

The Birthday Party

Stance on Abortion

Introduction 1

- **Selfish** 1
- **Unborn Human** 1
- **Murder and Killing** 1
- **Stance** 2

Introduction

Written by Central Committee Member Nuxart on November 4th, 2026, this short document is to make the stance of Nuxart's position on abortion clear.

Selfish

If one were to search up the definition of selfish they might find this definition "someone who cares only about themselves, their own advantage, pleasure, or well-being without thinking about or caring for the needs and feelings of others."

I found this definition, and for that reason I have decided to apply this to those who attempt to give birth or those who want an abortion. This is not intended to put down the person, but rather to accept that these decisions are selfish. Now, we are, of course, talking about the situation that one of our time would expect, of course, a person giving birth because they consented to having sex with another human.

Why would this be selfish? Well we all know that unborn humans cannot in any concrete manner consent to being birthed nor to being aborted. So, because of this, it is selfish as we have known that historically that for the humans who wish to finish the birth they might do it for some general purposes like creating a family of their own or passing off their genes and how they have historically treated their children as that of personal property rather than their own agents which eventually age to gain full independence.

Unborn Human

For this document and possibly future documents, an unborn human is a human who hasn't exited the body of the pregnant human. If one wants to argue about whether it is murder, then I would say that they can make that argument, but I do not care about this argument; I am indifferent to it. I also do not care about the other classifications made to try to avoid the fact that this is an unborn human. It was on their way of becoming human, since I do not know of any humans who can birth nonhuman creatures. The destruction of an unborn human is not wrong in my eyes mostly because this unborn human is usually brought here under circumstances of selfishness this same selfishness allows them to also order the destruction of the unborn human especially if we consider that the usual circumstances requires the occupation of the selfish human and if they so please to carry on or order the destruction of this unborn human that is their decision to make because of their selfishness.

Murder and Killing

Murder or Killings however you want to see it as there are legally distinct forms of it but for this document or future ones murder to me would mean just killing someone. I searched up the definition of murder, and I got this: "the unlawful and unjustifiable killing of a human being by another person, usually committed with malice aforethought or extreme indifference to human life." I then searched up the definition of unlawful and got "means an action, behavior, or condition that is not authorized, allowed, or justified

by law." I also looked up the definition of unjustifiable and found, "something unable to be defended, excused, or explained by a good, fair, or acceptable reason." Clearly, killing or destroying of an unborn person is also not unjustifiable

Now with these things added together there can be an argument that murder occurred depending on the legal statues of where one resides at least on the legal side of things, but if we are focusing on purely killing then the destruction of unborn humans is always a form of killing as you are destroying them. Killing is clearly not always wrong, especially if you ask others about situations of self-defense or when you enter things such as Natural law or Moral justice rather than statutory justice; then suddenly, if killing is bad or not changes. Under my current framework at the time of seeing this the destruction of unborn humans is a form of killing that would not unjustifiable first of all in the most normal of normal circumstances this unborn human was about in a selfish and because at this stage there is no way of consent it is ultimately up to the pregnant human if they wish to pursue the birthing of this unborn human. They are justified in the destruction of the unborn human because it occupies their human body, and because of this same selfishness, allows them to destroy them, as they have no autonomy of their own. Once they are a born human, they will develop into their own autonomous agents based on normal circumstances.

Stance

In case it is not entirely clear because of my bad writing and laziness in rewriting things, I am in full support of abortion, but I do hope that people who raise these born humans accept that they are their own autonomous agents and receive more listening than is currently provided to them in a reasonable way, since, as a human develops, there are different tiers of autonomy one can reach, and we know not everyone can reach these due to disabilities that might come before or after their birth. The only reason selfishness even provides this consent is because the unborn human cannot also consent to their birth or their abortion; we don't know entirely if they would've wanted to be born or not, so it is left as a personal decision, and because the unborn human also occupies the body of the pregnant human, they have a right to override the unborn human and their occupation of the pregnant human. I have heard arguments about how one may incur legal penalties for beating up a pregnant human, but this makes sense because it isn't known if the pregnant human will continue with their birth or not, and because, at the time the unborn human hasn't been aborted, it makes sense to add protections because, if this unborn human is to be born, then it is in their best interests that they develop with the least negative actions inflicted on them, and because of the selfishness of the pregnant person, this is needed to protect their right to continue with their selfishness and provide birth.