.

The cartoon correctly argues that such a stance is hypocritical.

How is that "logically flawed?"

Eggs were going to be discarded anyway? I don't feel like going back 2 pages to look at the cartoon again, so how about you explain that one.

The hippie is defending them because they will become living condors. Because they are an endanfered species. Not the same thing.

HydraToo bad science doesn't agree with you.

Yes, thank you, I know the literal definition of life, too. I was referring to the version of life that I believe applies to this issue.

HydraYet another shining example of hypocrisy coming from you. You give yourself such high praise in not using personal insults, then you say something like that... tsk tsk tsk.

Because you know they're so wrong.

HydraSo you're okay with killing babies as long as they're human babies.

Gotcha.

You missed the point. Entirely. Really, right over your head. WOOOSH.

Hydra

You're going to attribute abortion operation mishaps in Africa solely to its illegality?

Stop suggesting that because I say something it means I believe it is the one factor in a system. In this case it is the main factor. Yes, it is, and you are wrong if you believe it is not.

HydraDo you think those women would receive even half-decent operations if abortion was legal? They can barely receive a simple vaccination that doesn't somehow result in health complications! Healthcare in Africa sucks!

It sucks even worse in back alleys. Africa does have hospitals, besides what you see on FOX news. They're really not helpless people at all. Their health care system is poor, albeit, but it is not nonexistent. An African hospital can carry out sterilized abortions. Back alleys cannot. Vaccinating the countryside is an ENTIRELY different problem. It is a problem of supply. This is not.

HydraLegalizing abortion doesn't automatically mean those women receiving them now will suddenly get better healthcare as those people doing the back-alley abortions will be the same people performing the legal practice; they'll just be allowed to do it by the government for a cheaper price.

I'm afraid you know nothing about this topic.

HydraAnd abortion's illegality is a single factor among a myriad of others forcing those women to seek those abortions in the first place.

Then name the myriad of other factors. Because you wouldn't suggest that such a myriad existed if you didn't know what it was. Or would you?

If you're going to respond to a real-life example, try to become a little more informed on what is actually happening with it.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 15 Nov 2005 23:03:20 GMT

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

ACKThis line of thought requires that you assume spontaneous generation for life and consciousness. I say this because your intellect, your being, and your very existence are owed to the clump of cellular matter that forms a body and from there forms a consciousness.

That's a badly worded statement that wouldn't mean anything if it were worded correctly anyways.

You're just trying to confuse the other guy with fake big language to win an argument.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 16 Nov 2005 04:15:22 GMT

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

SuperFlyingLiberalToolEggs were going to be discarded anyway? I don't feel like going back 2 pages to look at the cartoon again, so how about you explain that one.

Quote:The hippie is defending them because they will become living condors. Because they are an endanfered species. Not the same thing.

The concept is still the same. Both the unborn condor and an unborn human baby are biological lifeforms in their earliest stages of development. Why is it okay to kill the human and not okay to kill the condor, because humans aren't endangered? Where the hell is the logic in that?

Quote:Yes, thank you, I know the literal definition of life, too. I was referring to the version of life that I believe applies to this issue.

....

The only "version" of life that applies to this issue is the only "version" of life that applies to EVERYTHING having to do with life. Life between sexually reproducing organisms begins at conception. That is a biological FACT. An unborn human is ALIVE FROM CONCEPTION; there is NO OTHER LOGICAL WAY TO EXPLAIN IT WITHOUT TOTALLY DISREGARDING EVERYTHING BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE HAS DISCOVERED.

Quote:You missed the point. Entirely. Really, right over your head. WOOOSH. You wouldn't know hyperbole if it hit you like a bus, would you?

I understood your point entirely. You, in accordance with your programming by militant leftist environmentalist groups, would go out of your way to protect the eggs of an endangered species from destruction if given the opportunity; yet you would not lift a finger to protect an unborn human being from annihilation simply because humans aren't an endangered species (and because you don't believe them to be alive in the first place).

Quote:Stop suggesting that because I say something it means I believe it is the one factor in a system.

I'll stop saying it once you stop implying it.

Quote:In this case it is the main factor. Yes, it is, and you are wrong if you believe it is not....

Then name the myriad of other factors. Because you wouldn't suggest that such a myriad existed if you didn't know what it was. Or would you?

To name a few: lack of abstinence education; oppressive governments; anti-capitalistic (and therefore anti-progress) economic policies imposed by said oppressive governments; the culture ("it takes a village to raise a child"); rampant war (civil war in many cases); religious/ethnic cleansing and genocide; the UN's inaction towards taking the proper steps to get rid of the malignant forces causing war; the funding of said oppressive governments by billions of dollars in foreign aid given directly to the governments (Africa is just a black hole that will suck up as much money as we can throw into it to no avail); the refusal of powerful foreign powers to remove the oppressive regimes forcefully

And elitists like you for criticizing them when they actually do.

Quote:That's a badly worded statement that wouldn't mean anything if it were worded correctly anyways.

It's worded correctly; you're saying that just because you disagree with him, yet you can't refute what he said because it is based on sound logic--logic that you can't beat.

Quote:You're just trying to confuse the other guy with fake big language to win an argument.

DO

NOT

TALK

ANYMORE.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Nov 2005 18:49:55 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller wrote on Sun, 13 November 2005 15:17Quote:A developing fetus, without a developed cerebral cortex that has yet to experience stimulation sensation and thus "sentience" cannot be compared to a post-sentient human that is rendered unconscious or sleeping.

This line of thought requires that you assume spontaneous generation for life and consciousness. I say this because your intellect, your being, and your very existence are owed to the clump of cellular matter that forms a body and from there forms a consciousness.

Do you or do you not agree with this? If not, explain why your logic seems to be unable to sustain itself.

I think that is debatable, from an objective standpoint. Personally I agree with jball, in that the only time it can be deemed a necessary evil is when both lives are in danger and it is certain that only one will live.

As for the generation of sentience, it could be said that self awareness comes as a result of cells clumping together in such a fashion that the reasoning human being can interact with the reality it exists in. Think of it as if the sentience always existed and the body formed to accept that particular existence. Decartes kind of had this idea as well.

The alternative (as far as I can tell) is to suggest that sentience IS created by clumping certain cells together. Both are very unknown to us now, but both are things to consider.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 16 Nov 2005 23:11:03 GMT

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

The Greatest Superhero Who Ever Lived! don't feel like going back 2 pages to look at the cartoon again, so how about you explain that one.

Thanks. You saved me the time it took to refresh my web browser.

HydraThe concept is still the same. Both the unborn condor and an unborn human baby are biological lifeforms in their earliest stages of development. Why is it okay to kill the human and not okay to kill the condor, because humans aren't endangered? Where the hell is the logic in that?

Yes, Hydra, we both know they are unborn life forms. The arguments for keeping the two alive are what is different. I'll explain this from another angle to see if you get it. The hippie's argument is obviously that the condor egg should be allowed to mature so it can repopulate the california condor population. Your side's argument for ending abortion is that a blob of cells have the same legal rights to life as a born person. Let's use our critical reasoning skills to determine that these two reason are not the same. Ok?

HydraThe only "version" of life that applies to this issue is the only "version" of life that applies to EVERYTHING having to do with life. Life between sexually reproducing organisms begins at conception. That is a biological FACT. An unborn human is ALIVE FROM CONCEPTION; there is NO OTHER LOGICAL WAY TO EXPLAIN IT WITHOUT TOTALLY DISREGARDING EVERYTHING BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE HAS DISCOVERED.

HydraYou wouldn't know hyperbole if it hit you like a bus, would you?

Yes, you exaggerated, but at the same time you entirely ignored what I was saying.

Hydral understood your point entirely. You, in accordance with your programming by militant leftist environmentalist groups, would go out of your way to protect the eggs of an endangered species from destruction if given the opportunity; yet you would not lift a finger to protect an unborn human being from annihilation simply because humans aren't an endangered species (and because you don't believe them to be alive in the first place).

See above.

Hydra'll stop saying it once you stop implying it.

SuperFlyingEngiIn this case it is the main factor. Yes, it is, and you are wrong if you believe it is not....

Then name the myriad of other factors. Because you wouldn't suggest that such a myriad existed if you didn't know what it was. Or would you?

HydraTo name a few: lack of abstinence education; oppressive governments; anti-capitalistic (and therefore anti-progress) economic policies imposed by said oppressive governments; the culture ("it takes a village to raise a child"); rampant war (civil war in many cases); religious/ethnic cleansing and genocide; the UN's inaction towards taking the proper steps to get rid of the malignant forces causing war; the funding of said oppressive governments by billions of dollars in foreign aid given directly to the governments (Africa is just a black hole that will suck up as much money as we can throw into it to no avail); the refusal of powerful foreign powers to remove the oppressive regimes forcefully

And elitists like you for criticizing them when they actually do.

First, of all, I give you credit for working Saddam into this. Even though it's an entirely unrelated concept. If African dictators were locked down to the extent Saddam was before Bush Jr. invaded Iraq, Africa would be a much safer place. That said, let's dissect.

Oh, wait, I don't have to. You misunderstood yourself. You listed a series of causes as to why women in Africa get abortions. Not why they have to get back alley abortions. Allow me to illustrate.

SuperFlyingEngiThat last point is actually readily demonstrated in African countries where abortion is illegal so women just get abortions in back allies instead of the hospital. As a result, many die from poor operations.

I personally don't want that to happen in America.

HydraYou're going to attribute abortion operation mishaps in Africa solely to its illegality? Do you think those women would receive even half-decent operations if abortion was legal? They can barely receive a simple vaccination that doesn't somehow result in health complications! Healthcare in Africa sucks!

Legalizing abortion doesn't automatically mean those women receiving them now will suddenly get better healthcare as those people doing the back-alley abortions will be the same people performing the legal practice; they'll just be allowed to do it by the government for a cheaper price.

And abortion's illegality is a single factor among a myriad of others forcing those women to seek those abortions in the first place.

SuperFlyingEngiThen name the myriad of other factors. Because you wouldn't suggest that such a myriad existed if you didn't know what it was. Or would you?

HydraTo name a few: lack of abstinence education; oppressive governments; anti-capitalistic (and therefore anti-progress) economic policies imposed by said oppressive governments; the culture ("it takes a village to raise a child"); rampant war (civil war in many cases); religious/ethnic cleansing and genocide; the UN's inaction towards taking the proper steps to get rid of the malignant forces causing war; the funding of said oppressive governments by billions of dollars in foreign aid given directly to the governments (Africa is just a black hole that will suck up as much money as we can throw into it to no avail); the refusal of powerful foreign powers to remove the oppressive regimes forcefully

Notice how you changed the meaning of those abortions. Do you need another try?

SuperFlyingEngiThat's a badly worded statement that wouldn't mean anything if it were worded correctly anyways.

Hydralt's worded correctly; you're saying that just because you disagree with him, yet you can't refute what he said because it is based on sound logic--logic that you can't beat.

Allow me to define why it is a poor sentence.

ACKThis line of thought requires that you assume spontaneous generation for life and consciousness. I say this because your intellect, your being, and your very existence are owed to the clump of cellular matter that forms a body and from there forms a consciousness.

Do you or do you not agree with this? If not, explain why your logic seems to be unable to sustain itself.

Now,

1) "assume spontaneous generation for life and consciousness" is itself a bad wording, but besides that point j_balls argument doesn't actually require the assumption that life and consciousness are created with no apparent reason.

2) "agree with this?" is an ambiguous pronoun.

3) Whether or not consciousness is generated spontaneously doesn't render his logic non... self-sustaining.

There are some reasons. And quite frankly, that phrase was less comprehensible than any literary question I saw on the SAT [And those can get pretty incomprehensible] If any sentence or phrase passes that point, it's time to go back and re-evaluate your ideas.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 16 Nov 2005 23:35:36 GMT

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

didn't you claim to be 14 at one point?

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 00:26:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 01:46:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How did you take the SAT already?

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 04:04:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Part of an application for a Junior/Senior year magnet high school.

Long story.

But yes, I did take the SAT I.

I tell you what, that thing is a party and a half.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 07:11:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 16 November 2005 17:11

Thanks. You saved me the time it took to refresh my web browser.

<<< "Stuff" omitted for brevity >>>

those can get pretty incomprehensible] If any sentence or phrase passes that point, it's time to go back and re-evaluate your ideas.

Wow, that was an interesting couple of posts. I thought that Nodbugger was the Master at wasting the internet, but he clearly has competition here.

Notice the sarcasm and obnoxious tone? That is what people that either A) don't care if they offend others use, or B) the tone that someone who really doesn't have a clue but thinks that he/she does uses. Certainly when added with the critiqueing of others' sentences and such off topic comments as your difficulties with the SATs, you fall in the latter. (That would be 'B' in case you are wondering)

Suggestion:

Until you grow up, and can have a proper debate, Shut up.

We now return you to the previously intelligent conversation that was underway.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 20:55:56 GMT

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

Arcane1 wrote on Thu, 17 November 2005 02:11 I thought that Nodbugger was the Master at wasting the internet, but he clearly has competition here.

You noticed this too? It's funny that new and/or like-minded people turn against him. I'm thinking SFE should take a hint from all of this...

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 21:31:39 GMT

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

ArcaneWow, that was an interesting couple of posts. I thought that Nodbugger was the Master at wasting the internet, but he clearly has competition here.

ArcaneNotice the sarcasm and obnoxious tone? That is what people that either A) don't care if they offend others use, or B) the tone that someone who really doesn't have a clue but thinks that he/she does uses. Certainly when added with the critiqueing of others' sentences and such off topic comments as your difficulties with the SATs, you fall in the latter. (That would be 'B' in case you are wondering)

My opinion differing from yours is not grounds to justify that I have no "clue" about the topic. Come to think of it, you sound like Nodbugger. Isn't that funny...

You missed what I was getting at with ACK's sentence. Sentence structure is something I could care less about as long as it is legibly understandable to the competent human. My point with ACK's sentence was he was suggesting someone's idea required the assumption of another idea which it in fact did not while at the same time using a rather cryptic sentence form to convey his "point" in an attempt to silence someone else's argument. Really, it was a sidetrack to the actual conversation. Which quite frankly you have ignored entirely in your poorly attempted deridement of my thoughts and views.

Furthermore, are you suggesting that it is a mark of poor intelligence to have difficulty with certain SAT critical reading questions? Because I assure you it is not. If you have taken the SAT yourself, I'm sure you understand.

[By the way, I had no intention of gloating that I had taken the SAT if you interpreted my meaning as such. I was merely referencing a constant of how difficult sentences can be to understand fully.]

ArcaneSuggestion:

Until you grow up, and can have a proper debate, Shut up.

You know, if you say that, surely you could debate my actual stance instead of the cut & paste "You are a liberal so shut up now" response that is practically the trademark of these forums.

One last thing...

Arcane(That would be 'B' in case you are wondering)

That sounds pretty sarcastic and obnoxious to me, doesn't it? Well, as I recall, you already set a standard for the conditions that govern those who would make remarks such as this. Let me refresh your memory...

Arcane That is what people that either A) don't care if they offend others use, or B) the tone that someone who really doesn't have a clue but thinks that he/she does uses.

Despite the fallacies inherent in this sentence, I believe we both understand what it means. So, which category do you fit into? Personally, I think it's both.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 23:15:57 GMT

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

You know what, I've had it. I don't have to prove myself to you, SuperFlyingLiberalTool. Responding to anything you say is pointless and detrimental to the discussion because you don't want to debate intelligently; you just want to make yourself look good.

You know, there was a time when I thought you had a chance of actually exhibiting some form of individual thought in what you say. When you and I were both fairly new here, I thought you would be able to discuss these political subjects fairly and open-mindedly.

Then, you kept on writing the same vehement Bush-hatred drivel for which you are notorious. To this day, you cannot name one single action of the president with which you agree. If he devoted all government funds toward cancer research directly leading to a cure, you would still not be satisfied. Why? Because you blindly hate him without any reason at all. Even I would probably be able to find a few programs and actions that Clinton enacted during his presidency that I would agree with. Yet you will not concede that there have been any good moral consequences resulting from the war in Iraq or anything else the President has done in his 4+ years in office.

This violent hatred shows itself in anything political you write. If there's an issue about poverty, you link it to Bush's lack of social program funding. If there's an issue about global warming, you link it to Bush's environmental policy. If terrorists threaten to strike again, you link it to Bush's foreign policy.

No matter you say, the message is the same--Bush is bad, Bush is bad, and Bush is bad a hundred times moreover.

You know what? We get it! Enough already! Contribute something to the discussion, please, other than "Bush is bad"!

"Okay, did you know Republicans were the cause of original sin? Both the serpent and Eve were Republicans!"

You never let up, which would be an otherwise admirable attribute if you actually used evidence and facts in your arguments (from credible sources, that is, not from www.bushwatch.org). Instead, we take turns proving you wrong time and again with clearly substantiated facts and evidence, only for you to totally ignore it all and continue with your random "Republicans are killing the Earth!" liberal bantering.

It's one thing if you're passionate about your ideas or your position on a particular issue; it's totally different to have absolutely no respect for the other side's argument.

That's the real issue with you. You have absolutely no respect for anyone else's opinions or beliefs other than your own. You show none to anyone else's unless they agree with you, and you try to give as much credit to yourself whenever you think you're flawlessly defeating your opponents' arguments. You think you have the absolutely correct viewpoint on an issue, and anyone else who disagrees with you is obviously less intelligent than you and does not deserve your respect.

That's why almost no one, especially me (like that mattered to you, though, since you think you're superior to me anyway), here has any respect left for you, either. Not even those who would be naturally inclined to agree with some your general viewpoints.

I've enjoyed reading some of Warranto's and Javaxcx's critiques of your anti-Iraq war posts. You and they agree in that the war was illegally initiated by the United States, yet they were the ones criticizing you on your unwillingness to accept any possible good that has come out of the situation. They agreed that the war is illegal, yet they concede that a large amount of moral good has emerged from the war as well; I even remember one of them saying that from a philosophical viewpoint, all wars are illegal, so the legality argument is not necessarily always applicable.

Their opinions I can respect. They disagree with me, sure, but they disagree with me for good reasons that they express articulately and disarmingly. They don't have to show everyone how smart they are by using "fake big language" because they don't have an inferiority complex like you.

I can discuss and debate intelligently with them.

You, on the other hand, can only converse with fellow like-minded blind fools (I'll refrain from naming names) who share your same vehement hatred of Bush and the Republican party. You refuse to debate intelligently with those who disagree with you, and you only succeed in throwing the political threads in which you participate off-topic.

You're a cancer to the Politics/Hot Issues forum.

I've had enough of you. I won't subject myself to any more of your Bush-hating bantering because it will only result in the breakdown of the discussion, and I urge others to follow my lead in ignoring this blind tool of the Democratic Party so more threads will not degrade into mindless bickering.

I'll discuss politics with people who can think for themselves and respect others' opinions.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 18 Nov 2005 01:05:00 GMT

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

Well, I suppose we've finally come to parting shots.

We'll never be able to agree with each other, that much has been obvious for over a year now. I make a post, you come to it with the intent of countering every bit of opinion, suggested policy, and referenced information in said post. When you make a post, I come to do exactly the same.

I can, in the past, claim that you used to be an interesting person of ideas to discuss ideals with. That has, however changed. What you used to contribute to forum discussions in generally felt political concepts has shriveled and blackened to a feeling of duty to protect what is Republican in the world. Where I can't be convinced that Republicans are doing good in the world, you can't be convinced that they aren't.

But there is one thing that seperates us entirely.

I say I used to enjoy your discussed opinions. The real reason that changed is your debate tactics, not so much the substance. To tell the truth, I really don't tire of listening to the political opinions of someone, on one condition, this condition being that they keep discussion civil. In the past year or so, your debate tactics have shifted from tolerance and civility to outright obnoxious dismissal and countless acts of ad hominem.

Your personal attacks are why I stopped caring for your arguments in any way, shape, or form. I quite frankly cannot stand it, and thus I cannot stand your arguments. I'm sure you think of your debating style still as being calm and reasoned through apparent logic, but that can no longer be held as true. That day is past and I fear will not come back any time too soon.

I can no longer post any source that is not trumpeted by the right of this forum, you central among them, as being biased against the President. This assumption every time is based not so much on reason for a belief in bias as it is that the source is contrary to the standing administration. As evidence of this I'd like to reference the Al Qaqaa ammunitions dump that I claimed the United States forces passed over and President George Bush failed to secure. My evidence for this was both reasonable logic, and testimony from an embedded reporter with an army group [I forget what degree of organization, spare me] who stopped only long enough to photograph the RDx dump. Additionally, the President's claim that that one group of 10-20 people secured the facility is ridiculous as well. The site is the size of a town with roughly 1,000 buildings. It is this kind of evidence I consistently attempt to, and thus do, use as substantiation to my opinions. Not opinion pieces from democraticunderground.com or wherever.

Not surprisingly, the first thing that crossed your mind, along with the rest of the Renforums right's minds when you saw this topic was "How could this be wrong?" The possibility that it could be correct was so incredibly ludicrous to you, apparently, that it never even occurred to you. You

claim that I base every one of my arguments on one sole assumption and cannot be deviated from this one assumption; you are however guilty of this yourself.

While we're on the topic of unilateral thought processes, I really must insist that I do not hold President George W. Bush in absolute contempt. Just off the top of my head, I believe the war in Afghanistan was the right thing to do. There was a genuine war on terror. However, when I see the War in Iraq, I can discern next to no factual evidence actually justifying invading a sovereign nation and usurping their leader. Let me pose this question to you; When I see something I believe is wrong, what should I do? Personally, since it is the direction my nation is headed in, I believe I should voice my concerns. Is this so wrong? More and more so as time progresses, you have increasingly come to believe that it is. I fear that if you could have a 1984 in America led by President Bush, you would accept that willingly.

It is not physically possible to be more ignorant, myopic, or servile than to suggest that we must be so acceptive of the ideals of a government.

Hypothetically assuming that I am close-minded about the acceptability of President Bush's actions and that I believe everything he does is wrong, at least this cannot be seen as wrong.

On the other hand, being entirely close-minded about the perfect excellence of President Bush cannot be seen as wrong.

Until you seek to silence others who do not agree with his perfect excellence.

Too many times on these forums I have been the recipient of comments such as "shut up, you don't know anything." and "stupid liberal, go home." I hope you can come to realize how incredibly wrong such attempted opinion removals are and how dangerous the acceptance of such attempted removals can be. More or less, the one sign above all others of a fascist nation is the removal of contrary opinion towards the government from the ears of citizens. Surely you realize how dangerous this is.

No system is perfect without constant, unending criticism; this is due to the inherent fact that no system can be perfect. Especially not a system so manufactured as a government. And especially not one man. Not even if he is President. A common republican talking point, one I fear you partake in, is that a wartime President should not be criticized. No one should be foolish enough to be duped by this incredible, nigh-treasonous nonsense.

I really do hope you shy away from this. If you would only become civil and acceptive of ideas again, I would not only accept your opinion, but enjoy reading it and not seek to prove it wrong, but to seek to determine whether it is right or wrong. I would then only hope you would do the same for me.

If you've had enough of my mindless bickering, then fine. Have enough. But know that it is not only my right, but my obligation to voice every aspect, no matter how minute, of my criticism of the standing administration. Don't hate me for it, for if you do you are only a truly mindless pawn of those who only care for themselves, and you're just helping to destroy America. I know it sounds

extrapolated from the genuine effects of your hate, but it really is not. If enough people rise to government with your idea of the submission of contrary ideas, America will wilt like a flower in a late-spring frost.

And we wouldn't want that, now, would we?

So ignore me or keep on hating. Your choice, really. I can't change your mind. But don't view my opinions as that which must be refuted and removed. I hope you change your idea of what contradiction means. And I hope you cease the disrespectful attacks upon myself. If you do I'll be more than thrilled to talk politics with you. Until such time, however, I won't exactly miss your company.

Have a nice day.

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]
Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Sun, 20 Nov 2005 09:18:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Thu, 17 November 2005 19:05 Well, I suppose we've finally come to parting shots.

We'll never be able to agree with each other, that much has been obvious for over a year now. I make a post, you come to it with the intent

---Snipped to save bandwidth----

attacks upon myself. If you do I'll be more than thrilled to talk politics with you. Until such time, however, I won't exactly miss your company.

Have a nice day.

You are 14, right? Maybe 15? And you have experienced, lived, worked, etc. to develop all these opinions or you have simple regurgitated them from Mummy and Daddy? Right, the latter.

I went through and read many of your posts to see if Hydra was being accurate or not. He was quite accurate in his comments. And I have no history or preconceived notions.

I'd bet that the lack of "missing" will be a mutual thing.

Don't let the door hit you on that ass on the way out, and don't forget to look both ways at the street.
