

Abortion moralities

possible for a man to understand the dimensions of the incredible agony suffered by a woman who is the victim of rape. Due to the outrageous ideas drilled into a young girl's mind since early childhood, as incredible as it may seem, the uncooperative victim of rape can feel ashamed of herself, and somehow feel guilty, after the incident. If young girls received a normal, healthy upbringing, they would feel the natural emotions of anger and hate after being hurt, just like a man: they would desire to have the rapist's life blood squeezed out, warmly, between her fingers. She may easily fear and hate all men thereafter, and the worst is yet to come. She seeks to defend her fellow women by trying to put the rapist in jail where he belongs, she is subjected to humiliation and humiliation, ordeal after ordeal.

And yet, many people still ignorant of the hold dangerous myths about rape: women generally 'ask for it' in most cases, that only a 'pure' woman can be raped, or that a woman has no right to expect safety on the same streets where she can walk safely without fear, but would rather stay properly locked up in her own home after dark.

The only solution to the extremely complex moral dilemma posed by the pregnant rape victim is to ensure that it does not arise: then, neither painful nor alternative, to grant or to withhold an abortion need be chosen.

While the long-term answer to rape is indeed a change in the attitudes of the generation of mankind now in its infancy, we can ill afford inaction in the short run. The penalty for rape should be increased, as well as that for murder and that for castration, which is the only thing worse than rape, that of murder, that can be done to a

man, and for other assaults, especially, for example, those that result in blindness.

At this point, up pops another question raised by the pro-abortion lobby. How can the same people (who generally appear to be on the right politically) advocate capital punishment and preparations for defense, wars overseas, and the like, while condemning abortion—out of a rather transitory reverence for life?

The answer to this is both simple and complex I was once a foetus: that is certain. But, I need never become a murderer: and in fact have only a slim chance of becoming one. My chance of being a victim is, I consider, much greater.

Also, a murderer is harder to identify and empathize with than a helpless little child: the smaller, the better.

But, a rational answer must be more complex than that. Disease, natural disasters and murder are all things that their victims cannot avoid: anyone can fall prey to them.

But, execution can easily be avoided by the simple expedient of not committing crimes that can result in execution.

Those who have done no wrong to me or those like me I am concerned about: but those who seek to do murder are not important to me, as it is the lives of their victims that command my attention the most.

To send a hundred guilty criminals to the gallows, and, thereby to save one innocent life is well worth it; but if even ten innocent lives were saved, yet one innocent man was executed, it would not be worth it.

If we held that the lives of murderers are as important as anyone else's, however morally just such a concept may seem, it would amount to suicide on the part of those who are not murderers: as, under such circumstances, we would agonize, and hesitate, to act quickly when quick action is needed, to save the lives of innocent people, like ourselves.

And, as for weapons of war, I say this: I am myself. I have no other body, there are no other eyes but mine through which I can see.

Thus, my life is the one that is most important to me. Perhaps one day it will take second place to that of a wife and children. But, always, the lives of total strangers will be less important. And, the lives of those who seek to slaughter or enslave myself and my loved ones will be at best inconsequential, and valueless.

He who is better armed has the better chance of survival. If we had no enemies, then we would have no need of weapons. But, as long as there is even one government on earth that oppresses, terrorizes and enslaves its people, and denies them their freedom, even if it seeks not, for the moment, to spread its blight elsewhere, yes, for this long shall we need weapons powerful and numerous enough to fight whole countries.

While Canada cannot afford to save all the world's starving from death, to save unborn children from being slaughtered unnecessarily, which requires nothing more than legislative fiat, is something we can indeed afford to do.

And, we must never cease striving to create the day when no human life will be lost to illness, accident, or the hatred of others: or even because of having seen too many yesterdays: when no one will suffer for crimes not his own, no one will be doomed to poverty by accident of birth, and all people shall be free to speak out and to have the real control of their own governments.

Then, we will finally be able to afford to value human life at its true worth, which is infinite; no longer shall anyone be denied what they need because there isn't enough for all.

But, at present, as there is not enough food, nor wealth to house and heal the world's people, we must temper our natural concern for other human lives.

Thus, I view with alarm proposals by both religious and political groups for 'a fairer and more equitable world economic order,' 'a policy of sharing our

resources with the less fortunate,' or 'an immigration policy that puts people ahead of their skills and their economic usefulness.'

For, to open our doors too widely to those whose lives would be better in Canada would force our own laborers to compete for jobs with people used to grinding poverty, thus forcing them to accept lower wages: and not to use immigrant labor for the jobs Canadians won't do, but to try to make the jobs acceptable to Canadians would result in higher prices, as well as, perhaps, a lowering in the standard of our social services. And, to call for 'real sacrifices' instead of 'handouts' on the part of Canadians would, by and large, only frighten Canadians away from any discussion of increasing foreign aid, when the sad fact is that we could increase it sevenfold with no real sacrifice on our part.

To sell our oil at below international prices to the Third World nations (whose plight with respect to oil is the fault of the Arabs, not of the industrialized nations) while halting oil exports to the United States in an effort to change their 'wasteful, energy-consumptive lifestyle,' (assuming we could get away with it) would result in resistance by the now poorer American people both to spending on improving the abysmal social services in that country and to spending on space exploration, pure science, and so on.

Oil sold to the Third World will only save human lives and assuage human suffering: only the oil we sell to the world's industrialized nations will help to fuel scientific and technological progress. As our oil reserves are finite, and thus certain to run out, we are now in a very real race to develop the new sources of energy needed to replace oil: and it is by no means certain whether discovery or depletion will win. Thus, in selling more oil to the Third World at lower prices, we are not generously sharing what we can afford to with those who need it: we are gambling with our own futures and, thereby, with the future of human civilization on this planet.

It is indeed true that North Americans consume fifty times as great a quantity of resources as do Third World citizens; but, however rich we may be in relative terms, our country is still filled with poverty, and medical care is often unavailable to those who need it for want of funds: so, in absolute terms, we are not very rich.

The quality of life does indeed depend on other factors besides the economic ones: but the economic factors are crucially important, else why would we be so insistently asked to share more of our wealth with the poorer nations of the world?

That one-quarter of the world's population, in the industrialized nations, consumes three quarters of the world's resources does not mean that they are greedy: it means that the world is overpopulated by a factor of three. Everywhere, the world's people must decide to conceive less children: the wealthy countries must bear their full share of this burden, so that everyone can have a reasonable standard of living, but without the poorer nations being forced to accept a decrease in their relative populations, compared to the wealthier ones.

Comfort, affluence, leisure, freedom, and security are needed by creative minds to produce most efficiently what the world needs from them; but their work, and their lives, would be in danger if they were a privileged elite in the countries in which they lived. This is why it has always been necessary to maintain at least a few countries at high levels of affluence, even though this somewhat worsens the poverty of those countries left poor.

Compassion and reverence for human life should indeed lead us to making what sacrifices we can for the poor, and to halting needless slaughter of innocent people: but not to hasty, reckless action which would, in reality, only succeed in ending all hope of really creating a just world order.

Also dangerous are the suggestions that we revert to an agrarian, rural mode of living, and discard our complex technological world. It is only continued scientific progress that will enable people to live longer, healthier lives than their ancestors: and only by using all our technological resources can we hope to ever provide an adequate standard of living for all the world's people.

Even more antithetical to the idea of a world where the immense value of the human individual is recognized is the outrageous position some people have taken that man should stop using science to exempt himself from evolutionary pressures and the laws of natural selection, and instead return to competing on a more equal basis with his fellow animals.

Thankfully, this kind of nonsense has little chance of being taken seriously, for the sake of everyone who is crippled, blind, or even diabetic.

The human population is indeed exploding, but there are more humane methods of solving this problem than abortion or removing health services and other aids to human survival: contraception is the most rational.

We are not justified in ignoring the unnecessary deaths of thousands of unborn children, whose lives can be saved with no more than a legislative fiat, just because we admit our incapacity to do as much as some people think we should to help others whose lives are threatened. Nor are we justified in pretending that murderous tyrants differ from our own leaders only in their 'politics.'

After this long digression, made necessary by the fact that all issues connected to the vital topic of human life are so inexorably bound together, I would like to return to the subject of abortion.

Some articles written by advocates of more liberalized abortion laws have used the argument that the quality of life is more important than the quantity of life, thus an unwanted child should never be brought into the world.

But, since the child already exists, birth merely constituting a change in his or her location and method of feeding, the unborn child has really already been in the world since conception.

Certainly, the quality of life is more important than the number of people living, and perhaps even more important than the number of years spent alive. But, as the unborn child is already alive, it is the quality of his or her life that is important; and, certainly even being 'unwanted' is preferable to being killed.

Allied with this is the even more ridiculous argument that no one really knows what the unborn child really wants: if he would really wish to live, knowing he was not wanted by his mother, or that he faced life with a disability or in foster homes.

Any animal will fight as hard as it can to survive: and the children who today live with disabilities, or in orphanages or unhappy homes accessible to our questioning: they would cling to life just as anyone else.

Last year, when Dr. Morgentaler was on campus in person, he used one argument that seems to be an old standby of the pro-abortion lobby, that the belief of some people that an unborn child has the same right to life as any other human being; the belief that an unborn child is a human being, is a value judgement; and people do not have the right to impose their value judgements on others.

In other words, if you believe that such-and-such a group are not human, you have the right to kill its members; those who say its members are human are merely making value judgements that they have no right to impose on others.

I really thought that you, of all people, would know better than that, Dr. Morgentaler. I really did. I really thought so.

John Savard
Grad Studies

rie top

event including a tour of the ball game, a banquet and dancing. (I don't know how the 16 kept up, but I hear they tied to the eye-lids will open for hours.) In order to succeed, the university must be between fifty- and sixty- to the Alumni Assoc. It pay Mr. Markle and his staff in the office and to cover the expenses across Canada and the

may feel that the money spent on a bunch of old people at this institution anyway is a waste. Those people should be at university does not generally have its funds, why should it be? Aside from the fact that it is up these relations for the alumni are a wise investment. Academic year of '73-'74 an investment set up. It has seen a sixty per cent in the value to make a total of almost \$1,000.00. This fund is used for projects such as academic and literary projects, and from this point of view, the investment is a lucrative aggregate, given them by the