

An anti-abortion philosophy (AAP)

*

DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.18129.89440](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.18129.89440)

Article version: 1.0 (15.07.2019) (no matter this current paper version, its latest variant can be always downloaded from this [URL](#))

*

Andrei-Lucian Drăgoi^{1,2}
(independent researcher)

*

For motivation of this Wikipedia-based paper format see [URL](#)

*

Abstract

This paper proposes an anti-abortion philosophy (AAP) containing some definitions, two main principles and some important recommendations (all based on a set of very solid scientific and juridical arguments), which AAP should be implemented in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and all organic laws on Earth, so that humanity to make a great step towards the definition of true high-morality civilization.

1. Introduction on human abortions

From the approx. 205 million pregnancies worldwide per year, >33% (>68 millions) are unintended AND ~20% (~41 millions) **end in induced/voluntary abortions (vABs)** [\[URL1, URL2\]](#): **most of the total number of vABs result from unintended pregnancies** [\[URL1, URL2\]](#) and only a small minority (<3%; 1-2% in UK for example [\[URL1\]](#)) are done “motivated” by genetic problems in the fetus. 50-80% of all human pregnancies (HPRs) DO NOT (naturally) PROGRESS past the 1st trimester of pregnancy [\[URL\]](#): the vast majority of these HPRs are lost BEFORE women become aware of them [\[URL\]](#) and many HPRs are lost before doctors can even detect an embryo (usually by ultrasound) [\[URL\]](#). 15-30% of known HPRs (depending upon the age and health status of the pregnant women) end in clinically apparent spontaneous abortions (sABs aka miscarriages) [\[URL\]](#): 80% of these sABs happen in the 1st trimester of HPRs [\[URL\]](#) (>50% of these 1st trim. sABs are caused by chromosomal abnormalities of the embryo or fetus [\[URL1, URL2, URL3\]](#)). According to an United Nations’ (UN) report (from 2013) on abortion law [\[URL\]](#), ~40% of the world’s women (mainly from USA, Canada, Europe, Russia, China and Australia) had access to “legal vABs”. Countries that allow vABs put various different limits to the gestational interval in which vABs are allowed [\[URL\]](#).

[1] Email: dr.dragoi@yahoo.com

[2] Main pages: www.dragoi.com; www.rg.dragoi.com; www.academia.dragoi.com; www.vixra.dragoi.com; www.gsj.dragoi.com

2. An anti-abortion philosophy (AAP)

This paper proposes an anti-abortion philosophy (AAP) based on a set of very solid scientific and juridical arguments listed next:

- Very important (initial) note.** AAP refers ONLY to voluntary (v)/deliberate/induced abortions (vABs), NOT to spontaneous Abs (sABs) (aka miscarriages). AAP ALSO EXCLUDES the small subset of specific vABs in which the life of the human embryo ^[3]/fetus ^[4](HEF) CANNOT be saved in a specific “space-time” (defined as a specific place and time), with any medical knowledge (accessible in that specific life-saving knowledge-space-time window [KSTW]), BUT that HEF puts his/her mother in life-threatening danger (which mother CAN be saved in that same KSTW), a danger for which that vAB is considered the ONLY solution (in that same KSTW), thus to actually choose the “smallest” from the two harms: a greater harm (of losing both mother and HEF) AND a smaller harm (losing HEF only) (versus the ideal of saving both mother and HEF, which is concluded by specific specialized medical forums to be unattainable in that specific KSTW). **Additional remark.** As one may observe, the medium of any abortion (and thus the virtual “medium” of AAP) is (at least) 3-dimensional 3D) and named “*knowledge-space-time*” (window) because it implies (at least) 3 dimensions: (1) a specific space (/place) of AB; (2) a specific time interval of AB; (3) specific life-saving medical knowledge accessible in that space-time window of AB.

*

- AAP’s definition of a “human person” (HP).** AAP defines the “human person” (HP) as being an entity having his/her own (i) self-conscious human rationality (reason/thoughts/mind constructs centered around a morality “hard nucleus”) & (ii) (human) emotionality (emotions/feelings) & (iii) (human) volition (will) & (iv) his/her own (human) physical body mainly based on human genome and human phenotype (in the present medical definitions of the term), NO matter if all these 4 mandatory HP subcomponents (no matter if entirely or just partially “encoded” in the human genome and epigenome) are: (a) still “archived” in a zygote OR (b) partially “de-archived”/“unzipped” in any of the multiple intrauterine developmental stages of a HEF. In other words, AAP states that ALL members of Homo sapiens (HS) species should be considered HPs, NO MATTER their phase of development (which varies from a single-cell zygote HS to an old/very old adult HS).

*

- AAP’s definition of the “individual liberty” (IL) concept.** AAP defines the individual liberty (IL) so that no IL should ever disturb any other IL: in other (more plastic) words, “an IL ends were another IL starts and vice versa”. AAP defines the

[3] the early stage of human intrauterine development (aka embryogenesis)

[4] the later stage of human intrauterine development (aka embryogenesis)

right to life (RTL) as the main IL of any born/extra-uterine or (still) unborn/intrauterine HP: however, as any other IL, RTL of any HP should NOT (and ISN'T allowed to) interfere with the RTL of any other HP (according to this AAP). The freedom of choice (FOC) is another IL: similarly, FOC of one HP should not disturb the FOC of any another HP (according to this same AAP).

*

4. **AAP's definition of a "civilized state/country" (CS).** CS is defined as a state/country in which the general/average level of morality/spiritual evolution (and NOT the average quantity of material resources per HP-citizen [which has only a low direct-proportional correlation with the level of morality]) of its citizens/HPs (and its institutions implicitly) is very high. **Important note.** Based on the international status of abortion laws worldwide and based on anti-vAB arguments that will be explained next, AAP's considers that NO state/country on Earth fits to this CS definition in the present moment of our history: HOWEVER, all present states should make a major goal of fitting this CS definition in the near, medium and distant future and should NEVER outlook/forget this main purpose of humanity in general. **Exceptions.** Individual HPs and groups of HPs that deserve the "civilized" attribute (which may be considered a veritable "honorific title" for any HP/group of HPs) SURELY exist on Earth: HOWEVER, civilized groups (CGs) remain just small "islands" of (true!) civilization in a low-civilization "ocean" of approx. 7 to 8 billions of HPs.

*

5. **AAP's "0-th" principle: the simple empathy principle (SEP).** SEP states that "you DON'T (aren't allowed to) DO to another HP (especially in his/her most vulnerable period of life, the intrauterine life) something that you SURELY wouldn't have wanted/liked (OR wouldn't want/like) to be done to you (especially in your same vulnerable intrauterine period of development)". **Reminder:** SEP is applied by AAP only to vABs (except those vABs in which the un-savable HEF threatens the life of his/her mother, who can be saved)

*

6. **AAP's 1ST principle (AAP-P1).** HEF is a human person (**HP**) DISTINCT from his mother (and obviously his father!) (and NOT some kind of additional "temporary" organ of the mother!), more specifically a temporarily dependent-and-vulnerable HP (dvHP) and should have all the rights deserved and usually given to any dvHP in any CS or in any state that pretends to really want the ..."<<CS>> honorific title".

a. Actually, the set of rights given to dvHPs is DEFINED by AAP as an important marker of civilization (a marker directly-proportional to the level of morality/spiritual evolution) in any state/country of this world.

b. **1ST argument of AAP-P1 (the medical genetic argument for HEF being a HP).** A HEF member of Homo sapiens (**HS**) species is a HP by definition, BECAUSE that (HS) HEF has all the four HP's definitory subcomponents (previously listed in AAP's definition of a HP) encoded in his/her genome and

epigenome (no matter if only partially "unzipped" in a human phenotype). Similarly to AAP, the American law 108-212 named the "Unborn Victims of Violence Act" (UVVA) defines the "child in utero" as "a member of the species Homo sapiens, at any stage of development, who is carried in the womb." ^[URL]: from this definition, it is clear that "child in utero" is equivalent to a (HS) HEF (as defined by AAP); from the same (US law) definition, it's ALSO CLEAR THAT children in utero (/HEFs) are HPs, BECAUSE all members of the Homo sapiens species are HPs. This definition of UVVA is thus in almost-perfect agreement with AAP-P1: HOWEVER, AAP-P1 additionally emphasizes the "dependence" and "vulnerability" attributes of a HEF (which HEFs are all defined by AAP as dvHPs). AAP further argues that, because HEFs are dvHPs, ALL fundamental human rights (FHRs) should be LITERALLY applied (like the prohibition of genocide [POG] for example!) OR adapted (in the case of FHRs that cannot be literally applied to HEFs because of objective reasons) to HEFs: honestly applying POG to all HEFs would oppose almost all vABs to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (by "pushing" almost all vABs outside UDHR!) and THUS may efficiently prevent >95% of vABs! The main difference between AAP and UVVA is that the AAP fights against vABs, BUT UVVA allows vABs (which is a serious self-contradiction of UVVA, as further explained and argued next).

- c. **2ND argument of AAP-P1 (the equivalence between a HEF and any other born dvHP).** HEF is highly dependent of his mother in the ~9 months of human gestation/pregnancy: this dependence plus HEF immaturity (by definition) both generate the high level of vulnerability of HEF which is VERY SIMILAR to the level of vulnerability (and dependence!) of MANY (born) child/adult HPs with serious diseases (or other serious conditions like post-traumatic states!) who spend many months or years in hospitals, fully sustained (and totally dependent!) by the entire community/society (including institutions!), usually by various health insurance systems.

d. **A "driver/pilot-mother" analogy.** The fact that HPs from a flying plane or a running bus temporarily (but almost totally!) depend on the mental and physical integrity of that plane's pilot (or that bus driver) does NOT give the pilot/driver the right to decide if those passengers "deserve to live or not"(!): a mother practically "drives" (with her mind/consciousness, thus her morality!) a bus-like body with one or more HEF-"passengers" and that fact SHOULD NOT give the mother any "live-or-die" decision right on those hosted HEFs.

Important note (1). This analogy emphasizes a serious juridical (and logical!) self-contradiction in ALL national legal systems (NLSs) that contain simultaneously laws that protect born dvHPs BUT allow mothers/parents/doctors to practically kill "unwanted" HEFs (which HEFs are ALSO, obviously and argued, dvHPs!). **Important note (2).**

NLSs that interdict [euthanasia](#) BUT allow vABs (which vABs are essentially a method of "disconnecting" a HEF from his/her mother to which that HEF is temporarily-but-highly dependent, thus very vulnerable) are ALSO in serious self-contradiction! **Important note (3)**. In many NLSs, most HPs are seriously condemnable by law if they would kill any other HP (with distinct human [genome](#), thus distinct human [phenotype](#)) AND even animals: in contrast, many (of the same!) NLSs DON'T condemn vABs (which ALSO means killing unborn dvHPs/HEFs with distinct [genome](#) and [phenotype](#)) AND THIS CONTRAST is OBVIOUSLY a serious flaw/"bug"/self-contradiction in those "schizophrenic" NLSs.

e. Rhetorical question. Given that, because of various natural imperfections/errors/problems of human reproduction, 50-80% of all human pregnancies DO NOT (naturally) PROGRESS past the 1st trimester of pregnancy ^[URL] and end as spontaneous Abs (sABs) (as already mentioned in the introduction of this paper), AAP asks rhetorically: Isn't nature cruel enough with HEFs? Why to add even more cruelty (by vABs) to the huge number of sABs?

f. Proposal no. 1 (absolute necessity in AAP's CS extended definition!). Based on the previous analogy (and the emphasized self-contradiction of many NLSs that allow vABs), AAP proposes that dvHP definition to be extended to BOTH BORN and UNBORN HPs. NOT only to the born HP (like it is currently the case in many NLSs, NLSs that greatly depart those corresponding states/countries from the CS definition!).

g. Proposal no. 2 (absolute necessity in AAP's CS extended definition!). Both HEF-as-dvHP definition and the unborn & born types of dvHPs should be included in ALL world's [constitutional laws](#), but also explicitly included in any set of elementary [fetal rights](#), including the [American Convention on Human Rights](#) (which includes the right to life of the HEF) and, more importantly and urgently, to be included (as an important update!) in the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#) (UDHR) so that, one to NOT be killed by a vAB (in his/her intrauterine stage of physical and mental development) to be a basic universal human right!

h. 3RD argument of AAP-P1 (referring to the absolutely asymmetrical distribution of innocence between a HEF and his/her mother). HEFs have ABSOLUTELY NO guilt (of any kind!) for them being created by artificial ([in vitro](#)) or natural ([in vivo](#)) [fecundation](#). HOWEVER, if these HEFs happen to be then "unwanted" by one or both their parents (and happen to be the victims of a vAB!), the actual guilt that they "changed their minds" (and "don't want those HEFs anymore") belongs (at least partially!) to their parents AND (very) probably to ALL society and its institutions insufficiently fighting against preventing the creation of such "unwanted" HEFs! It is also a serious self-contradiction of any NLS to allow an absolutely innocent HEF to pay (with his/her life!) the "change-of-mind guilt" of parents, societies

and institutions! In other words, AAP regards vABs as a murder/crime: more specifically, the killing of the innocent HEF to cover OTHER (truly!) guilty factors! Important note. "Change of mind" isn't obviously a guilt [per se](#), BUT, when it produces a consequent vABs (assimilated by AAP with a murder!), it really becomes a serious guilt attributable to all factors that participated directly and indirectly to that vAB. **Additional note.** Based on the previous arguments and BECAUSE (i) a HEF is NOT responsible of he/she being born after the [rape](#) of a fertile woman, (ii) NEITHER is responsible for having various defects of [genome](#) and/or [phenotype](#), (iii) NEITHER is "guilty" for his/her mother/father various [mental disorders](#), (iv) NEITHER is "guilty" for the possible poverty (of his/her parents or society) OR the possible [incest](#) (which i, ii, iii, iv are all used in some countries as a "motivation" for vABs), HEFs should NOT (and under NO circumstance, except the situations already listed in the 1st paragraph of this paper!) pay with his/her lives (by being the victims of vABs!) these "guilts" which are almost always and almost entirely attributable to born HPs (and generally to adult HPs): choosing a vAB in such situations is like killing the innocent with the FALSE "hope" that vAB may "solve" serious (and often chronic!) problems from that low-civilized society, in which those vABs are allowed by a specific (and obviously abusive, malignantly unfair and seriously self-contradicting!) NLS.

i. Additional comment. Even if a HEF is assigned the "uninvited guest" label, vAB (with the exceptions listed in the beginning of this paper) is such a cruel treatment for a HEF that it speaks a lot about the (very)low level of civilization of HPs on Earth (with that vAB-murder being actually the ugly-face-from-the-mirror of societies and NLSs in general!) and speaks nothing about that HEF.

j. 4TH argument of AAP-P1 (referring to reciprocal tolerance between a mother and her HEF). Given (i) AAP's definition of [individual liberty](#) (IL) (with the [right to life](#) [RTL] classified by AAP as the main IL), (ii) AAP's definition of HEFs as a dvHPs AND (iii) the exclusion by AAP of the cases in which an un-savable HEF may threaten his mother's life (so that vABs are allowed by AAP in such relatively rare situations), AAP states that HEFs and women have equivalent sets of ILs so that NO woman is allowed (/ has the right) to interfere with the RTL of any HEF as long as NO HEF doesn't usually interfere (and isn't allowed to interfere, according to the same AAP) with the RTL of that woman-mother. Because ALL HPs (HEFs or born HPs who were all HEFs in the past!) have a [sine-qua-non](#) vulnerable [intrauterine](#) phase of development (in which HPs aren't able to express [in articulated oral/written words] their freedom of choice and their choice for continuing their intrauterine lives) NO born HP (which pretends that he/she wants to continue living) has the right to kill a HEF, as long as that HEF doesn't harm anyone and according to AAP's simple [empathy](#) principle (SEP).

k. Additional recommendation (1). Because HEFs are essentially the “[stem cells](#)” of ALL societies, AAP recommends these societies (and their institutions) TO DEFEND all HEFs against any parents who choose vABs: furthermore, all parents should be informed (when they find out about a pregnancy with their HEF(s) that smoking, alcohol, drugs (or any other activity/[risk-factor](#) that puts their HEF in a life-threatening danger) is forbidden; after legally informing the parents (also in writing!) on all known possible activities (that may threaten any HEF’s life), any parent (or any other officially informed person!) who is proved to have exposed his/her HEF to such life-threatening risk-factors should be punished by law.

l. Additional recommendation (2). AAP further recommends that, based on their dependent-and-vulnerable HPs statute, HEFs to NOT ONLY be protected by law, BUT also that HEFs and their (pregnant) mothers to be accorded very many and special advantages in society: monthly free medical consults, free transport/traveling, free access to various health programs and health centers, free access to cultural activities (which may cost otherwise!) etc. Given the fact that they carry the “stem cells” of all humanity (the unborn children, as defined by AAP!), all mothers should generally be treated like “queens” in any society, because motherhood (regarded as a whole: from the moment of conception UNTIL that child reaches adulthood and becomes independent) can be alternatively defined as a very hard (and very high responsibility) “profession”, with a maximum “stake” for all humanity. Furthermore, this AAP recommends that all mothers should be given the high-statute of “privileged queen-like citizens” in any country/state and that high-statute to be emphasized in all the [constitutional laws](#) from Earth: it is almost sure that anti-vABs programs were and will be “sabotaged” from their first start, because this (recommended) highly-privileged statute of mothers isn’t specifically stipulated in the [organic laws](#) of many states/countries (if any!); this recommendation should NOT be confused with a [matriarchal](#) one, BUT AAP proposes that mother-child binome and generally the standard fertile family (composed from a mother, a father and at least one child) as the main focus of any mature and civilized society.

1. **AAP’s 2ND principle (AAP-P2).** AAP-P2 is strongly related to AAP-P1 and states that: “in order to respect AAP-P1 (BUT ALSO the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#) [UDHR]), a HP CANNOT be constrained by any means (thus NEITHER by any laws!) to kill himself/herself OR any other HP (including any HEF/dvHP): this obviously implies that (i) NO doctor (or any other medical professional) can be constrained (by any law!) to commit a vAB to a mother AND has also (ii) many other important implications/consequences, INCLUDING, for example, the AAP-legitimated right of any male/female soldier to REFUSE to kill (at any order of any of his/her hierarchical superiors!) himself/herself OR any other HP (implicitly, soldiers

for example CANNOT be judged or condemned for desertion if they refuse to kill any other HP at order)!.”

a. Additional recommendation. AAP recommends that BOTH AAP-P1 and AAP-P2 (which are based on modern [medicine](#), including [genetics](#) and [cell biology](#)) to be included in UDHR, NO MATTER if this may create “prejudices” to the stability of any [military system/army](#) of any state/country possessing such an army.

3. Final conclusions of this paper

In a future potentially more civilized world (possibly reaching a much higher level of unity), the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#) (UDHR) would probably reach a mature form (by large consensus of all Earth’s societies): this paper mainly concludes that (i) AAP is a sine-qua-non component of any mature future variant of UDHR and emphasizes the fact that (ii) a higher average level of civilization CANNOT be reached worldwide if the future variants of all [organic laws](#) from Earth (including [constitutional laws](#)) won’t fully incorporate and respect this hypothetical mature UDHR.

In other words, ALL HPs have to pass through the same intrauterine HEF-phase of development to become the adults they are, THUS they should simply show elementary empathy to all HEFs, because demonstrating such empathy ACTUALLY means showing (post-factum) empathy to themselves in their same past intrauterine developmental phase!

4. References (empty section)

(references were all integrated as Wikipedia URLs in the text)

For the motivation of this Wikipedia-based paper format, see [URL](#).