

PRO-LIFE VS PRO-CHOICE  
RIGHT VS ULTIMATE-RIGHT

At some point in the current evolution of the psyche of mankind, the realization that human do not live in a "perfect" world must be accepted. I personally would be appalled and under no forceable circumstances agree to my spouse or lover having an abortion, except for medical or life-threatening reasons; further I would be aggrieved if I personally knew of someone who was having an abortion. That being said it rapes the intelligents that others in religious and political concert would have the unmitigated gall, audacity and arrogance (ignorance to attempt to impose by force, threats, bullying tactics to coerce and impose their so-called moral convictions and "guilt" upon another. If a conflict arises between ~~between~~ the legitimate peace and dignity of the mother vs the unborn life of the fetus and there is no acceptable rationale-alternative. Universal and ultimate right must be defined and in that particular instance the ultimate right must be deferred to the actual (fully developed and societal participating life) the mother as opposed to the unrealized, unborn fetus).

We can no longer like children hide our heads under the cover from the boogymen or like the ostrich with our heads stuck in the sand, demanding that the world remain our sterile, projected idealism and adhere to our comfortable be(LIE)fs as to what we would like our world to be as . In our ever changing world of near capacity and near depletion, limited resources, the days of relatively simplified living between RIGHT VS ULTIMATE RIGHT and there lies no way back into the much simple days of yesteryear; no way back for those who lack the "courage" and the decisive-commitment to life in our ever changing world. The choice of who lives and who dies isn't new and this choice shall be made as it has been since the beginning from day one, similar as it occurs in nature. Our greatest illusion is to think that death isn't as natural occurrence as is the birth of life...life comes to us without our permission and so shall death.

The reality of abortions as grossly repugnant as it is-is four-squarely upon us and an undeniable truism of our humanity. This issue must be dealt with maturely, decisively and straightforwardly.

It is a fascist throwback to supremacy to presume our moral-convictions are superior to another in our "amoral" world. Especially, since we have not even been able to make any inroads into our collective social-ills(poverty, racism corruption; environment, air, water and land pollution; homelessness and the list goes on). It has always been the trick of the mind to find fault in others while ignoring the defect in self.; in part because the eyes sees outwardly and not inwardly. We seemingly only notice those who are having an abortion and fail to see those who participate in a world where abortions are being committed. Arguendo, even if the pro-lifers were correct, it still would not negate or supercede the moral convictions of another(e.g., a women having an abortion); regarding the sovereignty of self. As history so painfully and glaringly reveals it is mostly the taking of an individual's rights that in part has caused the collapse of past civilizations, and not the giving of individual rights. Abortions is not a national or world crisis in our near over populated world.. I say to the pro-lifers, is is ameri-K, land of the individual freedoms(BILL OF RIGHTS) and that you are the culprit in part to the current destructive national conflict attempting to encroach upon the freedoms of those who would exercise their freedoms of having an abortion. Quite frankly, the anti-abortion argument from my experience is unimpressive, no different than most emotional, fanatic, dogmatic or religious arguments, inarticulate,(A human being innate, inalienable right is the freedom of ones own body.) sorely lacking in logic or reason; one would have to be a mindless be(LIE)ver to be(LIE)ve in it. As we've learned from the civil rights era; you cannot legislate morality, similarly pro-lifers have not significantly been able to impose their morality upon pro-choicer individuals. The addage rings ever so true: If you cannot tell and show me what to do then you have no right to tell me what not to do.. If the pro-lifers were truly committed to saving lives; their campaign to save unborn lives/children; they would begin with those children already born and in many instances in desparate need of saving; caring for from abuse, sickness and homelessness; the ones in need of adoption in foster care homes.

Of course this entails long-termed sacrifice of every kind; a dropping of the hypocrisy of do as I tell you to do; and not just lip serve; the classical ameri-K lazy supremacy-arrogants of "do what I say do, because I am smarter, more godly, more humane and I know what's 2)

~~Best~~

best for you and everyone else!" The true teacher of morality is one who teaches by example, rather than by dictum. This is the ameri-Kan way to give advise rather than to live by their own advise. Quite accurately assessed, the natives of this country very knowingly named the european invaders as: one who speaks with "forked-tongue." This is european invaders of old revisited. Indisputably, true family planning is education and not family planned abortion.

Historically, it is the ameri-kan way to preach morality, while committing wars, every act of atrocities and immorality against others as is evident of our exploitative dealing with nearly every country on the world. Note the hypocrisy of pro-lifers who would fight for the life of an unborn black male fetus to be born in corrupt/racist amer-ameri-K; who will subsequently be declared by this government as an "endangered species; prime candidate for imprisonment, homicide; being gunned down in the middle of the street running away by a white police offoicer; discriminated against in housing and employment in hiring without affirmative action, still the law of the land. Yet, with their zealousness, pro-lifers have not saw fit in their zealousness with the same moral-outrage and vigor to oppose racism, unjust mass incarceration and the killing of blackmen in ameri-kkk in the street by white cops and other social-ills. Surely, if racism, sexism, neo-slavery and discrimination in ameri-Ka were brought down to a manageable level, at least abortions among those groups of some oppressed/suppressed, economically disadvantage people would drop significantly. There being a direct connection/correlation between abortion and social-ills( e.g., racism, discrimination, injustice).

10. isn'T RACISM IN AMERI-KKK PROVEN ALL DOWN THE AGES TO BE THE MOST APPALLING, EGREGIOUS ATROCIOUS FORM OF ABORTION IN ALL OF HUMAN HISTORY.

COMMENTARY(1): "Nimarodas, you infer that abortions are acceptable if there aren't any acceptable, rational-alternatives to abortions?"

This ~~filthy~~ filthy rich, corrupt and incompetent government(O.K., that may be an oxyomoron, since you can't be filthy rich and incompetent at the same time.), but let us move on; this government isn't able to balance the budget or to curb inflation and government corruption and you'd suggest that this very same government assume financial responsibility for every unwanted child in ameri-ka. Most assuredly this isn't a taxpayers consensus, ameri-kans are more charitible in theory than in application/practice

Intimidation or coercion, control a women's decision to have an abortion; ; failing the former criminal acts of pro-lifers, they must learn to control their emotions in respect to controlling their actions. More notably, the government is unable to take care of the children that it is now legally responsible for and you want to increase that burden to an unlimited proportion and then you ask: Allowing the government to financially support, etc., ~~unwanted children~~ as oppose ~~to~~ ABORTION is this not a rationale alternative To ABORTION? What is your fear of abortion, is it your own aborted-morality? Why do you fear the reality of the naked truth? What do you think war is? If not ABORTION OF HUMAN LIFE?

One of our greatest illusions that we suffer is that we think that we'll never die, when in reality all around us is death; in fact all we eat are dead things. We live in a finite world and you want to proactice an ethic of infinity and morality. Can't you mathematically see the inherent irrationale in such a pseudo-morality and illogical-thinking? Life is it's quality, not its quantity. The quality of life in ameri-K is rapidly deteriorating at an epidemic proportion and pro-lifers' response is some illogical pseudo-ethics. Pro-lifers' argument is for the irresponsible dead and not the responsible living, who must deal with the reality of life and living. Moving pass those women who would want an abortion in response to: Rape, Incest, Severely Defective or Diseased child or simply a defective women. Child-abortion is a fact and unstoppable, and age-old reality. It is asinine and idiotic to conceive otherwise. Many cannot and will not bear the economical-burden of this ill-thoughtout altruistic philosophy as asinine and idiotic; in the last threethousand years there have been over five-thousand wars. As history reveals, abortions have always occurred and more likely than not always ~~will~~ will; albeit if goverbment fascist once again criminalize abortions, prosecute and imprison those who would most certainly engaged in this rational control of their lives, the enforcement cost would not only be astronomical, but simply unenforceable. Has ameri-K not learned its lesson from attempting to prohibit certain human behavior? The criminalization of alcohol, prostitution, gambling, drugs, homosexual, etc, has proven grossly ineffective and disastrous. What ameri-Kans need is some sort of sign of the pro-lifer's works, accomplishments, by making better the lives of millions of unwanted, neglected, abused children to an acceptable level as a sign of "good faith". A sign of competents, commitments to all human life by the pro-lifers. More pointedly, that pro-lifers by example need put their time and resources where their moral-propaganda lies. In my considered opinion, political activist, pro-lifers who picket and onstruc the entrance of an abortion clinic to prevent a women from having an abortion are emotionally out of control. Since it now must be painfully and patently obvious that pro-lifers cannot be inti- 4)

## ABORTION BATTLE

The abortion battle evolved into one of the most painful and <sup>divisive</sup> dicisive issues in ameri-~~ca~~ka. This is so because both pro-lifers and pro-choice's positions are equally sustainable and this type of seemingly insurmountable divisiveness occurs when two rights meet, ~~and~~ collide and neither party are decidedly wrong. Nevertheless, both pro-lifers and pro-choice are indeed a choice and between the two there isn't an ultimate right. It is indisputable that a female pro-choice has the right of control over her body and her male counterpart who freely and unconditionally ejaculates his semen in her body's orifices has no right thereafter to its disposal, destination, creation or subsequent use or misuse (if that is possible). As to the moral or religious objections to a pro-choice decision to have an abortion; first and foremost their objections is a non-issue; secondly, the First Amendment under the Constitution lucidly prohibits "RELIGIOUS SUPREMACY", the imposition of another fascist religious be(LIE)fs or philosophical pseudo-morals upon another. And thus, the pro-choice female has a Univesal Right to her body's waste and to her body's by-product, to wit: an unborn fetus. Maybe sad but true.

Conversely, a pro-lifer who unconditionally allows/request the ejaculation of semen into her body orifices by her male counterpart, which results in her impregnation and she elects to have that child of this union; she does not have an absolute right to do so. First and foremost, the laws of this land requires both participants (male and female) who created this child to to be legally responsible for that child's care,, support and nurturing; this is a mutual legal responsibility.. Moreover, the father of the child has a Constitutionally Vested Interest in his offsprings (Where the Constitution makes no such provisional protection for his sperm Legally in most instances one parent cannot cede his or her economical ;ega; responsibility to the other, even if mutually agreed upon..

Primarily due to unforeseeable eventualities. Also, the government has a voice if governmental support becomes necessary; and of an unbridle population explosion and whether the child is defective or suffering from some incurable disease and government funds will be needed.

Therefore, it must be concluded that a pro-lifer's choice to have a child is limited and conditional (i.e., voluntariness of the male sperm donor). Whereas, a pro-choice female of age decision (unconditional impregnation) to abort isn't, it is her right to abort at will. Albeit, to many a most unsettling decision, C'est la vie

If the pro-lifers were genuinely and sincerely concerned about the abortion of the fetus, they would devote their economical resources and energies to assisting those who request child assistance; and ensure that they themselves as a group never fall victim to the very choice that they have so adamantly and vehemently denounced.

To eradicate the so-called negative, one must reinforce the positive, its opposite. Improving the lives of all childrens, by personal intervention and lobbying for legislative benefits for pregnant women.

#### **THIS ISN'T ROCKET SCIENCE!**

If the pseudo-hypocritical moral majority do not want women to have an abortion, than incentivise; as oppose to threats, harrassment and preaching their religion.

We are all fundamentally the same, given the same opportunities, resources and support, we will more likely than not arrive at a similar conclusion; probably no different than those of the pro-lifers.

Pro-choice is just that a choice and not a philosophy, some sinister intent of irretrievable goal.

The goal for life is one must have one, would be to improve the conditions for all of mankind, to aid and assist each other in making a better world for all of us to live in, rather than to condemn the choices that other have made.

Mostly, it is the environment in which we live in that shapes and causes the particular decision that we make and; thus if we really wanted to make more positive and progress the choices and decisions of others that effect all of us than we need work extremely hard in improving the access and opportunitiesto all that we enrich and empower us all to react to all of our societal challenges.