

We have a sacred duty to protect human life at all stages of development...or do we?

It is easy to submerge oneself in one's profession, but when that profession deals with the expressions of the greater society, those signs directly or indirectly have a bearing on that which an educator must ultimately face.

Once upon a time there was a news anchor and a candidate...

News Anchor: Senator, you've stated your view on abortion on many occasions; would you mind restating it for our viewers?

<u>Candidate</u>: I'd be honored to do so. As I've indicated, time and again, I support the right to life and oppose abortion because I believe that human life is sacrosanct, that we have a sacred duty to protect all human life, regardless of the stage of human development.

News Anchor: When you say "stage of human development," Senator, you are including fetuses?

Candidate: Of course. I believe life begins at conception.

News Anchor: And your strong belief in the sanctity of life is founded in your Christian faith?

Candidate: Absolutely.

<u>News Anchor</u>: Is it fair to say, given your belief that life begins with conception, there are many stages of development in the life of a human?

<u>Candidate</u>: Certainly.

News Anchor: You would agree, for example, that a six-year-old human is a child in the ladder of human development?

<u>Candidate</u>: I'm not sure where this is going, but yes, childhood is a stage in the development of a human's life. Adolescence, young adulthood, the elderly are all stages in the development of human life.

<u>News Anchor</u>: Thank you for clarifying that. I'd like you to clarify something else. It is a matter of public record that you have voted on numerous occasions to support military action in Iraq and Afghanistan.

<u>Candidate</u>: I'm one of this country's strongest advocates for using our power to stand up for democracy and freedom around the world.

News Anchor: I think our viewers would concur with that assertion.

Candidate: Thank you.

News Anchor: Given your strong understanding of the military, I'm sure you know that in every war or other military action, including the ones you have publicly supported with your words and votes, hundreds, even thousands, of innocent noncombatants—who, I might note, represent all developmental stages in human life—die as the direct or indirect result of the actions you have supported.

<u>Candidate</u>: Collateral damage is one of the unfortunate consequences of war.

News Anchor: You've just stated that human life is sacrosanct, that we have a sacred duty to protect all life regardless of the stage of human development. Are the lives of innocents killed by actions that you have supported not sacrosanct?

<u>Candidate</u>: I'm not saying that. Those lives are sacred, but there are times, unfortunate as they may be, when people die in the defense of democracy and freedom.

<u>News Anchor</u>: So are you saying that we have a sacred duty to protect the life of a fetus, but we do not have a sacred duty to protect the lives of innocents caught in the crossfire of war?

Candidate: It's an entirely different issue.

News Anchor: I'm not so sure. There was no ambiguity when you said we have a sacred duty to protect all human life. Are you saying that a fetus within the womb of an American woman is more important than the life of an Iraqi six-year-old, who is killed by an American airstrike that you supported with your votes and words?

Candidate: I'm not saying that.

<u>News Anchor</u>: Let me change the subject slightly. When you were governor, you were an outspoken supporter of capital punishment. Is the life of a convicted murderer less sacrosanct than that of a fetus?

<u>Candidate</u>: I would say so, yes. Someone who takes another's life deserves to feel the

wrath of the State.

News Anchor: You've also stated that you're proud to have never voted for anything

at the state or federal level that supports a welfare state, including, as you've stated,

support for the Affordable Care Act.

<u>Candidate</u>: Very proud of those votes. Obamacare and welfare are lynchpins of the

Entitlement Nation that Liberals have created. Most Americans work hard for what

they earn, and it's time we stopped asking those Americans to support those who

don't seem willing to pull their fair share of the load.

News Anchor: Let's focus on those Americans who you would characterize as not

"willing to pull their fair share of the load."

Candidate: Let's.

News Anchor: Is it fair to say that we're referring to those people generally

characterized as being poor?

<u>Candidate</u>: Well, not all poor folks exploit entitlement.

News Anchor: But most do?

Candidate: A significant number.

News Anchor: Are you aware that the life expectancy of an American child living in

poverty is appreciably less than that of a middle class American child?

Candidate: I am.

<u>News Anchor</u>: But you oppose providing support that would possibly add years to the lives of not just poor children but to all persons who are unable to access the quality of life available to the majority of Americans.

<u>Candidate</u>: I'm opposed to placing that responsibility on the backs of hard-working Americans.

News Anchor: On whose backs would you place that responsibility?

<u>Candidate</u>: The problem with the poor is, they just need to decide not to be poor, and then there'd be no need to answer that question.

News Anchor: (Looks at camera for a beat and then back to the candidate) When you say that all life deserves protection, aren't you equivocating?

Candidate: My views are clear and defensible.

<u>News Anchor</u>: But aren't you asserting that under certain circumstances—war, capital punishment, and poverty being three—human life is not worth protecting.

Candidate: I'm not saying that.

News Anchor: But your support of military action and capital punishment, and your opposition to the welfare state, support outcomes that you clearly know will not protect human life. Doesn't that indicate you believe not all humans' lives are sacrosanct, that influential persons—perhaps yourself being one—have the ability to determine the types of lives that we don't have to be concerned about protecting?

<u>Candidate</u>: You're totally distorting what I'm saying. You began by asking me about abortion. My views about abortion are clear, and most people understand that abortion is totally different from those other situations because a human fetus is defenseless and needs our protection.

News Anchor: Isn't a six-year-old Iraqi child confronted by an errant, thousand-pound bomb, or a very sick child whose parents cannot afford health care, just as defenseless as a fetus?

<u>Candidate</u>: Frankly, I don't intend to respond any further to this line of questioning, which seems to me to be nothing more than badgering from someone who is clearly attempting to make some kind of misguided, Liberal-leaning point.

<u>News Anchor</u>: Thank you, Senator, for making your views on the sanctity of human life quite clear. (Turns toward camera) And now, let's take a look at today's weather across the nation...