

THE PSYCHOPATHIC SOCIETY: part 5: "the massacre of the innocents"

alexis dolgorukii © 1997

I really can't bring myself to decide which aspect of the "National Psychosis" that typifies the disintegrating society in the United States of America is the most dangerous, but certainly the aspect I wish to discuss here, has clearly demonstrated its vast propensities for violence and bloodshed.

Many of my friends in other countries have confided in me their well-based fears that the subject of abortion will bring the people of the United States into another civil War.

I certainly hope this will not be the case, but surely the potential is there.

The primary problem is the level of rhetorical violence involved. **ON BOTH SIDES OF THE ARGUMENT!** Neither side is willing to admit either the sincerity or the good intentions of their opposites. The entire discussion has been encapsulated within conflicting storms of deeply held religious and political and social beliefs. The two sides of the discussion are both completely prisoners of their own rhetoric and neither side will listen to the other. The most intrinsic aspect of this situation is that both sides are correct and both sides are wrong, at least in certain aspects of their platforms.

The discussion has become a philological and semantic nightmare. Language, instead of being used to communicate and enlighten is being used in a sense in which both communication and enlightenment is impossible. The result is an emotional "fire storm" from which both sides will gain nothing and lose a great deal.

Let's look at the kind of language being used and the entirely negative results it causes before looking at the question itself.

Let's start with what I consider to be the most egregious misuse of language in this entire discussion. That is the self-labeling, by the people who oppose Abortion, of their movement as "Pro-Life"; the distinct implication being that those who do not agree with them are "Pro-Death" or rather "Anti-Life". This is absolute

nonsense and it is ex

To counter that, there is the stance taken by the "Pro-Choice" people (some of them at least) that the Anti-Abortionists are also misogynistically influenced in a direction that is intentionally harmful to women. This too is nonsense, but it is not nearly as inflammatory as the language used by their opponents.

I have to say that from my point of view it is the "Anti-Abortion" movement that is most guilty of using inflammatory language. Let me give some examples. One of the worst terms regularly used by these people is "baby killer". Now this is unfair and unwise as the people who perform Abortions are not "Baby Killers", nor do they wish to be. "Baby Killer" is an ugly term and it inspires ugly emotions. Whether or not a fetus is a "baby" is a matter for scientific discussion, not emotional "fire storms".

Worse still are the terms chosen by various religious leaders to describe legal abortion: It is regularly compared to the Holocaust, which is a comparison I consider to be both invidious and criminal. No matter who says it. And for John Paul II, the head of an organization which gave us "The Inquisition" and "The Crusades"; to call anything a holocaust is really more than a little insane, especially as Roman Catholic Christianity is the principal source of the hatred of Jews that led to Germany's holocaust. Legal abortion, for all of its shortcomings, bears no resemblance whatsoever to the conscious attempt to eradicate a group of people due to an accident of birth and belief.

Another expression that is equally ridiculous and dangerous is to compare legal abortion to "The Massacre of the Innocents", which of course refers to a fictional episode in the New Testament. There is no valid parallel between the fictional event and abortion. **BUT** the act of drawing the parallel has created a real "massacre of the innocents". Not too long ago three women, working to support themselves and their children, were murdered by a psychotic pro-lifer for the "sin" of working in a clinic where abortions were performed. They were not Nurses or Doctors but simply receptionists and clerks, condemned to death by a lunatic trying to compensate for his own perceived sins of being a homosexual. This is what Christianity does to people. These three women weren't the only innocents massacred by the fringes of the "Right to Life Movement"....but one has to ask what about their "right to life"?

A fetus is not a thinking, rational human being, it is only potentially a human being. How can anyone justify the murder of human beings to protest the termination of fetal development?

The intrinsic problem with which we are dealing in our society's debate on the subject of abortion is that neither side really wants to deal with reality, what they want to deal with are political and religious fantasies. The arguments of the Anti-abortionists are entirely based in Judeo-Christian Religious beliefs. On the other hand, many of the "Pro-Choice" movement's arguments are based upon feminism and political correctness. The "Bible" is not a valid basis for any argument in the "real World", but then neither are political theories and fads.

Of the two arguments I find the Anti-abortionists far more invidious than the Pro-Choice arguments. I personally stand completely with neither side of this argument. So then, where do I stand?

Abortion is a fact of life. It has been with us for millennia and will be with us for well into the foreseeable future. Historically speaking, no society has ever been able to prevent it. People who want to have an abortion will have one, even at the risk of their lives. No laws, no matter how Draconian, can ever change this fact one iota. It has long been a strong belief of mine that when laws are passed which are far more honored in the breach than not, then all that is achieved is the fostering of disrespect for laws and the societies that make them.

Abortion is, as every one knows the termination of pregnancy. Now the first thing I have to make clear is this: it is not a subject upon which any person other than a fertile female has any right to make decisions pro or con. One of my chief objections to the "Pro-life" movement is that it is so frequently a case in which men make decisions affecting the lives of women. The "Pro-Life" movement is far too much simply an extension of Conservative Christianity. Now, given the fact that I am a man, and ergo, the fact of abortion is intrinsically "none of my business", I will give my opinion on the subject.

The principle thing I wish to start out by saying is that the subject is not monolithic, and it is decidedly NOT a simple subject. There are a tremendous number of factors involved in the reality of the decision to have, or not to have, an abortion. One of the worst problems we all face in discussing the subject is that both sides tend to simplify the subject. It's anything BUT simple! It is not, and must not be viewed as simply a form of birth control, because it is far more than that.

The most important thing to remember for everyone who thinks about the subject; is that pregnancy and childbirth are very difficult and dangerous times in a woman's life. To forget that is an almost criminal action. Being pregnant is a tremendously uncomfortable and unpleasant condition, child birth itself is life endangering. Very much so. My own Grandmother "died in child birth". All one has to do to prove this is review parish registers of the past century. Millions of

women have died in the process of giving birth to life. Now we must all of us realize that each and every woman has the right to give "informed consent" to the process and to the discomforts and dangers it entails.

One of the greatest evils of the religious approach is that all too often it regards pregnancy as "the wages of sin". The idea that pregnancy is punishment is itself an evil far greater than abortion.

Every woman, married or unmarried has the absolute right to decide whether this is a process she really wants to undergo. There's another decision too, the end product of pregnancy is a small human being, totally helpless and in need of full time support for many years to come. Another decision a woman needs to be encouraged to make is a very difficult one indeed. And that is that she must decide whether she is ready, willing, and able to meet the responsibilities and challenges of parenting. Many are not. Being able to bear a child does not automatically confer the ability, responsibility, and character to be a parent. That this is true is more than amply demonstrated every day in our disintegrating society.

Many, many children in our society today would be infinitely better off had their Mother sought an abortion. Never being born is very much preferable to neglect and abuse.

Now, until contraception is readily and freely available in our society, and until everyone understands its necessity, and until the religious portion of our society realizes that abstention is a totally unrealistic and impossible option, then, of course, Abortion will be a necessity.

A REGRETTABLE NECESSITY!!!!

I have to say that I regard the termination of pregnancy by way of the abortion of the fetus as the "last resort". It is **NOT** simply a form of birth control, and should not be "**THE TERMINATION OF A LIFE**", there's one hell of a big difference. Nonetheless, a life is involved. This is something we must all take seriously.

Now, as far as termination of pregnancy is concerned in cases in which the life of the Mother is clearly endangered, or in those cases in which the fetus is so clearly damaged that any real quality of life is unattainable, then Abortion is a blessing, and hardly a problem. It is in the minds of those who disapprove of such a clearly beneficial action that a problem exists.

Now in my point of view, when a pregnancy is terminated because the individual just can't face the problems and discomforts of pregnancy and the dangers of childbirth, then in all probability the woman concerned, and the fetus aborted, are probably better off for the decision. The reason for my feelings are these: a person forced to undergo experience they did not want to go through is probably going to develop resentment and anger at the "cause of it all", the fetus, and the baby when it's born. Obviously this is not true in all cases, but it is true in a really significantly sufficient number of cases to render the results negative for the children involved.

LIFE ITSELF IS NOT AS IMPORTANT AS IS THE QUALITY OF THAT LIFE!

So then, where is there a problem? Well, as I see it, there's a problem when abortion is used, not as a "last resort" but in place of more benign birth control methods. Now I hasten to add that I view the so-called "morning after pill" as entirely a birth control pill and not in anyway an "abortion". The reality of the "morning after pill" is that there's a developmental process to prevent from starting, but there's no fetus to terminate.

I strongly believe that, due to their religious beliefs, the so-called "right to life movement" is targeting abortion as the most obvious and easy target when their real target is the entirety of birth control. If we give into them on this they will next be murdering druggists for selling condoms. Remember, it was the same people who make up the right to life movement who fought to keep condoms illegal.

The biggest battle we all have to fight is keeping people from enforcing their religious fantasies on those who do not share them.