

Abortion remains termination of life

To the editor:

I wonder if others found Ms. Julie Hall's recent letter to the editor as frightening as I did. In it, Hall states that she believes abortionists (who kill innocent, completely defenseless unborn children) to be heroes and heroines. I find that type of thinking to be very scary.

Next, Hall states that an unwanted child brought into the world "is likely to suffer physical and emotional neglect, live in poverty, and perhaps suffer horrible abuse." I know Hall has no statistical data to support this statement. So I could just as easily say the opposite. And I think I'd be closer to the truth, since many unwanted children brought to term are placed for adoption. These children are loved, nurtured and supported, and become responsible adults. Even if everything isn't perfect, what could be more horribly abusive to a child than to be killed in the mother's womb?

Later, if I understand correctly, Hall argues that we need to keep abortion legal because women who want abortions will jeopardize their lives to obtain illegal abortions. Throughout history, humans have jeopardized their lives in killing, stealing from, and abusing other previously-born humans. To follow Hall's thinking would require our society to legalize murder, robbery and assault (because people will do so even though illegal).

Hall also raises the issue of victims of rape and incest. It's interesting that when we "anti-abortion extremists" held up pictures of aborted fetuses that looked remarkably like small babies, we were scolded for appealing to people's emotions. But it's OK for abortion rights activists to talk about the emotional subject of rape and incest.

But, tragically, rape and incest is a reality. And some abortions do terminate pregnancies resulting from these horrible violations of a woman's body, although not to the extent implied by pro-abortion groups (the number I've heard is less than 5 percent of all abortions). The emotional pain experienced by these women must be awful. But I've never understood the concept of killing the child

because of the sins of the father. I can't imagine that aborting the child would eliminate or even ease the emotional trauma experienced by the woman. And while it would take a brave and insightful woman to do so, bringing her child to term and placing him or her for adoption would be the one possible good to come out of this horrible act of violence.

In reading letters like Hall's, it's important to see if there is logic in the writer's statements. And it's also very important to keep the truth in mind. And the truth is this:

■ Credible scientists have concluded that all life, including human life, begins at the time of fertilization/conception.

■ The unborn child has done nothing that any society could legitimately consider to be worthy of the death penalty.

■ Therefore, abortion is the unwarranted termination of a human life.

Richard A. Grimler
Loveland

Roe v. Wade correctly balances right to life

To the editor

The Bible never speaks specifically of abortion, neither condoning nor condemning it. It's very curious that God, speaking so specifically on other critical issues, didn't speak in clear terms about elective abortion, much less condemning it, especially considering anti-abortion claims that God holds fetal life most sacred.

Verses about God's involvement in the creation of the process of human life development, like Jeremiah 1:4-5 that Richard Grimler in his March 20 letter cited, say absolutely nothing about when God bestows official recognition of the beginning of human life, that being the moment of birth. Genesis 2:7, "... and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." The Hebrew word for human being or living person is *nephesh*, which is also the word for breathing. By God's own desire and design human beings breathe through their nostrils upon birth,

marking for God the official beginning of human life.

In Exodus 21:22-25 God leaves no ambiguity that for him; a born woman's life is paramount to that of an unborn fetus's life. "When men strive together and hurt a woman with child so that there is a miscarriage and yet no harm follows, the one who hurt her, shall be fined, according as the woman's husband shall lay upon him and he shall pay as the judges determine. If any harm follows then you shall give eye for eye, tooth for tooth, life for life."

If the woman miscarries but she doesn't suffer any other harm or death, the punishment is a fine for causing the death of the fetus. However, if any harm to the woman follows, then the punishment is an eye for eye or life for life.

The law considered the death of the fetus or any harm or death of the woman as a loss or damage to property that belonged to the husband. That's very different than the fetus having independent intrinsic value, which is what anti-abortion extremists desperately try to extrapolate from these verses.

Clearly, for God, a born woman's life outweighed that of an unborn fetus's life, conception to birth.

God killed the first born of Egypt including the innocent child just seconds out of the birth canal for vengeance. Is that frivolous? Punishing Israel for their impiety and idolatry, God caused abortions upon their innocent unborn babies by giving the Israelites "miscarrying wombs." Do I hear any outrage from anti-abortion extremists? For God, (and Pat Robertson, by his own recent admission) there are circumstances under which killing innocent human life, including fetuses, is moral. Seems current day anti-abortion extremists aren't in-step with God on this one.

For God, a woman has an absolute right to life and liberty over a fetus, conception to birth. For anti-abortion extremists a fetus has that absolute right. But it's Roe v. Wade that correctly and morally balances the right to life and liberty of both, hardly a public policy that would ever draw condemnation from God.

Peggy Loonan, executive director
Life and Liberty for Women
Fort Collins