

# Different words show other side of debate

## To the Editor:

Re: No way to win an argument, editorial, *ECHO*, June 4, 2002

I did not see the demonstration by a group of anti-abortionists [pro-lifers?] that is the subject of the editorial so I cannot comment on the appropriateness or otherwise of the graphics that were used, but I do have a number of questions.

1. Would the following opening sentence have been equally appropriate: "If you believe in a person's right to life from the moment of conception, then last week's demonstration was an effective way to graphically make your point"?

2. Rather than stating that "They angered more people than they converted," would it have been equally appropriate to say "Judging by the number of negative responses, it is clear that the protesters struck a nerve"?

3. Rather than asserting "The protest was wrong, period" would it have been equally appropriate to say, "This issue demands forceful presentation because of the sickening nature of abortion procedures and we ought to turn away from such procedures in horror"?

4. Rather than arguing that "the children passing by in cars . . . are too young to grasp all the intricacies of the abortion debate," would it have been equally

appropriate to argue, "The adults driving by in cars with their children ought to weep for all those aborted babies who will never enjoy the love of caring parents"?

5. Rather than suggesting that "Wednesday's protest was aimed at the vulnerable," would it have been equally appropriate to suggest, "Since so many teenagers are sexually active [see report on page five], and since the adult population has become callous to the fate of aborted babies, this issue needs to be presented as effectively as possible to the next generation of baby makers and societal leaders"?

6. Instead of saying, "it's wrong to think a fetus is not a real, living thing," would it have been equally appropriate to say, "it's wrong to think a fetus is not a real, living person"? Indeed the editorial goes on to make this very point. Why not be consistent?

7. Instead of asserting that "Anti abortionists" [pro lifers?] say they are simply valuing life," would it have been equally appropriate to assert, "Pro lifers say they are conscientiously valuing human life"?

8. In light of the fact that "there isn't some magic moment... when the baby changes from a "thing" to a new life," would it not have been appropriate to say, "Choosing to end a human life is an act charged with profound moral implica-

tions"?

9. Instead of saying that the "only legacy [of the protest] was anger and disgust — not very good ways to win an argument," would it have been equally appropriate to declare, "The protest effectively aroused the anger and disgust of some of our citizens; let's hope that such anger and disgust translates into a wave of pro-life sentiment in this country so that our legislators protect the lives of our children in the womb"?

Please understand that I am not a member of any pro-life organization, I admit that I have never had to struggle with the issue of actively ending a pregnancy and I have no quarrel with the editor expressing personal views. Indeed I thank *The Echo* for providing an appropriate forum for debate.

What saddens me most is to note the report on page 3 of *The Echo* of a teenage student supporting abortion because in some cases an unabortored baby "becomes a burden on society." I hope that this reflects only the perspective of an impetuous young person open to instruction because the implications of that philosophy are truly horrendous.

Don Wood  
R.R. 1 Haliburton