

Abortion is a serious topic that takes millions of unborn children's lives each year globally. While the reasons for abortion are numerous, we will not make light of it here, as taking human life on such a wide scale is not the purpose of this essay nor the goals of the writers. But it is important to talk about abortion and its consequences on society and individuals since human life, and by extension newborns, comprises the cogs and gears of society as we know it. Thus, the purpose of this essay is to analyze abortion as a part of a larger societal paradigm and give our opinions on it.

"The good and the bad: the necessities of nowadays society" - Prof. Credo

Even if we maintain a firm stance against degeneracy nowadays, trying to safeguard what's left of society, it is also necessary explain why would such abhorrent ideas would come to be. To oversimplify, as Dr. N. Igmar writes against abortion on most of it uses, I will play the devil's advocate myself, presenting reasons on to why abortion might be "acceptable" on nowadays society, presenting mostly the reasoning behind those who approve of such things, with the sole purpose of bringing the problems to the table, and thus letting Dr. N. Igmar presents his ideas on a more completed way.

"Abortion, women, and the manipulation of society" - Dr. N. Igmar

I highly doubt any morally sane person would uphold abortion as "moral". I speculate more women actually regret having abortions than if they kept the baby. In any sense, abortion is not upheld as a complete positive in most people's heads—but rather a convenience. Most women who have abortions do not do it for what I would call the "edge cases" where it is more morally murky ground to walk on; in fact, most abortions are done out of convenience to the woman for their own reasons, that do not fall into the edge cases. However, as it ties in with my overarching opinion on abortion, there are definitely reasons abortion is promoted and normalized in society. Prof. Credo will primarily cover the "why" aspect of abortion in his arguments presumably by playing devil's advocate, and while I can acknowledge that women do abortions for certain reasons, I of course can not condone it.

"Our society, our oportunities, our future!" - Prof. Credo

If we were to begin with a problem, I would like to start by presenting the present year as my first object of analysis (2021).

Back to the 1800s and 1900s, we didn't had the tools that we had nowadays (condoms and pills), the expectation of life was lower for the common man, and at the same time, we could argue that our expectations and needs where lower, thus, allowing the grow of the regular family as any other flower does on the green grassfields of our society. Sadly, those beautiful hills seem to rot and dry with each year, as our society doesn't seem fit for the classical family, not even the nuclear one.

One of the biggest problems that young adults argument on favor of abortion, is the lack of funds for settling down: most Americans have problems with rent, and thus, some haven't even left the nest, creating a new whole phenomena of "parasitic sons" that don't leave the house. Nowadays the economy might be one of the factors to blame, but there is more, as the lavish present this young adults live on instead of a classical familiar life, is also boosted by their hedonistic desires: cars, trips to Europe, figurines, parties and alcohol are some of the few reasons on why the paycheck doesn't seem to be enough for a settled life, and thus, pushing the idea of settling down farther beyond.

Finally, and the most important factor of them all, is the introduction of the woman at the workforce, which might be the results of an extra competitive society, a capitalistic one, or simply the degeneracy of the social roles on this one.

This last point, seems to be the biggest factor, as the promises of independence and equality for both genders, where one of the biggest factors on the jump of the woman into the world of bussiness and employment. We must argue then, that perhaps there are good reasons into why this is ok, after all, women participated quite well not only between wars, covering the jobs that their husbands and other men left open to hold the line in the Maginot or the far east, yet, they seem to had been lied to, as older, single women complain about not finding a good man on their 30s or 40s, or being too high to pick average Joe, as she makes more than him and deserves a king, while being around her 43 birthday. So, women seem to be victims of our society apparently, tricked into leaving the comfortable life on the house, for an always competitive one on the office, letting their hedonistic desires flourish without control, and thus letting them take over, pushing far away the idea of family, and welcoming the wine and cats more and more.

"On Feminism: A lie they were sold" - A Dr. N. Igmar and Profesor Credo work

While most women would stay at home the moment they are married, nowadays we see the opposite; women working, being mothers and housewives.

Some don't though, some of them, decide to abandon the idea of marriage and having a family to chase an independent life, full of luxuries and pleasure. A hedonistic lifestyle that "hits the wall" past the age of 30.

The biggest problem with this lifestyle, is the lack of purpose this people end with and the spread of degeneracy they commit: Sure, at age 25 they might feel like at the top of the world, with money, getting a new guy on the bed every week, and not having to worry about "kids waking them up like she has to" when referring to the neighbor, and sharing a drink every party night with their buddy's, sounds like a paradise to them. Yet we know the answer to this fake reality they were sold by certain agents of our society, and in the end, they suffer the consequences of their decision, and not only pleased with that, they decide to drag everything down with them.

But what changed when before feminism was popularized and after? The mentality of women. When you give women as much freedom as they have today as a result of feminist movements, it's an inevitable trend toward societal decline, due to the nature of women.

As we touched in our previous essay, "[Social Issues: Destruction of the Family](#)", men and women are different in many respects, complementary but not equal. Understanding the roles of men and women in society boils down to understanding the nature of both sexes. Women are producers of children, holding the wombs we all gestated in; men the protectors, holding the spears, knives, guns, etc. used to protect the women they love. This is the essential nature of both sexes in a natural sense. It's obviously more complex than that, but everything about the nature of the sexes stems from those two distinctions.

So that brings us back to why feminism leads to decline. Society, government, civilization, whatever you want to call it, only works well because men are there to guide the structure of it in a functional, rational way, understandably, as men are the protectors of it, thus needing to be logical about it. However, women do not operate under the same baseline thinking as men: it's obvious to anyone who has spent enough time around both of the sexes that women tend to be more emotional and men more reserved and logical. I would argue this is an evolutionary design at work, taking into account the dimorphic nature of the sexes and splitting them according to their strengths to produce complementary sexes, unequal by nature.

To the greater point of that, women's strengths are not in logic, they are in emotion; women are, by nature, the nurturers of society (e.g. mothers, nurses, childcare, etc.), and that is where they work best. When you put women in positions of power, you get emotional responses that are not based on logic, rather how they feel about a given subject; consequently, deriving from the woman's role as a nurturer, she is enticed by taking on the role of provider and expanding her or others' power in order to do so as it extends her natural inclination, which is why we see that women tend to vote for bigger government.

On the flip side, women also do this out a feeling of necessity for security. When feminism tells women they "don't need no man!", the effect of that is the resulting feeling of being insecure, as that is what women look for externally in men, a protector that can provide her with a sense of security. Thus, the average feminist inclined woman will externalize her natural need for security onto the government, to supplement the void left by having no protecting husband or boyfriend.

And after the government gains more power through feminist movements, this is where the decline of the society spurs downward. As women now derive their sense of security from the government, the natural man in the equation as a protector is effectively moot to her. In her mind it is the equivalent of, "why waste my time dating a beta to marry and provide for me when I can simply collect a welfare check?". Because for women, their logic is based on an instinctual need for survival, extending their need for security, whereas men are stronger to begin with and granted by evolution the ability of rationality and greater logic to do great things as inventors, pioneers, builders, warriors, etc. Ultimately, as the protector sex, men are granted more liberty by nature of taking more responsibility is the way I see it.

Tying in with abortion, feminism, as Prof. Credo touched on earlier, encourages hedonism and taking conveniences in life for women. So it's not surprising logically to see women take the "easy" route in life when they no longer have to concern themselves with having children in a marriage when the government will unconditionally provide for them, in lieu of men as the original protectors.

It seems to me, many women nowadays choose to get abortions because they simply no longer have an obligation to raise the child due to the general "liberation" of women from marriage and being protected by the government. Another idea of feminism beyond voting and influencing government is that women can now also work, generating their own incomes, separate from men. Men, as protectors, are also providers as well, similar enough for either to be used but worth mentioning here. Thus, when women no longer need a man to provide income for them, they become more hedonistic, less wife-material, less inclined to marriage, and more inclined to feminism. And it's worth noting that women didn't necessarily marry before feminism out of love, but rather out of economic and security necessity. So when the government takes away the main driving force of women to marry men (economic stability), you can see how it leads into feminism and thus increased abortions.

"On the 'why' of abortion" - A Dr. N. Igmar and Profesor Credo work

Why would anyone on their sane judgement would kill an unborn infant? Well, it's quite simple, at least in the disfigured eyes of nowadays society: it's a burden, and a burden "I don't wanna carry with".

Why would many of the successful women with high careers throw all of that away to have a kid? Why have a kid, who will drain you of your life and wake you at the nights for some basic needs every human went through? Wasting your "Young" years into a "parasite" is not a way to live girl! - That's what they heard, they think and what they repeat once they meet more young ladies who are in the cross-paths of their future.

In reality, they are throwing away more than what they are winning: a family, a child, and an entirely different future from the empty house they could afford with all those millions that the career they run with could offer them.

Statistically, the overwhelming majority of abortions are done out of convenience, rather than the edge cases mentioned earlier. Of a [surveyed 2.4 million women aborting](#), 96.5% of the abortions were social and economic reasons, while the rest were edge cases (e.g. mother's health, rape, birth defects, etc.).

That alone should effectively destroy any pro-abortion argument in its tracks. But unfortunately, we live in a society that promotes degeneracy similar to the decadence of Weimar. Many people no longer even value the most innocent form of human life: the unborn. Yet, the equivalent of child sacrifice in ancient times is performed everyday on women seeking an "easy-out", for freedom from consequences, performed by compliant "doctors", who really should have no right to call themselves that if they perform such an egregious procedure deliberately harming human life in the process. I don't need to post gore of the remnants of abortion here since I'm sure the readers of this essay likely aware, but more importantly, the sin of the aborting women will follow her cemetery of a womb, as it will be cursed for the rest of her life with her dead child for her choice of hedonism over newborn life.

This obviously does not apply to miscarriages and spontaneous abortions in the same sense, as the women likely did not intend to kill

her child. It is the intention here of abortion that is truly the greatest sin of it. When thalidomide was tested on pregnant women, it caused birth defects and miscarriages in the *thousands* as a result of negligence in (lacking) testing of the drug. Many children effected by thalidomide were born with deformed limbs and other parts of their body. Though, I doubt many would blame the pregnant women for the drug being linked to these unfortunate outcomes; realistically, more likely the blame would be attributed to the negligence of the pharmaceutical company manufacturing the drug. It's an important example to bring up here because when a woman gets an induced abortion (induced, being the central topic of this essay) there is clear intention to kill the unborn child, whereas with certain medication and other things taken during pregnancy, usually the blame is more muddled, often due to negligence on the mother or another entity.

Truly, there is no defense for induced abortion since the intention and means are available to women and they often take it for their own convenience. With an overwhelming majority of abortions being done out of convenience, hiding behind the edge cases is nothing short of disingenuous and immoral. For a woman to take so little responsibility in her life, spreading her legs to every man she meets at the bar, and then protest about her "right" to have an abortion as an easy out from responsibility under the pretense of "rape" or "her life in danger" is truly the lowest of the low of women. Abortion really puts an interesting spin on the phrase "womb to tomb" as both are one and the same for women with abortions.

"An end to the end: Final thoughts and reflections"

Why would we allow this? Why this would become the regular? Truth is that we are playing the devil's game, and we are just following the rules he puts up slowly and steadily. Soon, just as it has happened before, what's wrong will be right, and what's right will be wrong. Remember how things like homosexuality, premarital sex and so many other things were seen as bad things before, yet, nowadays are accepted. Soon our society will collapse in its own degeneracy; soon, we will pay the broken plates we broke; and soon, we will see a line of whining people asking "who did this?", "why did it happen?" when the answer is at the front of a mirror.

References:

Finer LB, Frohvirth LF, Dauphinee LA, Singh S, Moore AM. Reasons U.S. women have abortions: quantitative and qualitative perspectives. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2005 Sep;37(3):110-8. doi: 10.1363/psrh.37.110.05. PMID: 16150658.

<https://sci-hub.se/10.1097/01.AOG.0000165274.06811.86>

<https://www.hli.org/resources/why-women-abort/>

<https://archive.ph/HCvu4>

<https://www.drugs.com/monograph/thalidomide.html>

Miller M. T. (1991). Thalidomide embryopathy: a model for the study of congenital incomitant horizontal strabismus. *Transactions of the American Ophthalmological Society*, 89, 623–674.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1298636/>