
Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 21:26:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Thu, 10 November 2005 23:35: Clare, what the fuck are you smoking? How can killing a child at any point and time whether or not someone's in financial hardship be acceptable? So if you have 5 kids, in financial hardship, is it okay to kill one of your children to make the load easier on you? This is the same idea. To have an innocent child pay for the stupidity of a person is just pointless and stupid. The male is responsible for this too, and it's unfortunate for your friend to have been put in that situation, but guess what, she DIDN'T have to consent to sex which led to her being pregnant. The guy didn't just say to your friend, "haha, now you're pregnant." She had equal part in this too, and as a mother, you're supposed to take care of your child no matter what. You wouldn't kill Aurora if you ran into some financial trouble. You love and protect her, but why should the fact that the child is in the womb make the situation any different?

Not having the history here, I can only assume that "Clare" is Kytten. Based on that: Warranto was not over the line in my opinion or read. Kytten's posts were not either until the assault began out of what she perceived as an attack. This proves the bottom line issue here that the emotional aspects here far outweigh most people's logical abilities. You start using the words, human, embryo, life, fetus, baby and so on and people's emotional strings start getting plucked. If not, then they are emotionless and don't count. Agreed?

A lot of this comes down to the reality that it takes "two to tango" as it was put. That is true. Now for the rest of the story: After the music stops, ONE is left with the weight of the responsibility. One is left not being able to work to support themselves and the baby, one is left with the 20+ year responsibility of teaching and training and raising that life that started during that 90 seconds of bliss. Only one is left with the overall life changing responsibilities that range from diapers to school to driving a car to college tuition. I have 2 16 year olds, and one that I have raised from that zygote stage, only the first 6 with his Mother. (and BTW, she never has paid support).

So now look at the issue that even though it takes two to screw, only one gets pregnant. Only one has the long term responsibility by mandate. Only one has their life _permanently_ changed completely. Even if the sperm donor is made to pay \$ on a regular basis that isn't much compared to 2am feedings and a 24x7 x20 year job.

So does a woman still not have the right to abort that child? Or at least be able to have that option? (please don't mix into this those that use abortion as post-birth control, that is a whole different issue of irresponsibility)
