Another paradox that I find incredible is that of doctors and hospitals putting to death unborn babies almost <u>six months</u> following their conception, and then turning around and employing heroic efforts and many thousands of dollars to keep alive babies who are prematurely born only <u>five months</u> following their conception!

On the surface, the central issue in the pro-choice/pro-life debate has been the question of when an embryo or fetus becomes a <u>person</u>. I think there is a much deeper issue -- the question of sexual freedom versus sexual responsibility. If sexual activity results in pregnancy, is there any <u>responsibility</u> for that pregnancy on the part of those who produced it? If sexual activity results in bringing a human life into existence, do the persons who engaged in the sexual activity (or any other persons) have the <u>right</u> to abort that life for personal or social reasons? Does personal preference, or interference with a career, or economic hardship give one the right to take away human life?

Since 1973 (the year <u>Roe v. Wade</u> was decided), a high percentage of women obtaining abortions have been unmarried. Does this not suggest that "reproductive freedom" for a number of women is a euphemism -- a pleasant term for the license to commit fornication whenever and with whomever they please, with abortion as an escape hatch in case of an unintended and unexpected pregnancy?