

SAVE THE BABIES

method is performed up to twelve weeks into the pregnancy. Thus, the unborn child - who possesses a completely formed skeleton, complete and functioning organs, a nervous system, ten miniature fingers and toes, and a beating heart - can be cut up into pieces and "vacuumed up"....LEGALLY! The same fetus that recoils at the pain of a needle prick is considered a "non-person". There are those who will say, "but even a rat can be conditioned to make a particular response" - but does a rat have a cell structure composed of forty-six chromosomes? Does a rat have its beginnings in the union of a human sperm and ovum?

When a woman has been pregnant for twelve to sixteen weeks it is extremely dangerous (to her) to attempt to abort the unborn child. Consequently, abortions are seldom performed within this period. However, after sixteen weeks, there is another method used to terminate the new life. The pregnant woman lies on her back, while a long needle is inserted through the abdominal wall into the amniotic fluid around the baby. Some of this fluid is withdrawn and replaced with a salt solution - "salt poisoning" or "saline amniocentesis" abortion. The unborn baby "breathes" in the solution; struggling on the part of the baby can sometimes be felt by the mother. An hour later - he lies still, his heart ceases. Since he is now considered "dead" he must have been "alive"

to begin with. A day after the injection, the mother goes into labor and delivers a raw red-looking baby; the salt solution burns and strips away the entire outer layer of skin! Because of their appearance the victims are often referred to as "candy apple babies". Occasionally it happens that a burned baby is born alive.

In later months of pregnancy an abortion often takes the form of a Caesarian section. The baby is removed by way of an incision into the abdominal wall. The umbilical cord is cut and the baby is dropped into the bucket to die.

How then can anyone still maintain that abortion does not destroy a human life? At the moment of conception, there comes into existence a new living being, undeniably human in its genetic make-up and inheritance. At that moment of conception everything is decided - color of eyes and hair, likes and dislikes - everything! Everything is determined by which twenty-three chromosomes he takes from each parent. It is a distinctive person, not merely a part of a woman's body over which she has a "right to exercise control."

Some maintain that life does not begin at conception. When, then, does it begin? When all organ systems are functioning? Then "life" would be said to begin at eleven or twelve weeks. When the entire body is completely formed? Go back one week. If, however, one chooses to believe that it begins when brain waves are detectable (a popular measure of "life" these days) then six weeks after conception would have to be the dividing line between "life" and "non-life".

"Viability", that is the ability to maintain existence outside the womb, is often used as the dividing line for humanity. However, viability is a wishy-washy standard - a cop out from taking a responsible moral position on a critical issue. Its flimsiness is easily illustrated: many years back premature babies had

a high mortality rate. An eight-month baby a century ago would probably have the chances of a six months one today. Premature babies have greater chances of living today because of more extensive knowledge and improved facilities. Viability is not a measure of humanity, rather it is simply a reflection of the care and competence of the physician. The rapid advance of technology will reduce the viability age.

reason for abortions is that many women "do not want" the children in their wombs. What about those who "do not want" those they already have?

Which leads to the ridiculous proposal that easily obtainable abortions will lead to a decrease in child battering. In other words, the woman who is likely to beat up her child after it is born can get the doctor to kill it before it is born. (Reduces the pain



While society develops more effective methods of decreasing premature birth mortality, it simultaneously develops more effective methods of terminating pregnancies. They are fighting equally to fill one crib and keep another empty. The contradictions are blatant.

Few people still protest for "abortion to save the life of the mother". This situation is ancient history. The argument is irrelevant. Since we have already established that the unborn child is a person, posing the question of "mother-survival" places one in a slightly altered moral dilemma; it is requiring one to make a value judgment between the life of an unborn child, and the life of a woman. Another arbitrary decision. Anyway, this is not important here, because it is not why millions of babies are killed (if one will permit the severity of the verb.)

Why then? The main

for it somehow.)

There seems no necessity for dismissing, in sequence, the other "good reasons" people have for killing an unborn baby. To all and any, one must only ask, "Would you kill the same baby, for the same reason, an instant after it was born?"

Indeed, the argument that the world is overpopulated could be similarly used in defense of euthanasia or infanticide. The latter, a practice only slightly different from abortion, is curiously condemned universally. (Infanticide is the killing of babies who have already survived the birth process.)

Yes, it seems unbelievable that a people who have compassion even for a seal could unquestioningly assent to the slaughter of a baby in the womb.

BY VALERIE MOORE AND MARSHA GAUDET

