I'm afraid he missed the point (again). The is-sue is that of viability. There is a basic inconsistency. If we say that the unborn child is not a child, but rather something else (perhaps not human) until it be-comes viable apart from its mo-ther, then what do we say of the man or woman who is not "viable" apart from a dialysis machine? Clearly something is missing from the viability argu-ment.

Mr. Harmse seems to miss another point, not in Mrs. Ellio-tt-Green's analogy but in his own. The "victim," as he puts it, who is coerced to serve as a human dialysis machine corresponds to the mother who (except in rare cases) is not coerced to be "con-nected" to the unborn child. Rather, though a previous deci-sion with the father, they took upon themselves the risk and re-so-nableness of pregnancy and paren-thood.

"Disconnected" seems to be a rather interesting word for Mr. Harmse to choose. It connotes a very simple process which is not at all descriptive of the process of abortion. Perhaps a better ana-lysis would be allowing his human dialysis machine to choose whether or not he will be "con-nected" to the ill violinist (or what you will, then giving him a sword with the explanation that if he wishes to "disconnect" himself he may do so by killing his de-pendant according to a well de-fined procedure.

While we might agree that an individual has the "right to walk away rather than to be con-nected" to the ill violinist in Mr. Harmse's analogy, I think this better corre-sponds to sexual obscenity or some method of birth control prior to conception. A blatant at-tempt at birth "control" via abortion produces a casualty, namely the unborn child. Even calling it a "right" does not change its death.

While many might sympathize with Mr. Harmse's reaction to the legalizing of drugs, I think a more appropriate analogy of li-galizing abortion to make it safe is to legalize murder to make it safe. The result would be precise-ly the result of legalized abor-tion. Before Roe vs. Wade there were approximately 100,000 abortions annually (illegal). That number has risen to over 200,000. Are we to believe that these are all due to "hard cases?"

Concerning medical difficulties, I must admit that I am as con-fused as Mr. Harmse. The cate-gory "medical difficulties" is too vague and nebulous to deal with in any substantial manner. It is no wonder that Mrs. Elliot-Green did not say more. However, Mr. Harmse seems to miss an-one specific case which was raised (by himself and others) for the one of an ectopic pregnancy. In this case the unborn child has be-en to a degree developed within the fallopian tubes. If carried to term, both the mother and the child will die. In this case we are dealing with two deaths versus one life. Questions about other medical difficulties will have to be raised specifically and not in vague generalities.

What of "hard case" of rape? Mr. Harmse presupposes that the child would (which is not the pro-life position) and then points out that this will re-sult in "vast numbers of false ac-cusation" which "will make rape effective". I fail to see how, since when, in the name of jus-tice, do we punish one for the crime of another? If a child is conceived due to rape, do we sen-tence the rapist to prison and the child to death?

Roland Roberts '84

To the Editor:

I was extremely disappointed because his com-ments from the night before were so inap-propriate, especially when we were talking about the mor-tality of the late violinist and our concern for the woman's safety. We were discussing the fact that the woman's husband had refused to consent to an abortion in order to save the violinist's life, but when it came time to ap-proach the issue of sexual autonomy, Mr. Harmse seemed to lose his way. He repeated his comments from the night before, which I found disturbing and offensive.

Despite the fact that Mr. Harmse made a number of valid points about the legal and ethical implications of abortion, his use of analogies and his failure to address the issue of women's autonomy was disappointing. His reiteration of his comments from the night before was especially striking, as it seemed to suggest that he was unwilling to engage in a meaningful dialogue about this issue.

I am concerned about the future of abortion rights, especially in the context of Mr. Harmse's comments. It is important that we continue to have open and honest discussions about this issue, and that we work to ensure that women's rights are protected and respected.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]