

User:Zero Contradictions/Efilism

W en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Zero_Contradictions/Efilism

Efilism is an extremist, negative utilitarian, pro-mortalist, antinatalist philosophy that advocates for the forced extinction of all life on Earth by any means necessary.^{[1][2][3]} Efilists believe that there is a moral obligation to eradicate life from Earth.^[4] Efilism was created by YouTube vlogger Gary Mosher,^[5] better known online as "Inmendham",^[2] and coined on 2 September 2011.^{[6]:28} Efilism's etymology was derived by spelling "life" backwards.^[7] Efilists believe that "DNA, and the suffering of sentient consciousness, is the greatest problem in the universe".^{[8][9]} Efilism has been praised for challenging philosophical assumptions that most people take for granted.^{[10]:176}

Efilists and promortalists have been criticized for inciting and causing violence, under the guise of philosophical debate.^[4] Adam Lanza, the perpetrator of the Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting in 2012 was influenced by efilism.^{[1][10]:7–8} Guy Edward Bartkus, the perpetrator of the 2025 Palm Springs fertility clinic bombing, was an efilist and a promortalist.^{[4][11]} Amanda Sukenick, a prominent efilist activist, supports ending suffering via global extinction by any means necessary.^[1] Sukenick has said she has had to "talk people down from just going out and killing random people or hunting animals in some disgusting violent manner" of committing violence.^{[1][2]:1,13} Inmendham and Sukenick have been criticized for making inconsistent statements and denying responsibility for violence committed by efilists.^{[5][2]:14} Major factions of the antinatalist community have outspokenly criticized and condemned efilists and promortalists for inciting and advocating violence.^{[2][12][6]:44}

Philosophy

Beliefs

Efilism is atheist, moral realist, altruistic, and pro-evolution, as opposed to creationism.^{[10]:170} In *On the Edge* (2017), Canadian philosopher and biologist T. K. Van Allen wrote that efilism is the logical conclusion of egalitarianism.^{[13]:183} Van Allen has praised efilism for its willingness to challenge assumptions that most people would never question, namely for asking whether life is worth living, its realism about the nature of life, and its moral consistency in applying altruism to all sentient beings.^{[10]:176} Van Allen has said "Efilism raises profound philosophical questions about the meaning, purpose and value of life."^{[10]:176}

Van Allen describes efilism as being based on three premises: 1. negative hedonism, 2. altruism, and 3. sentient beings experience more pain than pleasure, on average.^{[10]:170} Van Allen believes that at least one of these premises must be rejected in order to reject efilism.

[10]:171 He rejects all three premises, as he rejects altruism, believes that pain and pleasure balance out in the long run, [10]:215–216 and is not a hedonist. [10]:202 Van Allen argues that efilism is irrational for failing to adequately question these core assumptions. [10]:170–176

Efilism, antinatalism, and promortalism should not be confused with nihilism. [14] Nihilists believe that life is meaningless, whereas efilists and promortalists simply do not value life. [14] Efilism is distinct from nihilism because efilists believe that they have a mission to accomplish. [14] A moral nihilist would believe that there are no moral obligations, whereas efilists believe they have a moral obligation as negative utilitarians to minimize suffering [14] (which could entail killing themselves and/or others from their promortalist point-of-view [15]) and to permanently destroy all life. [1] According to Van Allen, "You might arrive at the philosophical position that life is meaningless, but you won't act as if life is meaningless. The brain that generates philosophical skepticism also generates the will to live." [10]:334 Since nihilism is thus compatible with any set of actions, it is possible to be both a nihilist and an efilist. [13]:207

Antinatalism

Main article: Antinatalism

Antinatalism or **anti-natalism** is the philosophical value judgment that procreation is unethical or unjustifiable. Antinatalists thus argue that humans should abstain from making children. [16][17][18] Some antinatalists consider coming into existence to always be a serious harm. Both antinatalists and efilists believe that antinatalism should apply to all sentient creatures, not just humans, arguing that coming into existence is a serious harm for sentient beings in general. [19]:2–3, 163 [20][21] Efilists have criticized antinatalists for being too "anthropocentric", even though all antinatalists generally believe that antinatalism should apply to animals too. [2]:23 [3] Efilists often promote veganism. [22]

Japanese philosopher Masahiro Morioka has proposed a taxonomy that divides "antiprocreative" (at times called antinatalist) thought into four major branches: the childfree movement, the voluntary human extinction movement (VHEMT), efilism, and antinatalism in general. [9][23] Only the latter one is philosophical antinatalism *per se*, meeting the definition of philosophical antinatalism and having no other features on top of that, whereas the first three items can only be deemed antinatalistic in the sense that they oppose the alleged duty to procreate. [9][23]

Promortalism

Promortalism or **pro-mortalism** is the philosophical value judgment that death is always better than life. [1][6]:5 [24] A common motivation for pro-mortalism is to prevent the perceived future suffering of oneself and/or other sentient beings. [25] Promortalism positively values death, whereas antinatalism negatively values birth, so both value judgments are distinct

from each other.^{[26][27]} Antinatalism is generally supportive of abortion rights and anti-pro-life, while pro-mortalism and efilism are plainly anti-life.^[8] Pro-mortalism is among the core values of efilism, and is strongly related to negative utilitarianism.^{[28][29]}

Antinatalists and promortalists generally agree that if one accepts that life is suffering and no other premises are assumed, then antinatalism (ceasing the propagation of life) and promortalism (ending life) are both implied.^{[1][24]} As an analogy, if one believes that smoking causes harm, then not only should people not start smoking, but they should also stop if they already smoke.^{[24][1]}

Similarly, Jiwoon Hwang argued that the hedonistic interpretation of Benatar's asymmetry argument of harms and benefits entails promortalism — the view that it is always preferable to cease to exist than to continue to live. Hwang argues that the absence of pleasure is not bad in the following cases: for the one who never exists, for the one who exists, and for the one who ceased to exist. By "bad", we mean that it is not worse than the presence of pleasure for the one who exists. This is consistent with Benatar's statement that the presence of pleasure for the existing person is not an advantage over the absence of pleasure for the never existing and *vice versa*.^[30]

However, emeritus professor David Benatar of the University of Cape Town has argued that if one accepts antinatalism, many arguments and premises besides antinatalism would be necessary in order for antinatalism to imply promortalism.^{[3][31]} Hence, antinatalism does not imply pro-mortalism by itself.^[19] It is possible to simultaneously support antinatalism and oppose promortalism.^[31] For example, an antinatalist who is also a rights theorist would support antinatalism while opposing murder on the basis that people have a right not to be killed or murdered.^[3] An antinatalist could also oppose promortalism by believing that it is worse for anyone to die earlier than they need to, or simply because it is troubling to kill people.^[31] An antinatalist can believe that while life is not worth starting, life can be worth continuing.^[32] Many promortalists also oppose violence and coercion.^[15] For example, the promortalist Jiwoon Hwang asserted:

"My pro-mortalism does not imply that it is obligatory or even permissible to kill other people without their consent, even painlessly and with good intent. There may be many reasons for this, such as autonomy and right to life."^[30]

—Jiwoon Hwang, *"Why it is Always Better to Cease to Exist"*

Hwang later died by suicide.^[1] The antinatalist and promortalist communities sympathized with his choice while mourning his death as a loss.^[1] Promortalists have also cited autonomy and end-of-life dignity as reasons for avoiding death.^[15] Some journalists have expressed concern that promortalist values may be increasing in the modern world, amid rising loneliness, suicides, the youth mental health crisis, inceldom, and doomerism.^{[1][15][33]}

The red button thought experiment

See also: [The benevolent world-exploder](#)

[Ninian Smart](#) conceived the benevolent world-exploder (BNE) thought experiment in a 1958 article for the purposes of coining the term "[negative utilitarianism](#)" and arguing against it. He stated that negative utilitarianism would entail that a ruler who is able to instantly and painlessly destroy the human race, "a benevolent world-exploder", would have a duty to do so.^[34] This is the most famous argument against negative utilitarianism, and it is directed against sufficiently strong versions of negative utilitarianism.^[36] Many authors have endorsed this argument,^[37] and some have presented counterarguments against it.

The red button thought experiment that is proposed by [efilists](#)^{[6]:36} is similar to the benevolent world-exploder,^{[2]:23} but there are multiple key differences. Smart's BNE explicitly assumes that a benevolent attempt to destroy the human race must be completely painless and instantaneous, whereas the red button thought experiment is not necessarily instantaneous nor painless.^[3] Efilists are more concerned with making life extinct as thoroughly and as quickly as possible.^[4] The red button also applies to all life, while the BNE only applies to human life.^{[6]:33} As conceived by [Inmendham](#), the main version of the red button thought experiment proposes that the Earth should be destroyed using [nuclear bombs](#).^{[2]:2,9,23,24}

Efilists are primarily concerned with eradicating sentient life, since sentient life has the potential to suffer. Regardless of whichever method for destroying is chosen, it is important to Efilists that nonsentient life, such as plants and bacteria, also be destroyed. Efilists want to destroy nonsentient life as well, since it could theoretically evolve into sentient life and reignite the core moral dilemma of their worldview. Any proposal to destroy the Earth that they may favor would have to be guaranteed to destroy *all* life, lest the proposal ultimately be futile.^[38]

Efilists believe that humanity should end all suffering at all costs [by any means necessary](#).^[1] ^[3] Efilists would be willing to press the red button even if it inflicts tremendous amounts of pain on all life, on the belief that the total pain inflicted would be less than the future suffering that is prevented by pressing the button.^[3] Efilists believe it would be [evil](#) to not press the button.^{[2]:23}

Smart proposed the BNE in an attempt to make a reductio ad absurdum of negative utilitarianism, while efilists propose the the red button experiment to emphasize their commitments to consequentialism and global extinction.^[3] When Dr. David Benatar was asked in an interview if he would press the red button, he said that he would refuse to press it.^[39] In a 2017 debate against [Sam Harris](#), Benatar also opposed a similar global extinction scenario where nobody suffers pain from dying on the grounds that people who already exist have an interest in not ceasing to exist.^[40] [Inmendham](#) is infuriated that Benatar does not support global extinction.^{[2]:9}

Violence

Most of the antinatalism movement condemns violence,^{[12][2]} whereas most efilists are willing to support violence when they believe that it would reduce net suffering,^{[1][2]} especially if such violence would destroy all life on Earth.^[2] Online efilist communities have been increasingly plagued with death threats, hate speech, and calls to sterilize the human race, under the guise of philosophical debate.^[4] Efilists have encouraged suicide, murder, and violence on YouTube.^{[4][33]} Even anonymous antinatalist communities have started calling for parents to be murdered or sent to concentration camps.^[4]

Amanda Sukenick

Amanda Sukenick (born 1982 or 1983), a filmmaker and artist from Chicago,^[41] is one of the most significant activists in the antinatalist movement, and she identifies as both an antinatalist and an efilist.^{[1][42]} Sukenick believes that all sentient life, including humans and animals, should go extinct.^[42] Sukenick has said "If it were possible to unplug the universe so there was nothing — and no possibility of suffering — that would be my idea of a great time."^[42] On another occasion, Sukenick answered that her idea of a perfect world would be "A barren universe. A place where no sentient beings can be harmed".^[41] Sukenick regards that the decision of parents to have kids as naive and arrogant.^[41] Sukenick supports ending suffering via global extinction by any means necessary.^[1]

Sukenick has stated that one of the main goals of efilist movement is to "Efilize Antinatalism from within".^{[2]:1} Regarding her relationship to efilism, Sukenick has said "This is my life. This is my chosen path in this existence that I have put 10 years of blood, sweat and tears into this thing. Not to be dramatic, but it is true. I've dedicated my life to this and I want to dedicate whatever is left of my life to it."^{[2]:2}

Sukenick has also stated:

"I do believe that Efilism is the superior version of this philosophy. My entire reason for trying to build the big tent of Antinatalism is to make Efilism more heard. That is my entire goal, I'm sorry, I know most of you disagree with that but that is my reason for doing everything that I do. Projects like the podcast and everything, yeah, I want to talk to more Antinatalists and like-minded people because I want to insert more of this idea into the conversation and that's kind of been my entire goal."^{[2]:2}

—*Antinatalist Community, "Antinatalist Community Open Letter (2021)"*

Sukenick has said she has had to "talk people down from just going out and killing random people or hunting animals in some disgusting violent manner" of committing violence.^{[1][2]:1,13} Sukenick and other efilists have formed an organization known as 'Antinatalism

International', which is actually run by efilists, despite its name and branding.^{[2]:1} Even though the organization claims to condemn violence, members like Sukenick and Inmendham have made multiple statements condoning violence in the past.^{[2]:1–2}

Inmendham

Gary Mosher (born 1959),^[5] better known as "Inmendham",^[2] created "Efilism" and coined his philosophy on 2 September 2011.^{[6]:28[1]} in New Jersey.^[5] Inmendham has been ranting online and making videos to promote his efilist philosophy since 2005.^[4] Inmendham has been criticized for misogyny, classism, animal cruelty,^[4] homophobia, Holocaust denial, and inciting violence.^{[2]:3–21[5]} Inmendham once proclaimed "You want to make something go extinct? You have to kill the generation."^[5] In another video, Inmendham exclaimed "I would kill a bitch if she tried to have my baby."^[5] Inmendham has been described as "a particularly vile lowest-common-denominator sophist on our rapidly unhinged internet."^[5]

2012 Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting

Main article: Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting

Adam Lanza, the perpetrator of the Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting in 2012 was influenced by efilism,^{[1][10]:7–8} although he did not identify as an efilist. Lanza identified as an antinatalist, and suggested "eulavism" (derived from "value" spelled backwards) as a term for describing his philosophy.^{[10]:7–8} On his YouTube channel, Lanza once said "I've always had an immense hatred for culture. I consider culture to be delusional values which humans mindlessly coerce onto each other, spreading it no differently than any other disease."^[33]

Unlike efilists, Lanza believed that morality is a cultural delusion, and he did not value altruism.^[10] He criticized efilists for their belief in moral realism and moral universalism.^[10] Lanza did not share the negative utilitarian values of Efilists either, at least not in the same way as they do.^[43] Even if all suffering were abolished, Lanza would still reject life because life causes the existence of value:

"It's my value which leads me to hating value. (sigh) And another thing about the Efilists is that a lot of them seem to think, that it's possible for there to be... it's possible for there to be an instance under which it would be a good idea to propagate life, that if suffering were abolished tomorrow, that it would be okay to bring new lives into the world or to live your current life. But I don't really focus on suffering, at least not directly, I focus on really, value itself, that's the problem. Even if there were Paradise tomorrow, and there were no suffering forever in the future, I would still be advocating this position because I... you can sum me up in one sentence: I have a vendetta against value. So instead of an Efilist I'm more of a... [?] I only oppose life because life is the source of value and it's value that I really hate. [short pause] Well I guess that just says it all: I have a vendetta against value. And I guess that's a good place to finish my video, I mean I basically support the Efilists because I do hate life and value, but um... it's just that I have several problems with them, and also the same applies to Gary[?] there are a lot of things I disagree with him about but listening to his rants are kind of my idea of pornography. It's just fun to listen to."^[43]

—Adam Lanza, *"Rambling vlogrant of a ruminative vagrant (Part 2/2)"*, *Culture Philistine* (7 September 2011)

Van Allen believes that eulavism influenced Lanza's decision to commit mass murder.^[10] However, Van Allen also believes Lanza had other motives for the shooting as well, since he believes that the philosophy described by Lanza alone does not imply murder.^[10] Van Allen believed that Lanza's mother's desire to sell the house^[44] pushed Lanza over the edge since the selling the house would have required evicting Lanza from his bedroom.^{[10][45]}

Lanza expressed antinatalist views and disgust at the idea of childbirth on his channel: "I think that you should say 'I'm so sorry for your loss' whenever you hear that someone is pregnant."^[33] The website of Guy Edward Bartkus, the culprit of the 2025 Palm Springs fertility clinic bombing, included a link to the transcripts of Lanza's videos and audio recordings, posted to his YouTube "Cultural Philistine",^{[33][46][47]} which Lanza recorded a year before he did the shooting.^[10]

2025 Palm Springs fertility clinic bombing

Main article: [2025 Palm Springs fertility clinic bombing](#)

On May 17, 2025, a car bombing occurred at a reproductive center in [Palm Springs, California](#), which injured four people and left one person dead, later confirmed to be the perpetrator.^{[48][49]} The attack was carried out by Guy Edward Bartkus, who was motivated by efilism and pro-mortalism.^{[4][11]} Before the attack, Bartkus registered a website that expressed hatred of religion, life, and pro-lifers.^[11] The website included a 30-minute audio recording explaining Bartkus's motivations for the bombing.^{[11][5]} Bartkus's father confirmed that the audio file included on the website sounds like his son.^[5] In the recording, Bartkus

said "Basically I'm anti-life. And IVF is like kind of the epitome of pro-life ideology".^[46] He also said "This life on earth game is really nasty... As Inmendham, Gary, would say, there is no carrot, only the whip."^[5]

The website contained a manifesto with answers to potential questions about why he did the bombing, "Life can only continue as long as people hold the delusional belief that it is not a zero sum game causing senseless torture, and messes it can never, or only partially, clean up. I think we need a war against pro-lifers." The manifesto also includes a quote that anthropomorphizes DNA, "It is clear at this point that these people aren't only stupid, they simply do not care about the harm they are perpetuating by being willing agents for a DNA molecule."^[47]

The site also included links to efilist YouTube channels and communities,^[50] including to transcripts of videos from Adam Lanza's YouTube channel.^{[33][46][51]} Efilism has been linked to at least one real-world act of violence before the bombing occurred.^[5]

On 21 May 2025, Reddit banned its r/efilism subreddit, a community which had over 10,000 members, for violating its rules against inciting violence. Bartkus had directly mentioned several Reddit communities, including r/efilism, in his writings.^{[52][7][53]} Prior to the r/efilism subreddit ban, many efilists have also been banned from Discord, Facebook, Reddit, Twitter, and other social media platforms for their violent rhetoric.^{[2]:1}

Inmendham posted a video a day after the Palm Springs bombing, where he denounced the attack and called it a "dumbass act of violence".^{[8][54]} In the same video, Inmendham complained that the bombing could undermine the efilism movement.^[5] Inmendham also forewarned in the video "The end game will require some unpleasant activity. That's just a fact. You can't get around it".^[5] In a request to comment by the *Long Beach Post*, Inmendham responded by email "All causes have bad advocates. I do not encourage or incite any social violence."^[5] Inmendham and Sukenick have been criticized for making inconsistent statements and denying responsibility for violence committed by efilists.^{[5][2]:14} Inmendham's history of violent rhetoric has caused him to be questioned by the police.^{[2]:5} The FBI declined to confirm or deny whether Inmendham is currently under investigation.^[5]

Antinatalist opposition to efilism

Major factions of the antinatalist community have outspokenly criticized and condemned efilists and promortalists for inciting and advocating violence.^{[2][12][6]:44} In 2021, these factions have expressed great concern that efilism may someday inspire lost, aggressive, and depressed young men to commit horrible atrocities.^{[2]:2} Extremism researcher Brian Levin also noted that efilism may have growing influence over unstable and suicidal people.^[5] Some efilists, such as Inmendham, perceive their goals to be so different from antinatalists that they do not consider themselves to be antinatalists.^{[2]:1,7}

British philosopher and antinatalist David Pearce has suggested that humankind will never voluntarily euthanize itself since it would go against most people's natural instincts. For this reason, Pearce believes that genetic-engineering and transhumanist technologies would lead to a more viable path for eliminating suffering from life than Efilism.^{[6]:28}

See also

- Speciesism
- Unintelligent design
- Existentialism

References

- ¹. [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r Dee, Katherine (5 April 2023). *"We need to talk about extreme antinatalism: Childfree doomsters believe life is suffering"*. *Unherd*. Retrieved 29 May 2025.
- ². [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h Benatar, David; Godfrey, Steve (8 December 2024). *Philosopher David Benatar on efilism* (Video). Cape Town, South Africa. Retrieved 29 May 2025.
- ³. [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j Baxter, Holly (19 May 2025). *"Was 'efilism' the extreme ideology behind the Palm Springs fertility clinic bombing?"*. *The Independent*.
- ⁴. [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r Kari, Doug (31 May 2025). *"Efilism, the ideology behind the Palm Springs bombing, has been spread online for years"*. *Long Beach Post News*. Long Beach Journalism Initiative Inc. Retrieved 2 June 2025.
- ⁵. [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h Häyry, Matti; Sukenick, Amanda (February 2024). *Antinatalism, Extinction, and the End of Procreative Self-Corruption* (PDF). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781009455299. ISBN 978-1-009-45529-9. ISSN 2752-3934. Retrieved 1 June 2025.
- ⁶. [^] ^a ^b *"Reddit bans an anti-natalist group after Palm Springs explosion"*. NBC News. 19 May 2025. Archived from the original on 19 May 2025. Retrieved 25 May 2025.
- ⁷. [^] ^a ^b ^c Sledge, Matt (19 May 2025). *"What is "Efilism," the Obscure Anti-Natalist Ideology of the Palm Springs Bomber?"*. *The Intercept*. Archived from the original on 20 May 2025. Retrieved 29 May 2025.
- ⁸. [^] ^a ^b ^c Morioka, Masahiro (2021). *"What Is Antinatalism?: Definition, History, and Categories"*. *The Review of Life Studies*. **12**: 11–12.
- ⁹. [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o ^p ^q ^r ^s Van Allen, T. K. (6 January 2024). *Lucifer's Question*. Amazon Publishing. ISBN 9798303675940.
- ¹⁰. [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d *"Bomber of California fertility clinic identified, described himself as pro-mortalist"*. *BNO News*. 17 May 2025. Archived from the original on 17 May 2025. Retrieved 17 May 2025.

11. [^] ^a ^b ^c Weber, Peter (19 May 2025). "Bombing of fertility clinic blamed on 'antinatalist'". MSN. Retrieved 29 May 2025. "The antinatalism movement, which considers procreating unethical or unjustifiable, "specifically condemns violence," Brian Levin, an extremism expert at Cal State San Bernardino, told the Times. The bomber's "purported rambling, idiosyncratic 'political' statements" suggest he was a "hopeless unstable young man" driven to a "brutal death" by a "personally distorted embrace of an obscure anti-life ideology.""
12. [^] ^a ^b Van Allen, T. K. (18 December 2017). On the Edge. Amazon Publishing. ISBN 9798386656836.
13. [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d Krishnan, Manisha (21 May 2025). "IVF Clinic Bombing Suspect Was Linked to 'Anti-Life' Ideology. Experts Fear Its Growing Influence". Wired. Condé Nast. Retrieved 2 June 2025.
14. [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d Faith, Scott (20 May 2025). "What are 'Pro-Mortalists,' and Why are They Blowing Things Up?". The Havok Journal. Retrieved 31 May 2025.
15. [^] Akerma, Karim (2021) [2017]. Antinatalism: A Handbook. Neopubli GmbH. ISBN 978-3754923658.
16. [^] Coates, Ken (2014). Anti-Natalism: Rejectionist Philosophy from Buddhism to Benatar. First Edition Design Pub. ISBN 978-1-62287-570-2.
17. [^] Kutás, Michal; Svoboda, Filip; Giraud, Théophile De; Poledníková, Markéta; Akerma, Karim; Koumar, Jan; Cabrera, Julio; Lochmanová, Kateřina, eds. (2020). History of Antinatalism: How Philosophy Has Challenged the Question of Procreation. Independently Published. ISBN 979-8-6456-2425-5.
18. [^] ^a ^b Benatar, David (2006). Better Never to Have Been: The Harm of Coming into Existence. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-929642-2.
19. [^] Zandbergen, Robbert (2021). "Wailing from the Heights of Velleity: A strong case for antinatalism in these trying times". South African Journal of Philosophy. **40** (3): 265–278. doi:10.1080/02580136.2021.1949559. S2CID 237402237.
20. [^] Vinding, Magnus (2016). "The Speciesism of Leaving Nature Alone, and the Theoretical Case for 'Wildlife Anti-Natalism'". Apeiron. **8**: 169–183.
21. [^] MacCormack, Patricia (2020). The Ahuman Manifesto: Activism for the End of the Anthropocene. Bloomsbury Academic. p. 153. ISBN 978-1350081093.
22. [^] ^a ^b Morioka, Masahiro (2021). What Is Antinatalism? And Other Essays: Philosophy of Life in Contemporary Society (PDF). Tokyo Philosophy Project. pp. 26–28. ISBN 979-8754050419.
23. [^] ^a ^b ^c McGregor, Rafe; Sullivan-Bissett, Ema (2012). "Better No Longer to Be". South African Journal of Philosophy. **31** (1): 55–68. doi:10.1080/02580136.2012.10751767.
24. [^] Keane, Isabel (18 May 2025). "What is pro-mortalism, the belief held by Guy Bartkus?". The Independent. Retrieved 18 May 2025.

25. [^] Deak, Megan (16 January 2024). *"What Is The Antinatalism Movement?"*. *World Atlas*. Retrieved 29 May 2025. "Sometimes, people confuse anti-natalism with pro-mortalism. However, the two philosophies are very different. Pro-mortalism is a philosophical movement that places a positive value on death. In the pro-mortalist view, the best thing to do for the world to end suffering is to end our own lives. However, most pro-mortalists claim they don't do this (end their life) because they lack willpower. Anti-natalism is a completely different philosophy. It focuses on procreation and the moral question of having children."
26. [^] Melo, Rafel Tages (2011). *"A última filosofia: Um ensaio sobre o antinatalismo"* [*The Last Philosophy: An Essay on Antinatalism*] (PDF). Brazil. Retrieved 31 May 2025. "Ab initio, the concept of antinatalism is not to be confused with euthanasia, suicide, abortion, homicide or any of the other categories (and relative studies) of natural or caused deaths."
27. [^] Metz 2012, pp. 1–2: "Negative utilitarianism is well-known for entailing anti-natalism as well as pro-mortalism, the view that it is often prudent for individuals to kill themselves and often right for them to kill others, even without their consent. It pretty clearly has these implications if one can kill oneself or others painlessly, but probably does so even if there would be terror beforehand; for there would be terror regardless of when death comes, and if death were to come sooner rather than later, then additional bads that would have been expected in the course of a life would be nipped in the bud."
28. [^] Belshaw 2012, p. 118: "Negative utilitarianism can be plucked from the shelf, but there is no good reason to suppose it true. And were it true, it would take us too far, generating not only anti-natalism but straightaway also its pro-mortalist neighbour."
29. [^] ^a ^b ^c Benatar, David (2006). *Better Never to Have Been: The Harm of Coming into Existence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 196. ISBN 978-0-19-929642-2.
30. [^] Rothman, Joshua (27 November 2017). *"The Case for Not Being Born"*. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved 31 May 2025. "People sometimes ask themselves whether life is worth living. Benatar thinks that it's better to ask sub-questions: Is life worth continuing? (Yes, because death is bad.) Is life worth starting? (No.)"
31. [^] ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f Olivier, Indigo (24 May 2025). *"The Dark, Nihilistic Philosophy Behind the IVF Clinic Bombing"*. *The New Republic*. Retrieved 2 June 2025.
32. [^] Smart 1958, p. 542: "Suppose that a ruler controls a weapon capable of instantly and painlessly destroying the human race. Now it is empirically certain that there would be some suffering before all those alive on any proposed destruction day were to die in the natural course of events. Consequently the use of the weapon is bound to diminish suffering, and would be the ruler's duty on NU grounds." For his use of the term 'the benevolent world-exploder' see page 543.

33. [^] That is, the argument is directed against strong versions of negative utilitarianism that prescribe only reducing negative well-being, as well as weak versions that are sufficiently close to strong negative utilitarianism. Such weak versions would be those that, although they give weight to both negative and positive well-being, give sufficiently much more the weight to negative well-being, so that they would have the same implications as strong versions in relevant situations.
34. [^] For example, [Bunge & 1989 230](#): "Negative utilitarianism ... is open to the following objections.... Fourthly, the most expeditious way of implementing the doctrine would be to exterminate humankind, for then human suffering would cease altogether (R. N. Smart 1958)." [Heyd, 1992 & 60](#): "Negative utilitarianism, which seems promising in guiding us in genethics, also urges (at least in its impersonal version) paradoxical (and to some, morally abhorrent) solutions to the miseries of humanity. Primarily it recommends the painless annihilation of all humanity—either by the collective suicide of all actual beings, or by total abstention from procreation by one generation (Smart 1958, 542–543)." [Ord 2013](#): "R. N. Smart wrote a response [3] in which he christened the principle 'Negative Utilitarianism' and showed a major unattractive consequence. A thorough going Negative Utilitarian would support the destruction of the world (even by violent means) as the suffering involved would be small compared to the suffering in everyday life in the world."
35. [^] [Häyry, Matti; Sukenick, Amanda \(February 2024\). *Antinatalism, Extinction, and the End of Procreative Self-Corruption* \(PDF\). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. p. 32. doi:10.1017/9781009455299. ISBN 978-1-009-45529-9. ISSN 2752-3934. Retrieved 2 June 2025. "Being against sentient reproduction means being against sentient reproduction, including that of human and nonhuman animals, extraterrestrials, and machines. Eventually, this entails accepting the extinction \(or noncreation\) of all these forms of being. Nonsentient entities, including plants and bacteria, may survive, unless they are seen to be a threat. Left behind, they could, in time, once again develop sentience, and the chain of suffering would remain unbroken – not an acceptable result in this conceptual box."](#)
36. [^] [Benatar, David; Godfrey, Steve \(8 December 2024\). *Philosopher David Benatar on efilism* \(Video\). Cape Town, South Africa. Event occurs at 28:55. Retrieved 29 May 2025.](#)
37. [^] [Benatar, David; Harris, Sam \(5 December 2017\). *Is Life Actually Worth Living?: Debate between Sam Harris and David Benatar* \(Video\). Cape Town, South Africa. Event occurs at 45:29-48:08. Retrieved 2 June 2025.](#)
38. [^] ^a ^b ^c [Stieg, Cory \(14 August 2019\). "Antinatalism: The Popular Reddit Movement To Stop Procreation". Refinery29. Retrieved 1 June 2025.](#)
39. [^] ^a ^b ^c [Solé, Elise \(16 September 2024\). "What is antinatalism? Meet the folks who say no one should have kids, ever. Some of them are parents". TODAY.com. NBCUniversal Media, LLC. Retrieved 31 May 2025.](#)

40. ^{^ a b} Lanza, Adam (7 September 2011). *vlogrant of a ruminative vagrant (Part 2/2)*. Newtown, Connecticut: YouTube. Event occurs at 11:14. Retrieved 2 June 2025.
41. [^] *Report of the Office of Child Advocate Archived* November 26, 2014, at the *Wayback Machine*, p.103
42. [^] *"Nancy Lanza had considered moving with her son to Washington state". The Seattle Times*. 18 November 2012. *Archived from the original on 24 August 2017*. Retrieved 24 August 2017.
43. ^{^ a b c} Marino, Joe; Hussain, Zoe (19 May 2025). *"Vegan IVF clinic bomber declared 'war against pro-lifers' in chilling 'pro-mortalist' manifesto"*. The New York Post. NYP Holdings, Inc. Retrieved 2 June 2025.
44. ^{^ a b} Giatti, Ian M (20 May 2025). *"Website linked to suspect in Calif. IVF clinic bombing declared 'war against pro-lifers'"*. The Christian Post. Retrieved 2 June 2025.
45. [^] Blankstein, Andrew; Cohen, Rebecca (17 May 2025). *"1 dead, 4 hurt in Palm Springs car explosion deemed 'act of terrorism' by FBI"*. NBC News. *Archived from the original on 18 May 2025*. Retrieved 17 May 2025.
46. [^] Fahy, Claire; Levien, Simon J. (17 May 2025). *"Palm Springs Bombing Kills 1 and Damages Fertility Clinic, Mayor Says"*. New York Times. *Archived from the original on 18 May 2025*. Retrieved 17 May 2025.
47. [^] Crozier, Husdon (20 May 2025). *"'War Against Pro-Lifers': Inside Suspected Manifesto Of IVF Clinic Bomber"*. The Daily Caller. Retrieved 2 June 2025.
48. [^] Brinker, Andy (20 May 2025). *"Officials Give Report On Fertility Clinic Incident"*. The Independent American. Retrieved 2 June 2025.
49. [^] Harikrishnan, A (21 May 2025). *"Reddit Bans Radical Subreddit After Fatal Blast Outside Fertility Clinic"*. Techstory. Retrieved 23 May 2025.
50. [^] Powel, James; Anglen, Robert; Damien, Christopher (19 May 2025). *"Reddit bans anti-natalist forum in wake of Palm Springs fertility clinic bombing"*. USA Today. Retrieved 29 May 2025.
51. [^] Novak, Matt (20 May 2025). *"Reddit Bans Fringe Anti-Humanity Group After Attack on Palm Springs IVF Clinic"*. Gizmodo. Retrieved 31 May 2025.

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User:Zero_Contradictions/Efilism&oldid=1294041411"