

**Susan said:**

*“No SeanG, unlike you, we are not forcing morality on anybody. We are for allowing a choice. **NOWHERE** in the pro-choice agenda is there anything about making abortion mandatory.”* (Emphasis in the original)

**Answer:** For women, *Roe* means more than having control over their bodies; it allows them to plan her life. If there’s a contraceptive failure, the law protects her, permits her to decide whether-or-not to become a parent.

Once contraception has failed (about 97% [or-so] abortions are merely for convenience), the women have **ALL** the rights. She can get an abortion. If she decides to have the child, she can make the father pay for support, **whether** he wanted it or not. According to *Roe*, the man’s obligation begins and ends with his wallet. This is true, but money facilitates existence (*one of the reasons an abortion is allowed... monetary standard of living*). The quality of life is measured in dollars and cents – regarding the mother.

.001%	The pregnancy resulted from an incestuous relationship
.065%	The woman's life was endangered by the pregnancy
.085%	The woman was raped
.288%	The woman's physical health was threatened by the pregnancy
.294%	The woman's psychological health was threatened by the pregnancy
.666%	There was a serious fetal abnormality
6.268%	The woman aborted for social or economic reasons
92.330%	No reason (elective)

Inarguably, the man is required to pay support for eighteen years and will have his standard of living diminished (*severely so, if his circumstances are modest*). Certain *career, education, and family options* will be foreclosed – for the man at least.

*(Sound familiar? These are excuses for the women to get “off the hook” – e.g., abort a life – but men don’t have that choice.)*

**If maximizing personal freedom** is the primary goal of our legal system, why should men be held to their traditional obligations (supporting the children they’ve fathered) while women are **liberated** from theirs?

**Question:**

➤ *“Do you believe the government should be able to **force** someone to become a parent?”*

Well? This is precisely what **is** being done by the government → as I speak! You would argue that the government should stay out of your affairs when choosing whether to become a parent (i.e., to abort or not), however, you wish the government to be involved in telling the father that he **has** to become a parent and supply all the necessary needs for that child. Thus, **you are** forcing your morality on me **Susan** (as a defined group) **and** using the power of the Federal Government to boot!!! You cannot

say any differently with what I just have shown above. This belief is self-refuting and shows **you to-be-the hypocrite**, and not me. You see... *I am for **equal** rights under the Constitution.* You are for **special** rights inferred upon groups of people.

---

**An aside:** in the Laws of Logic, the Law of Non-Contradiction is the most important and can thus be stated like this – “A” cannot both be “A” and “non-A” at the same time. This law is valid in science, law, politics, philosophy, etc. Any theory which *purports* something, *cannot also deny that “purport’ion.”* As in this case, the pro-choice movement is purported to be about liberating – “civil” rights – etc., however, in doing this they deny to some what they want for others... it is self-refuting, a non-logical theory that is really about *special rights* rather than *equal protection under the law*.

An updated post of this can be found on my website as:

- [\*\*FORCING MORALITY \(UPDATED\)\*\*](#)