

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Texas Gov. Greg Abbot signs Heartbeat bill. Making Abortion illegal past 6 weeks](#)

ghostboy - May 19, 2021, 10:24 pm

Greg Abbot

Quote:Republican Texas Governor Greg Abbott on Wednesday signed into law a "fetal heartbeat" abortion bill that bans the procedure after about six weeks of pregnancy and grants citizens the right to sue doctors who perform abortions past that point.

-

<https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/texas-governor-signs-law-banning-abortions-after-about-six-weeks-pregnancy-2021-05-19/>

Fuck yes let these children stand a chance. Killing an almost completely developed fetus/infant is absolutely horrible and this should have never been legal to begin with.

BigDawgAustin - May 20, 2021, 7:12 am

I Agree with this 110%

This is a quality post

Forensic - May 20, 2021, 7:13 am

Pretty disgusting and I'm sure the ALCU will do something about this. Old men should not be dictating what young girls do with their body.

XMR - May 20, 2021, 8:58 am

(May 20, 2021 07:13 AM)ForenSiicckk Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Pretty disgusting and I'm sure the ALCU will do something about this. Old men should not be dictating what young girls do with their body.

If one needs to get an abortion they have no reason to wait such a long time. Additionally, there are alternatives that don't involve murdering an unborn child.

OT: Good on Texas. Realistically speaking, there is no valid reason to abort a child past the first trimester (with some possible but very rare exceptions that I won't get into here). I am not a lawyer, but I believe there is language in the bill such that they're not actually enforcing the law themselves, but anyone involved (including the mother, doctors, etc.) can have legal action filed against them, perhaps by the father? Nothing happens to the mother or doctors unless someone files a suit against them, so by that technicality they aren't actually enforcing this law with anyone and I guess that means they aren't making it "illegal" in the sense that most people think of it.

Forensic - May 20, 2021, 9:04 am

(May 20, 2021 08:58 AM)XMR Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If one needs to get an abortion they have no reason to wait such a long time. Additionally, there are alternatives that don't involve murdering an unborn child.

Some people don't even know they're pregnant for the first 8 weeks

XMR - May 20, 2021, 9:14 am

(May 20, 2021 09:04 AM)ForenSiicckk Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Some people don't even know they're pregnant for the first 8 weeks

If you're sleeping around to that kind of level then you should be using protection. If you're doing it enough (with protection) that you get pregnant without knowing it (eg. protection fails), then pregnancy isn't your only problem. Even then, there are instant pregnancy tests, birth control, the "morning after" pill or "plan B," and some other options. On top of all this, if you can't deal with the potential consequences of having sex (eg. getting pregnant), then you shouldn't be having sex.

Abortions aren't easy for the vast majority of women to go through either because they all know what they're doing. In most cases it's extremely stressful and emotionally tolling on the woman to get an abortion, not to mention the social ramifications if others find out about it, the chances the woman would end up being disowned or shunned by her family and friends, etc. If you can't accept these as potential risks that you may have to go through and it's something you really don't want, then you shouldn't be having sex to begin with.

Prepper - May 20, 2021, 1:04 pm

This is very good I am happy to see this, now it just needs to be done in every state.

Bluffer - May 20, 2021, 1:06 pm

Some kind of freedom this is when your government is controlling the bodies of it's women.

Prepper - May 20, 2021, 1:19 pm

So a serious question for the anti-life/pro-abortion/choice people.

Since you support abortion and not allowing the father to have a say in his own child being killed do you support men being able to opt out of fatherhood and opt out of child support at any point without the mothers say?.

[Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PaQMhfXTeBA>]

Prepper - May 20, 2021, 1:25 pm

(May 20, 2021 01:23 PM)ForenSiicckk Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yep.

I must say you are the first one I have seen in years to say yes to that question.

After all my money my choice right? although I am not a shitty parent I will take care of my kids.

Forensic - May 20, 2021, 1:31 pm

(May 20, 2021 01:25 PM)Prepper Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I must say you are the first one I have seen in years to say yes to that question.

After all my money my choice right? although I am not a shitty parent I will take care of my kids. Yeah, I think it should be a choice. Forcing somebody to pay for a kid they have no interest in or did not want doesn't seem fair to me. If it's tough for the mother then that's what the welfare state is for.

Of course in an ideal situation, nobody gets in a situation where either an abortion or no father exists but in those situations I support choice in both circumstances. I don't like the concepts of abortions tbh but it is too sketchy & impossible to ban them now. Things like what Abbott did are just always done for the political benefit not much else. Very small chance that stands up in court & it only strengthens the pro-choice crowd who will always outweigh the pro-life crowd these days.

If people truly hate abortion the best thing they can do is try to limit them through various means/methods/advice. Any steps to ban or limit abortion only results in a bigger backlash.

?

ghostboy - May 20, 2021, 2:45 pm

(May 20, 2021 07:13 AM)ForenSiicckk Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Pretty disgusting and I'm sure the ALCU will do something about this. Old men should not be dictating what young girls do with their body. theres a growing human inside this body. there is now 2 bodies. the baby shall make the choice over its own body.

(May 20, 2021 01:31 PM)ForenSiicckk Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yeah, I think it should be a choice. Forcing somebody to pay for a kid they have no interest in or did not want doesn't seem fair to me. If it's tough for the mother then that's what the welfare state is for.

Of course in an ideal situation, nobody gets in a situation where either an abortion or no father exists but in those situations I support choice in both circumstances. I don't like the concepts of abortions tbh but it is too sketchy & impossible to ban them now. Things like what Abbott did are just always done for the political benefit not much else. Very small chance that stands up in court & it only strengthens the pro-choice crowd who will always outweigh the pro-life crowd these days.

If people truly hate abortion the best thing they can do is try to limit them through various means/methods/advice. Any steps to ban or limit abortion only results in a bigger backlash.

?

so instead of pursuing options like affordable/free birth control we will just kill everything we created? the baby didnt fuck itself into existence.

there are so many options like increasing funding for orphanages, making the adoption process quicker, allowing the child to live, birth control, condemns, or the best of all : abstinence

its truly sad to see someone refer to it the way you did " Forcing somebody to pay for a kid they have no interest in or did not want doesn't seem fair to me " seems kind of hypocritical to the baby doesnt it?

Lindros - May 20, 2021, 6:57 pm

(May 20, 2021 07:13 AM)ForenSiicckk Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Pretty disgusting and I'm sure the ALCU will do something about this. Old men should not be dictating what young girls do with their body. It's arguably not "her body" that's being blended up by surgical devices. So does a 9 month old baby in the womb have no "human rights"?

maryous - May 20, 2021, 10:09 pm

Questions for pro-abortion

Why is it double murder when a pregnant women get killed since it's just a fetus ?

Why is it the babe's fault when two adults have sex knowing the risks ?

luv. - May 21, 2021, 11:44 am

(May 20, 2021 10:09 PM)maryous Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Questions for pro-abortion

Why is it double murder when a pregnant women get killed since it's just a fetus ?

Why is it the babe's fault when two adults have sex knowing the risks ?

Because laws are passed by states and not pro-abortionists

What were you trying to prove lmfao

maryous - May 21, 2021, 5:35 pm

(May 21, 2021 11:44 AM)luv. Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Because laws are passed by states and not pro-abortionists

What were you trying to prove Imfao
So the states are saying the fetus is a living thing yet a not living thing ?
Would pro-abortionists agree it's not a double murder ?
What if the mother wanted the baby, would that make it a double murder and if so is the decision to want the baby makes it a living thing ?

luv. - May 21, 2021, 7:16 pm

(May 21, 2021 05:35 PM)maryous Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So the states are saying the fetus is a living thing yet a not living thing ?
Would pro-abortionists agree it's not a double murder ?
What if the mother wanted the baby, would that make it a double murder and if so is the decision to want the baby makes it a living thing ?
Yeah states are saying that...hence the laws.

I'm not sure the stance of pro-abortionists, I just replied to tell you that pro-abortionists don't pass laws :-)

The Pact - May 24, 2021, 4:14 pm

(May 19, 2021 10:24 PM)triple6 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) fugg yes let these children stand a chance. Killing an almost completely developed fetus/infant is absolutely horrible and this should have never been legal to begin with.
I looked into this and most states in the USA have not been allowing abortion on an "almost completely developed fetus" despite a lot of fake propaganda implying that to stir people up and get votes. From what I read most states have not been allowing abortion in the third trimester unless it's to save the mother's life. In much of Europe it's only allowed in the first trimester. In other first world countries it's often not allowed in the third trimester.

From what I could ascertain the propaganda about "OMG 'liberals' are killing third trimester babies that are almost ready to be born." appears to be making a meal out of the very tiny number of cases where doctors took action to save the mother's life.

Grey - May 24, 2021, 4:16 pm

Unconstitutional bill that will get struck down by SCOTUS. Greg Abbott is a clown.

ghostboy - May 24, 2021, 4:25 pm

(May 24, 2021 04:14 PM)The Pact Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I looked into this and most states in the USA have not been allowing abortion on an "almost completely developed fetus" despite a lot of fake propaganda implying that to stir people up and get votes. From what I read most states have not been allowing abortion in the third trimester unless it's to save the mother's life. In much of Europe it's only allowed in the first trimester. In other first world countries it's often not allowed in the third trimester.

From what I could ascertain the propaganda about "OMG 'liberals' are killing third trimester babies that are almost ready to be born." appears to be making a meal out of the very tiny number of cases where doctors took action to save the mother's life.

Most states dont allow 3rd trimester Abortions correct, but this one only allows for the first trimester. Anything else is 100% not allowed (Which I dont completely agree with)
I honestly feel this bill will be overturned soon anyways, this came completely out of nowhere almost as if it was only intended to stir trouble.

(May 24, 2021 04:16 PM)Grey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Unconstitutional bill that will get struck down by SCOTUS. Greg Abbott is a clown.

Its not unconstitutional if it was passed through congress and voted on.

Grey - May 24, 2021, 4:29 pm

(May 24, 2021 04:25 PM)triple6 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Its not unconstitutional if it was passed through congress and voted on.

It wasn't passed through congress. It's a state bill. But even if it was passed through Congress and voted on, it can still be unconstitutional.

SCOTUS is what stops unconstitutional bills once they've been enacted, not before. Nothing is stopping Congress from passing a outright firearm confiscation bill, but that is unconstitutional and would be stopped by SCOTUS after it passed.

Utility - May 24, 2021, 4:33 pm

(May 20, 2021 08:58 AM)XMR Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If one needs to get an abortion they have no reason to wait such a long time. Additionally, there are alternatives that don't involve murdering an unborn child.

OT: Good on Texas. Realistically speaking, there is no valid reason to abort a child past the first trimester (with some possible but very rare exceptions that I won't get into here). I am not a lawyer, but I believe there is language in the bill such that they're not actually enforcing the law themselves, but anyone involved (including the mother, doctors, etc.) can have legal action filed against them, perhaps by the father? Nothing happens to the mother or doctors unless someone files a suit against them, so by that technicality they aren't actually enforcing this law with anyone and I guess that means they aren't making it "illegal" in the sense that most people think of it.

There's perfectly understandable situations in which this is explainable.

Abusive relationships is one. How do you know the women in the relationship is forced to keep the child and didn't have the freedom to make the choice herself until then?

There's plenty of reasons why this would happen, and to brandish EVERYONE as a criminal and a bad human for doing it is pretty ignorant. All this is doing is basically labeling the bottom percentage of child bearing women who have no intention of keeping the child but by endeavors outside of their own control or maybe their own, as criminals. It's giving these women absolutely NO avenue and NO hope for their own choices or freedom. They either accept their fate, do the abortion themselves or go through extenuating circumstances to get the procedure done if not readily available to them already and not be labeled as a criminal.

I mean sure outside looking in everyone has the choice to do what they please, but this is a pipe dream for some women in slave like relationships too afraid and too weak to do anything about it.

The Pact - May 24, 2021, 4:35 pm

(May 20, 2021 09:14 AM)XMR Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If you're sleeping around to that kind of level then you should be using protection. If you're doing it enough (with protection) that you get pregnant without knowing it (eg. protection fails), then pregnancy isn't your only problem. On top of all this, if you can't deal with the potential consequences of having sex (eg. getting pregnant), then you shouldn't be having sex.

If you can't accept these as potential risks that you may have to go through and it's something you really don't want, then you shouldn't be having sex to begin with. How does not knowing you're pregnant until the 8th week mean you are sleeping around? That makes no sense. I would presume a happily married woman might be just as likely to not realise she was pregnant until the 8th week as someone sleeping around?

So much woman blaming in this paragraph and lets pretend that men don't constantly badger women for sex when they're saying no and blame it all on how the woman must be sleeping around. This makes it look like more of a woman hating thing than a love of fetuses.

Also if a woman is on the pill and she gets any stomach bug or other reason for having diarrhea or vomiting the pill does not work it can get flushed out boom surprise baby.
The thing is most people especially young women don't even know this fact.

All that being said I certainly have mixed feelings about abortion I don't know that "pro abortionists" are even a thing though.... it's more a question of "is it productive to criminalise doctors who perform abortions and women who seek them."

I do feel there is less need for abortions now that we live in an era where woman are not so demonized and don't have their name and lives completely ruined by being unwed mothers etc... But then again society does treat poor single mothers like the bottom of the barrel without blaming the men who ran off much.

ghostboy - May 24, 2021, 4:36 pm

(May 24, 2021 04:29 PM)Grey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It wasn't passed through congress. It's a state bill. But even if it was passed through Congress and voted on, it can still be unconstitutional.

SCOTUS is what stops unconstitutional bills once they've been enacted, not before. Nothing is stopping Congress from passing a outright firearm confiscation bill, but that is unconstitutional and would be stopped by SCOTUS after it passed.

That's my fault. I say Congress as a common term outside of this conversation but you are correct: I referred to the wrong one.

I can agree that there are a couple of things on this Bill that I straight up do not agree with, but its not unconstitutional. I do not see the need to have an abortion after the first trimester. Period. Women will also be followed up with an investigation after a miscarriage. This should have already been a thing as well.

The Pact - May 24, 2021, 4:37 pm

(May 24, 2021 04:25 PM)triple6 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Most states dont allow 3rd trimester Abortions correct, but this one only allows for the first trimester. Anything else is 100% not allowed

The first trimester is 12 weeks not six weeks.

Grey - May 24, 2021, 4:40 pm

(May 24, 2021 04:36 PM)triple6 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) That's my fault. I say Congress as a common term outside of this conversation but you are correct: I referred to the wrong one.

I can agree that there are a couple of things on this Bill that I straight up do not agree with, but its not unconstitutional. I do not see the need to have an abortion after the first trimester. Period. Women will also be followed up with an investigation after a miscarriage. This should have already been a thing as well.

You can say you think it isn't unconstitutional, but it literally is.

It's laid out in established constitutional law under the 4th amendment that the government cannot restrict abortion at all before the 14th week.

The Pact - May 24, 2021, 4:52 pm

(May 24, 2021 04:29 PM)Grey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It wasn't passed through congress. It's a state bill. But even if it was passed through Congress and voted on, it can still be unconstitutional.

SCOTUS is what stops unconstitutional bills once they've been enacted, not before. Nothing is stopping Congress from passing a outright firearm confiscation bill, but that is unconstitutional and would be stopped by SCOTUS after it passed.

Your signature is kind of funny in this thread. At first I thought you were saying "only a man" like "only a man would think that" about the people you quoted in the thread. ?

(May 24, 2021 04:36 PM)triple6 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Women will also be followed up with an investigation after a miscarriage. This should have already been a thing as well.

What??? What the actual fuck? They are going to harass women going through the tremendous grief and pain of a miscarriage like they are criminals and accuse them of somehow deliberately having one? That's horrific and bizarre. How are they going to know who has had a miscarriage? They're going to comb through hospital records? Wouldn't that break some kind of privacy laws? And why do you think this should have already been a thing?

Might be type to rename it the Misogyny Bill.

XMR - May 25, 2021, 6:07 pm

(May 24, 2021 04:35 PM)The Pact Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) How does not knowing you're pregnant until the 8th week mean you are sleeping around? That makes no sense. I would presume a happily married woman might be just as likely to not realise she was pregnant until the 8th week as someone sleeping around?

I never said this, and a happily married woman is much less likely to abort her child than someone who is sleeping around. A woman who sleeps around doesn't intend to get pregnant, she intends to have fun without any care for the potential consequences. Happily married women are much more likely to have sex with the intent to get pregnant than random women sleeping around.

Either way, if a woman decides to have sex then she should be aware of the risks (that are discussed in every sex ed class these days).

(May 24, 2021 04:35 PM)The Pact Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So much woman blaming in this paragraph and lets pretend that men don't constantly badger women for sex when they're saying no and blame it all on how the woman must be sleeping around. This makes it look like more of a woman hating thing than a love of fetuses.

The majority of men don't "badger women for sex" any more than the majority of women badger men for sex. What you are thinking of are the cases that are over-amplified and sensationalized in the media. I care more for the lives of the unborn (who by definition haven't even had a chance at life at all) than I do for a woman who has most likely just been making irresponsible decisions and using abortion as a quick escape from the consequences of her actions.

(May 24, 2021 04:35 PM)The Pact Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Also if a woman is on the pill and she gets any stomach bug or other reason for having diarrhea or vomiting the pill does not work it can get flushed out boom surprise baby.

The thing is most people especially young women don't even know this fact.

These cases are outliers and I've already stated in the past that I won't be arguing these as such cases are usually far more complex than simple abortions. There are cases in which women do genuinely need abortions (eg. threatening mother's life) but other than that a mistake on the woman's part is not a valid reason to murder an unborn child. Even if someone in such a position gets pregnant there are usually options other than abortion (eg. adoption, epidurals, etc). Abortion should only be used as a last resort and when there are no other options.

(May 24, 2021 04:35 PM)The Pact Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) All that being said I certainly have mixed feelings about abortion I don't know that "pro abortionists" are even a thing though.... it's more a question of "is it productive to criminalise doctors who perform abortions and women who seek them."

Being "pro-choice" is the same as being "pro-abortion." Abortion is a hot topic of debate and has been for a long time. In the majority of cases, women don't 'need' abortions. In those cases, they want abortions because they want to avoid consequences for their own bad choices. Doctors who perform abortions on request and without any good reason otherwise (eg. pregnancy endangering mother's life, rape, incest, etc.) are directly violating their own Hippocratic oaths (to do no harm) and should be stripped of their medical credentials.

(May 24, 2021 04:35 PM)The Pact Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I do feel there is less need for abortions now that we live in an era where woman are not so demonized and don't have their name and lives completely ruined by being unwed mothers etc... But then again society does treat poor single mothers like the bottom of the barrel without blaming the men who ran off much.

I think you would be surprised. One would think that abortion is more accepted than it was before but the reality is it hasn't gone anywhere. In the case of single mothers, I would actually say the man is more at fault than the woman.

(May 24, 2021 04:33 PM)Utility Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) There's perfectly understandable situations in which this is explainable.

Abusive relationships is one. How do you know the women in the relationship is forced to keep the child and didn't have the freedom to make the choice herself until then?

The women who want/need abortions because of rape, incest, abusive relationships, or medical reasons is very small compared to the amount of women who want abortions because of their own mistakes. There are valid reasons for getting an abortion such as those I've just mentioned, but sleeping around is not one of them. If someone voluntarily has sex then they should know the risks. Ignorance isn't a valid excuse.

(May 24, 2021 04:33 PM)Utility Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) There's plenty of reasons why this would happen, and to brandish EVERYONE as a criminal and a bad human for doing it is pretty ignorant. All this is doing is basically labeling the bottom percentage of child bearing women who have no intention of keeping the child but by endeavors outside of their own control or maybe their own, as criminals. It's giving these women absolutely NO avenue and NO hope for their own choices or freedom. They either accept their fate, do the abortion themselves or go through extenuating circumstances to get the procedure done if not readily available to them already and not be labeled as a criminal.

I never said everyone who has an abortion is automatically a criminal and a bad person. If a woman gets pregnant after having consensual sex then it's entirely within her control. Sex (and relationships in general) is an entirely voluntary action (in the vast majority of cases, and as I said I won't be arguing cases of rape for example because those are uncommon outliers as well as very complex issues). Again, ignorance alone is not a valid reason to get an abortion.

(May 24, 2021 04:33 PM)Utility Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I mean sure outside looking in everyone has the choice to do what they please, but this is a pipe dream for some women in slave like relationships too afraid and too weak to do anything about it.

Not everyone has this choice, but the vast majority of people do. I won't be arguing on behalf of the small minority that don't have such a choice because that's a very complex topic well out of the scope of just abortions.

To clarify my position on abortion: It should be allowed, but not on simple request. Anyone having an abortion should have a valid reason to do so such as rape, incest, or medical reasons.

I fully agree with this. Condoms, Birth control pills and IUD are all rather inexpensive methods of contraception. Adoption is also an option. Fathers who never knew about this pregnancy could also be affected if they find out about it. I was married for 8 years before I had my first kid. We dealt with infertility and we actually gave up on having kids.

I think that abortion should only be in consideration:

1. If the pregnancy could result in a fatal outcome towards the mother or infant.
2. The pregnancy is the result of rape or an incestual relationship

If you choose to have unprotected sex and you get pregnant then you should be an adult and start handling your responsibilities.

The Pact - May 27, 2021, 7:17 pm

(May 20, 2021 01:19 PM)Prepper Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So a serious question for the anti-life/pro-abortion/choice people.

Since you support abortion and not allowing the father to have a say in his own child being killed do you support men being able to opt out of fatherhood and opt out of child support at any point without the mothers say?.

Men already HAVE that option and they do it ALL THE TIME and that's one major reason that abortion exists. Do you think it's a coincidence that abortion became legal in the USA after all the promotion of "free love" which was about men getting to sleep around and not make a commitment to one woman and provide for a family. Seems like you're happy with men running off and doing whatever they want while women suffer.

And I'm not "pro-abortion" or "anti-life" I suppose maybe I'm very reluctantly pro choice because throwing doctors and women in jail over it doesn't seem productive and that's really all it's about as a legal concept.

I agree that I don't really understand why you need an abortion in the second trimester but the first trimester is 12 weeks which isn't in line with this crazy woman hating new law the thread is about. Some people get abortions in the second trimester when it's found that the fetus has a severe abnormality or the baby has Downs (which is a whole nother kettle of ethics we won't go into here.) All the nonsense about third term abortions is right wing propaganda that literally isn't happening if you look it up. The statistics on third term abortions are all cases where the mother was going to die if it wasn't performed or at least 99% of them are. When I looked it up it's not legal in any of the separate US states to have third term abortions on a whim it's being done to save the mother's life in those cases. But lies about that have been promoted as a political football. I looked it up because I wondered if it was actually happening in the USA and why and apparently it is not. The country I moved to from the USA, New Zealand also does not allow abortions after the second trimester.

What also really puzzles me is that most of these pro-life anti-women people are always the FIRST people to tell you they don't want any social programs to feed or house the baby after it's born because "mahhhh precioussss tax dolla!" So you people don't care about babies or these fetuses at all so it ends up looking like you just despise women.

Prepper - May 28, 2021, 8:20 am

(May 27, 2021 07:17 PM)The Pact Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Men already HAVE that option and they do it ALL THE TIME and that's one major reason that abortion exists. Do you think it's a coincidence that abortion became legal in the USA after all the promotion of "free love" which was about men getting to sleep around and not make a commitment to one woman and provide for a family. Seems like you're happy with men running off and doing whatever they want while women suffer.

And I'm not "pro-abortion" or "anti-life" I suppose maybe I'm very reluctantly pro choice because throwing doctors and women in jail over it doesn't seem productive and that's really all it's about as a legal concept.

I agree that I don't really understand why you need an abortion in the second trimester but the first trimester is 12 weeks which isn't in line with this crazy woman hating new law the thread is about. Some people get abortions in the second trimester when it's found that the fetus has a severe abnormality or the baby has Downs (which is a whole nother kettle of ethics we won't go into here.) All the nonsense about third term abortions is right wing propaganda that literally isn't happening if you look it up. The statistics on third term abortions are all cases where the mother was going to die if it wasn't performed or at least 99% of them are. When I looked it up it's not legal in any of the separate US states to have third term abortions on a whim it's being done to save the mother's life in those cases. But lies about that have been promoted as a political football. I looked it up because I wondered if it was actually happening in the USA and why and apparently it is not. The country I moved to from the USA, New Zealand also does not allow abortions after the second trimester.

What also really puzzles me is that most of these pro-life anti-women people are always the FIRST people to tell you they don't want any social programs to feed or house the baby after it's born because "mahhhh precioussss tax dolla!" So you people don't care about babies or these fetuses at all so it ends up looking like you just despise women.

To tackle your first point, false. Men do not have the option to not pay child support, if a man refuses to pay child support they get locked up and while they are locked up that child support continues to rack up. So no they don't have the option to opt out. Where did I say I am happy with men running off while women suffer? and why do you assume it is only men running off? hell I didn't even say I am against child support I simply asked a question and you just assumed

but to clear this up as well I am against child support as it is right now because many times the parent who has custody ends up using that child support money for things that have nothing to do with the well-being of a child such as drugs, alcohol, etc. I would rather see requirements of showing how the money was spent with proof being put into place such as a dedicated child support card which has records of what was purchased.

It seems like you support women killing the child of a man knowing he can't do anything about it, knowing he has no say and has to suffer knowing his child was just killed. You seem to be all against women suffering but not men.

I have nothing against social programs such as snap benefits or wic benefits to feed a family or feed a baby, I am pro-life that do you realize how stupid it would be to be against abortion in most cases and claim to be pro-life but to then support that a is child starving?. I do however believe these programs are being taken advantage of not by just women but men too and that needs to stop.

The Pact - May 28, 2021, 9:56 am

(May 28, 2021 08:20 AM)Prepper Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It seems like you support women killing the child of a man knowing he can't do anything about it, knowing he has no say and has to suffer knowing his child was just killed. You seem to be all against women suffering but not men.

Not really but I don't see any easy and fair solutions to the issue. Men can pretend they care then once the baby is born skip out and not help. I personally know men who did that men who begged the woman not to abort their second baby but then skipped out on the relationship and never paid child support. I guess if the man is going to complain about it there would need to be a system to insure he really does care and help out with the baby for life. I've known many women who don't put the father's name down on the certificate to ensure he pays child support when they go on welfare

because they are frightened of potential beatings or just rage filled phone calls if they name the dad. That's what happened with one man I know who begged his then girlfriend not to abort the baby. She didn't and hadn't put his name on the certificate afraid he'd fly into a rage if she did and then he skipped out on her and when she called him saying the kids were driving her crazy and she couldn't cope he said "go crazy then" and hung up on her and never paid the child support. Men in the USA can skip state to avoid child support I think. I've read and seen on videos and documentaries plenty of cases where the dad never pays the child support in the USA. Men get out of it all the time it seems. Women have to fight to get it and sometimes they don't want to deal with the man's rage over it. There was a man in the USA who was a phlebologist and he injected his baby son with AIDS thinking that would get him out of child support although that's a pretty obscure, irrelevant case but you just reminded me of it.

(May 28, 2021 08:20 AM)Prepper Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) , I am pro-life that do you realize how stupid it would be to be against abortion in most cases and claim to be pro-life but to then support that a is child starving?.

YES I DO but you're in the minority among proliferers if you don't want that. But since you're complaining about abuse of the programs generally that means right wing parties using possible abuse as an excuse to "crack down" and take the programs away from people for a cost cutting exercise using the bogeyman of possible abuse of programs as an excuse for the cost cutting.

Lol I don't know why I'm getting into all this luckily non of this sh** has ever happened to me and our babies were planned and wanted. I did end up a single parent anyway though because ...death.

Prepper - May 28, 2021, 10:42 am

(May 28, 2021 09:56 AM)The Pact Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Not really but I don't see any easy and fair solutions to the issue. Men can pretend they care then once the baby is born skip out and not help. I personally know men who did that men who begged the woman not to abort their second baby but then skipped out on the relationship and never paid child support. I guess if the man is going to complain about it there would need to be a system to insure he really does care and help out with the baby for life. I've known many women who don't put the father's name down on the certificate to ensure he pays child support when they go on welfare because they are frightened of potential beatings or just rage filled phone calls if they name the dad. That's what happened with one man I know who begged his then girlfriend not to abort the baby. She didn't and hadn't put his name on the certificate afraid he'd fly into a rage if she did and then he skipped out on her and when she called him saying the kids were driving her crazy and she couldn't cope he said "go crazy then" and hung up on her and never paid the child support. Men in the USA can skip state to avoid child support I think. I've read and seen on videos and documentaries plenty of cases where the dad never pays the child support in the USA. Men get out of it all the time it seems. Women have to fight to get it and sometimes they don't want to deal with the man's rage over it. There was a man in the USA who was a phlebologist and he injected his baby son with AIDS thinking that would get him out of child support although that's a pretty obscure, irrelevant case but you just reminded me of it.

YES I DO but you're in the minority among proliferers if you don't want that. But since you're complaining about abuse of the programs generally that means right wing parties using possible abuse as an excuse to "crack down" and take the programs away from people for a cost cutting exercise using the bogeyman of possible abuse of programs as an excuse for the cost cutting.

Lol I don't know why I'm getting into all this luckily non of this sh** has ever happened to me and our babies were planned and wanted. I did end up a single parent anyway though because ...death.

I personally know people who were paying child support but got a little behind because shit happens and the state literally took his car and sold it to pay for the child support, he didn't have a say in it so as a result of them taking his car he had no way to work and as a result got even further

behind in child support.

I lived in 2 states and no matter what the situation is the states always favor the mother and immediately slap child support on the father. I also know a situation where the women lied to someone I know and said the kid wasn't his and she refused a DNA test. Then I believe 15 years later the police come knocking on my door looking for the guy because he lived in the same house at the time this was years ago well they served him papers and all of a sudden he gets slapped with child support and has absolutely no rights, no visitation or nothing, even though the child wants to have a daughter/father relationship the mother wont allow it and the courts side with her. And keep in mind he is clean, he doesn't do drugs, he pays his child support on time every time but he can't even see his own daughter.

The child support system is broken and it needs to be fixed, not taken away. I am not one of those far right idiots who want to demolish welfare completely. Like I said I think a child support card is a fair idea which will have records of everything the child support was used for and if it was not used for the well-being of the child then the guardian should have to pay it back. Well-being of the child can include rent, electric, water, food, transportation. However if someone chooses to buy cigarettes, weed, alcohol, etc with it then they need to be held responsible.

Even SNAP is broken, I know of people who have decent income but still rack in over \$600 in food stamps while other people I know are barely making it and cannot even get approved for food stamps.

Also you mention you are now a single parent, I am not sure if you are a mother or father but that is something people have to take into consideration as well. Don't have babies unless you can take care of the child by yourself because things like this can happen, use protection. If protection has failed then use a morning after pill. Don't wait months and be like oh you know my one night stand isn't going to be there so I am going to abort the child.

Don't get me wrong sometimes abortion has its place such as in the cases with the mother or child is at high risk of death or serious complication