
Subject: Re: Abortion [split]

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 16 Nov 2005 23:11:03 GMT

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

The Greatest Superhero Who Ever Lived! don't feel like going back 2 pages to look at the cartoon again, so how about you explain that one.

Thanks. You saved me the time it took to refresh my web browser.

HydraThe concept is still the same. Both the unborn condor and an unborn human baby are biological lifeforms in their earliest stages of development. Why is it okay to kill the human and not okay to kill the condor, because humans aren't endangered? Where the hell is the logic in that?

Yes, Hydra, we both know they are unborn life forms. The arguments for keeping the two alive are what is different. I'll explain this from another angle to see if you get it. The hippie's argument is obviously that the condor egg should be allowed to mature so it can repopulate the california condor population. Your side's argument for ending abortion is that a blob of cells have the same legal rights to life as a born person. Let's use our critical reasoning skills to determine that these two reason are not the same. Ok?

HydraThe only "version" of life that applies to this issue is the only "version" of life that applies to EVERYTHING having to do with life. Life between sexually reproducing organisms begins at conception. That is a biological FACT. An unborn human is ALIVE FROM CONCEPTION; there is NO OTHER LOGICAL WAY TO EXPLAIN IT WITHOUT TOTALLY DISREGARDING EVERYTHING BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE HAS DISCOVERED.

HydraYou wouldn't know hyperbole if it hit you like a bus, would you?

Yes, you exaggerated, but at the same time you entirely ignored what I was saying.

Hydral understood your point entirely. You, in accordance with your programming by militant leftist environmentalist groups, would go out of your way to protect the eggs of an endangered species from destruction if given the opportunity; yet you would not lift a finger to protect an unborn human being from annihilation simply because humans aren't an endangered species (and because you don't believe them to be alive in the first place).

See above.

Hydral'll stop saying it once you stop implying it.

SuperFlyingEngiIn this case it is the main factor. Yes, it is, and you are wrong if you believe it is not....

Then name the myriad of other factors. Because you wouldn't suggest that such a myriad existed

if you didn't know what it was. Or would you?

HydraTo name a few: lack of abstinence education; oppressive governments; anti-capitalistic (and therefore anti-progress) economic policies imposed by said oppressive governments; the culture ("it takes a village to raise a child"); rampant war (civil war in many cases); religious/ethnic cleansing and genocide; the UN's inaction towards taking the proper steps to get rid of the malignant forces causing war; the funding of said oppressive governments by billions of dollars in foreign aid given directly to the governments (Africa is just a black hole that will suck up as much money as we can throw into it to no avail); the refusal of powerful foreign powers to remove the oppressive regimes forcefully

And elitists like you for criticizing them when they actually do.

First, of all, I give you credit for working Saddam into this. Even though it's an entirely unrelated concept. If African dictators were locked down to the extent Saddam was before Bush Jr. invaded Iraq, Africa would be a much safer place. That said, let's dissect.

Oh, wait, I don't have to. You misunderstood yourself. You listed a series of causes as to why women in Africa get abortions. Not why they have to get back alley abortions. Allow me to illustrate.

SuperFlyingEngiThat last point is actually readily demonstrated in African countries where abortion is illegal so women just get abortions in back allies instead of the hospital. As a result, many die from poor operations.

I personally don't want that to happen in America.

HydraYou're going to attribute abortion operation mishaps in Africa solely to its illegality? Do you think those women would receive even half-decent operations if abortion was legal? They can barely receive a simple vaccination that doesn't somehow result in health complications! Healthcare in Africa sucks!

Legalizing abortion doesn't automatically mean those women receiving them now will suddenly get better healthcare as those people doing the back-alley abortions will be the same people performing the legal practice; they'll just be allowed to do it by the government for a cheaper price.

And abortion's illegality is a single factor among a myriad of others forcing those women to seek those abortions in the first place.

SuperFlyingEngiThen name the myriad of other factors. Because you wouldn't suggest that such a myriad existed if you didn't know what it was. Or would you?

HydraTo name a few: lack of abstinence education; oppressive governments; anti-capitalistic (and therefore anti-progress) economic policies imposed by said oppressive governments; the culture ("it takes a village to raise a child"); rampant war (civil war in many cases); religious/ethnic cleansing and genocide; the UN's inaction towards taking the proper steps to get rid of the malignant forces causing war; the funding of said oppressive governments by billions of dollars in foreign aid given directly to the governments (Africa is just a black hole that will suck up as much money as we can throw into it to no avail); the refusal of powerful foreign powers to remove the oppressive regimes forcefully

Notice how you changed the meaning of those abortions. Do you need another try?

SuperFlyingEngiThat's a badly worded statement that wouldn't mean anything if it were worded correctly anyways.

Hydralt's worded correctly; you're saying that just because you disagree with him, yet you can't refute what he said because it is based on sound logic--logic that you can't beat.

Allow me to define why it is a poor sentence.

ACKThis line of thought requires that you assume spontaneous generation for life and consciousness. I say this because your intellect, your being, and your very existence are owed to the clump of cellular matter that forms a body and from there forms a consciousness.

Do you or do you not agree with this? If not, explain why your logic seems to be unable to sustain itself.

Now,

1) "assume spontaneous generation for life and consciousness" is itself a bad wording, but besides that point j_balls argument doesn't actually require the assumption that life and consciousness are created with no apparent reason.

2) "agree with this?" is an ambiguous pronoun.

3) Whether or not consciousness is generated spontaneously doesn't render his logic non... self-sustaining.

There are some reasons. And quite frankly, that phrase was less comprehensible than any literary question I saw on the SAT [And those can get pretty incomprehensible] If any sentence or phrase passes that point, it's time to go back and re-evaluate your ideas.
