

Science fact: Life begins at fertilization

To the editor:

Reporter Herald
1-24-01

I would like to comment on the letter from Margaret L. Anderson appearing in the Jan. 18 edition of the Reporter-Herald. In it, she opposes John Ashcroft's nomination as U. S. attorney general because of his anti-abortion beliefs. That is her prerogative. It is the rationale that she uses to support abortion that amazes me.

In its Roe v. Wade decision in 1973, the U. S. Supreme Court said that it could not determine when human life began. Incredibly, instead of possibly erring on the side of life, the court used its lack of a determination to conclude the unborn child is not a person under the language of the U. S. Constitution, thus stripping him or her of any rights and allowing abortion on demand. At the time, since the religious denomination of which I am a member opposes abortion, I was told that I could not/should not impose my religious beliefs on others.

In the 28 years since Roe v. Wade, the scientific community has concluded all life, including human life, begins at the time of fertilization/conception. I know of no scientist with any credibility who would disagree with that. So now Ms. Anderson wants the world to ignore the scientific fact that life begins at fertilization because it is "a concept not supported by most of the major faith groups in the United States."

Opposition to abortion is not based on one's membership in this or that major faith group. That was a ploy used by pro-abortion organizations to try to "divide and conquer." Opposition to abortion has always been based on the civil right-to-life of the unborn child. Now, science supports the fact that abortion is the unwarranted termination of a human life.

Richard A. Grimler
Loveland

Reporter Herald

Differentiating abortion 'rights'

To the editor:

I, for one, take issue with the quoted statements by Kate Michelman, the abortion-rights advocate, appearing on the front page of the Jan. 23 edition.

I don't wish to deny her the right to speak out for abortion if she believes in the cause. I do, however, detest seeing her position mislabeled. Her position very definitely has absolutely nothing to do with the reproductive rights of women. It has everything to do with inspiring sex without consideration for responsibility.

Just don't ever say that the reproductive rights of a woman were violated by the lack of an opportunity for abortion. That woman still has the right of choice. She can say "no" and really mean it. She can demand sex with protection, which in this day and age is only sensible to start with. Or, she can own up to the responsibility that she willingly shared with her partner.

The abortion-rights people have, for the past 28 years, failed to consider the other partner in the union that created the product of that alliance. I don't think any conception, save one, has been immaculate. That squirmy little sperm had to join the party through mutual consent.

If that right of reproductive choice is violated, through rape or incest, there is a different situation.

Why provoke an excuse for a situation that comes about in one chance out of a million?

Abortion is one thing.

Reproductive rights are another.

Reporter Herald

Jerry Myre
1-26-01
Loveland