

---

Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [Arcane1](#) on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 13:39:58 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 17:20

Okay, so let me "stretch" it even farther. What if someone's sleeping? They, for that time being, have no consciousness. Thus, does this make it legal for someone to enter another's house and shoot them while they're asleep, and it not technically be "killing"?

A developing fetus, without a developed cerebral cortex that has yet to experience stimulation sensation and thus "sentience" cannot be compared to a post-sentient human that is rendered unconscious or sleeping.

Hydra wrote on Fri, 11 November 2005 21:17

I don't think emotion has much to do with it anyway. Let's call those embryos what they are--developing humans. It isn't bringing emotion into the discussion to call them by their true nature. They are human lives in the earliest stages of development. We all were once that tiny bundle of cells in a woman's womb. We're all humans now, and we were human then.

I can't possibly think of any other way to describe them other than human.

Well, to be pragmatically antagonistic, we could call it a biomass that hasn't achieved any real form yet. Yes it has the potential of form, but it has not reached any state above potential. The sex is not even determined yet, the heart has not beaten and the nervous system has yet to fire a neuron.

Hydra If it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it must be a duck; I'm not going to try calling it a hummingbird or an eagle as it would be simply factually incorrect to do so.

That's all true, and it's all sad. No one here is trying to vindicate the man responsible for getting her pregnant. He is just as responsible for getting the woman pregnant as she is. That alone doesn't vindicate the woman from fault, though. She should have thought about all that before choosing to have sex (or make a baby (since that's what sex is biologically for)). That is a point that I seriously appreciate. Realistically, any argument that did that, I would ignore, as I don't consider a position like that worth arguing against. On the contrary, there hasn't been the slightest hint of that yet, which says a lot about the participants.

HydraShe made a mistake, a dire mistake, and now she has to live with the consequences. Sorry babe; tough luck; you shouldn't have done that; hope you learned something; now own up to what you did and take care of the child you made.

The same should apply to the man, too.

Of course, nothing can really stop him from leaving, besides being labelled a coward and downright despicable human being.

It's too bad if that happens, but it happens; sorry if this sounds too rough, but the girl should have thought about that before having sex before getting married.

There is such a thing as culpability in law. That the woman be made to shoulder all the burden ultimately is not an appropriate result for a single bad act according to the body of Civil and Criminal Law in the US.

-If I give you a loaded gun, and you go kill someone, you will go to jail and possibly get the death sentence. I, for supplying you the weapon will also be charged, and most likely with a close to as heavy a punishment as a participant.

-If I supply you with alcohol, and you leave my home and cause an accident with fatalities, again, you will be prosecuted and potentially convicted and sentenced to life in prison or death for murder. I, as the supplier, would also be charged and be held responsible, convicted and sentenced.

-If you are building a structure, and choose to use Company X as a supplier of a critical component, and it fails, killing occupants, ultimately the designer that chose Company X's product, Company X and its owners will be held liable.

-In a divorce settlement, where kids are involved, the Father is basically sentenced to a degree of support for the child(ren) over a period of time.

And there are thousands of other examples of shared responsibility. Why then in the situation of creating life is the Sperm Donor allowed to escape/avoid culpability? At most the SD is held to a minimal financial degree, leaving the other person 99% responsible.

That doesn't make legal sense to me, and is further proof of the misogynistic nature of this country's legal system. In the case of the divorce and settlement of support, while the laws mandate non-custodial responsibility, there are minimal resources to actually enforce this. Again, leaving the woman lacking support or recourse much of the time.

HydraThere is no guarantee that a boyfriend who she thinks loves her will stay around forever. Like I said before, if he's not ready to commit to marriage, how could he possibly be ready to commit to raising a child? So for what possible reason should the woman make a go at making a child by having sex with him? She should have weighed the consequences before making such a decision.

Now that she has a child to deal with, she should not have the right to kill it off simply because it has become an inconvenience to her, as J\_Ball said earlier.

If parents were allowed to kill their children for being inconveniences, I sure as hell wouldn't be here to bore you all with all this typing.

OK, the whole "boyfriend" issue is beyond the scope of this conversation I'm afraid. Any girl that is allowed to fall into that trap has her parents to thank as much as the guy that she's in the back seat with. I have a 16 year old daughter, that knocks guys eyes out when she walks down the hall according to my Son that is also 16 and at the same school with her. She knows better because she has been taught better.

As for the "inconvenience" issue. There are a number of cultures that still keep a bucket of water next to the birth bed, and if the newborn is a female, then it goes in head first. The liability of a female in those cultures is perceived as so high that a female is disaster. The Eskimo, Chinese (rural), Indian and much of the Indonesian areas. The inability to work to support the family and the potentially bankrupting dowry are the primary reasons to my understanding.

HydraWhether it is conscious or unconscious is irrelevant; it is still a human life. A human doesn't need to be conscious to be labelled "human". Terry Schiavo was a human; Terry Wallace is a human. Both were unconscious for a long period of time, but both were still considered "human."

There is nothing emotional about it, yet everything logical and biological about it; a developing human is just that--human. Just because it may be at the stage before a functioning brain or a consciousness develops does not change its inherent nature of being a human.

Like I said, we were all once that small in our mothers' womb at some point in our lives. If we weren't human, what were we, and why do we consider ourselves human now if we didn't start out as humans?

Agreed, the label of "human" sticks validly. I don't think that was ever in question. Whether it should be considered primary over the Mother's interests, needs and desires/will at that stage of development is the issue that we again end up at.

---