

*Lorella Rouster*

December 6, 2003

Dear Editor,

As a woman concerned with the rights of women (and others), I strongly disagree with the recently published letter calling a law against partial-birth abortion “anti-choice legislation.” Nancy says this “procedure” is usually done to save a woman or for severe abnormalities in the fetus. That’s ridiculous. If the woman’s life is in danger, why stop the birth with the head still in the birth canal and the rest of the body outside? Why pause to jab scissors into the base of the child’s skull, insert a tube, and suck out the child’s brains? That procedure takes time. If the woman’s life is in danger, why pause for such a time-consuming procedure, putting her at further risk? Why not let the head come out quickly so that the woman will be more quickly rid of that life-threatening pregnancy? We should remember that not every choice is permissible and not every choice should be lawful. The law prohibiting partial-birth abortion is not by any means a restriction on a woman’s health. I am concerned about women’s health, and I rejoice that partial-birth abortion is gone. Let’s hope our nation makes better “choices” for women in the future.

Lorella Rouster