

Stances make 'pro-lifers' hypocrites under close scrutiny

To the editor:

Anti-abortion extremists recently admitted that illegal abortion doesn't save babies and that illegal abortion kills women. However, their lack of concern for the loss of even one born woman's life from illegal abortion begs the "pro-life" label they ascribe to themselves. Unbelievably escaping self-proclaimed "pro-lifers," is reasoning a solution that would best serve both the goal of "saving babies" and born women from death from illegal abortion.

The solution is simple. Abstinence-based, age-appropriate, comprehensive sex education, greater birth-control availability, more birth-control research, and greater male responsibility in the sex act will reduce the need for abortion, while leaving *Roe v. Wade* fully intact to protect the lives of both viable fetuses and women.

Anti-abortion extremists say *Roe v. Wade* legalizes the killing of viable fetuses. That's a lie. After viability, or in the third trimester, *Roe v. Wade* gave states the right to deny a woman the right to terminate her pregnancy for any reason, in a clear and unequivocal support of protecting fetal life, with the only exception being the protection of a woman's health or life. Forty-two states and the District of Columbia have such laws on the books.

Anti-abortion extremists indiscriminately apply "Thou shall not kill," to legal abortion, claiming God himself makes the application. Dr. Roy Bowen Ward, a professor of religion at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, 1996, "No direct object is supplied for the verb 'to kill.' Certainly the commandment doesn't indiscriminately refer to killing anything alive. The Israelites were expected to kill animals, both to eat and sacrifice. They were also expected to kill Philistines and other enemies in war. And whoever killed his father or mother was to be killed.

The command not to kill was certainly not 'pro-life' in an unqualified way."

Additionally, the death penalty, which most "pro-lifers" support, violates this commandment.

We are often asked who we think we are that can judge what the quality of

life for someone else is. We at Life and Liberty for Women, make no judgments about the quality of life a woman may or may not be able to give her child. She makes that judgment call, as well she should. We simply point out that it's right and moral for a woman to consider what her child's quality of life may or may not be if born and terminating her pregnancy because she believes she can't offer her child the quality of life she believes is deserved and she can't give up her child for adoption, her decision isn't a wrong one or an immoral one.

Julie Hall, board member
Life and Liberty for Women
Milliken

Lowland Reporter
Herald
August 26, 2001