

Lowland Reporter Herald
January 2, 2003

Clarifications to add to the abortion debate

To the editor:

Life and Liberty for Women agrees with Sam Nordstrom, Dec. 2, that it doesn't work to use religious text as proof something is right or wrong when speaking across different religions. But these religious discussions have been with Christians about their beliefs from their Bible. We agree with Nordstrom that individuals' religious beliefs shouldn't be used as arguments in the formulation of civil public policy, however, evangelical Christians, who now have unprecedented political power in Congress and state legislatures nationwide, insist on forcing their religious belief about abortion into civil public policy.

The Rev. Steven Schlei, Dec. 2, falsely claims women can have abortions for any reason through the ninth month. Roe v. Wade allows states to criminalize abortion in the third trimester, after viability, to protect fetal life, the health and life of the woman the only exceptions. Forty-two states and the District of Columbia have such laws. The reasons women have third trimester abortions; fetuses incompatible with life or a life-threatening illness for the woman, and the number performed in the third trimester, .04 percent, or 400-600 a year, clearly shows Schlei bears false witness.

Paul Boyne, Dec. 4, says the state should force women to become mothers to children they aren't prepared to parent as punishment for having unprotected sex, but doesn't say how a man should be punished. I assume in fairness Boyne would also force men to be involved fathers and pay child support. Boyne says there's no such thing as an accident. Chalk that irresponsible statement up to his youth.

Boyne said the unborn killed unintentionally in Exodus 21:22-25, was protected by the law because the men had to pay a fine for that, but the fine wasn't for killing the unborn but for harming the woman by forcing the miscarriage. We know that because the phrase "and yet no harm follows" refers back to the direct object of the sentence, the woman and not to the adjective, the child. Intentional or unintentional killing of the unborn isn't the issue here; harm to the woman, who had legal personhood status, is.

Robert Morse, Dec. 25, repeats that "nephesh," describes sea creatures in Genesis 1:20 but again provides no evidence, whereas Julie Maslowski cited precise evidence to the contrary from The New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Bible. Morse should substantiate not restate his assertion.

Nephesh, a breathing creature characterizing soul and person, by definition has to breathe to be alive, which is precisely why nephesh isn't a characteristic of live sea creatures. Strong's defines "life" in Genesis 1:20 as "chay," living thing or creature. Clearly you can have a living creature that isn't a breathing creature like unborn human life in the womb.

Peggy Loonan
executive director
Life and Liberty for Women