

# FEMINISTS WAGE “WAR ON WOMEN”

Recently, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld a Texas law that protects women’s health.

The federal appeals panel ruled that it was a “legitimate purpose” of the Texas law “to provide the highest quality of care to women seeking abortions and to protect the health and welfare of women seeking abortions.” This ruling is consistent with the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision that legalized abortion: “The State has a legitimate interest in seeing to it that abortion, like any other medical procedure, is performed under circumstances that insure maximum safety for the patient.”

Who could possibly object to high standards of medical care for women? Women’s advocates, that’s who. *The New York Times* objected. Ironically, a story on its website on this issue provided a link to a factual description of abortion, and it listed seven risks, among them “excessive bleeding” and “reaction to the medicines or anesthesia, such as problems breathing.” Would not common decency argue that these problems be minimized, and that quality treatment be afforded? Why would the *Times* be willing to settle for less?

The Center for Reproductive Rights called the high standards “harmful.” NARAL Pro-Choice Texas also preferred lower standards. Wonkette declared abortion to be “one of the safest procedures in America,” which, even if this were true (it most certainly is not safe for the child), raises the question: Why oppose safer conditions? Planned Parenthood of Texas said the law was “medically unnecessary,” and both Salon and RH Reality Check called it “draconian.”

Liberals are fond of saying that education is empowering, yet when it comes to educating women planning an abortion, they say they should not be required to see what it is they are aborting. They demand that women be given the best medical

care, yet when it comes to abortion, they are prepared to put them at risk. They love to spend money on healthcare, yet when it comes to maximum safety for women considering an abortion, they complain about costs. Whose side are they really on? Women deserve better than “back-alley” treatment.