

QUESTIONS RE ABORTION, IRELAND 2013

I have some questions for people who are thinking about the rightness or wrongness of abortion.

- Is a right to life that does not respect bodily inviolability a right to life at all? What use is a right to life if people have the right to harvest even a cupful of blood from you to save the life of another whether you consent or not?

- Is a right to life the same as a right to exist?

- Pro-life claim to respect the right to life of the mother equally with that of her baby even if only a few weeks into pregnancy. Would they let a mother die over something that may be too undeveloped to have a right to life the same as she has?

- Is it not obvious their lives cannot be equally valuable?

- If abortion is wrong is it due to the circumstances not comparable with murder?

- If abortion is murder and the Church says lying to prevent murder is wrong but not sinful for you have no choice then it does it follow that counsellors should tell lies in order to stop women who are contemplating abortion from going ahead with it?

COMMENT: The Church is too hypocritical to admit it endorses this. Even if it cannot clearly endorse it, it still is to blame for creating the situation. Not all endorsement needs to be clear or verbal.

- Even if abortion is wrong, has anybody the right to say it should result in everlasting damnation if the woman fails to repent and turn to God?

COMMENT: That is hate speech pure and simple. There is no need to go that far. The Catholic Church hides its hate in its passive aggression and the mask often slips.

- If calling abortion murder or a grave sin is hate speech then how can it be pro-life to imply it is better for the woman to die in an accident rather than have an abortion?

- Have pregnant women been in agony while Catholic hospitals have refused to conduct aggressive pain management in case it would kill the baby even if it were possibly dead anyway or was dying?

- Is condemning abortion as the killing of the most defenceless innocent life out there not indirectly at least calling for the murder of the doctor as defence of the babies?

[The Church forbids the shooting of abortionists despite teaching that abortion is one of the worst forms of murder. It refuses to admit that in theory, if killing an abortionist saves the babies he will abort then he should be killed for better one death than many. If the abortionist was a doctor killing born babies the Church would agree he should be shot dead if its the only way. The priests know deep down their religion is based on hypocrisy. Their belief does not really respect the unborn babies. Such hypocrisy festers inside and can make the priest callous towards say the Church's victims of sexual abuse. The person who thinks for example that taking the contraceptive pill is murder can get desensitised, at least partly, in relation to real murder. And we have seen how all the bishops and priests that knew what was going on hardly any became whistleblowers. Atheists realise that it is better to allow abortion than to teach that it is murder. That teaching implies that if it is possible to know that you can save babies by killing abortionists then you are obligated to do it. That implication is enough to justify allowing abortion and discouraging the view that it is necessarily murder.]