



In my time as a student and militant of Catholic Action, there was in Mexico, and in many more places, a true psychosis of advancement of communism in the world. They had to act, and people of good faith decided to become anti-communist. I remember that in Monterrey an organization was formed and financed to face the diffusion of the communist ideology, in charge of which an ex-military man became executive; I do not remember his name but a phrase that I heard: "We, the professional anti-communists ..."

Oh, my God! I thought how can one be anti-something? What is not better to be in favor of something, and consequently to challenge contrary ideas, in the face of what we consider to be higher values and at odds with others?

If what we wanted to defend was (and remains) democracy as a form of political life, the values of human dignity and religion, then we would have to offer them as a superior choice to the mistakes arising from atheist Marxism.

The same is now true, in the face of the culture of death, for the defense of the fundamental right to life, from conception to natural death, as well as the millennial concepts of the cell family and marriage, such as the union of a man and a woman and their offspring, all of it intimately linked.

I've just been on a course in which the question arose: Are you against abortion? Logically, everyone present, in line with the fundamental values indicated, was against it. But the correct answer, which suddenly emerged was: "I am for life."

Right, if I'm pro-life, I can't accept the practice of miscarriage. But the bottom line is "being for life, " in this case of life.

In the terrible ideological and legislative struggle over the permissiveness of abortion, if you are not defending life, you fall into the game of false feminism that a woman can and must decide "on her body," and therefore you can decide to abort if you find it right or just useful. Opponents of abortion, pro-abortionists and fanatical feminists, are against women!

Being pro-life is the answer; the primary declaration of action in defense of the unborn is: "I am pro-life". With this we necessarily derive the non-acceptance of the infanticide of the non-born, and never be against women, until we reach the rejection of euthanasia, kill by action or omission to a terminally ill.

Finding the world with great movements for life, what is called the "culture of life",

it is very difficult for someone to proclaim themselves openly opposed to life, to be a supporter of the "culture of death". They turn around as they can to that reality. That's why they say "pro-choice," freely pro-choice whether to abort or not.

Thus, pro-life movements, and not just against abortion, face a euphemistic statement of pro-death: they are in favor of what they call women's "right to decide". Evade thus to speak of the supposed doubt of when the life of the unborn begins, and what abortion means to kill him. They claim a woman's "right" to an abortion if she believes her life is at risk, due to pregnancy or childbirth. Very clear, but they also evade it: avoid the possible harm to maternal health, including the mortal, they defend that it is worth killing the unborn.

When we are pro-life, we defend the right to live by an innocent against the likely danger of death, only probable, of a woman. When we are pro-life, we also face that right as the proper of a suffering sick person, so that he is not made to die, or is directly killed, for those who say themselves mercifully think that they do him a great favor: that he should die now!

When we have at the table of discussion opinion on abortion (and in many fewer cases euthanasia), we must make it clear that we cannot accept it because it goes against the primal human right, that of living and, it is worth repeating, which depends to enjoy all other human rights.

We must say that we are pro-life because that is it: it is the fundamental human right, which as the basis of the natural law of man is defensible regardless of the political ideology or religious creed that we profess. The latter, the religious, is an "in addition to" the first thing, it is, says, a valuable "plus".

The important thing then is to be contrary to something, like abortion or false family, or false marriage, because we are a "favor for" life and social institutions that support a vital culture in the broadest sense.

May the conceived have the right to live in the womb, and always have in practice the treatment that allows him his whole life to be worthy too, in the broadest senses: to be loved, educated, fed, sheltered, medicated, followed by long etcetera, until he dies in peace with himself before God.

It is so broad the pro-life militancy, that defending the unborn so that it is not aborted is only the first part (and criticism, no doubt), of the struggle for life, since as I have just listed, much, much to do until reaching the defense of death without euthanasia.

The right to live is primal, and instead, natural law tells us that a so-called "right" to kill an unborn person does not exist, nor does there be the one to kill a baby already born, even if some legislators immorally approve that it is lawful in its legislative scope Vo.

Thus, let us always remember to be please of life, and therefore not be able to accept any practice (whether given legal permission or not) that violates it. "Are you for or against abortion?" ...

"I'm pro-life, so abortion is unacceptable to me!" Being against it is a simple consequence of being in favor.

Long live life!