

TODAY'S "SHORT TOPIC"

FETAL RESEARCH:

We aren't even arguing about the same thing!



By Stephen L. Bakke  August 2, 2015

Here's what provoked me:

In the midst of the daily arguing about the Planned Parenthood "crush" scandal, came a sincere but totally "off base" explanation of how opposition to PP amounts to an ideologically based contradiction. In other words, blind acceptance of a pro-life ideology has trapped us in a contradiction. That deserved a quick response!

Here's my response:

Fetal Research: We aren't even arguing about the same thing!

Mary McLeod argues that "those who are exercised about donation of fetal remains for scientific purposes apparently put a higher value on fetal remains than on deceased victims of accidents or bodies willed to universities and other scientific institutions ("Fetal Research - Critics' ideologies leave them stuck in a contradiction" - July 31). McLeod asks: "What's the difference, exactly?"

Ms. McLeod is totally missing the important point, so I will answer her question. She makes it sound as if opponents of Planned Parenthood's "organ harvesting activities" are, quite simply, concerned about using aborted fetuses for research. For most of us, that isn't the concern at all! The main concern is about how that fetus became (what she refers to as) "remains."

McLeod draws an equivalency between fetal remains and deceased victims of accident or disease. That might come close to being a legitimate comparison if the abortion had occurred "spontaneously." What most of us are opposed to is taking a human life, whether pre or post birth, for research purposes.

We seem to be in agreement on the "post" part. But what has been decreed by McLeod and many others is that taking "pre" birth life through an elective abortion process is often not only OK, but to be praised and celebrated for altruistic reasons. We disagree! There's no contradiction! That's the difference - exactly!