

# Unwanted Children Don't Protest, Petition Or Vote

She was 15 years old and pregnant — a not unusual condition in a state where one in 12 girls under age 19 has a baby.

She came to Atlanta to have an abortion. The reason doesn't matter — one-third of all abortions in Georgia are performed on teen-agers, and the decision to follow suit put her in a rather large league.

But something went wrong. And now she lies near death in the city hospital.

So why was the kid allowed to seek an abortion in the first place?

Abortions are emotional traumas, minor medical procedures and Pavlovian triggers for those who feel compelled to do what the Lord would do if only He were an intervenor in the case.

What abortions are not is dangerous.

Before one can rationally discuss the abortion issue, one must first look at it in terms of what abortions are — medi-

cal procedures which, in their simplest form, are the equivalent of vacuuming a home. A home for incomplete persons.

Statistics supplied by the U.S. Center for Disease Control show the death rate per 100,000 to be: 100 for tonsillectomies, 315 for appendectomies, 14 for full-term pregnancies and 1.5 for "legally induced" abortions.

"The technology of baby-killing is enormous and continues to grow," says Anne O'Donnell, vice president of the National Right to Life organization.

Nature tends to end 10 percent of all pregnancies without explanation. Man does it in one of three ways:

- Suction and curettage, which essentially means vacuuming the embryo out of the womb.
- Injecting a 20 percent salt solution, which essentially makes the fetus pucker up and die.
- Injecting a hormone — prostaglan-

## roger witherspoon

Health and Science Writer



din — which induces premature labor. The fetus is born naturally but is too young to survive. A variation on this requires the insertion of a dried seaweed stick into the cervix. It gets wet, swells and opens the cervix to let the fetus fall out.

New York State was the first to let abortion clinics flourish without interference, and the Right to Life movement was incensed. They sent 20,000 red roses to the office of Sen. Jacob Javits to protest the "death" of 20,000 fetuses. Javits

had the flowers sent to Washington's Childrens Hospital.

The organizers of the protest, when they learned of the destination of the flowers, went to Javits and demanded that he retrieve them. He declined. They went to the hospital and told the hospital director to retrieve them. He declined but gave them permission to take them back from the kids if they wanted to.

By now, there were reporters present, and the protesters demurred from snatching flowers from the hands of sick children. They bitterly criticized Javits, however, and said the issue was the dead children, not the living. Someone had to protect the unborn. The "Pro Life" movement has always been like that. Protect the unborn. Stop the "killing." They lobby for that. Incessantly.

They have invaded abortion centers in the midst of operations (forget the germs involved in that maneuver) to

protect the unborn even if the protest kills the mother. They are dedicated women who fight a lot of things.

What they haven't lobbied for is money for day-care centers, money for food stamps, money for job programs for unwed teen-agers; money for counseling for 12-year-old mothers, money for child support and foster-care programs, adoption services, educational programs and living in general. Money to take care of kids whom nobody wants.

There are several states wrestling with proposals to "regulate" abortion clinics and abortion centers, mainly because medical issues may only be handled by medical regulators when the medical problem does not involve a social or political issue. Like vacuuming wombs.

A number of states are considering the Akron model — which basically

prohibits non-adults from receiving abortions without parental permission, requires adults — married or not — to wait two days before obtaining an abortion, requires the father's consent to an abortion (wherever he is, even if he's dead, in some cases) and requires the physician to try his or her best to talk the woman out of having an abortion. The last provision includes requirements to show the woman films of fetuses, in hopes that the shock treatment will do what pro-life arguments won't.

Similar laws have been enacted in six states and are being considered in several others. The Supreme Court may or may not uphold them.

But, unfortunately, the Supreme Court has never been asked to consider responsibility or the quality of life. Unwanted children do not protest, petition or vote. They merely exist — reveling in the right to have nothing.