

PRO-LIFE, BUT NOT ALL LIFE

***Earl A. Sealy**

Formerly of Lynn University

3601N Military Trail

Boca Raton, Florida 33431, U.S.A

**Author for Correspondence: dr.earlsealy@gmail.com*

The institutions that promote or reject abortions are now a global concern. Therefore where laws (lawyers) control when, where and how abortions takes place they become an issue for medicine and other branches of science. Abortion is now a global phenomenon. Even where plant medicine is the only form of primary care there is abortion.

All life is sacred. But not all aspects of the pregnancy is safe for some mothers. Medicine and known science should play a role in whether a fetus should be aborted or not. If the mother's health or life is endangered by the pregnancy then it is between the woman and her doctor to determine what options should be taken after consultation. Lawyers cannot/should not make decisions that are medical in nature.

It is widely proposed by many law makers that aborting a fetus is murder. However, those who determines the stage at which the development of the fetus constitutes murder is deemed appropriate science. No one can seriously predict whether or not a fetus will survive until late in the pregnancy. There is continuous monitoring of women in their pregnancies by their doctors until child birth. If during the monitoring the doctor recognizes diseases that would result in deformity of the infant at birth or possess a great risk to the life of the mother, I would say that the fetus should be aborted regardless of the developmental stage. It should be noted that the mother could try again to get children or be advised not to get pregnant because of the risks involved.

The healthy fetus should not be aborted mainly because of proposed financial hardships. There are institutions in many countries that would help a struggling single mother or couple overcome most of the hardships in rearing the child. Incest has strong scientific and medical reasons for abortion and so in such situations abortion is a must.

Rape, though controversial should not be an automatic abortion. There should be careful monitoring of the developing fetus and if there is no danger to the rape individual's life or the fetus being deformed or perceived to very ill and have a low chance of survival then there should be no abortion. There is foster care and other forms of help that can be given to the raped individual in rearing the child. Adoption is a popular method for unwanted children. Young women who get pregnant during their school years could give up the infant for adoption and move on with their life. However, I believe that they should be a clause in the adoption process for the Biological parent to have access to the child later in life. At a stage in life when the child could appreciate and understand he/she should be told why he/she was not reared by the Biological parent.

Abortion is "abortion" whether it is late term or early term. If it is legal to destroy a cluster of developing cells in the uterus why shouldn't it be legal to destroy the fetus which is merely a more advance stage of embryological development. It is true that no one knows what would happen to the cluster of cells in the uterus, they might be spontaneously aborted for some biological reason(s) or they might develop into a healthy infant. In some rare cases these clusters can become cancerous and have to be removed medically. Certain food borne diseases cause still birth in women which is considered a spontaneous abortion. If such a natural phenomenon is possible why should we not pay careful attention to how we determine when, where and how abortions should take place?

The proponents of abortion have as their premise, "a woman's right to choose", but I would add that the decision to have any type of abortion should be the result of close consultation between a woman and her doctor. Economic conditions, Religious beliefs and rape are not automatic reasons for abortions.

The anti-abortionists believe that all life is sacred and should be protected. They have God as their sole premise, but we are now living in times of advance medicine and unwanted deaths during pregnancy can be prevented by abortions. In the case where the life of the mother is at risk, which should be the choice? Mother or Fetus? The anti-abortionists do not choose. They say leave it to God, yet when such individuals are ill they seek the best medical care. Why not just leave their medical issues to God and not seek medical care. In some cases it is pure hypocrisy. All life is sacred, but not all conditions allow us to achieve that premise. There should be exceptions to life (abortions) and not a straight situation of “NO ABORTIONS”. Lawyers should not be involved in medical and scientific decisions. The legal profession has used abortion to redefine murder. It is now considered a “kill” regardless of whether it is a mass of cells or an underdeveloped detrimental embryo.

Fanaticism has taken over the abortion issue and there is “for” or “against” without rational thought. We should be extremely cautious because issues relating to abortion are more widely spread in this communication era. Where laws control the abortion issue individuals will travel to areas/regions/countries where abortion can be performed without being incarcerated? This certainly is the case for the well to do. But back street abortions and self-induced abortions without proper medical care will be the choice of the less fortunate. This could lead to deaths for many of the under privileged. Are we also going to consider the use of contraceptives murder? I hope not because contraceptives can protect against sexually transmitted diseases as well as unwanted pregnancies. Are we going to say that preventing the sperm from getting in contact with the egg murder? It is evident that everyone should try to protect life, even of the unborn, but it is not always possible.