

APOLOGETICS AGAINST INFANTICIDE



LEGIO CHRISTI

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Rebuttals.....	4
Do not do these.....	7
Extras.....	8
Early Christianity.....	9
Conclusions.....	11
References.....	12



INTRODUCTION

This resource was created as a response to the argumentation of pro-life advocates stumbling in their apologetics against infanticide. As such, this resource acts as a complete answer to every major talking point of pro-"choice" advocates, showing that their choice is always murder. The intended audience are those who want good, short answers in these often-heated discussions.



REBUTTALS

A. "But they are not independent, they depend on the mother, so they are not alive."

- The same applies to the baby one hour before being born.
- The same applies to the baby several years after being born.
- You can take a fetus out of the womb and use a machine to feed it nutrients, so there is really no dependence on the *mother*, but on some nutrients; like all of us.
- A fetus can be alive for a time after the mother is dead, so there is clearly no dependence. Two lives, two bodies.

B. "But they are just a clump of cells."

- We are all just clump of cells from this materialistic point of view.

C. "But they do not feel pain, so they are not alive." (That is, they do not have the capacity to feel pain) NOTE: also applies to similar arguments related to arbitrary thresholds in development.

- If we somehow removed someone's entire sense of touch completely and all related sensations, that person would still be alive.
- Pain, ultimately, is the transmission of electrical impulses through dedicated wires. Following this to its logical conclusion would lead one to consider a computer to be alive, as they also transmit electrical impulses.
- If someone "starts feeling pain", it is implied that there is a pre-existing living consciousness to which we add sensory information.
- Overall, the definition of life as "feeling pain" is arbitrary, and could as well be "it is not alive because it doesn't see yet", or "it is not alive because it has not heard someone playing the guitar yet" or "it is not alive because the moonlight beams have not struck it yet". The other responses are a consequence of the foolishness of trying to come up with these arbitrary definitions.



D. "But what about rape or incest?"

- A mother murdering her child is far worse than an act of rape. Not even something much worse than rape would justify the murder of a child.
- If abortion is justified because a fetus is not human, then logically, a proponent for infanticide would not attempt justification through situational dilemmas like rape or incest. If a fetus was not a human, then they would not have to do so (justify with situational scenarios). If it is human, then abortion is not justified in any case.

E. "But what if the life of the mother is endangered"

- Mothers with the slightest moral compass will die for the safety and future of their children.
- In most cases the life of the mother can be saved through modern medical practices with a premature delivery. This gives both the life of the mother and the child the best prospect of survival. Infanticide is not an option, let alone the first option for a pregnancy complication.

F. "But what if they grow up poor and unloved?"

- The same could be applied to people after they are born.
- In no way should it follow that we should execute those who may be subject to suffering.
- Overall this "argument" reflects the perverse mind of those who defend infanticide, unable to feel even the slightest love towards their own children if they are a nuisance.

G. "But I am not financially prepared."

- The murder of a child is never an answer. There are charities and support groups that provide help for the poor. Even for those who are perverse enough to abandon a child for money, there is adoption.
- Adoption is a gift; not just for the child whose life is saved, but also for the parents who have been blessed with a child.
- Do not murder because you are poor.
- Most people are just not willing to let go their childish entertainments or their vices.



H. "But people who oppose abortion do not care about children after birth."

- There is no reason to think that at all.
- Adopting children is virtuous, not murdering them is foundational. It is not normal for people to be outstandingly virtuous; but people should be expected to have basic morality.
- With regards to adoption, it is like saying that we cannot complain about beggars being murdered unless we house beggars in our homes.
- Statistics show that people who oppose abortion adopt far more children. This is not surprising, considering the people who defend infanticide usually talk about how much they hate children and how they will never have them so that they can go on trips and indulge their hedonistic lifestyles.

I. "My body my choice!"

- It is not your body, just like it is not your body after it is born. [See \(A\)](#).

J. "Abortion is a right!"

- It is not. Not being murdered as a child, however, is.
- If it was a right on the grounds that the fetus is not human, then killing anything that is not human would be inherently justified.
- "Rights" are whatever the current year leftist celebrities proclaim in emotional propaganda speeches. What matters is morality, the good or evil of an action. The only rights we have are our natural rights, of which, infanticide is not one.

K. "But what if you are given the chance to save a baby or 100 fertilized eggs? Does that show an inner awareness that a fetus is really alive?"

- It is always easier to kill the ones you cannot see. People feel less guilt when there is no face to remember.
- Whoever wants to save more living human beings will save the 100 fertilized eggs.
- Because of bias, people will usually tend to save the born baby, just like a father will probably save his unborn baby over several born children from other people. That in no way alters their humanity.
- In the end, people tend to do what requires less active participation. In similar hypothetical situations, people are not willing, for example, to actively push someone to death to save several people.



L. "No uterus, no opinion!"

- Being a woman does not give someone permission to murder a child.
- It follows that we cannot complain about any actions performed by a group we don't belong to. For example, we can't complain or have an opinion about the torture and murder of the boer in South Africa unless we are black.

M. "Restricting abortions just makes them unsafe!"

- The objective of law is to make immoral actions unsafe for the perpetrator; just like how murder is not legal, it is unsafe to murder due to the consequences.



DO NOT DO THESE

- Do not argue on the basis of pictures that show the visual aspect of a fetus, because then you justify infanticide in earlier stages, and reduce humanity to emotional reactions. Said images are only useful for getting attention.
- Do not accept arbitrary, materialistic definitions of humanity/life like “feeling pain” or “knowing how to play the guitar”, i.e. do not try to argue whether or not a fetus can feel pain. If you play by their rules you will never win, because those rules are made to justify infanticide. You are also conceding that the fetus can be killed, for example, if it doesn’t feel pain. You won’t have time to explain the supernatural nature of life and consciousness, but you can show the absurdity of their definitions ([see C](#))
- Do not use a tone softer than what is appropriate for people who defend the mass murder of babies, because you are implying that nothing serious is being done, and they do not deserve it.
- Do not condemn those who very strongly protest the slaughterhouses that are abortion clinics, because you are defending the apathy of those who see a kid being killed on the streets and do nothing. Actual murder of children justifies action against it, so the rejection of this action implies that it is blown out of proportion because there is no actual murder.
- Do not argue on the basis of how many women/blacks/whatever are killed by abortion, because then you are implying that there is no murder, since otherwise you would defend all babies instead of trying to further feminism. You aren’t being smart, you aren’t using their own weapons against them, you are just falling into their trap, implying there is no murder, and furthering their other causes.
- Do not argue on the basis of “potential for life”, since then you are denying the murder, saying that there is no life yet.
- Do not argue on the basis of how few abortions are caused by rape, because then you justify the murder of the children in those cases, and doing so would only be justified if they are not alive/human, and if they are not alive, then all abortion is justified.
- Do not make “pro-life” into anything other than “anti-abortion”. “pro-life” doesn’t mean nobody can ever be killed. We focus on innocent children.



- Do not entertain discussions on alternatives to abortion as if disallowing it was somehow depriving people of a right and had to offer a compensation. It is as if, in order to denounce child rape, you had to offer alternatives like life-like dolls or computer-generated child pornography. Those are just attempts to turn abortion into some kind of reasonable norm that serves a good purpose, so those who oppose it have to answer for the chaos they have created, usually by normalising another evil like contraceptives. Infanticide is an abomination that you are denouncing. You don't have to solve other problems, which are, in most cases, a product of the same perversion that leads people to defend abortion.



EXTRAS

- Groups that defend abortion using the former arguments have consistently supported leaving the babies that result from failed abortions to die while they scream, voting down laws that would force the staff to try to save the baby [1,2,3,4]. Politicians and celebrities have constantly defended the “right” of the mother to decide whether or not the already born child should be killed.
- There are several records of abortion providers joking about dismembering children, talking about selling baby parts, etc [5].
- Some groups and communities have stopped pretending they care about it and just concede that they know the babies are alive, but they don’t care. Some have realized that there is no magical threshold for humanity, and removing it altogether to be consistent, they advocate for “post-birth abortion” [6]. This is also known as euthanasia. Several born babies, children and adults have been killed because it was considered it was “in their best interests” [12, 13, 14].
- Similarly, people are also forced to abort their children because it is “in their best interests” [15].
- It is no surprise that it is only in the modern western world, with 11 year old transvestites dancing at gay bars for money [7], drag queen story time hours [8], pronouns madness, pornographic ice-cream ads with priests [9] (or even abortion ice-cream flavours [10]) and cartoons [11], and many more, that infanticide is widely defended.
- The defence of abortion, like that of degeneracy, euthanasia, and atheism, are all based on hedonism and avoiding responsibility as the ultimate life goal. People don’t want to have children because they are an obstacle to cheap pleasure. Mothers will murder their own children because they will also get in the way of their pleasure. “Hedonistic pleasure is love.” Lives without pleasure do not count as actual lives. If at some point pleasure ends, it is better to end the life. There cannot be a God if there is suffering because since pleasure is the ultimate good, God would create the ultimate pleasure.egalization of infanticide is usually enabled by false testimony, such as the Roe vs Wade case, where Roe repented, admitted lying, remarked the evil of those who supported her, and spent the rest of her life fighting infanticide.



EARLY CHRISTIANITY

From time to time, a self-declared Christian comes up and states how infanticide is God's gift, or that they are personally opposed to it, but will protect it by any means so that people can keep murdering children. Let us see what we can find in the earliest Christianity:

The Didache (1st century). chapter 2:

“you shall not murder a child by abortion nor kill that which is begotten”

St Basil of Caesarea (4th century). Letter 188:

“Women also who administer drugs to cause abortion, as well as those who take poisons to destroy unborn children, are murderesses”

“The woman who purposely destroys her unborn child is guilty of murder. With us there is no nice enquiry as to its being formed or unformed”

St John Chrysostom (4th century). Homily 24 on Romans:

“Why sow where the ground makes it its care to destroy the fruit? Where there are many efforts at abortion? Where there is murder before the birth? For even the harlot thou dost not let continue a mere harlot, but makes her a murderess also. You see how drunkenness leads to whoredom, whoredom to adultery, adultery to murder; or rather to a something even worse than murder. For I have no name to give it, since it does not take off the thing born, but prevent its being born. Why then do you abuse the gift of God, and fight with His laws, and follow after what is a curse as if a blessing, and make the chamber of procreation a chamber for murder, and arm the woman that was given for childbearing unto slaughter?”

Council of Ancyra (4th century). Canon 21:

“Concerning women who commit fornication, and destroy that which they have conceived, or who are employed in making drugs for abortion, a former decree excluded them until the hour of death, and to this some have assented. Nevertheless, being desirous to use somewhat greater lenity, we have ordained that they fulfil ten years [of penance], according to the prescribed degrees.”

Council in Trullo (7th century). Canon 91:

“Those who give drugs for procuring abortion, and those who receive poisons to kill the fetus, are subjected to the penalty of murder.”



The Apocalypse of Peter (Apocrypha, 2nd century). Paragraph 25:

“And near that place I saw another strait place into which the gore and the filth of those who were being punished ran down and became there as it were a lake: and there sat women having the gore up to their necks, and over against them sat many children who were born to them out of due time, crying; and there came forth from them sparks of fire and smote the women in the eyes: and these were the accursed who conceived and caused abortion.”

Apostolic Constitutions (4th century). Book VII. Paragraph 3:

“You shall not slay your child by causing abortion, nor kill that which is begotten; for everything that is shaped, and has received a soul from God, if it be slain, shall be avenged, as being unjustly destroyed.”

St. Barnabas (1st century). Epistle of Barnabas:

“You shall not slay the child by procuring abortion; nor, again, shall you destroy it after it is born”



CONCLUSIONS

Overall, our position is summarized as follows: the murder of children will be punished as murder of children.

It is evident for anyone with basic intellect that abortion is always murder. With the passing of time there are more and more people who will just laugh and say that they will try to have as many abortions as they can, or that they will not bat an eye while they dismember their own children. That, of course, only shows the moral level of those who defend infanticide. Overall, a better case could be made for those who defend infanticide not being alive/human, since they do not give any signs of having any decency or humanity, being like wild animals that scream at anything that threatens their pleasure and filth.

A million more things could be said about the hypocrisy of those who defend abortion, a group that correlates, for example, with the people who will try to murder you if you crush a turtle egg. The groups that defend abortion are well known for their promiscuity, hedonism, materialism, lack of responsibility and morals, relativism, etc. To keep their debauchery without worries, the easiest way is to just murder the product of their vices to keep indulging in them. That is why the apologist of infanticide will shapeshift constantly and periodically come up with new arbitrary definitions of humanity as time goes by.

Brace yourselves. Soon it will be considered that our lives, empty of their nihilistic hedonism, are too miserable, and that we are subject to so much self-inflicted "suffering", that we can hardly be considered to be alive, and it will be in our best interests to go through a post-birth abortion.



REFERENCES

- [1] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SkTopSKo1xs>
- [2] <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2015/roll506.xml>
- [3] <https://dailycaller.com/2019/01/31/ralph-northam-no-regrets-abortion/>
- [4] <https://www.nationalreview.com/corner/born-alive-bill-fails-to-pass-senate-vote/>
- [5] <http://www.centerformedicalprogress.org/cmp/investigative-footage/>
- [6] <https://jme.bmj.com/content/39/5/261>
- [7] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BcGHC-hYwKg>
- [8] <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/second-drag-queen-story-hour-library-reader-exposed-as-convicted-child-sex-offender>
- [9] <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/newsbysector/mediatechnologyandtelecoms/media/8087413/Gay-priests-ice-cream-adverts-banned.html>
- [10] <https://twitter.com/prochoiceoregon/status/1030117982012301312/photo/1>
- [11] <https://www.netflix.com/title/80218634>
- [12] <https://jme.bmj.com/content/43/7/450.full>
- [13] <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng61>
- [14] <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/gard-press-summary-20170411.pdf>
- [15] https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2014/06/09/high-court-orders-abortion_n_5473628.html?utm_hp_ref=uk&guccounter=1

