

## The Taking of Conner's Life

Conner was the unborn son of Scott and Laci Peterson. He died when his mother was murdered. His father was convicted of the double homicide in 2005. In 26 states, the death of an unborn as the result of violence is homicide. At the time of the tragedy, according to a Fox News Poll, 84% of those surveyed agreed Conner's father should be charged with two counts of homicide.

Conner's case raises questions about the consistency of legal systems and modern thought in general. How can people legalize the wholesale killing of nearly 1.5 million unborn sons and daughters each year, and call the killing of Conner and other such victims, homicide? Is abortion less violent? Does the mother's stamp of approval on the killing of her unborn child somehow "de-victimize" her child? Does the victim of abortion have a choice? Is the victim of homicide any more human than the victim of abortion is?

Homicide is by definition the unlawful killing of one human by another. Do abortion advocates shoot themselves in the foot by calling Conner's death "homicide"? Are they not acknowledging that Conner was the separate victim of a murder? Are they not giving him full human status by doing so? Do they really believe that society can legislate away the dignity of one human over another? What is the fundamental difference between the unborn victim of a murderer and the unborn victim of an abortionist? The taking of Conner's life is an abomination, but what is the taking of the lives of millions of unborn sons and daughters with no names?