

Pro-choice students shouldn't abuse BYU logo

According to its promotional literature, the purpose of Tuesday's pro-abortion protest at the State Capitol building was to draw together a "broad-based coalition" in favor of "choice." Indeed the group was heterogeneous: one could find Gay and Lesbian rights activists and representatives of the Socialist Worker's Party, as well as a small group brandishing a sign that read, "BYU Students For Pro-Choice"—the sign contained the official BYU logo.

The contingent from BYU was the hit of the gathering. Photos were taken and compliments were offered to the students for displaying their "enlightenment." This little group was hungry for attention—but only on its own terms. I asked for an interview but was turned down when it was learned that I write for the *Daily Universe*. The young woman I spoke to said she would "Answer no questions, give no names, make no comments" for a reporter from BYU.

Obviously this little group—which

was untutored in both ethics and grammar (what kind of construction is "Students For Pro-Choice?")—wanted to avoid answering this question: Who commissioned them to use the BYU logo to defend abortion?

After pestering this young woman for a few minutes, I received a partial response. She insisted that the "Pro-Choice" students had as much right to use the logo as the football team or the Campus Republicans. Really? Unlike the campus abortophiles, the groups mentioned above are sanctioned by the school, and were not established to defend a practice utterly antithetical to the values of BYU. It is nonsense on stilts to maintain that a pro-abortion group is as morally innocuous as the football team.

If a group of white supremacists on campus were to conscript the school's logo to use at a gathering of racists, it would be an outrage almost—but not quite—as offensive as that perpetrated by the *soi-dissant* Students For Choice. I say "almost" because

racists—unlike abortophiles—direct their murderous hostility at targets more or less their own size.

Another member of the group sought to persuade me that the "Pro-Choice" position harmonized with the position of the LDS Church; it is, he declared, the essence of the principle of free agency.

Quick: Name one activity that could not be defended in the name of "freedom of choice."

If one is free to choose stamp collecting as a hobby, is he free to choose genocide as well? It is moral idiocy to believe that the principle of free agency is predicated upon the assumption that all choices are created equally.

The LDS position on abortion is that it is permitted in strictly specified circumstances, after consultation with Church authorities. The young man I spoke to specifically supports the status quo, which is abortion on demand at any time during the pregnancy for any reason. One has to pos-

sess a fascinating combination of ignorance and dishonesty to present this as the position of the LDS Church.

The "Pro-Choice" movement is not so much pro-choice as it is anti-responsibility. Evading responsibility for choices already made is the *raison d'être* of abortion rights. The pro-abortion movement enshrines moral cowardice as a positive virtue. The BYU abortophiles exemplify the moral indifference one finds in the pro-abortion movement. Using the BYU logo was a perfect way to provoke the admiration of the politically "progressive." As it made them celebrities among their ideological kindred, the "Students For Choice" were happy to use the logo. But when it came time to deal with uncomfortable questions—questions that involve assigning responsibility—the logo suddenly wasn't "the issue."

In all of this Hamlet's apothegm is confirmed: Conscience does make cowards of us all.

William Norman Grigg