Pro-Choice Group Only Advocates Rights

The Tech received a copy of this letter addressed to John Rodkin.

Our name: "MIT Students for Choice and Reproductive Freedom." We believe that a woman should have a choice in aspects of reproductive freedom, including abortion. We do not "condone" abortion; calling an "un-
schooled for abortion" makes it sound as though we want every woman to get pregnant just so she can have an abortion. On the contrary, we hold only that a woman must have a legal right to have a safe, accessible abortion as one of her many options if she becomes pregnant. Please consider a few facts concerning public support for abortion in the United States. Most Americans say that a woman should have the right to choose an abortion — in the first trimester of her pregnancy — if she cannot support another child, if her life is in danger, if her pregnancy threatens her life, if she is under duress, or if the fetus is not viable.

Bush and Reagan are anti, indeed, strongly anti-choice. This is in fact explained by our position: "Choice Group's Name in Midland," March 20] that the present extremely conservative Supreme Court is not adequate for anti-choice justices. The two statements are critical to the issue, when Justice Rehnquist, a president is influential in determining who those future justices will be. Far from avoiding that choice in a minority opinion, the new Supreme Court merely confers the efforts of the Reagan/Bush anti-abortion "limbo" test for judicial appointments.

Consider also that five of the original democratic candidates were pro-choice; President Bush is not a one-man minority. Does the fact that we have not had a pro-
choice president mean that the country does not support reproductive freedom? We know we never had a president pro-choice, and only, 5% of the Senate is women; of the 95% of them we believe, must seem to see some of the same
defensive as something that can be toppled lightly by the same kind of pressure as we faced in the Anita Hill hearings. Are they representa-
tives of the people of this country in this respect?

Your observation that this country is short on political actors is the result of analysis of the conflict between abortion and reproductive rights is not. It is precisely because of the huge prob-
eness of welfare and poor women not being able to support another child, it is often in their best interests, that we need to allow the right to abort to as many women as they want. We do not have the right to choose who can abort. They do not have the right to choose if they want, because we do not have the right to choose.

Currently, the "gap" prohibitions facilitate

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Abortion Opponents Forget Women's Rights

I would like to thank John Rodkin for his letter in the April 2, 1992, "Choice Group's Name is Malendung, Wrong," March 20]. We suspect that Rodkin has confused the pro-choice and anti-choice standpoints. The pro-choice movement was started as an offshoot of the Women's Pro-Choice Club. After several repealed attempt attempts, the remaining Pro-
Choice initiatives were pestering to the promulgation of all lifes. In fact, pro-choice and anti-choice advo-
cates support the right of women to choose to have abortions at all stages of their pregnancy, including the extension of the human race. Further, the name "pro-choice" is not meant to conceal drug abuse or prohibition, despite Rodkin's suppositions. Nevertheless, we sympathize with his confusion.
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