



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 23, 2012

Sex-selective Abortions and the Anti-choice People Who Oppose Them

While such abortions have long been illegal in the U.K., an [undercover investigation](#) by the *Daily Telegraph* found abortionists willing to perform them at three of nine abortion mills investigated. Writes the paper, “Doctors at British clinics have been secretly filmed agreeing to terminate fetuses purely because they are either male or female. Clinicians admitted they were prepared to falsify paperwork to arrange the abortions even though it is illegal to conduct such ‘sex-selection’ procedures.”



The paper cites two examples — more information will be released tomorrow — one involving a woman who didn’t want her girl for “social reasons” and another who wanted to kill her unborn boy because she “already had a son.”

In response to these revelations, Health Secretary Andrew Lansley said, “I’m extremely concerned to hear about these allegations. Sex selection is illegal and is morally wrong.” My, what moral clarity.

What judgmentalism.

What inflexibility.

What?

Let me get this straight. Lansley and others have no problem with murdering unborn children; when you murder them for the wrong reason, however, *that’s* when their moral compass kicks in.

Besides, as “personally” objectionable as it may be, shouldn’t we legalize abortions based on sex? I mean, women are going to have them anyway, right? We wouldn’t want back-alley, sex-selective abortions, and we know it’s either the clothes hanger or the government-sanctioned hangman. And we could even extend this beyond the womb: Since we can’t eliminate every single case of child abuse, why criminalize it at all?

Now, for the record, I agree that there’s something particularly cold about aborting a child simply because he doesn’t fit your world view. It reflects a ghoulish mentality. If you can say “It’s a boy” or “It’s a girl,” it’s clear the rationalization that he may not “yet” be human isn’t even being entertained. Yet this isn’t what bothers the abortion-loving Left. They will allow a woman to kill her baby simply because she’s concerned about over-population, doesn’t want another child, because he would interfere with her career, or for some other frivolous reason. Just don’t be politically incorrect about it, now.

This is the same pathology that gives us hate-crime laws, only it’s far worse. It’s like allowing murder (of those actually walking around), theft, and rape and simply prohibiting the choosing of victims based



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 23, 2012

on privileged-group status. Hey, you can single out a rich guy, a Republican, a libertarian, or a baker — or even a black fellow. Just don't do it *because* he's black. We find that completely reprehensible, you reprobate you. In the case of abortion, you can whack a second boy child because he's second, but not because he's a boy.

This is whacked, but it reflects the socialist mindset perfectly. They care about equality, and misery is fine.

As long as it's shared equally.

It much reminds me of [the case](#) in which Sweden's healthcare czars denied a multiple sclerosis sufferer a new, more effective drug because it was 33 percent more expensive. Not only wouldn't they foot the bill, they wouldn't even let the hapless patient pay for it himself, saying that it would violate the principle of equal access to medicine. I wonder, if there were a flood and a leftist could only save one of his children, would he rather not save any?

The kicker here is that liberals aren't even consistent about equality. You see, their model involves equality only among groups they deem more equal than others. Their hate-crime and hate-speech laws don't cover everyone, only privileged — or, as some say, "protected" — groups. Affirmative action isn't designed to just aid poor people, which itself would be an act of discrimination, but members of groups the Left has deemed historically "disadvantaged" (somehow, my ancestors' persecution by the Romans doesn't pass muster). And they have no problem with singling out handicapped unborn children for murder; I guess they're an example of "life not worthy of life." Speaking of which, didn't another set of ideologues embrace that principle, too, and didn't they also start their killing with "defectives"?

One of the abortion "doctors" exposed in the *Telegraph's* sting operation, Prabha Sivaraman, said about women's reasons for wanting abortions, "I don't ask questions." She sounds like a hit man, but she's not alone. If leftists would ask some questions — honestly and of themselves — they might realize that what's truly defective is a mentality that deems some people sub-human and thus fair game for murder.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.