

ABORTION THOUGHTS - WHY BE PRO-ABORTION WHEN THE WOMAN CHOOSES TO HAVE AN ABORTION?

The idea that an early termination is really murder is silly and controversial so the best thing the law should do is keep out of it. It is a private matter and does not affect the public order. The law is to keep its nose out when it is not a matter of public order. Respecting the privacy does not make the state supportive or unsupportive of early terminations - it merely accepts that it is a matter for the woman. Later abortions need to be carefully regulated when it is clear that a human life may be present.

Some Catholics who believe in the ban think that abortion is never necessary to save a woman's life. But even if that is true, it has nothing to do with the ban on abortion. The Church would still ban abortion if say the vast majority of women needed abortion to live. There is a real hatred of women in the Church's attitude. Also, you can say that there is no case where a woman needs an abortion to save her life. But they know fine well they cannot be sure that a case will not appear next week? They do not care about the woman who may be the exception.

The Catholics always like to say that they do not regard the life of the baby as more important than that of the mother. They say that for saying any different would provoke nearly the whole world to rage. They do not mean it because if one unborn baby had to be slain to save a million mothers they would still forbid abortion.

What they say is based on a desire to manipulate us and keep us calm-ish. But we must perceive that saying the unborn baby's life matters more than the mother's is bad, but to say a woman's life is on an equal footing to a bunch of cells is worse. Why? Because it makes no sense therefore it IS putting the "baby" first in the sense that its given an importance it does not have even if it means hurting the mother. If you believe a ball of cells must be kept alive even if the mother needs to get rid of it or suffer grave harm or die as its her equal then your behaviour will be no different to that of the person who holds the ball of cells comes first.

Many pro-life Catholics do not care if abortion is necessary to save a woman's life. They still forbid it. Pope John Paul II did that . He claimed that its wrong to slay the foetus even to save the mother's life as the foetus is innocent. He said its not like killing somebody in self-defence for the baby is not an aggressor! He closed his ears to those who pointed out, "But the point is not that the person is deliberately killing. Many attackers are insane. The point is that one life must be sacrificed for another."

The Church says it is wrong to kill the baby even if it is right to kill an unjust aggressor to preserve your own life for the baby is not an unjust aggressor (Question 1010-1011, Radio Replies Volume 2/ page 15, Moral Questions, A Statement by the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales). But this is an excuse for she would let you kill a insane person to save yourself though they would be as innocent as the baby. The Church is trying to murder women who need an abortion to live, by its obviously discriminatory teaching. It hates all women even if pregnancy kills no more for any woman could have a fatal pregnancy and the Church teaching would be the same if it were common.

The idea that the unborn baby is innocent is hard to accept when human nature even when it cannot act on it is in fact about taking even if it leaves somebody else short. Most of us do not need to make that side of us so obvious but it is still there.

We hold that a person who thinks animals have no feelings is a twisted kind of person. We must think the same of those who want us to invest a ball of cells with the same right to life as a grown woman. Its not a rational argument but a religious fundamentalist one.

The Church also says that when life starts as it does at conception, from that point on, the mother has no right to treat the child as her property that she can get rid of or dispose of (page 15, Moral Questions, A Statement by the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales).

A foetus according to some is a person at a certain stage but as time goes on becomes more and more of a person. Nature does things bit by bit. If a car is potentially scrap you will not treat it as scrap until it can't be anything else. This seems to ban abortion except for grave reasons. It seems to forbid treating any embryo as hospital waste.

The child cannot be its own property until it becomes a developed being that knows its alive. A ball of cells is perhaps nobody's property which is why the mother can dispose of it. Without intending disrespect, a dog is more developed than a human being and though it is nobody's property (for it is a conscious being and nobody can technically own a conscious being but merely treat it as if they owned it) the person responsible for its care has the right to have it put to sleep. Religion

takes it for granted that the unborn child is its own property from conception but that stance is far from convincing and isn't even relevant.

Anti-abortionists contend that killing the baby to prevent the death of the mother is wrong for it is making sure that one of them will die and if they were let alone both might have lived. They are stating that it is better to risk two lives than to take one. Medical predictions aren't always correct. But at the same time we have to take them as probably correct. This argument would proscribe killing unjust aggressors. You aren't sure that they will kill you. The pope knows this for critics come at him from all sides.

The Church likes to claim that abortion hurts women. It is not abortion that hurts women but careless doctors or perhaps the woman knew the risks and took the chance of being hurt which is her concern and gives nobody else the right to say she should not have the option of abortion. Women having abortions are too often left without the counselling before and after the abortion that is so vital to their mental well-being. It is not abortion that hurts but bad attitudes in the woman having the abortion and bad preparation and bad consideration of the consequences. Many liberated women have had many abortions and do not feel any guilt and believe that it was worth it. The Church doctrine that abortion has babies dying outside the family of God and therefore excluded from Heaven because they are not baptised brings horrendous pain to many women. Read my pages condemning infant baptism to learn why this cruelty is so unnecessary. Baptism is just a rite and has no magical power to make a baby fit for Heaven. The rite is anti-feminist in so far as it hurts women who have abortions.

It is not abortion that causes the remorse a woman may feel. It is the fear that she might have killed a person. It is the teaching of the Church that is to blame for that. The Church does not put as much energy into feeding the starving millions of the world as it does into the war against abortion. What about the unborn babies inside mothers starving to death? The war is really about power over women and to manipulate people into holding the Church in a regard that is waning in other people. Pro-lifers pretend that pro-abortionists do not really care for women but even if they don't that does not mean the woman should not have an abortion. They are trying to make women feel that abortion is bad by putting them off the idea of going to these people to get one. That is conniving. Why? A woman might not be treated right while and after having an abortion but that does not mean that abortion is not the best option for her. Pro-lifers have a strange concern for women when they say they love women despite often wanting a woman to die in pregnancy rather than advise her to terminate it. They insult all women by this for they would have the same attitude to any one of the women they claim to love. If Ann next door needed an abortion to save her life they would want her to kill herself by not having one so if Ann has any sense she will take it personally.

The Church says mother and unborn baby have an equal right to life. But the mother is classed as a sinner in the wishful thinking of the Church and the baby is not so the baby's life should be preferred to her if sin exists. It is obviously wrong to suggest that someone who has had a life has as great a right to live as a baby that has had none.

The Church permits a womb or fallopian tube to be removed to save the mother even though it entails the death of the baby inside. She says this is not murder or abortion for it has to be done and is the only way. The death of the baby is a side effect. This is called the law of double-effect which means we have to do harm when it is for the greatest good and the harm is a side effect for it is not intended because there is no choice.

That permission shows us something. The Church gives the following as a reason for forbidding abortion: "Abortion even if ever acceptable might turn out to have been unnecessary to save the mother's life. So it is best to ban it." This is only an excuse when it allows the tubes and wombs removed with the babies inside. The Church can't say aborting a baby to save the mother is doing a certain evil instead of doing a less certain evil of causing the mother's death. She cannot say that possible evils are better committed than sure evils for she advocates the certain evil of killing the baby indirectly. The Church states that this is not abortion for there is no choice but to kill the baby indirectly. That this is folly is obvious from the fact that it is permitted to take away the tube and thereby cut off the baby's life but not permitted to kill the baby and then remove the tube. Moreover, if foetal life comes first as the Church implies by her rancour towards women then it is best to let nature run its course and kill the two of them if it wants to so indirect killing is still abortion and freely meant to kill the baby. It is possible to be pregnant even if the womb is taken away for the foetus can grow off other organs. It is no wonder some think that the Church must ask that the foetus be frozen alive to wait for the day when science can do something with it to give it a chance to be born or ask that the foetus be implanted elsewhere in the mother or in another woman by force if necessary when the Church permits the removal. Some feminists have said that the Church would certainly rape women in the sense of forcibly implanting babies in them.

If the baby's life comes before the mother's life when abortion is not allowed it comes before it in double-effect too. Thus the baby's death would not be a side effect for it is not morally necessary to kill the baby for the baby is all that matters. It is killed indirectly but that it is still as good as killing directly.

The law of double effect as used by the Catholic Church becomes lethal when an omnipotent God is believed in. Suppose a fallopian tube with a baby inside needs to be removed according to medical opinion to save the mother. Nobody knows for

sure if not having the operation will kill the baby and/or the mother. Statistically, most in this situation will die. But when there is a God he might change this and most will live. The women then should not be touched just in case. Thus, the Church endorses an abuse of the law of double effect. The babies' deaths it allows are not unavoidable. Moreover, taking away the babies prevents God from showing the statistics reversing. Perhaps if the tube was left inside, we would see a change in the statistics thanks to God and there would be no need to remove them on statistical grounds again. When he reverses the statistical trend more babies lives will be preserved and the indirect termination of ectopic pregnancies will be forbidden. This thought alone condemns the Church's teaching.

Abortion cannot be bad just because it hurts the foetus. The foetus will face more pain than that if it lives.

Only if the foetus may have the need to live can killing it be evil. To have this need it has to be able to understand what life is which simply means it has to be conscious. It may not understand how it comes to be alive but it knows it is aware so it understands what it is to be alive. It doesn't have the need so abortion on demand would be right if we are sure it does not know.

The abortion of a foetus that has no consciousness is not murder for it is just preventing a person from coming into existence. If this is evil then men should be impregnating girls as soon as they start to ovulate.

The woman who brings a child into the world to suffer is a callous child abuser. Her child will have the right to sue her.

Christian opposition to abortion has more to do with dislike of women and sheer bigotry than anything else. The interference of Christians which is geared to making abortion hard to obtain results only in late abortions. For them, early or late abortion is bad. But the truth is, even if it is bad it is less bad in the early stages. Then there is a lesser chance that the baby is a person.

The Catholic Church officially teaches that the war against abortion and contraception are the same war. It is believed that a woman using contraception will often choose abortion if the contraception fails. The Church is insinuating that contraception leads to abortion. This aims to trick women into thinking they are assisting in murder if they use contraceptives for it is not necessarily true and contraception would have to necessarily lead to abortion to be wrong like abortion supposedly is. It is true that the pill often causes a very early abortion but there is a world of difference between this and having a later abortion requiring surgery. That you would use the pill does not necessarily mean that you would have the baby killed at a later stage. That is why the Church's logic is fraudulent. It is wrong to say that contraception is bad for it leads to abortion for it does not. Using condoms does not mean you will use the pill. Using the pill does not mean you will have a later abortion if the pill lets you down. If you do use the pill or have a later abortion the reason is that you made a new decision that nothing made you make. There is no link. The Church needs this emotionally stirring argument to put a veneer of respectability and compassion on its crusade against birth-control. The woman has all the trouble with pregnancy and the man does not. In a sense the man is in the same position as a contracepting woman. It is clear then that the ban on contraception and abortion in Catholicism really stems from a hatred of women. It is pure sexism. It denies that women should have the freedom with sex that men have. It seeks to punish women for having sex.

Today there are safe abortion pills, that can terminate an early pregnancy without any need for surgery. This is a great development. Most women will feel better about an abortion when it happens early enough. And it prevents the turmoil and surgery that can arise from a later abortion. We all feel that those who would make such pills illegal and condemn the taking of them are interfering cranks. They may claim to believe that that embryos in a test tube are people but they do not act as if they really do. All they are doing is scaring women off using the abortion pill and making some of them leave it too long when the embryo may indeed be a human person. This is particularly evil when the woman is a rape or incest victim.

The Church says that a child is a gift from God. This means that the suffering of having an unborn child is a gift from God too. To say that suffering is a gift from God which you have to say if you believe in an all-powerful God who lets suffering take place for a good reason is to discourage people a lot from fighting suffering. We will not take orders from believers in God about whether abortion should be legalised or forbidden.

Only .3 of professional abortions lead to medical complications. That is an important thing for people to know. The book, Christianity is Not Great. The pro-life people exaggerate the numbers who suffer from complications to deter people from abortion. More women die from having babies than having those abortions.

The Church will do a lot to stop abortions in poor countries but it will not do much to stop the babies dying of starvation or malnutrition or disease after they are born. Banning abortion gives men the right to procreate through rape or through lying about contraception. The woman's body belongs to men. The woman is sentenced to a living death and to bondage and fear. Her life is not valuable while the baby's is. What the fight against abortion really is about is stopping women from using their own judgment and being free. Women who campaign against abortion are traitors to their sex and are conditioned by

men and religion.

Anything is possible in human life. Therefore it is possible that abortion may save the life of a woman who is suicidal and who wants rid of the baby. All Catholics have to say to this is that the suicidal are NEVER helped by abortion. They cannot know that! Are they psychic? Its just a dogmatic faith based assumption. They are therefore willing to kill the women by their teaching. The unborn baby makes them willing to kill for it in that underhand way. Whoever refuses to consider each case on its own merits and prefers to make blanket condemnations is not a true friend of women. Science works without religious assumptions and is based on what the evidence says. Science will revise and repudiate theories that are not properly verified. Science is free from religious pressure. The religious attitude to women who need abortion to avoid suicide is therefore unscientific.

Even we cannot legalise abortion on the basis of a threat of suicide, we know that there would be circumstances in which it would be right. Proving it could be the problem. We would be banning abortion because we can't get the needed evidence that abortion will avert suicide. We are not fortune-tellers. But religion just doesn't care even about that. Even if the evidence was clearcut it would still oppose the legalisation.

The pro-life in Ireland have tried to make out that Savita Halappanavar's death was not the fault of Catholic pro-life policy and its meddling with legislation. She was refused a termination of pregnancy to save her life. She was told it was a Catholic country. Of course the pro-life have tried to manipulate people to think she was not told that. They then virtually accuse her devastated husband of being a liar. But nobody denies that she was refused a termination because the foetus had a heartbeat.

The pro-life people will not stand for Ireland having even a strictly limited abortion law. They prefer to drive women abroad to nations that provide abortion on demand even at later stages than Ireland would ever countenance. Is it not better that if abortion is coming in and is wrong, to have the law made up in such a way that the woman will have a safe early abortion in Ireland? Even if abortion is wrong, then surely its monstrous to argue that a foetus of 6 weeks has as much a right to life as one of 24 weeks?