

Killing is wrong regardless of ideology and theology

To the editor:

Paul Boyne is wiser than his 13 years. Paul, I applaud your apology to Pat Thomas for characterizing liberals, environmentalists and feminists as monsters. (June 26). You are the better person for it. All liberals and environmentalists do not support abortion, as feminists make clear they do. We can only pray that one day pro-choice advocates see the wrong in murder of any kind.

Because our beliefs are 'righteous,' pro-choice people interpret us to self-righteous. If anything, they are self-absorbed, as they lack concern for the unborn infant and think only of their own desires. The pro-choice people provide only opinions and misinterpreted verses from the Bible.

"Thou Shalt Not Kill" is one of the Ten Commandments, which is also contained in the Bible. Abortion is killing. Therefore, it's wrong, as evidenced by God himself. Those who intentionally abort need to worry about "Judgment Day."

A statement made by one letter writer that, "One must display concern for both the life of woman and fetus, which Roe v. Wade does," not only lacks credibility, but is ludicrous. Roe v. Wade legalizes "abortion" which kills viable fetuses. How is this (abortion) a display of concern for the life of the human fetus? This proves abortionists are not on the side of life. No harm need come to unborn children or women. If women "choose not" to abort, both the life of the baby and the woman will be spared. Isn't this a logical and caring solution for both?

Common sense also tells us when you legalize drugs, prostitution or abortion, you will have many more criminal acts and abuses committed.

Unborn children's lives are lost through both legal and illegal abortions and far outnumber women's lives lost due to illegal abortions. All women who had illegal abortions did not die, but the child always does (did) die.

Pro-choice people argue quality of

life. Who are they to decide or judge what is quality of life for someone else? "Killing" the child is more acceptable than locking a child in a closet? This is a well-reasoned statement? Are you a better person for killing that child to spare he or she possible abuse?

People who commit or support acts of violence will never incriminate themselves and will always try to justify their ungodly action. Why then would anyone accept and believe self-seeking, supposed evidence justifying abortions?

God knew people could and would misinterpret and misrepresent his teachings. That's why he handed Moses the Ten Commandments by his own hand. The Ten Commandments are very clear to all and are to be followed by religious and non-religious people alike.

Erika Bruning
Loveland

Abortion rights advocates resort to splitting verbal hairs

To the editor:

Laura Meckler's article in the Nation & World section on July 7 ("Bush policy backs health care for unborn"), concerning a plan to offer low-income women access to prenatal care, is a wonderful example of the power of language.

In her article, Ms. Meckler makes reference to "the developing fetus," "the fetus," and "a fetus," without using quotation marks. However, when she refers to the unborn child, she is careful to use quotation marks as in the first paragraph: "unborn child," and the fourth paragraph, "a targeted low-income child."

The purpose of this careful use of language is to create the impression that unborn children are not human beings. They are instead some underserving entity such as a "fetus," or an "embryo" to be dispensed with if they complicate our lives or interrupt our plans.

Here is the point: For some people, unborn children are not human, they are an "embryo" or a "fetus." These people will not even say, or print "human embryo" or "human fetus" for

fear of giving any human quality to these unborn human children. It is much easier to kill an embryo or a fetus than it is to kill an unborn child.

There is a problem, however, with this theology. The problem is that terminology does not change reality. A human egg fertilized by a human sperm in the body of a human female will never be anything other than a human child. It is only through some unfortunate circumstance, illness or accident, or purposeful destructive intervention that this human child can be prevented from being born.

Of course, according to Kate Michelman, president of the Nation Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League, anyone with this simplistic viewpoint is, by definition practicing "The most cynical of politics ... to satisfy the demands of the far right wing." Now there is an unbiased and scholarly statement of reality for you. Or perhaps, the statement of a cynical person trying desperately to avoid the horrible reality of advocating the death of innocent, unborn human children.

Ms. Meckler failed as a seeker of truth in this article, or even someone willing to present in an unbiased way, both sides of an emotional and defining issue in our society.

Perhaps we should ask the important central question, "When does human life begin?"

Sadly, we know what medical schools teach. They created the terms embryo and fetus. After all, it would hardly do for a profession whose credo is: "First, do no harm," to admit committing homicide on unborn human beings for a fee.

What a difference might have been made by the use of simple and honest descriptive definitions of terms. Any embryo conceived by a man and woman is a human embryo. After eight weeks this human embryo becomes a human fetus. These are technical terms used to describe the developmental stages of a human child. They are not terms to be used to deny these children their honest claim of the right to live and not to be killed before birth.

Gary B. Rapp
Loveland