

## Re: Controversial Obama article

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.transcription/2008-05/msg00394.html>

---

- *From:* Samantha Hill – remove TRASH to reply <[samhill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:samhill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 21 May 2008 04:37:23 -0700
- 

RaeMorrill wrote:

to even compare other beliefs. IMHO, though I do not agree with a lot of their teachings, as long as they do not allow their minor children to marry or have sex, they should be allowed to practice their beliefs. Of

I hope you really meant to say that they didn't coerce their minor children to marry or have sex against the minor's wishes. If not, there certainly are enough people with no particular religious beliefs who allow their children to do these things (if you are talking about age 18) that you are technically excusing by your statement here if they are not allowing it because of some religious belief — and by logical extension the State of California should also be held in contempt along with any other state that automatically grants emancipated status upon request to any minors that become pregnant for any reason. (just razzin' at ya a bit, Rae ROTFL)

One of my best friend's moms married at age 13 (in the Depression era) and had her first child at age 14, but this was not coerced. So did Loretta Lynn, for that matter, and her parents didn't force her into it, either, according to her autobiography.

I was told quite a while ago that for some medical things (and I am not talking about reproductive types of issues here, but I don't remember what they were right now), a child can give consent as young as age 10.

.