

Students against abortion

Women make choice well before the abortion

This is in reference to C. Graydon's letter of the 20 February. My quarrel with this letter involves several points.

I disagree with the implications that abortion is a forward step for human liberties and progress. Quite the reverse, Graydon. Until recently, all human beings, including unborn ones, were entitled to certain freedoms, chief among them the right to live. Today, only those fortunate enough to have escaped the womb, where residence may be punished by death, are entitled to these liberties. You all this progress?

Furthermore, being against abortion has no relation to one's views on women as property or commodities. The reasoning, or lack thereof, behind this accusation leaves me weak. No doubt people who are against abortion are also responsible for menopause.

C. Graydon, a woman's choice is made well before the

abortion. Be realistic. Conception control (a more accurate term than birth control) is the responsibility of both parties, but only the woman stands to lose if either person abdicates that responsibility. Often even

the woman will shirk her responsibility, so how can one expect the man, who according to

popular myth has nothing to lose, to be any more responsible? Women know this, and they should take steps to insure that their early morning jogging will be uninterrupted. To allow the control of your future to pass out of your hands is nothing short of idiotic.

There are many devices around to prevent conception, so

there is no excuse for an unplanned pregnancy. The pill is safer than an abortion, and much safer than being pregnant. If one weighs the odds, the conclusion is obvious. However, accidents happen. If one finds the risk

unacceptable, one abstains. If one finds the risk acceptable, one must accept responsibility for

one's own actions. Kill a baby because you were unlucky (or stupid)? If I become a paraplegic as a result of a skiing accident, I don't kill the person who sold me the skis. I accepted the risk when I put them on.

As must be obvious by now, I think abortion is murder. Making it legal does not change anything, and it most certainly is not progress, and it will not liberate anyone. No one who wants to protect human life can be a caveman, C. Graydon. Rather, preserving life, even at the cost of a personal sacrifice, is the mark of a very civilized human being.

In closing, I find it amazing that a society which abhors the killing of baby seals considers the killing of children a fundamental democratic right. Someone has a very interesting blind spot where their own personal comfort is concerned.

James R. Sykes
Sc III

Ekelund represents large numbers

I wish to comment on C. Graydon's letter of Feb 20 denouncing students' council for failure to support a pro-abortion organization, and in particular, Mike Ekelund for expressing his views. On one point I agree; Mr. Ekelund has succeeded in raising the hackles on the back of my neck several times this year. His recent implication, perhaps unintended, that women alone are responsible for contraception was offensive.

However I support Mr. Ekelund on the abortion issue, and I applaud him for standing up for what he believes. Contrary to Graydon's statement, a person in a leadership position does have the right, in fact the obligation, to "expound his personal opinion." One of the reasons someone runs for office is so that he can express his own viewpoint, and that of a similarly-minded group of people, in an attempt to persuade

others of the merit of that viewpoint. A leader is supposed to lead. Mr./Ms. Graydon, if it is contemptible that a member of students' council should take the liberty to make a denouncement of such a controversial issue, is it not equally contemptible that students' council, or anyone on it, support such a controversial issue? Or is it only appropriate to "espouse personal opinion(s)" if they happen to agree with yours?

Notwithstanding this, Mike Ekelund is representing a large number of people on campus who would consider themselves "pro-life" and who oppose abortion. In answer to the original question (Feb 16 Gateway) of whether a woman's right to control her own body is subordinate to the right to life—YES! I am appalled to think that anyone would place so little value on life. Free agency, or the right to govern one's own lifestyle, is important, but not more so than life itself.

Heather Reese
Med II

Unborn victim

Students' Council in general, and Mike Ekelund in particular, are to be congratulated for their stand on the abortion issue. It's about time somebody stood up for what is right and not merely for what is popular concerning this issue. The taking of a life after conception is murder. Whether the victim has been born or not is irrelevant.

David Craig
Med I

Fundamentals

of human

nature missed

Well, I see we've had another letter from old Ross. Good old Smillie Ross. He continues to prove that Arts students do not have a monopoly on shit-for-brains.

In his "Morality not invariable" letter, Mr. Smillie lectures on The Fundamentals of Human Nature. Old Smillie must be an extraordinary fellow. Being in sciences, I wouldn't have thought he could find the time to pick up assorted Ph.D.'s in anthropology, sociology and other social sciences.

I've really got to hand it to him. I wouldn't know how to begin proving (scientifically) that the primary motivations (of love, hate, greed, lust, curiosity, and jealousy, among others) do not change, and responses to these stimuli do not change." I think he should publish it — if he can type.

Something (as Columbo would say) is bothering me, though. Being a believer in the theory of evolution I find it hard to believe that man's characteristics, mental or physical, are fixed forever. Mr. Smillie though, is probably an old church groupie and doesn't believe in nosuch theory nohow.

Smillie also claims that morality is not "old fashioned." Well it sure as heck (pardon me) isn't *avant garde* either.

Smillie claims, too, that he knows the moral values of "... a sizeable portion of the people on campus."

"I'd like a sizeable portion of peas, please."

"What!? You call one pea a sizeable portion." That's at least one sizeable portions! And if you disagree ..."

Will Bauer
Eng I



Step forward

I would like to comment on the recent debate regarding the Students' Council's refusal to support the International Campaign for Abortion Rights. As a firm believer in the immorality of abortion I support the Students' Council's rejection of the abortion campaign. I am well aware that not everyone on campus shares my view, therefore in attempting to represent the diversified opinions of the student body the Students' Council has no right to take a stance on this controversial issue. I his letter printed Feb. 20, C.

Graydon denounces Mr. Ekelund's acclamation of personal beliefs on the grounds that he has no right to "espouse his personal opinion" and then proceeds to present his own personal opinion on the issue. The view that abortion is a "human liberty" is contested by myself and many others and Graydon's sarcastic suggestion that any objection to abortion is a "step backward" cannot be taken seriously. The right to dictate who is allowed life and who is not belongs only to God.
Richard Feehan

Therapeutic abortion vs contraceptive

C. Graydon's letter of Feb. 20 exemplifies an attitude which I find most shallow and simplistic. Abortion on demand is not a fundamental human right, nor is its institution part of the "general evolution of humankind." It is just the reverse which is true.

Ms. Graydon fails to distinguish between therapeutic abortions and contraceptive abortions; thus I am left to conclude that she sees access to both kinds as being a natural right of all women.

There can be little dispute over the value of a therapeutic abortion, if continued pregnancy will endanger the woman. The same cannot be said for contraceptive abortions, however. To abort an embryo or foetus simply because it was an undesirable side effect of sexual intercourse is brutal and dehumanizing. Essentially it amounts to premeditated murder. An ovum, from the instant it has been fertilized by the sperm is endowed with human life, and it will mature to become a fully functional human being. One of the pro-abortionists' favourite ploys is to attempt to pinpoint the precise moment at which the foetus "turns into" a human being. This is absurd. Who can determine

the exact time when a middle-aged man becomes an old man? Each of these are stages in an ongoing process, of which conception is only the beginning. A foetus or an embryo may not "look like" a human being; nonetheless it is one. Any attempt to deny this is to avoid this profoundly important human issue. To then justify contraceptive abortion as a means of eliminating an unexpected and unwanted result of recreational sexual intercourse shows a callous, even inhuman indifference.

Certainly sex is important for more than the simple perpetuation of the species. It can be a deep expression of love between a man and a woman. It can even be a "mutual interaction between two equal participants" as Ms. Graydon puts it. Pleasure from intercourse belongs to both partners, but so does responsibility. If two people wish to make love without creating a new life, then both the man and the woman must ensure that measures are taken to prevent this. True, a woman is not "a commodity to be used and exchanged." However, Ms. Graydon, neither is a nascent human being.

Neil A. Macdonald
Arts 2