

---

Subject: Re: abortion...

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 16:34:23 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Wed, 24 October 2007 09:58: Because they are extreme cases. With rape, the pregnancy did not occur by choice. As well, if that does not seem like a big deal, the mental anguish it can cause the mother is something I would not wish on anyone. Just think that if she has the kid, whenever she sees the kid, it would be a reminder of what happened to her. There would always be that underlying resentment toward the child for that. Even if she ends up giving the baby up for adoption, it is still 9 months of constant reminders of what someone did to her whenever she looks in the mirror.

Basically, it boils down to a mental health issue.

As for the medical reasons, it should be fairly obvious. Since it is impossible to save both, you must choose one or lose them both. Since the mother has a life ahead of her and the opportunity to become pregnant again, it is the logical choice to let her live. More often than not, if there is a problem with the pregnancy, there is a very limited stage (if any) in which the developing fetus/child could survive without the mother anyway.

If the mother wasn't raped, couldn't the baby be considered a reminder of the jerkoff who had his fun and left? Would that be easier to deal with than a rape? Is it, in a sense, rape? If the baby was given up for adoption, wouldn't this also give the mother distance without the additional guilt of having taken a life?

If the baby has a right to life, why would it have any less of one if it was conceived through rape? Is it still a wonderful thing that another human being was made despite the brutal way in which it was done? If someone must die, why not the rapist instead of the baby?

As for the medical reasons, I have no ready argument against it although I still don't agree with it.

---