

PRO LIFE

SUPPLEMENTARY ARGUMENT

Johannesburg
11 June 1996

To: The Registrar of the Constitutional Court

We refer to your letter of the 4 June 1996. We enclose our written arguments supplementing our objections.

As we have had very limited time in order to prepare adequately, what we are now submitting forms only part of our argument.

We earnestly request the opportunity to give oral evidence before the Court in due course.

We submit that it is extremely relevant to our objection to prove that the unborn child is a person or falls within the term "everyone" as stated in the 34 Constitutional Principles. The video accompanying this submission shows clearly that the unborn child is a human being and is fully deserving of legal personal and the full protection of the law. Accordingly we request permission to submit the video in support of objection.

Dr. Claude E. Newbury

President of Pro Life of South Africa (also representing in this matter: Human Life International,

Victims of Choice

The World Federation of Doctors Who Respect Human Life)

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE FURNISHED TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT BY PRO LIFE, HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL, VICTIMS OF CHOICE AND THE WORLD FEDERATION OF DOCTORS WHO RESPECT HUMAN LIFE.

Very relevant to this objection is evidence that the unborn child is a person and thus falls within the definition of "Everyone" in the Constitutional principles. Such evidence is accordingly submitted as follows.

1. **Opinion by Professor Johan van der Vyver (Formerly of the Law School of the University Witwatersrand) (Reported in the Medical Chronicle 1994).**

Section 9 of the Interim Constitution provides that every person shall have the right to life, and the crucial question is whether or not the human foetus is a person. In terms of section 35(1) of the Interim Constitution, when interpreting the particular provisions thereof, one must also look at the meaning given to rights such as the above in international law. One is also authorised to take cognisance of judgements in foreign jurisdictions. In all such judgements in e.g. Canada, USA, UK and the European

Court of Human Rights, it has been decided that the human foetus is not a person. However, certain interests of the unborn are protected in South Africa, just as they are in foreign jurisdictions. Those persons in favour of abortion will try to persuade the constitutional court that, on the basis of the judgements of the foreign jurisdictions, the human foetus should not be regarded as a person and thus not qualify for the right to life. This is not correct, for the following reasons. In our legal system, since the days of the Romans, the human foetus has always been regarded as a person for certain purposes. When referring to the judgements of foreign jurisdictions one cannot ignore our common law. In terms of our common law, the human foetus *is* a person, not only for the protection of certain rights, such as hereditary rights, but also in respect of the right to life specifically. If our law thus far has maintained that the human foetus is a person for certain purposes, *including the right to life*, then one would expect that, if those who drafted this Interim Constitution had wanted to change the law, they would have done so during the negotiations at Kempton Park, (as they did not). The above mentioned judgements from Canada, England, Australia and the European Court of Human Rights, and other similar judgements, will have to be weighted against our common law. There has never been any doubt in South African Law that the human foetus is a person: except in one case (*The Christian League of South Africa vs. Rall*) where a woman applied for an abortion. The Christian league wanted to be curator of the unborn child so as to be able to look after its interests. The court declared that the unborn child was not a person entitled to a curator to look after its interests. The correctness of this decision was legitimately doubted in another South African court judgement during December 1993 (*G. vs Superintendent Groote Schuur Hospitaal. 1993 (2) (S.A. 255). C.P.D. Page 259*). The observations made in the Christian league case were clearly wrong because they went against the grain of general legal opinion in South Africa. In the event of a conflict between South Africa Common Law and Foreign Jurisdictions, the Common Law must take precedence.

2. **Additional opinion on South African Case Law. (Evidence to be submitted at oral hearing)**

1. The appellate division case of *van Heerden vs Joubert. 1994. (4) SA. 793 A*) did not decide that a foetus was not a legal person. It only decided that a stillborn child was not a person in terms of the Inquest Act No 58 of 1959. This is specifically stated at page 17 of the judgement.

2. Section 101(5) of the Interim Constitution states that "The appellate division shall have no jurisdiction to adjudicate any matter within the jurisdiction of the Constitutional Court".

The above *van Heerden* decision was handed down after the commencement of the interim constitution. It may thus not be allowed to influence any decision of the Constitutional Court.

3. **Principles of Roman Dutch Law**

i) Unborn children are regarded as having been born and as being persons, as soon as they have been conceived, whenever such an implication is to their advantage. (Voet 1.5.5; Grotius 1.3.4.)

- ii) A child in its mother's womb has special rights and privileges: it is entitled to have its life preserved. Consequently, if the mother is sentenced to death, the execution of the sentence will be postponed until the birth of the child. (Voet 1.5.5)

Surely we can conclude from the above that the unborn child enjoys natural rights recognised by S.A. law which pre-exist the Interim Constitution, and therefore the New S.A. Constitution.

4. **Opinion of Dr. A L Christiansen of the Department of Human Genetics and Development Biology, University of Pretoria. (Reported in the Medical Chronicle, September 1994)**

In recent times, with rapid advances in prenatal diagnostic techniques, care of the foetus has developed to, stage when it has to be considered in certain circumstances as a person, and thus a patient. With these advances, management of the abnormal foetus has become an increasingly more complex task. Central to this management is prenatal counselling of the foetus' parents. This requires that the foetus' parents are at all times informed, to the greatest extent possible, on what their foetus' problems are; how these can be investigated and at what risk, the results of the investigations; and the treatment modes available.

5. **Opinion of Professor Peter Kreeft, Professor of Philosophy at Boston University, USA.**

The personhood of the human foetus is the crucial issue for abortion. Is the foetus a person? The case for prolife's affirmative answer is well-known, and so are the biological facts which constitute its simplest and strongest evidence, especially the genetic identity and individuality of the unborn child from the moment of conception. How does the pro-choice position argue this case?

To understand the controversy, we must understand the general structure of moral reasoning. A moral conclusion about the goodness or evil of a human act is deduced from two premises: a major premise, which states a general moral principle (e.g., "we ought to pay our debts") and a minor premise, which sees a particular situation as coming under that principle (e.g., "international debts are debts"). Thus the essential pro-life argument is as follows. The major premise is: "Thou shalt not kill"- i.e. all deliberate killing of innocent human life is forbidden. The minor premise is that abortion is the deliberate killing of innocent human beings. The conclusion is that abortion is wrong.

There are two significantly different pro-choice answers to this argument. The more radical, or "hard", pro-choice position denies the major premise; the less radical, or "soft", pro-choice position denies the minor. "Hard pro-choice" denies the sanctity or inviolability of all humans; "soft pro-choice" denies the humanity of the foetus.

I think no one in the Christian Medical and Dental society will take the hard pro-choice position, for Christianity clearly teaches (1) that all of us are made in the image of God,

and (2) that God Himself has forbidden us to kill, i.e. to murder innocent persons. I confine myself, therefore, to refuting the soft pro-choice position.

Is the foetus a person? Obviously it is biologically human, genetically human, and a distinct member of the Homo-Sapiens. So the soft pro-choicers must distinguish between human beings and persons, must say that foetuses are human but not persons, and say that all persons, but not all humans, are sacred and inviolable.

Thus the crucial issue is: Are there any human beings who are not persons? If so, killing them might be permissible, like killing warts. But who might these human non-persons be? Jews? Blacks? Slaves/Infidels? Counter-revolutionaries? Others have said so, and justified their genocide, lynching, slavery, jihad, or gulag. But pro-choicers never include these groups of non-persons. Many pro-choicers include severely retarded handicapped humans, or very old and sick humans, as non-persons, but this is still morally shocking to most people, and many pro-choicers avoid the morally shocking position by including only foetuses as members of this newly invented class of human non-persons, or non-personal humans. I think no one ever conceived of this category before the abortion controversy. It looks very suspiciously like the category was invented to justify the killing, for its only members are the humans we happen to be now killing and want to keep killing and want to justify killing.

How is a person to be defined? The crucial point for our argument is not which acts are to count as defining a person (is it speaking, or reasoning, or living?) but the relation of these personal acts to the person-actor.

Is a person one who is consciously performing personal acts? If so, people who are asleep are not people, and we may kill them.

Is it one with a present capacity to perform personal acts? That would include sleepers, but not people in coma. How about one with a history of performing personal acts? That would mean that a 17 year old who was born in a coma 17 years and is just now coming out of it is not a person. Also, by this definition there can be no first personal act, no personal acts without a history of past personal acts.

What about one with a future capacity of performing personal acts? That would mean that dying persons are not persons.

Surely the correct answer is that a person is one with a natural, inherent capacity for performing personal acts. Why is one able to perform personal acts, under proper conditions? Only because one is a person. One grows the ability to perform personal acts only because one already is the kind of thing that grows into the ability to perform personal acts, i.e., a person.

To say that some human beings are not persons is to say that only achievers, only successful functioners, only sufficiently intelligent performers, qualify as persons and have a right to life. And who is to say what "sufficient" is? The line can be drawn at will - the will of the stronger. Nature, reason, and justice are then replaced by artifice, prejudice, and power. When it is in the self-interest of certain people to kill certain other people, whether foetuses, or the dying, or enemies of the state, or Jews, or Armenians, or Cambodians, or heretics, or prophets, the killers will simply define their

victims as non-persons by pointing out that they do not meet certain criteria. Who determines the criteria? Those in power, of course. Whenever personhood is defined functionally, the dividing line between persons and non-persons will be based on a decision by those in power, a decision of will. Such a decision, given the fallenness of human nature, will inevitably be based on self-interest. Where there is an interest in killing persons, they will be defined as non-persons.

Those arguing against the personhood of the human foetus make the following two errors:

1. reducing persons to functions and
2. reducing "human being" to a merely biological category. The first is the root cause of the second.

Once a person is defined in terms of functioning, then zygotes, foetuses and even normal new-borns are no longer fully persons. What are they, then? Only members of a biological species, "human being".

This justifies abortion, of course and infanticide. I know of no argument justifying abortion that does not also justify infanticide.

Those arguing against the personhood of the human zygote state that it has no brain. (That stage of life when the individual is in the form of one single cell and is that state of human development after fertilisation and before the first subdivision of the zygote. When the first subdivision of the new human individual is completed the individual is then termed a human embryo.) This is true, but the zygote does have what will grow into a brain, just as an infant does not have speech but has what will grow into speech. Within the human zygote is an already fully programmed individuality, from sex and ageing to eye and skin colour and aversion to spinach. The personhood of the person is already there, like the tuliphood of the tulip bulb. One must actually be a human being, after all, to grow a human brain.

Human Life commences at conception (fertilisation), and all development is gradual after conception. Conception is the break, the clear dividing line, and the only one. I am the same being from conception. Otherwise we would not speak of the growth and development and unfolding of that being, of me. I was once an infant, I was born. I was once in my mother's womb. My functioning develops only gradually, but my me has a sudden beginning, the time of conception (fertilisation). One must not confuse being a person with functioning as a person.

If personhood is only a developing, gradual thing, then we are never fully persons, because we continue to grow, at least intellectually and emotionally and spiritually. Albert Schweitzer said, at 70, "I still don't know that I want to do when I grow up." But if we are only partial persons, then murder is only partially wrong, and it is less wrong to kill younger, lesser persons than older ones. If it is more permissible to kill a foetus, than to kill an infant because the foetus is less of a person, then it is for exactly the same reason more permissible to kill a seven-year old, who has not yet developed his reproductive system or many of his educational and communication skills, than to kill a 27-year old. The absurd conclusion follows from defining a person functionally.

No other line than conception can be drawn between pre-personhood and personhood. Birth and viability are the two most frequently suggested. But birth is only a change of place and relationship to the mother and to surrounding world (air and food); how could these things create personhood? As for viability, it varies with accidental and external factors like available technology (incubators, respirators). What I am in the womb - a person or a non-person cannot be determined by what machines exist outside the womb! But viability is determined by such things. Therefore personhood cannot be determined by viability.

It cannot be argued that the human foetus is only a potential person. If the human foetus is only a potential person, it must be an actual something in order to be a potential person. What is it? An ape? The human foetus is in fact an actual, and not merely a potential, person. There are no "potential persons" any more than there are potential apes. All persons are actual, as all apes are actual. Actual apes are potential swimmers, and actual persons are potential philosophers. The being is actual, the functioning is potential. The objection confuses "a potential person" with "a potentially functioning person" -Functionalism again, which is wrong.

It cannot be argued that personhood is an unclear concept. If personhood were a matter of degree, determined by the degree of functioning, then it would indeed be unclear, and a matter of opinion, who is a person and who is not.

Personhood is indeed unclear if it is defined in terms of Functionalism. Such questions as the following are not clearly answerable: Which features count as proof of personhood? Why? How do we decide? Who decides? What gives them that right? And how much of each feature is necessary for personhood? And who decides that, and why? Also, all the performance-qualifications adduced for personhood are difficult to measure objectively and with certainty. To use the unclear, not universally accepted, hard-to-measure functionalist concept of personhood to decide the sharply controversial issue of who is a person and who may be killed is to try to clarify the obscure by the more obscure, *obscuram per obscurius*.

It cannot be argued that the human foetus is only a part of the mother. In terms of this argument a hilariously absurd consequences follows> The relation of part to whole is what logicians call a transitive relation: If A is part of B and B is part of C, then A must be part of C. If a wall is part of a room and the room is part of a building, then the wall must be part of that building. If a toe is part of a foot and a foot is part of a body, then the toe is part of the body. Now if the foetus is a part of the mother, then the parts of the foetus must be parts of the mother. But in that case, every pregnant woman has four eyes and four feet, and half of all pregnant women have penises! Clearly, the absurd conclusion came from the false premise that the foetus is only part of the mother.

To define a person in terms of functionalism is totally inaccurate, and involves defining a person by his or her functioning or behaviour. A "behavioural definition" is proper and practical for scientific purposes of prediction and experimentation, but it is not adequate for ordinary reason and common sense, much less for good philosophy or morality, which should be based on common sense. Why? Because common sense distinguishes between what one is and what one does, between being and functioning, thus between "being a person" and "functioning as a person". One cannot function as

a person without being a person, but one can surely be a person without functioning as a person. In deep sleep, in coma, and in early infancy, nearly everyone will admit there are persons, but there are no specifically human functions such as reasoning, choice, or language. Functioning as a person is a sign and an effect of being a person. It is because of what we are, because of our nature or essence or being, that we can and do function in these ways.

Functionalism makes the elementary mistake of confusing the sign with the thing signified, the smoke with the fire. The Functionalist or Behaviourist would reply that he is sceptical of such talk about natures, essences, or natural species as distinct from conventional, man-made class-groupings). But the Functionalist cannot use ordinary language without contradicting himself. He say e.g. that there is no such thing as 'river', because all rivers are different. But how then can he call them all 'rivers'? The very word 'all' should be stricken from his speech. His Nominalism makes nonsense of ordinary language.

The Functionalist claims he is being simple and common-sensical by not speaking of essences. He says traditional talk about essences is dated, dispensable, mystical, muddled, and anti-scientific. But he is wrong. Talk about essences is not dated by perennial, built into the very structure of language, for most word: universals predictable of many individuals. Essence-talk is not dispensable without dispensing understanding itself and reducing us to an animal state of mind where brute empirical fact reigns alone. Essence talk not mystical but common-sensical. It is not muddled but clear to any child. It is not anti-scientific, for science seeks universal laws, truths about the species, not quirks of the specimen.

Functionalism is not only theoretically weak, it is also practically destructive. Modern man is increasingly reducing his being to functions. We no longer ask "Who is he?" but "What does he do?" We think of a man as a fireman, not as a man fighting fires; of a woman as a teacher, not as a woman teaching.

Functionalism arises with the modern erosion of the family. Our civilisation is dying primarily because the family is dying. Half of our families commit suicide, for divorce is the family committing suicide qua family. But the family is the place where you learn that you are loved not because of what you do, your function, but because of who you are. What is replacing the family, where we are valued for our being? The workplace, where we are valued for our functioning.

This replacement in society is mirrored by the replacement in philosophy of the old "Sanctity of Life Ethic" by the new "Quality of Life Ethic". In this new ethic, a human life is judged as valuable and worth living if and only if the judges decide that it performs at a certain level eg. a functional IQ or 60 or 40; or an ability to relate to other people (it would logically follow that a severely autistic person does not have enough 'quality' life, he lacks personhood and the right to life. I find this ethic more terrifying than the ethic of the Mafia, for the Mafia at least do not rationalise their assassinations by inventing a new ethic which pretends that the people they want to kill are not people. I would feel more comfortable conversing with a hired killer than with an abortionist, for an abortionist is also a hired killer, but pretends not to be.

The Functionalism that is the basis of the "Quality of Life Ethic" is morally reprehensible for at least three reasons. First, it is degrading, demeaning and

destructive to human dignity; it treats persons like trained seals. Second, it is elitist: it discriminates against less perfect performers. Third, it takes advantage, it is power play, it is might over right rationalised. To see this point, let us dare to ask a very naive and simple question, a question a child might ask, especially a child like the one in "The Emperor's New Clothes"; Why do doctors kill foetuses rather than foetuses killing doctors? Foetuses do not want to die. They struggle to live. (...) The answer is power. Doctors have power, but Foetuses not. If foetuses came equipped with suction tubes, poisons, and scalpels to defend themselves against their killers, there would be no abortions.

Imagine George Bernard Shaw's utopia of the future in which each citizen would have to appear annually before a Central Planning Committee to justify the social utility of his or her (or its) existence, or else be painlessly "terminated." That is the crotch of the Functionalist camel whose nose is already under our tent. The nose is abortion. The camel is all one piece. Let the nose in and the rest will follow. To keep the camel out you must hit it on the nose.

“..... suppose all of my arguments are somehow inconclusive. Suppose I was wrong in my very first point, that abortion is a clear evil. Suppose abortion is a difficult, obscure, uncertain issue. Even if you take this ‘softest pro-choice’ position, which we can call ‘abortion agnosticism’ you stand refuted by the following quadrilemma.

Either the foetus is a person, or not; and either we know what it is, or not. Thus there are four and only four possibilities:

1. that it is not a person and we know that,
2. that it is a person and we know that
3. that it is a person but we do not know that, and
4. that it is not a person and we do not know that

Now what is Abortion in each of these four cases?

In case (1), abortion is perfectly permissible. We do no wrong if we kill what is not a person and we know that it is not a person - e.g., if we fry a fish. But no one has ever proved with certainty that a foetus is not a person. If there exists anywhere such a proof, please show it to me and I shall convert to pro-choice on the spot if I cannot refute it. If we do not have case (1) we have either (2) or (3) or (4). What is abortion in each of these cases? It is either murder, or manslaughter, or criminal negligence.

In case (2), where the foetus is a person and we know that, abortion is murder. For killing an innocent per knowing it is an innocent person is murder.

In case (3), abortion is manslaughter, for it is killing an innocent not knowing and intending the full, deliberate extent of murder. It is like driving over a man-shaped overcoat in the street, which may be a drunk or may or only be an old coat. It is like shooting at a sudden movement in a bush which may be your hunting companion or may be only a pheasant. It is like fumigating an apartment building with a highly toxic chemical not knowing whether everyone is safely evacuated. If the victim is a person, you have committed manslaughter. And if not?

And even in case (4), even if abortion kills what is not in fact a person, but the killer does not know for sure that is not a person, we have criminal negligence, as in the above three cases if there happened to be no one in the coat, the bush, or the building, but the driver, the hunter, the fumigator did not know that, and nevertheless drove, shot or fumigated. Such negligence is instinctively and universally condemned by all reasonable individuals and societies as personally immoral and socially criminal; and cases (2) and (3), murder and manslaughter, are of course condemned even more strongly. We do not argue politely over whether such behaviour is right or wrong. We wholeheartedly condemn it, even when we do not know whether there is a person there, because the killer did not know that a person was not there. Why do we not do the same with abortion?

The answer to that question is not an easy one to admit. It is this: If we do not see the awfulness of abortion, that is not because the facts and arguments are unclear but because our own consciences are unclear. Mother Teresa says 'Abortion kills twice. It kills the body of the baby and it kills the conscience of the mother'. Abortion is profoundly anti-women. Three quarters of its victims are women: half the babies and all the mothers.

If Mother Teresa is right, the second killing that abortion does is even worse than the first, if souls are more important than bodies. If abortion kills consciences, it kills souls. To the extent that conscience is killed, repentance is killed, and without repentance and faith we simply cannot be saved - unless Jesus was a liar or a fool when he told us that.

This is not to condemn the personal motives or integrity of all who abort. We must distinguish the sin from the sinner and hate and judge the sin but not the sinner. Both aborters and justifiers of abortion may be victims as much as victimizers: victims of propaganda, prejudice, and passion. Before they victimize their babies' bodies, their own souls are victimized - their thoughts, their consciences. But the victimization must start somewhere, the buck must stop somewhere, and not in safe abstractions like 'society' but in the choices of individuals.

All of us are implicated in some way. for 'the only thing that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that the good do nothing'. What should we do? For one thing, we must put up one hell of a stink, for abortion is, precisely, one hell of a stink.

There is a time to be polite and scholarly, and a time to tell the truth plain and prickly. Plainly put, abortion comes from Hell and it can lead us to Hell if not repented. Any unrepented sin can, and we all need repentance, whether we abort or hate or lust or despair or coldly condemn. Both abortion is more likely than most sins to be unrepented because there are so many pro-choice voices justifying it. The justification of abortion can be more lethal than abortion itself

(End of Peter Kreeft.)

6. **Quoting from : John D. Gorby: The "Right" to an Abortion, the Scope of Fourteenth Amendment "Personhood" and the Supreme Court's Birth Requirement. Southern Illinois University Law Journal, Volume 1979, No. 1.**

p.6.- Thus, history also supports the Roe majority reasoning that if the foetus is a person, and thus entitled to a right of life, the Court has an obligation to protect that right. John Locke, whose influence on the thinking of the founders of this nation is well known, wrote of the natural rights to life and property and that 'civil government is the proper remedy for the inconveniences of the state of nature, which must certainly be great where men may be judges in their own case.' (see J. Witherspoon, JOHN LOCKE'S CONCEPT OF THE CHILD AS A PERSON scheduled for publication in 1979.) This principle, applied to the abortion problem, suggests that if the unborn does enjoy a natural right to life, the protection of the right should not be completely entrusted to the pregnant woman since her self-conceived interests may conflict with those of the unborn and since she could not be expected to be a fair 'judge in her own case'. (J. Locke: The Second treatise of Civil Government, Chapter 2; ed. T. Peardon, 1952). The solution to this problem, according to Locke, would be civil government as is the case for all conflicts between the rights of one and the interest of another. (...)

Although natural law fell out of vogue during the nineteenth century, the importance of the right to life in modern political and social theory has remained nearly unscathed, as evidenced by the third article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which stated: "Everyone has the right to life," the second article of the European Human Rights Convention and the arguments to abolish capital punishment expressed by Mr Justice Brennan in *Furman vs. Georgia*: "The country has debated whether a society for which the dignity of the individual is the supreme value can, without a fundamental inconsistency, follow the practice of deliberately putting some of its members to death." (408 U.S. 238 1972). He also wrote that "death is a unique punishment in the United States. In a society that so strongly affirms the sanctity of life., not surprisingly the common view is that death is the ultimate sanction." (...)

One should not lightly conclude from the Supreme Court's holding in *Roe* that the concept of a 'person' has no prenatal significance, that the unborn was not, after all, entitled to a 'day in court'. Such a conclusion assumes the outcome. Furthermore, it would be sound only if one is willing to assume that the adversary process is not essential to sound judicial decision-making - an assumption hardly compatible with the common law tradition. To a great degree, judicial decisions are made legitimately only if there is an opportunity for vigorous advocacy, an opportunity not allowed the foetus in the cases thus far in which his right to personhood or, expressed differently, its right to even have rights, has been adjudicated.

Concluding a rather long but important section of his paper, pp. - 23, concerning the Roe Court's questionable handling of 'personhood' in the 14th Amendment and elsewhere in the US Constitution, as this applies to the unborn, John D. Gorby concludes significantly: "These clauses (the apportionment clause and extradition clause) do not define "person". In any case, this approach offers nothing to support the Courts conclusion that "person" has only postnatal meaning..... and in the same vein, on p.24, Gorby notes: "There is nothing in the function of the fourteenth amendment to suggest that its scope or purpose is to protect only the born. And to the

extent that an unborn can be the owner of property and is living, a fourteenth amendment purpose exists in case of the unborn just as surely as it does with a born person who owns property and possesses "life" (...) John D. Gorby has a section which we feel should be reproduced in full:

(2) **The Judiciary and the "Life" Issue in Non-Abortion Cases**

The Court implied in the statement 'when life begins' that it would be improper for the judiciary to speculate as to the answer to such an enquiry. It is noteworthy that the Federal Constitutional Court of Western Germany, a court which enjoys the power of judicial review of the constitutionality of statutory enactments and which occupies in the German political structure a position comparable to the United States Supreme Court, did not feel so inadequate when faced with the question whether the constitutional provision 'Jeder hat das Recht auf Leben' (Every one has the right to life) includes the unborn. In striking down a statute which allowed abortion on demand during the first trimester of pregnancy after the mother had undergone counselling, the German Constitutional Court wrote:

In construing article 2, Paragraph 2, Sentence 1 of the Basic Law, one should begin with its language: 'Everyone has the right to life' ...Life, in the sense of historical existence of a human individual exists according to definite biological, physiological knowledge, in any case, from the fourteenth day after conception (nidation, individuation), ... The process of development which has begun at that point is a continuing process which exhibits no sharp demarcation and does not allow a precise division of the various steps of development of the human life. The process does not end even with birth; the phenomena of consciousness which are specific to the human personality, for example., appear for the first time a rather long time after birth. Therefore the protection of Article 2, Paragraph 2, Sentence 1, of the Basic Law cannot be limited either to the 'completed' human being after birth or to the child about to be born which is independently capable of living. The right to life is guaranteed to everyone who 'lives', no distinction can be made here between various stages of the life developing itself before birth, or between unborn and born life. 'Everyone' in the sense of Article 2, Paragraph 2, Sentence 1 of the Basic Law is 'everyone living', expressed in another way: Every life possessing human individuality; 'Everyone' also includes the yet unborn human being.

The sense of judicial humbleness expressed by the United States Supreme Court in ROE has prevented neither the English courts from deciding in a will construction that " an infant en ventre sa mere [in its mother's womb, who by the course and order of nature is then living, comes clearly within the description of "children living at the time of his decease" nor the American Courts from reaching similar conclusions. It has not prevented the courts from allowing recoveries in tort for prenatal injuries as did the California District Court of Appeal when it noted: The respondent asserts that the provisions of Section 29 of the Civil Code are based on a fiction of law to the effect that an unborn child is a human being separate and distinct from the mother. We think that assumption of our statute is not a fiction, but on the contrary that it is an established and recognised fact by science and by everyone of understanding.

It did not discourage the Illinois Supreme Court in a wrongful death case in which the foetus was born dead, from quoting with approval the following from a New York case: To hold, as a matter of law, that no viable foetus has any separate existence which the law will recognise is for the law to deny a simple and easily demonstrable fact. This child, when

injured, was in fact, alive and capable of being delivered and of remaining alive, separate from its mother.

Nor did it discourage the Illinois Supreme Court in that case from allowing a wrongful death recovery, as have the majority of state supreme courts which have ruled upon the question of the scope of "person" in wrongful death statutes. It also did not discourage the State's Attorney of Cook county Illinois, or the State's Attorney of Will County, Illinois, from requesting that the Grand Jury return a murder indictment for the killing of a viable but unborn child. In fact, the Grand Jury in the Cook County case was instructed by the State's Attorney to return a true bill only if it made a finding of the shooting. Based on the testimony of a pathologist, a true bill for murder was returned.

In short, in areas not so politically volatile as abortion, the judiciary has not hesitated to take notice of, to consider, and to uphold that "life" existed before birth. In fact, ROE is actually unique, representing one of few instances in which a court has refused to take cognisance of established scientific data concerning the nature of the unborn. [End of Section 2,p.30].

Further noting the anomalous decision of the Roe Supreme Court, John D.Gorby makes the very pertinent observation on p. 32

(3) **Ability to Live Outside the Mother's Womb.**

For reasons which are not completely clear, the (Roe) Supreme Court decided that, although not important for constitutional personhood, viability is an important criterion for the State's assertion of a compelling interest. In other words, the State can assert its interest in keeping the foetus alive at "viability", which the court defined E.S the point at which the fetus is "potentially able to live outside the mother's womb, albeit with artificial aid". The Court their noted that "viability is usually placed at about seven months (twenty eight weeks) but may occur earlier, even at twenty-four weeks. Here, the Supreme Court, for reasons neither apparent nor offered, utilised scientific date in determining when a State's interest in the unborn become compelling enough to preclude the abortion but, because of its creation of the birth requirement, rendered the same or similar data irrelevant in its determination when the right to have constitutional rights begins. Considering that the Court placed such emphasis on the viability concept, it perhaps should be of interest that in a study of 650,000 live births in New York City, over twenty percent of the children born at less than twenty weeks gestational age survived neonatal period. The Court's figures accordingly appear to be unsound. Beyond the soundness of the data however, the Court's decision means that prematurely born children are entitled to all the constitutional protections whereas their counterparts, who are equally individual, older, more competent, and better able survive outside a mother's womb but not fortunate enough to have been prematurely born, are without constitutional protection. (...)

p.35. John D.Gorby notes that "Professor John Ely obviously had a point when he wrote that "having an unwanted child can go along way toward ruining a woman's life." [Ely, THE WAGES OF CRYING WOLF: A COMMENT ON ROE VS. WADE, 82 Yale L.J. 920,923 (1973)]. No one is denying the personal tragedy or the hardships involved in an unwanted pregnancy. The solution, however, should turn on what is being sacrificed to avert the tragedy and hardships. These are hard decisions.

To put these hard decisions in their proper perspective, it must be borne in mind that constitutional protection of fundamental rights never takes place in a social vacuum. Rather, the protection of the fundamental rights of one necessarily requires personal sacrifices of some significance by those against whom the right is enforced. For example, when the Illinois Supreme Court and the United States Federal District Court enforced the first amendment right of the American Nazi Party to march in Skokie, a sacrifice on the part of the Jewish population in Skokie was necessarily involved. Similarly, an order requiring desegregation in certain neighbourhoods may have the effect of substantially reducing the market value of the property holdings of those already in the neighbourhood, and the privilege against self incrimination may, and occasionally does, in the instance of a killer set free, later result in the sacrifice of the life of an innocent person. To be emphasised here is that fundamental human rights theory necessarily implies sacrifices. All the great judicial decisions in this area have thus been hard decisions. And the problem of the right to life of the fetus must be viewed in this context. But courts as well as people have faced difficult problems before and have resolved them with dignity intellectual honesty. Such was the problem in the famous case *United States vs Holmes*, where, following shipwreck, the sailors threw fourteen passengers overboard to lighten a sinking lifeboat, and *Regina vs Dudley and Stephens*, where two seamen starved after twenty days in an open boat, killed a youthful companion and fed on his flesh until they were rescued. In both of these cases the doctrine of necessity was raised as a defense to men's actions. And "necessity" there was - nothing less than the lives of those later accused of homicide were at stake. These were hard decision for the courts, harder than the abortion decision because rarely is 'necessity' in the abortion situation of the magnitude of that facing *Holmes and Dudley & Stephens*. Nonetheless, the courts held that "necessity cannot justify killing.

Is that what is involved in the abortion controversy? Is abortion an act of killing? The German Federal Constitutional Court concluded that it was. [Footnote 168: The Federal Constitutional Court of West Germany wrote, in this regard as follows: The interruption of pregnancy irrevocably destroys an existing human life. Abortion is an act of killing; this is most clearly shown by the fact that the relevant penal sanction is contained in the section 'Felonies and Misdemeanour against Life' and, in the previous penal law, was designated the killing of the Child en ventre sa mere.' The description now common, "interruption of pregnancy" cannot camouflage this fact.] and sought to resolve the abortion problem in a manner consistent with its understanding of the values involved and their authoritative legal principles. In its concluding paragraphs, the West German Federal Constitutional Court wrote:

The parliamentary discussions about the reform of the abortion law have indeed deepened the insight that it is the principal task of the state to prevent the killing of unborn life through enlightenment about the prevention of pregnancy on the one hand as well as through effective promotional measures in society and through a general alteration of social concepts on the other. (End of quote from W.G.F.Constitutional Court).

Would not such an approach be much more compatible with the deepest values and the authoritative ideals of this (the USA) society?

7. **The opinion of Dr. Claude E. Newbury. M. B., B.Ch., D.T.M.&H., D.O.H., D.P.H., M.F.G.P. D.A., D.C.H., M. Med.**

The legal definition of abortion. "Abortion means the abortion of a live foetus of a woman with intent to kill such foetus". (Abortion and Sterilisation Act. No 2. 1975.

Government Printer Pretoria.) As defined The Abortion and Sterilisation Act allows intentional killing of innocent unborn children.

Thus legalized abortion is the intentional killing, of totally innocent unborn human beings allowed by the State. The deliberate killing of innocent human beings is murder.

The murder of human beings, approved of by the State, destroys the moral authority of the State in the eyes of all right-thinking persons, and is an offense of cosmic enormity against Almighty God the author of all life.

Facts concerning the earliest hours and days of a new human life.

There is no doubt whatsoever among scientists, as to the humanity of the unborn child, and no scientist would hesitate to identify the living fertilized human ovum as being a living member of the human species, albeit an extremely young member.

The Human embryo from the earliest stages of its life, is undeniably a member of the human race and the intrinsic human nature of each and every individual cell of its body can be easily and certainly established.

It is a scientific fact that the life of each human being begins when the living human sperm from the father, which carries half the genetic component of the new human being, fuses with the living human ovum from the mother, which carries the other half of the genetic material.

From the time of the successful completion of this event, all that is necessary for the further development and growth of this new human being, is food, oxygen, and shelter. Not only is the completion of successful fertilization the beginning of a new human life, but in those cases where identical twins develop, this event also marks the beginning of the lives of two separate human beings.

Concerning the beginning of the life of new human being, Charles Goodhart, Professor of Zoology, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge University, said "At the moment of conception we know that the embryo is alive by the very fact that it can die; we know that it is human - it can be attributed to no other species than *Homo sapiens*."

The Science of Human Genetics is based on these universally accepted facts concerning the transmission and beginning of human life. At the time of the birth of Louise Brown, the world's first "Test-Tube Baby", Professors Edwards and Steptoe who developed the technology of "In Vitro Fertilization", and who were responsible for the conception of Louise Brown in their laboratory, and who supervised her safe delivery at birth said: "When last we saw Louise she was a beautiful four-celled human embryo'.

That human life is an unbroken continuum from conception to natural or accidental death is a self-evident truth which is verified by the Science of Embryology. The fact, that the genetic component of a fertilized human ovum is sufficient when provided with the necessary nutrients and conditions, to determine the pattern, order and rate of its own development and growth to full adulthood, has been known for at least the last 30

years, when the earliest stages of embryonic human development were first directly observed.

At the very outset, when a being begins its career, it is genetic information which, accidents apart, dictates all its qualities. According to the felicitous formula of the mathematicians, the being called to life is reduced to its simplest expression. The language is of course, extremely miniaturised. Let me give you some idea how much. In the head of a spermatozoid, there is a linear meter of DNA; the code of life, the minute mass of the genetic code required for all mankind. If one brought together all the DNA molecules which will define each and every quality of each and every one of the five billion men who will take our place on this planet, the amount of matter would be equal in size to two aspirin tablets". Prof Jerome Lejeune. Professor of Genetics, University of Paris.

These facts are incontestable and are unhesitatingly relied upon, in the test-tube baby programs, when the fertilization and subsequent development of new unique human beings who are:- fully human and exclusively so; fully alive and capable of growth into fully developed adults, is directly brought about and observed in the laboratory.

These facts form the basis for, and provide the security and predictability of outcome in the birth of a child, after successful fertilization, implantation and gestation. Upon these facts "Test Tube Baby" programs depend. The child that is born bears the genetic characteristics of its biological parents and even if it is implanted into a surrogate" womb, does not obtain any genetic material or characteristics from its "surrogate" mother.

There is not the slightest chance that the progeny of the union between a human sperm and a human egg, could be anything other than a child. The thought that some other species of animal might emerge from the womb of a woman is ludicrous. Although the opossum has the same number of chromosomes in its cells as a human being, the outcome of the fertilization of a opossum egg by a opossum sperm, could not possibly give rise to the birth of a human baby, because human chromosomes are characteristically human, while opossum chromosome characteristically opossum.

Professor E. Blechschmidt, Professor of Anatomy and Director of the Institute of Anatomy at the University Gottingen, West Germany writes concerning the matter of the beginning of a new unique human life, "Today, the question regarding the point in the course of prenatal development at which it is licit to speak of a human being can be clearly answered, because today we know that each developmental stage of the human being is demonstrably a characteristically human one. Already, on the basis of the well-known chromosomes of human ova, the specificity of a human germ cell can no longer be doubted. Therefore, this principal applies today: a human being does not become a human being but rather is such from the instant of its fertilization. During the entire ontogenesis, no single break can be demonstrated, either in the sense of a leap from the lifeless to the live, or of a transition from the vegetative to the instinctive or to characteristically human behaviour. It may be considered today a fundamental law of human ontogenesis that not only human specificity but also the individual specificity of each human being remains preserved from fertilization to death, and that only the appearance of the individual being changes in the course of its ontogenesis. What we term the ontogenesis of a human being begins with fertilization because the

fertilized ovum is already a form of man. Indeed, it is already active because, seen in its minute dimensions, it constitutes a momentary picture of organized metabolic processes, becoming manifest in the developmental movements. While the unicellular fertilized ovum divides, or rather subdivides, a characteristic multi-cellular condition occurs. All the organs of the developing organism are differentiation products of each unique fertilized human ovum. Its specificity is a prerequisite for the later individuality of the human embryo of the child, and of the adult. We find no break between a manifestation of a perhaps not yet human characteristic and a perhaps only arising human peculiarity. Blechschmidt E M D 'Human Being from the Very First. New Perspectives on Human Abortion - University Publications of America.

Professor Jerome Lejeune, Professor of Fundamental Genetics at the University of Paris, France, was the person to identify the extra chromosome in patients who have Down's Syndrome. This was the chromosomal disorder to be identified. Professor Lejeune, writes as follows concerning the beginning human life: "When does a person begin? I will try to give the most precise answer to that question actually available to science. Modern biology teaches us that ancestors are united to their progeny by a continuous material link, for it is from the fertilization of the female cell (the ovum) by the male cell (the spermatozoa) that a new member of the species will emerge. Life has a very, very long history but each individual has a very neat beginning, the moment of its conception To accept that fact, that after fertilization has taken place, a new human has come into being, is no longer a matter of taste or of opinion. The human nature of the human being from conception to old age is not a metaphysical contention, it is plain experimental evidence".

Professor H. Gordon, a South African, formerly of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Cape Town, and at the time of writing this opinion Chairman of the Department of Medical Genetics, Mayo Clinic, U. S.A, writes: "Thus, from the moment of conception the organism contains many complex molecules; it synthesizes new intricate structures from simple raw materials; and it replicates itself. By all the criteria of modern molecular biology, life is present from the moment of conception.

Dr. Watson A.Bowes,Jr, of the University of Colorado Medical School writes:" But one thing is clear. Following fertilization there is an inexorable series of events that unfolds with cells dividing, moving, pausing differentiating, and aggregating with a baffling precision and purpose. In the early hours, days, and weeks of this development a hypothetical observer, if able to witness this microscopic drama, would find it impossible to identify precisely when major qualitative changes have occurred just as parents observing daily their child's growth and development cannot say precisely when he or she stopped being a child and became an adult. Thus the beginning of a single human life is from a biological point of view a simple and straightforward matter- the beginning is conception. 'In conclusion, the beginning of a human life from a biological point of view is at the time of conception. This straightforward biological fact should not be distorted to serve sociological, political, or economic goals.'

12. **Facts concerning the development of the child before birth.**

By the time that the baby is eighteen to twenty-five days old, long before the mother is sure that she is pregnant, the heart is already beating. At forty-five days after conception, you can pick up electroencephalographic waves from the baby's developing brain. At eight weeks, there is not only a brain, but the fingerprints on the hands have already formed and except for size, will never change. By the ninth and tenth weeks, the thyroid and the adrenal glands are functioning. The baby can squint, swallow, move his tongue, and the sex hormones are already present. By twelve and thirteen weeks, he has fingernails, he sucks his thumb and can recoil from pain.

In the fourth month the growing baby is eight to ten inches in height. In the fifth month there is a time of lengthening and strengthening of the developing infant. Skin, hair, and nails grow. Sweat glands arise. Oil glands excrete. This is the month in which the movements of the infant are felt by his mother. It has always seemed extraordinary to me that as the pregnant woman feels the first movements within the uterus, the mother-to-be says, "Today I felt life."

In the sixth month the developing baby responds to light and to sound. He can sleep and awake. He gets hiccups and can hear the beat of his mother's heart. Survival outside the womb is now possible. In the seventh month the nervous system becomes much more complex. The infant is sixteen inches long and weighs about three pounds. In the final eighth and ninth months there is a time of fattening and of continued growth. Professor C. Everett Koop. University of Pennsylvania and Surgeon General of the United States of America.

Confirmation of the facts of development before birth are to be found in all text-books of Human Embryology of which the following are more commonly available. L.Arey "Developmental Anatomy, A Textbook and Laboratory Manual of Embryology"; K. Moore "The Developing Human"; K.Moore. "Before We Are Born"; " Gray's Anatomy"; B. Pansky. " Review of Medical Embryology".

The methods used by the medical profession to kill unborn children by abortion. Dilatation and Suction Abortion.

The mouth of the womb is forced open by a process called " dilatation" and a hollow tube, which is connected to a powerful vacuum pump, is inserted into the womb. The suction tube then tears the body of the child apart and sucks the pieces of abortion, and is used mainly to kill unborn children before they reach the intrauterine age of three months. In the USA 95% of abortions are performed in this way. (This method is demonstrated in the films "A Matter of Choice" and "The Silent Scream" - the authenticity of which is attested by Professor Ian Donald, Regius Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of the University of Glasgow, and graduate of the University of Cape Town. Prof. Donald, was primarily responsible for the development of ultrasound technology in medicine which enables doctors to evaluate unborn babies and for the introduction of ultrasound for the practice of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. This technique of abortion is used in a procedure which is deceitfully called "menstrual extraction" or 'pregnancy interception', when very young pre-born children, usually before they have reached the age of six weeks after conception, are eradicated.

Dilatation and Curettage Abortion.

After the mouth of the womb has been forced open, a loop-shaped steel knife called a curette, is inserted into the womb and is used to cut up the child and to scrape the parts of the child

out of the womb. Usually the head - because it is the biggest part of the child - remains behind and a forceps, is needed to catch the head in order to crush it and pull it out of the womb. This method is used to abort children before they have reached the intrauterine age of three to four months. A curette is often used after the (methods of abortion in order to remove the placenta. The placenta is the organ which effects the physical inter-connection between the mother and the child, allowing the supply of nutrients to the child and the elimination of waste products from the child. The placenta is embedded into the wall of the womb. The connection between placenta and the baby is through the umbilical cord.

Dilatation and Evacuation Abortion.

After dilating the mouth of the womb a forceps which has spoon shaped blades, is used to catch hold of the child and to crush, pull and tear the child apart and then to remove the fragmented remains of the child from the womb. This method is used to kill children as old as six months after conception. ("The Eclipse of Reason", shows the destruction of a child of 24 weeks of gestational age by this method).

Salt Poisoning Abortion.

Also known as " Salting out" and " Saline Abortion". A highly corrosive solution of salt (20% Salt) is injected into the sac which surrounds the child and which contains the amniotic fluid in which the child lives. The use of this poisonous salt solution, is a form of chemical warfare waged by the medical profession against preborn children. The salt solution burns the child, causing profound disturbances of blood electrolytes, and clotting mechanisms. Bleeding occurs into the tissues and organs of the baby and brain haemorrhages occur. The child usually struggles frantically for an hour or more before dying. (This method is shown in the films "Assignment Life" and "A Matter of Choice"). Variations of this technique which employ other chemicals to kill the child, such as glucose and urea, are less commonly used because they are more dangerous for the mother.

Obviously all of these methods of abortion are intended to be lethal for the child. These methods of injecting poisons into the womb, can be used from about the 16th. week of pregnancy onwards. Occasionally severely burnt or otherwise mortally injured children are born alive after being aborted by these chemicals, however no attempts are made to help them, and these babies are neglected and abandoned until they die. After death they are incinerated with the other hospital wastes, or disposed of by the hospital garbage shredding and grinding machines, and then flushed into the sewers. If not incinerated or shredded, they are disposed of on municipal garbage disposal sites where they become food for rodents and other vermin.

Prostaglandin Abortion.

A powerful hormone called prostaglandin is used to cause the womb to go into labour and to expel the child. This hormone can be injected into the womb or used as a pessary which is inserted into the vagina. it can be used in combination with saline and other abortifacient substances. Prostaglandins can be used throughout the whole duration of pregnancy and is the preferred method of abortion when babies are to be used for " spare parts".

The reason that prostaglandin is used on its own, is that it does not usually directly kill the child nor seriously damage the organs and tissues of the child, whereas Prostaglandin in combination with salt invariably kills the child by extensive damage to its organs and tissues, thereby rendering the child unusable as a source of foetal tissue of fetal "spare parts". There is a considerable and steadily growing demand for fresh undamaged living fetal tissue and organs which are used for tissue culture, the production of vaccines, and transplantation. The Peel Report on the Use of Foetuses and Foetal Material for Research HMSO, 1972. Obviously this tissue must still be alive when it is used for culture, brain and organ transplantation.

Partial Birth Abortion. (D and X Abortion).

This is a technique of abortion in which the child in the womb is rotated into a breech position (feet first position) and partially delivered. The legs, abdomen, chest and arms of the child are delivered, leaving only the head of the child still retained within the body of the mother. While the child is in this position the abortionist is able to remove organs from the child via incisions made into the child. When all the various organs and tissues are removed from the child the abortionist inserts a sharp pointed instrument through the nape of the neck of the child upwards through the skull of the child into its brain. The instrument, usually a pair of sharp dissecting scissors is opened and closed in several planes inside the brain of the child. The abortionist then inserts a suction tube into the brain of the child and sucks out the brain of the child. This causes the skull of the child to collapse then allowing an easy delivery of the collapsed head. The organs and tissues taken from the living child are then used as spare parts for implantation into other children or adults. The various tissues and organs removed can also be used as a source of human tissues for various purposes, including in tissue-culture laboratories, where cells derived from the cannibalised organs and tissues of the child can be used for biological experimentation as well as for the production of vaccines and various other biological by-products.

During April 1996, the United States Congress voted to ban this particularly barbaric form of abortion. President Clinton vetoed this Congressional ban and so this form of abortion is still available in the USA.

Hysterotomy Abortion

This method is in reality a Caesarean Section, performed before the child reaches a stage of maturity - which would allow the child to survive outside its mother's womb - with the intention of killing the child. Usually the child is killed while still inside the womb of the mother. The reason for killing the child inside the mother, is that a living, moving, gasping and usually crying aborted baby provides some embarrassment and difficulties of the abortionist and for the hospital staff, who have contracted with the mother to kill her baby by abortion. A living aborted child is a breach of that contract and presents many dilemmas concerning the care and ultimate disposal of the child. Obviously if the mother had wishes to give her baby to adopting parents she would not have agreed to the hysterotomy.

Usually the child is killed inside the mother by cutting or clamping the umbilical cord thereby causing the child to bleed to death inside its mother's womb. Should the child be alive after its removal from the womb, it is then usually killed by exposure or by suffocation unless the living child is destined to be used in experiments and as a source of fresh living fetal tissue. F.McCullagh, The Foetus as Transport Donor. The killing of children by the hysterotomy method is used after the 24th week of pregnancy.

Although Hysterotomy is actually a Caesarean Section, the name of the operation is changed by calling it a Hysterotomy, because everyone knows that Caesarean Sections are used to deliver live babies whereas the intention in these cases is to kill the child. By changing the name of the operation the mother and the abortionist are spared the embarrassment of having to explain to interested inquirers, whatever happened to the 'Caesarean bay'?

Mifepristone Abortion

Commonly called the 'French do-it-yourself abortion Pill'. This drug has been given the code name RU 486 by Roussel-Uclaf, the French Pharmaceutical Company which manufactures it. This substance kills the child by 'hormonal counterfeit', it mimics and blocks the action of a hormone which is produced by the developing child which is essential for the continuation of the life of the child. The use of RU 486 is a form of 'biochemical assassination' of an unborn infant. It is yet another form of chemical warfare which is waged by the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry on unborn children. RU 486 is commonly combined with prostaglandin in order to augment its lethal abortive effects.

Films showing some these methods are in our possession and are available for viewing.

The various methods described above for killing unborn children, are described in detail in Gynaecology and in 'Family Planning' textbooks. One such book containing precise information on how to perform abortions, as well as extensive rhetoric in support of abortion is: 'Abortion and Sterilisation . Medical and Social Aspects'. Jane E. Hodgson, the Academic Press.

The Acceptance by the Medical Profession of the Practice of Killing Unborn Children by Abortion

Absolute respect for Human Life is the fundamental ethical basis of the practice of medicine. The adoption of the Hippocratic Oath by doctors, 450 years before the birth of Christ, transformed doctors from being both healers as well as killers - a situation which prevailed until that time and which still prevails amongst primitive medical practitioners such as witch doctors and shamans - into a profession devoted exclusively to healing and to the preservation of human life.

The transformation of the practice of medicine which the Hippocratic Oath brought about, created the intellectual and moral conditions and attitudes which made the development of scientific beneficent medicine possible. Abortion as well as other forms of killing human beings, such as infanticide and euthanasia, are forbidden by the Hippocratic Oath.

The Declaration of Geneva of the World Medical Association, which was published in 1948, was an attempt to restore Hippocratic ethics and to re-establish the moral and ethical foundation of the medical profession, which had been besmirched and finally destroyed by the co-operation of German doctors in the Nazi Euthanasia Program, and in the involvement of doctors in the later established death-camp extermination programs. The Geneva Declaration reaffirmed the Hippocratic Oath and once again obliged doctors to preserve and to protect human life from the time of conception.

All doctors know that abortion kills innocent human beings. To deny this would be totally contradictory to logic, scientific facts, and medical experience. However in spite of this knowledge the medical profession, by its merciless war on the unborn children, has now turned the womb into the most dangerous place for a human being to live, and through abortion the medical profession has become more terrible in the scale of killing than any army in history. In accepting abortion, - the killing of innocent pre-born human beings as part of its legitimate range of activities- the medical profession accepted the role of killers and of public executioners.

The acceptance by doctors of the killing of innocent infants in the womb has destroyed the moral basis of medicine and has turned doctors into mere technicians in the field of life and death. Worse still, in moral terms, abortion has turned abortionists and those doctors and nurses who co-operate with them in slaughtering unborn children, into professional assassins. Abortion is the only procedure performed by doctors - with the approval of a large section of the Medical profession - which is deliberately intended to kill a human being. Abortion is a completely non-medical and non-therapeutic procedure and always involves the intention of killing the child. (The Abortion Act clearly reveals this and defines abortion in a way which shows the intention to kill the child.) Pregnancy is not a disease nor is the child a cancer, nor does the killing of unborn children, even by the widest stretch of the imagination, constitute a form of treatment.

Doctors who, by killing babies in the womb, have disregarded their calling to preserve and to safeguard human life, and have by so doing abandoned the basis for moral reasoning. Consequently such doctors have no moral base on which to make ethical decisions and Medical Ethics will be increasingly based, not on the fundamental difference between good and evil, but on what the majority of doctors consider to be acceptable or on what the state or society requires of them.

This tragic situation applied exactly to the German medical profession during the Nazi regime, when the majority of German doctors abandoned Hippocratic Ethics and without protest, accepted the murderous role which the German government gave them. Doctors became impassive spectators to, or were directly involved in, the slaughter of millions of human beings in the German Euthanasia program. This program first eliminated handicapped German children and adults, and only some years later was expanded into a program to eliminate those who were considered to be racially, socially or religiously handicapped, in the empire of killing institutions typified by Auschwitz, which were established for non-Germans, some years later. These killings were considered to be in the best interests of the German State, and of the German people, and the German medical profession merely accepted its assigned role as "killers" which their government gave them. Human beings who were held in the concentration camps, had their humanity stripped from them by classifying them "sub-human", "useless eaters" or to use a Hitlerian phrase as "oxygen wasters.

In a similar manner dehumanising language is used by the medical profession to deny the humanity of children the womb by classifying them as mere 'foetuses'. Even the scientifically correct classification of unborn children as 'human foetuses'- a classification which is essential to distinguish them from animal foetuses which belong to various non-human species, such as cat, rat and dog foetuses, is deceptively and malevolently withheld from these human foetuses. Once the inmates of the Nazi concentration camps had been dehumanised, inside the corrupted minds of their captors, it was then possible for their captors to murder them or to abuse them

in other ways; slaves; as human "guinea pigs" in medical experiments - which were mainly conducted in the death camp of Treblinka - and even to use the fat from their corpses for the production of soap, and their skins for lamp shades. At present, in a similar way aborted human fetuses are used in medical experiments; as spare parts, and even for the production of cosmetics. The Minnesota Citizens Concerned for life published a photograph which shows Dr. Lawrence Lawn of Department of Experimental Medicine of the University of Cambridge England, experimenting on a living aborted human fetus which was held in a tank of fluid. Dr. Lawn was quoted in the Cambridge Evening News as saying, 'We are simply using something which is destined for the incinerator to benefit mankind ... Of course we would not dream of experimenting with a viable child. We would not consider that to be right'. A British newspaper reported that the Middlesex Hospital School of Medicine was using aborted babies which it obtained from the Langham Street (Abortion) Clinic.

The tragic betrayal of medical ethics by the German medical profession was clearly revealed and documented in the proceedings of the Nuremberg War Trials. The origin and the evolution of the stark tragedy which befell the German Medical Profession, is described by Dr. L. Alexander in 'Medicine under a Dictatorship'. The New England Medical Journal of Medicine, 14 July 1949.

Dr. H. Ratner, clearly detailed how the betrayal of medical ethics by the German Medical Profession had originated in the abandonment by German doctors of the Hippocratic Oath and inevitably led to the involvement of these doctors in the medical atrocities in the German concentration camps, during the Second World War. Raner H. 'Child and Family' vol 10. nos 1,2,3 1971. Reprinted 1987.

The present acceptance of Abortion; used in population control [population] abortion and the willing involvement of the medical profession in population control programs, in which doctors abort 'unplanned babies' in order to prevent the risk of 'over-population' and to improve the 'quality of life' for those already born, has led doctors into accepting the rolls of public executioners in other situations. Among these situations, is the elimination of human beings, after their births, for social reasons - when their killing is considered, by society or by the state, to be necessary or desirable.

The growing acceptance and practice, by the medical profession of infanticide as a 'cure' for handicapped children,, and of 'mercy killing' in order to eliminate 'human vegetables' and aged persons, is macabre reality, as are experiments by doctors on living human embryos and living aborted babies, and the medically approved use of aborted babies as a source of 'spare parts and tissues'. Eminent Priest Sociologist Dr. Paul Marx of Human Life International observed that: 'support within the medical profession for infanticide received a considerable boost in May, 1973, when Dr. James D. Watson, Nobel prize-winning scientist, stated that consideration should be given to withholding legal status from an infant until three days after his birth. Parents who suspect fetal abnormalities may now legally obtain abortion, he point out; but most birth defects are not observed until birth: Watson said that 'The doctor could allow the child to die if the parents so chose and save a lot of misery and suffering. I believe this view is the only rational, compassionate attitude to have!'

The common practice of infanticide in South Africa was brought to the attention of the public by a Johannesburg newspaper, which reported that 'a member of the Johannesburg Hospital staff told how she had seen a living baby left in the sluice room, where stillbirths and delivery

waste are usually taken, because doctors had decided it had a minimal chance at life'. The report went onto quote another staff member at the hospital who said that: 'when babies are born prematurely and very small, or if they were badly deformed, they were wrapped in a towel, taken to a separate room and left unattended until they died. They were not fed or given any medication'.

Commenting on this infanticide Professor Alan Rothberg, Professor of Pediatrics at the University of the Witwatersrand, said: 'South African law states that any baby born less than six months into pregnancy - or about 900 g in weight - can be classified as a miscarriage. One in every 100 babies falls into this category. 'Rothberg continued ' When a baby is born weighing between 600 to 700 grams and is just breathing, there is no point in trying to save it as it has only a 10% chance at life and an even smaller chance of living normally. In addition, it would take the hospital three to six months to get that baby into a state of good health. The resources that would be required to do so could be used to better effect on other babies who have a greater chance at survival. Everything would be done to help a baby, born of a mother who had a history of miscarriages, to live. 'The reporter went on to say that 'The babies seen in the sluice room at the hospital were definitely alive, according to a hospital source'. Professor Rothberg however is reported to have said that they were simply making reflex movements. Sunday Star 16 April 1989.

Considering the use of words such as "sub-humans" by the Nazis to describe people that they wished to eliminate, it is of considerable interest to note that doctors who practice infanticide never refer to these children as "babies", which term they describe as emotive, but as "neonates". The use of the brains of aborted babies for implantation into adults who are afflicted with Parkinson's disease is an established practice throughout the world as well as in South Africa. Sir Raymond Hoffenberg, an ex South African who left South Africa in protest against the suppression of human rights by Apartheid, and who is now president of the Royal College of Physicians in the U.K. is reported in the press as saying that a working party of the Royal College had been established to consider the use of aborted (human) foetuses as a source of brain cells for transplantation. Natural the brain cells which are cannibalised from aborted babies must still be alive for these cells to be capable of growth, development and replication after implantation. It would be totally futile and contrary to elementary biological reality, to expect dead brain cells from aborted babies to be capable of growth and of replacing the damaged brain tissues and brain functions of adults, after implantation into senile or otherwise damaged, adult brains.

At present doctors perform about 60 million abortions each year throughout the world. This staggering squandering of human life is unparalleled in history. American doctors kill in one year - by abortion - more Americans than the total number of Americans who were killed in all the wars in America's history. In one single day British doctors kill more human beings in their terrible war of abortion on unborn babies, than the total British military losses during the Falkland War.

During the Second World War - which was the bloodiest war in history - approximately sixty million human beings were killed. It is an appalling fact that doctors - who kill sixty million unborn children each year in the Abortion War - now kill six times as many human beings in surgical abortions each year, as the number of persons who were killed each year during the Second World War.

Of the total of sixty million deaths during the Second World War, at least six million persons were murdered in Nazi death camps, giving an average rate for the killings in those concentration camps of about one million prisoners each year. The wholesale slaughter in the death camps is constantly remembered as "The Holocaust". Those even remotely responsible for this savagery are still being hunted down in order to punish them for those atrocities.

The hounding down of Kurt Waldheim, former Secretary General of the United Nations, and presently the President of Austria, is just one such case - while those responsible for the "Silent Holocaust" perpetrated on preborn children, are untroubled by reprisals and on the contrary often have honors heaped upon them. One such person, David Steele, the leader of the British Liberal Party, who was responsible for the Abortion Holocaust on unborn British babies, has recently been knighted by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, who is, besides being Queen of England, The Defender of the Faith, and the head of the Church of England.

In South Africa, Mrs. Helen S. Suzman, long serving member of Parliament - honored throughout the world for her opposition to apartheid - attempted for years to have liberalized abortion introduced into S. Africa, because abortion in her view was a fundamental human right. Mrs. Suzman even offered to pay, out of her own pocket, the costs of sending a young pregnant woman who had been refused an abortion in South Africa, to a British abortuary. Mrs. Suzman has been honored and feted by governments, church leaders, international organizations and universities throughout the world, as a champion of human rights and she has recently been made by Queen Elizabeth, a Dame of the British Empire.

At present members - in good standing - of the American medical profession alone kill more than 1,600,000 infants in the wombs of their mothers by legal abortions each year. This number of killings easily surpasses the yearly scale of killing during the "Holocaust", and many respected professors of Gynaecology of Obstetrics and Gynaecology easily surpass the record of the "Beast of Belsen" and other infamous Nazi war criminals, in snuffing out the lives of human beings.

However This " Silent American Holocaust" and similar large scale slaughter of unborn children in many other countries is fully supported by the American Medical Association and the Medical Associations of those other countries.

While Britain viewed the deaths of 97 people who were killed in "The Hillsborough Soccer Disaster", as a catastrophe of such dimensions that a national day of mourning was declared, on which Her Majesty the Queen; The Prime Minister; Eminent Clerics, and politicians, (including Mr. David Steele - the architect of the British Abortion Law), attended memorial services. During these services many of these notables were seen weeping openly, their sobbing and the tolling of church bells adding to the atmosphere of national shock and horror. These notables, in the midst of their tears, gave no thought to the 500 babies that are murdered each day in Britain, and who were even being murdered by British doctors, in the same hospitals where some of those who were injured in that soccer disaster, were taken for compassionate and efficient healing. The abortion holocaust in British Hospitals continued unabated while the Nation was attending the memorial services for those accidentally killed in the soccer disaster, and the media, who have so unreservedly approved of the murder of unborn infant children by abortion, was filled with stories of the soccer deaths, with messages of condolence, and demands that those responsible for this tragic accident be brought to book.

Referring to the war on the unborn, which is ferociously waged by American Doctors, on helpless unborn American children, Joan Andrews said, "The war of abortion is the most brutal of all, for it deliberately and directly targets the children, during prosperity, and amidst a pretended, obscene " peace'.

A medical profession that accepts the killing of human beings by abortion destroys the trust of patients in doctors and in scientific medicine. No sane patient should trust his life and the lives of his loved ones to a doctor who murders unborn children or who supports this murder.

"Abortion turns the womb into a bloody tomb; it turns women into walking graveyards; it turns doctors and nurses into professional assassins and it turns hospitals into antiseptic abattoirs". Bishop M. Gonsalves of Lisbon, Portugal.

Abortion and the Legal Profession.

The first precept of the law is that good is to be done and evil to be avoided. There can be no greater evil than the murder of totally, innocent human beings. Legalized abortion is legalized murder, and any country which enacts this appalling injustice, totally corrupts its legal system. Legal abortion destroy respect for the law and for law makers; and unless laws permitting abortion are completely repealed, legalized abortion will result in the destruction of the rule of law. "The Morality of Abortion. Legal and Historical Perspectives" Edited by J.T. Noonan Harvard University Press.

No law-maker or legal system is above the law of God, who forbids the killing of the innocent. God tells us that He hates the spilling of innocent blood and that He considers this to be a crime which cries out to Him for vengeance. The fact that killing the innocent by abortion, may be permitted by human law does not lessen the profound intrinsic evil of abortion, but rather makes those law-makers and countries which legalise abortion, accessories to this awful modern "Massacre of the Innocents", which easily outstrips in its scale and brutality, the massacre ordered by King Herod in his attempt to murder the new-born baby Jesus. This modern slaughter stains lawmakers and State authorities who support abortion, with the blood of aborted children and turns them into modern King Herods..

The widespread rejection of abortion by American citizens, and the confrontation that legalized abortion has caused - between those who support the killing of unborn children - and those who try to defend these children, is now the greatest divisive public issue in the United States of America, and it appears that the conflict which has been brought about in society by the legalized murder of unborn human beings, will persist while this injustice persists, and that opposition to abortion will continue to escalate until all laws permitting abortion are struck down.

Those who promote the killing of unborn children declare that the matter of the personhood of the unborn should only be determined by the law. They hold that the law should determine that unborn children are not persons in the full sense of the law, and consequently they can be disposed as the mother sees fit. In this way the promoters of abortion have used the law to destroy protection for the unborn while at the same time they claim that the matter of abortion 'is a narrowly religious issue which should be regulated by conscience rather than by law'. Marx.D Paul O.S.B. "The Death Peddlers - War on the Unborn" Human Life Center, St. John's University. Minnesota 1971.

Should the law decide to contradict:- 1. The Divine Law 2. The evidence of biology 3. The natural law of reason:- in determining that the child in the womb is not a human person; or if the law makers should deliberately avoid expressing opinion on this crucial point, as was done by the U. S. Supreme Court, in the matter of Roe vs Wade which thereby opened the way to the wholesale slaughter of unborn children; then the tragic experiences of mankind during the recent past must be recalled, otherwise these tragedies - which embodied total disregard and disrespect for human life - will be repeated.

In recent history, the classification of whole groups of human beings as sub-humans and non-persons which occurred during the Nazification of the German legal system, resulted in the Holocaust. The "Dred Scott" decision by the Supreme Court of the United States of America, which was passed by a seven to two majority of that court, deprived slaves of intrinsic human rights and value in the eyes of the law. The legal decision eventually led to the American Civil War. It was the Supreme Court of the U.S.A which passed the decision which allowed unborn children to be murdered by abortion, and just as in its disastrous "Dred Scott" decision one hundred years earlier, the Court approved by a majority decision - of seven against two justices - of the court.

In our own country, South Africa, we are now suffering the tragic consequences of having, by way of the Law, deprived people of their intrinsic human rights by Apartheid. The role played by lawyers and jurists in the establishment of, and in the maintenance of Apartheid is a fact which is to the profound discredit of the profession. However compared to the total evil of abortion, the evil of Apartheid is trivial. "The law is that which puts a difference betwixt good and evil, betwixt just and unjust. If you take away the law, all things will fall into confusion. Every man will become a law to himself, which, in the depraved condition of human nature, must needs produce great enormities. Lust will become a law, envy will become a law, covetousness and ambition will become laws." John Pym speaking to the British House of Commons: November 1640.

The increasing scale of the slaughter of unborn children contrasted with the cessation of capital punishment.

The death sentence is only passed on those who have been found guilty of a capital offense and who, after due process of law - in which the accused must be afforded full and proper legal defense - guilt is proven beyond all reasonable doubt. Should there be any doubt about the guilt of the accused then the benefit of the doubt must be accorded to the accused. It is frightening to contrast this benign and fair application of the "benefit of the doubt" - which is accorded to major criminals - with the readiness to justify the killing of totally innocent pre-born children by the use of the totally unscientific, illogical and homicidal - "we are not sure when human life begins" - argument.

The legal execution by the State of felons, has now been found contradictory to the "Right to life" enshrined in the Constitution and the Constitutional Court has forbidden all executions. Recently the State President, out of compassion for criminals and their relatives and out of respect for what he called the "sanctity of human life", has ordered that all capital punishments be stopped. This moratorium on capital punishment has been in effect since October 1989. This compassionate attitude towards cold-blooded murderers rapists and terrorists, is in hideous contrast to the acceptance of the ruthless execution of totally innocent unborn

children by means of legal abortion. This appalling contradiction and travesty of "compassion" is emphasized by comparing the 1112 children legally killed by abortion during 1988, with the 117 felons who were executed by the State during that same year, and the 50 major criminals who were executed during 1989, until the moratorium on legal executions was introduced in October 1989.

The innocence of the child and the profound injustice of causing the death of a child in the womb of a woman who has been sentenced to death, is clearly demonstrated in Article 6 of the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which prohibits the judicial execution of the death penalty on a pregnant woman because such an execution of the guilty mother will at the same time also kill her innocent unborn child.

The American Medical Association forbids any doctor to be involved in capital punishment. Even for a doctor to prescribe a drug which could be used to kill a criminal who has been sentenced to death by the State, or the supervision of the placement of the hypodermic needle through which a lethal drug could be injected by a non-medical state employee, is strictly forbidden. This attitude is in appalling contrast to the support by the American Medical Association of the slaughter of more than 1.6 million unborn American children each year in legal abortions performed by American doctors.

The British Medical profession, various British medical journals and the British Media have castigated the South African medical profession for its failure to severely punish doctors, whom they alleged failed to care properly for Steven Biko while he was in police custody - while at the same time the British Medical Association supports the murder by British doctors of more than 185,000 unborn infants each year in Britain. The British Medical Association has attempted to foist abortion onto the people of Northern Ireland, against their democratically expressed rejection of abortion, by way of an Order in Council, and when this ruse to foist the extra violence of legalized abortion on Northern Ireland failed, invited a member of parliament in Britain to do this by way of a private members bill. The British Medical Association suggested that abortion could be enforced on Northern Ireland through the European Court of Human Rights. British Medical Journal. 28 March 1987.

Amongst the British babies slaughtered in Britain by ethically acceptable British doctors, there were many South African babies whose mothers were prevented from killing, their babies in South Africa, because South African doctors refused to approve their abortions. These mothers then made their unholy pilgrimages to Britain so that ethically impeccable British doctors could kill their babies for them, after ethically detestable South African doctors had refused the murderous wishes of these mothers.

One good effect of the international medical sanctions campaign waged against South Africa in the recent past, was that various members of the British abortion industry including the Brook Advisory Center, and the British Pregnancy Advisory Service, out of "solidarity with the repressed in South Africa" and in response to the calls for international sanctions to be maintained against South Africa and all South Africans and South African organizations, refused to abort South African women. However the Marie Stopes International of Britain quickly took advantage of this situation, by establishing an abortuary in the town of Mafeking, now known as Mafekeng, in the South African homeland of Bophuthatswana. It was anticipated by the international abortion cartel that this abortuary in an independent homeland within South Africa, would evade the South African Abortion Law. Marie Stopes

International, is registered as a non-profit tax-exempt charity in the United Kingdom. Its overseas services, such as those of killing unborn children in Africa, are funded by the British Overseas Development Administration of the British Government, the European Economic Community, various foundations and private donors and its budget for the fiscal year 1988 was about \$7 million. Marie Stopes International imported a Dutch abortionist to kill the local African babies of all races. This Marie Stopes Abortuary, operated under the name of "The Well Woman Clinic", from a house in one of the back streets of Mafeking. The abortions were performed in what once was the kitchen of the house.

The Marie Stopes "Well Woman Clinic" operated in close association with the Abortion Reform Action Group of South Africa (ARAG). ARAG enjoys the support of Mrs Helen Suzman and Mrs Carole Charlewood, the latter a Catholic member of Parliament for Umbilo Natal. It was Mrs Charlewood who, acting in association with the Abortion Reform Action Group and Planned Parenthood, is largely responsible for the South African Government agreeing to consider the further liberalization of Abortion in South Africa. This Marie Stopes abortuary also enjoyed the support of various notable family planners and population controllers. However because of the protests from Pro-Life, this illegal back-street abortuary was closed by order of Bophuthatswana's Minister of Health.

Marie Stopes was, like Margaret Sanger, a savage racist who founded "The Society for Constructive Birth Control and Racial Progress". Stopes was a pivotal figure in the abortion campaign in Britain and abortionists still honor and revere her memory. Like her friend Margaret Sanger, Marie Stopes urged the eugenics movement to adopt effective technological methods for cleaning the human gene pool. In "Radiant Motherhood", published in 1920, Stopes wrote "Society allows the diseased, the racially negligent, the thriftless, the careless, the feeble minded, the very lowest and worst members of the community, to produce innumerable tens of thousands of stunted, warped, inferior infants. A large proportion of these are doomed from their very physical inheritance to be at best but partly self-supporting, and thus to drain the resources of those classes above them who have a sense of responsibility. The better classes, freed from the cost of institutions, hospitals, prisons and so on, principally filled the inferior racial stock, would be able to afford to enlarge their own families".

Mafeking was once famous as the birth-place of the international scouting movement for it was here in this town that Lord Baden-Powell was trapped during the Anglo-Boer War and it was here that during the siege of Mafeking that he formulated the concept of the Boy Scouts.

The South African Medical Association has ruled that doctors are obliged to protect the lives and health of children who are held in police detention and to prevent the abuse of adult prisoners and to report all instances of abuse and neglect of children and adults. Doctors who have reported instances of abuse of political prisoners, have been praised and honored by the local and foreign medical professions, because of their courage and devotion to the Hippocratic Oath: these doctors have been honored by the media, while the same medical profession and media condoned and promoted the murder by abortion, of 11 12 unborn South African infants during 1988.

The practice of killing unborn children by abortion and the concept of justice.

The Government bases its motivations and strivings towards the establishment of a new political dispensation for South Africa on the concept of justice. The Government hopes to

establish a society founded on justice, where the fundamental human rights and dignity of all our people will be respected and safeguarded.

The system of Apartheid is unjust because while it acknowledges the fundamental human right, i.e. the right to life, it devalues the intrinsic worth of human beings, and restricts and denies other subsumed human rights. This unjust discrimination against individuals is based on their racial classification. Apartheid is now acknowledged by our Government to be an unjust system which is morally indefensible.

Abortion is the fatal discrimination against unborn children and is the most extreme and evil form of injustice, as life itself is taken from the helpless innocent child. Yet the South African Government permits the killing of unborn children and is now willing to consider motivations for the further increase of this frightful injustice against unborn infants. The contradiction of logic inherent in the Government's attempts to establish justice - by restoring basic human rights to those already born by the removal of Apartheid - while concurrently expressing its willingness to consider motivations which will entrench and expand the ultimate injustice of killing by abortion, those not yet born - is appalling.

The primeval injustice of promoting and allowing, fatal discrimination against unborn children by abortion, is embodied in and encouraged by the use of the following circumstances and arguments.

1. Age. The child is very young.
2. Size. The child is very small.
3. Legal identity. The child is not yet a legal person.
4. Place of residence. The child is living in the womb and is considered by its mother to be an unwelcome squatter without any right to shelter and protection.
5. The degree of intelligence of the child. The child is not yet intelligent or after birth might be mentally handicapped or of diminished intelligence.
6. The degree of intelligence of the mother. The mother of the child is an idiot or an imbecile and consequently is not considered capable of consenting to sexual intercourse or of caring for the child.
7. The degree of physical perfection. The child is physically handicapped or is at risk of being so.
8. The very close relationship of the parents in terms of consanguinity and affinity. The child is the result of incest.
9. The state of mental health of the mother. The child would cause excessive mental stress to the mother.
10. The state of the physical health of the mother. The pregnancy would cause a threat to the health of the mother.

11. The violent criminal actions of the father. The child was conceived in an act of rape.
12. To relieve social problems. a) The parents of the child are poor. b) The poor have too many babies. c) There is insufficient housing, infrastructure, and employment to accommodate more people. d) There is a shortage of medical, educational and other facilities.
13. The lack of love for the child. The child is not wanted. The child is "unplanned".
14. The accidental circumstances of the conception of the child. The child is a "mistake", an "accident", a contraceptive failure".
15. The degree of social competency and maturity of the mother. The mother of the child is too young, too inexperienced, or socially disadvantaged to care for her child.
16. The convenience of their parents. The birth of the child would be inconvenient.
17. The careers of the parents of the child. The child would prevent the advancement of the school, business, and professional careers of his parents.
18. Environmental conservation. The child will pollute the environment and deplete natural resources. The child is a threat to trees, tropical forests, the ozone layer, the ocean, unspoilt beaches and to all those already born.
19. To nurture the preservation of Wild life. The child threatens the existence of wild animals and insects such as; Cape fur-seals, whales, elephants, rhinos, riverine rabbits, Cape vultures, and butterflies
20. Overpopulation. The child will cause the overcrowding of the planet and reduce the quality of life of those who are already born.
21. Food shortage. The child will cause a shortage of food for the rest of mankind.
22. The right of the mother to control her body. Because the child is resident in the womb of the mother and is totally dependent on her, the decision to kill the child is solely at the discretion of the mother, who in killing her child is merely exercising "her right to control her own body".
23. The financial interests of the parents and of the country. Women have to spend a lot of money to go overseas in order to abort their babies. This is a luxury that only affluent women can afford, thus this situation discriminates against poor women who cannot afford the cost of overseas abortions. This situation causes a loss of foreign exchange, is a financial drain on the country, and discriminates against local abortionists by depriving them of earning a livelihood which is derived from performing abortions.
24. The physical health of their mothers. Women who resort to "back street" abortionists thereby risk their health, and their lives. Therefore it is argued that the State has an obligation to provide antiseptic facilities where women can have their unwanted and

unplanned babies killed by skilled scientific abortionists who only use sterile instruments and the latest technology - thereby causing minimal risk to the health of the aborting mothers.

25. The future fertility of women could be damaged by unskilled and unhygienic abortionists. This damage could prevent these aborted women from having children in the future when they "choose", therefore it is asserted that the State has an obligation to arrange for unborn children to be killed in such a manner, so as not to cause or allow any risk to the future fertility of women.

It is argued that the State must provide facilities and services out of public funds which are needed to restore the fertility of those women who have had their fertility damaged by abortion, venereal diseases, sterilization, or birth control pills, injections and devices. It is argued that these facilities and services to restore the fertility of women should include "Test-Tube Baby Programs".

26. The helplessness of the child. The child is held in detention in the womb and while thus detained abortionists claim that the child has no rights and consequently it is acceptable to kill the child.

The contrast between the promotion of the killing of unborn children while they are held in detention in the womb and the public and medical revulsion at the abuse of political prisoners while they are being held in police detention has previously been noted.)

27. To prevent future child abuse. The unborn child is unwanted and thus might at some time in the future, become "battered child" or be subjected to other forms of child abuse and social deprivation. In order to prevent this future possibility, it is better to kill the child before birth. Abortion thus replaces possible, future, extra-uterine child abuse, with fatal intrauterine child abuse.

28. The personality and degree of mental self awareness of the child. Some justify the killing of unborn children on the imagined basis that unborn children, irrespective of the stage of their development, have a diminished sense of pain. Thus they argue that the probability of severe pain being experienced by the unborn during the process of killing them, must be totally discounted and any suggestion that abortion is cruel should be rejected. Those who favor the killing of unborn children say that any counter-arguments based on the observed reactions, unborn children to light touch and needle prick; their reactions to sound and even their efforts to move themselves into comfortable intrauterine positions, are best dealt with by ignoring these arguments, and that even if these children were capable of experiencing pain, the fact that the mother is anaesthetised should eliminate any objections to abortion based on its cruelty.

Most abortions are performed under local anaesthesia but even when general anaesthesia is used to make the mother oblivious of any pain, the child is not anaesthetised to anywhere near the same degree. The difference in levels of anaesthesia between the mother and the child is clearly evident when the vigorously crying and moving child of an anaesthetised mother, is lifted out of the womb during Caesarean operations. The reason for the difference in the levels of anaesthesia

between the mother and the child is that the placenta acts as a barrier to the transfer of the anaesthetic agent from the mother's circulation, into that of the child.

In practice, the lack of anaesthesia of the child is required in order to give the child the best chance of survival after its birth. It is predominantly for this reason that most Caesarean births are now performed under spine anaesthesia.

The use of the argument that abortions are painless for the unborn child and therefore acceptable, would justify the extermination of other unwanted persons, such as the senile and the handicapped, provided they are eradicated in a painless manner. It should be noted that the Nazis eliminated the unwanted in a painless manner by the use of cyanide gas.

29. The promoters of abortion argue that objections to abortion which are based on the fact that abortion does to unborn children, what animal protection societies would not permit to be done to animals, are best dismissed by labelling these objections to be 'emotive'.

More recently it has been established that those brain cells which are responsible for the sense of consciousness are present in the unborn child by as early as 10 weeks after conception. Those nerves which transmit pain are developed before nerve pathways which can suppress in the brain the sensation of pain are developed and so in the light of this information it is possible that the unborn child has a more acute sensation of pain than an adult. It is thus probable that the child may suffer greater pain from the same painful stimulus than an adult.

Abortion and child abuse.

In an abortion the mother seeks out and hires an abortionist to murder her own baby; fully cooperates with the abortionist; and often protects the abortionist from police prosecution. The mother becomes a willing accessory to the murder of her baby.

Abortion is the ultimate form of child abuse. In the case of parents who have murderous intentions against a child after its birth, attempts to murder the child might attract the notice of a doctor, neighbour, an observant social worker or a passer-by, who would be morally and legally obliged to rescue the child and to place the child in the protection of the State.

The Child Care Act of 1985, obliges, under the threat of prosecution by the State, anyone who knows or who suspects that a child is being abused - to rescue the child, to protect the child by all lawful means; to immediately report the abuse; and to place the child in the protection of the State in a "place of safety". Any doctor or nurse, including those doctors and nurses who perform and who are involved in legal abortions - who fail to report a case of child abuse and who fail to protect, even at the risk of their own lives, an abused child would be found to be totally negligent in their duty and would be liable to criminal prosecution by the State, and to trial and punishment by the medical or nursing profession.

The Child Care Act which was drafted and promulgated by the State stands in bizarre contrast to the Abortion and Sterilisation Act, in which the deliberate and always fatal abuse of unborn children is permitted and supervised by the State. Any government which shows such legal

inconsistency and confusion, and reveals such moral abandonment is not deserving of respect and clearly indicates that it is not fit to govern.

The inhuman treatment of unborn children which is permitted by the State, has had a significant effect on medical and public attitudes towards children who are often considered as chattels and commodities.

Abortion denies inalienable human rights and abortion requires for its practice the acceptance of extreme violence directed against unborn children. Abortion has brutalised and corrupted society and has seriously diminished the abhorrence of violence and abuse which is directed against those already born. If a government considers abortion to be morally and legally acceptable, knowing that life is a continuum from conception to death, why does that same government consider the abuse of a child after birth to be so evil?

It has been established that abortion" is the cause of the increase in battered and murdered children. Abortion decreases an individual's instinctual restraint ... diminishes the social taboo against aggression directed against the defenceless; truncates mother-infant bonding with diminished future mothering capability". (P.Ney)

"Following permissive abortion in the United States of America, the incidence of child abuse increased by 500%". Ney P. "Relationship Between Abortion and Child Abuse," Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, vol 24. no.7, 1979.

Abortion is procured during satanic rites. Recently South Africans were shocked by police revelations, that seven new-born babies have been murdered during satanic rituals. This number of babies murdered by satanists must be compared with the 1112 babies who were murdered by doctors during legal abortions in South Africa during 1988.

How does the skillful, legally approved murder of babies in the womb by doctors, differ morally from the murder of babies by satanists during their fiendish rituals?

Those who stimulate the diabolic practice of killing unwanted children claim that society will be spared the burden of caring for these children when their parents abuse and neglect them. These diabolists invariably claim that liberal access to abortion will solve these problems and reduce the numbers of children in State care. The facts are the very opposite of this claim. Following. abortion on request in Britain the numbers of children in care in England and Wales increased from 69.1 00 in 1966, which was 2 years before the Abortion Act, to 70,700 in 1977 and were 72,800 in 1985. Social Trends 1987.

The practice of killing perfectly formed and developed unborn children, has resulted in the rapidly growing acceptance by the medical profession of infanticide, whereby handicapped children are killed after birth - generally by starvation, thirst and neglect. "Selective Non-treatment of Handicapped Newborns". R. Weir. Oxford University Press. 1984. "Infanticide and the Handicapped Newbom" D. Horan and M. Delahoyde Brigham Young University Press. 1982

Abortion has opened wide the door to infanticide, experimentation on human embryos and human foetuses, and to Euthanasia. The close links between the abortion lobby and the infanticide and euthanasia lobby have been revealed by Dr. Paul Marx. O.S.B. in his analysis

of euthanasia. Dr Marx noted that the promoters of liberalized abortion in America were also the founders of the euthanasia movement and that amongst these were Dr. A. Guttmacher President of Planned Parenthood, Professor Arval Morris who co-engineered abortion in the State of Washington, theologian Joseph Fletcher, respected authority on ethical issues, who is acknowledged to be the "father" of situational ethics, and Dr. Glanville Williams author of the widely praised book "The Sanctity of Life and the Criminal Law". Dr. Marx has documented that "Similarly, the thousand-member Abortion Law Reform Association of England was a reincarnation of a euthanasia group after the latter's early attempts at euthanasia legislation in Britain in 1936, 1950, and 1960, had been defeated in the House of Lords". Key spokeswoman for the Abortion Law Reform Association of Britain, Madeleine Simms, authored a pamphlet entitled "Severely Handicapped Infants" in which she attempts to conceal the process of the murdering of handicapped newborn children by doctors, as "the infants right to die". "Death without Dignity. Killing for Mercy" Marx. Dr Paul O.S.B. The Liturgical Press. Collegeville Minnesota. 1978. "And now Euthanasia" Marx. Dr Paul O.S.B. Human Life International. Washington. 1985.

The grotesque contrast between the Government's laudable efforts to prevent child abuse after birth, and their complicity in fatal child abuse before birth by legal abortion, is astounding.

Medically approved and State condoned methods for killing unborn children, involve poisoning, battering cutting, crushing, disrupting, evicting, disembowelling and dismembering them. "Abortion and Sterilization" J.E.Hodgson. Academic Press; Grune and Stratton.

Abortion and morality

When the citizens of a country accept the murder of unborn children by legal abortion the basis of all morality, which is "to do good and to avoid evil", is destroyed.

Because abortion is intrinsically and profoundly evil the public acceptance of it completely corrupts morals.

After legalising the brutal killing of totally innocent, helpless, human beings in the wombs of their mothers, and the population accepting this savagery, then in comparison with the enormity of this evil, no other acts could I considered to be evil, and thus the destruction of all morality will be inevitable, unless all abortion is forbidden by the state,

Abortion and peace.

During 1988, a total of 1112 unborn children were killed by doctors in legal abortions South Africa, while during that same year, the number of people killed in the widespread, horrendous, political violence totalled 1149.

In discussions with various political organizations in order to establish a new political dispensation in South Africa, the Government has asked these organizations to forswear violence and has constantly stated that the absence of violence is an essential precondition for the establishment of a "New South Africa".

Contradicting its own expressed abhorrence of violence, the Government, in terms of the Abortion Sterilization Act, permits, and is directly involved in the ruthless violent directed against unborn children; it approves of applications from hospitals and clinics to be registered

as abortion centers; and has now agreed to consider motivations for the further expansion of the scope and scale of abortion.

Once again this situation reveals a tragic confusion of moral reasoning by the Government, and should this lack of morality prevail during the drafting of a "New South Africa", it will be disastrous for the future of this country. There can never be peace in a country which permits abortion, because abortion is totally evil. Peace and evil laws are totally incompatible. They cannot co-exist.

The attitude of the African National Congress in favor of totally free abortion; its ominous threat to establish abortion on request; and its intention to prohibit any efforts to protect unborn children, even by husbands and fathers and any other person, from the murderous intentions of their mothers and doctors; is noted with profound concern and revulsion. Sachs. Albie "Women in a Future South Africa". The New Nation, 4-10 May 1990.

Mother Teresa of Calcutta said during her visit to South Africa, "In abortion a double murder takes place, the murder of the child and the murder of the conscience of the mother. There will never be peace in the world until there is peace in the womb. How can there be peace when a mother can murder her own baby in her own womb"?

Abortion and family planning

"The most merciful thing that a large family does to one of its infant members to kill it". Margaret Sanger. Founder of Planned Parenthood.

Many of the present methods of "family planning" prevent implantation of very young human embryos into the wombs of their mothers and therefore such methods are abortifacient. This abortifacient action is more powerful and frequent in the use of some of these "family planning" methods, than in others.

This use of abortifacients contravenes the Hippocratic Oath and the Declaration of Geneva of The World Medical Association.

While being primarily concerned with the presently available methods of abortion, it is possible that RU 486, otherwise known as the "do-it-yourself abortion pill" will be introduced into this country in the near future, and that this "people pesticide" will by-pass all existing abortion legislation, in the same way as other abortifacient methods of "family planning" have done in the past. Among the many abortifacient methods which have by-passed the Abortion Law are the use of intrauterine devices; the strongly abortifacient action of birth control pills and injections; the abortifacient 'morning after pill', the insertion of the intrauterine device into the womb of women who are in the early days and weeks of pregnancy; early direct surgical abortions which are euphemistically called 'menstrual extractions' and D and C's'. While many "D and C's" are done for reasons other than to induce abortions, widespread contempt for the law is shown by doctors and hospitals who use the term "D and C", to cloak their performance of illegal abortions.)

It is noted with dismay, that the French "do-it-yourself abortion pill" was tested in the Pharmacology Department of the University of the Orange Free State, under the direction and control of Professor Bernhard Meyer. Professor Meyer, during a television documentary program on abortion argued for the use in South Africa of this drug which is designed to kill,

with great efficiency, very young human beings, in order to control the alleged population explosion" in this country. M.Net Television. "Carte Blanche" 30 July 198

The Pharmacology Department of the University of the Orange Free State is sponsored by the Hoech Pharmaceutical Company of West Germany, which is a majority shareholder in Roussel-Uclaf the French company which makes this lethal drug. Hoechst was formed after the Second World War out of the I.G.Farben Company, which was broken up by the Allies. The I.G. Farben Company used slave labour during the war and manufactured Zyklon B, the chemical used to kill the unwanted in the Nazi death camps..

Family Planning organizations further promote the killing of unborn children by the use of the following stratagems and rhetoric:

1. By calling unplanned children, "contraceptive failures".
2. By promoting the idea that abortion is essential for the correction of "contraceptive failures" in order to guarantee "contraception".
3. By presenting the idea that in killing her unborn child, the woman is truly in control of her fertility.
4. By, presenting the idea that the unborn child is part of the woman's body and consequently that "the woman has the right to control her own body", by abortion.
5. By insisting that abortion is exclusively a woman's issue, and that the father of the child, and the grandparents of a child which has been conceived by their minor daughter, have no rights to attempt to protect the unborn child if the mother decides to kill the baby. The decision of the mother to kill the child is frequently made in response to the unbiased advice of the "family planing" organisation that she has consulted. Arrangements for the killing of the child and the actual killing the child are often made and done by the 'family planning' agency in their own abortuaries, which are frequently subsidised by public funds and are registered as tax-exempt public charities.
6. By arguing that the 'male dominated' legal and medical professions have no right to inhibit the "reproductive rights' and "reproductive choices" of women.
7. By the use of so-called 'family planning' methods which cause abortions such as intrauterine devices, morning-after pills; menstrual extractions or menstrual regulations, and do-it-yourself abortion pills, code-named RU 486; and by the use of the deliberately abortifacient actions of "contraceptive pills" and contraceptive injections.
8. By denying the personhood and the humanity, of the unborn child and by encouraging and depicting the killing of unborn children as merely " a matter of choice'.
9. By promoting panic about overpopulation.

10. By propagating the lie that only "religious fanatics", oppose the killing of "foetuses" and that these "dangerous religious extremists" and "nuts" are "attempting to impose their narrow-minded views on society.
11. By publishing false information which purports to show that the majority of people are in favor of abortion.
12. By denying that there are any adverse physical or mental sequelae of abortion.
13. By grotesquely exaggerating the numbers of "back street' abortions and material deaths which arise from septic abortions, thereby contending that the deaths of women can easily be prevented by legalising abortion.
14. By viewing the child as a form of sexually transmitted disease.

I consider our world and almost our civilization for the next 25 years is going to depend on a simple, cheap, safe contraceptive to be used in poverty stricken slums and jungles and amongst the most ignorant people ... I believe that now, immediately, there should be national sterilization for certain dysgenic types of our population who are being encouraged to breed and would die out were the Government not feeding them". Margaret Sanger, Foundress of Planned Parenthood. 1951. Grant. G. Grand Illusions. The Legacy of Planned Parenthood Wolgemuth and Hyatt. Tennessee.

The corruption of language which is needed to promote abortion.

Those who perform abortions and the who promote abortion are obliged to corrupt and pervert the meaning of words, in order to disguise the fact that abortion is murder. It is only by the use of euphemisms, lies and perverted language that it is possible to advocate abortion without causing revulsion and disgust. This strategy of deceit was laid down by abortionists and their supporters as early as January 1971, two years before the Supreme Court decision in January 1973 which allowed abortion on request in the U.S.A. This strategy was documented by Dr. Paul Marx O.S.B., who attended a pro-abortion Conference held in Los Angeles, which was supported by Planned Parenthood, eminent Gynaecologists, social workers, nurses and clergymen. Marx. Dr Paul O.S.B. "The Death Peddlers. War on the Unborn" St.John's University Press. Minnesota. 1971. The diabolic elimination of children by abortion is predominantly dependent on lies and a murderous attitude towards unborn infants.

The words which Jesus Christ used to describe Satan are particularly applicable to abortion and abortionists. "He was a murderer from the beginning, and is not rooted in the truth; there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie he is speaking his own language, for he is a liar and the father of lies." (John. 8. 44.)

For example the unborn child is invariably referred to as a "foetus", instead of a " child'. If the use of Latin terminology is insisted upon, then the correct Latin term for the unborn child would be "Foetus humanus". This correct Latin terminology is necessary in order to indicate the essential moral, medical, legal and scientific importance of the fact that the foetuses who are killed by abortion, belong to the human species, and are not foetuses belonging to any other species of mammals. The Latin term 'foetus' means "offspring".

A doctor who examines a woman during her pregnancy never refers to the child as a 'foetus' unless an abortion is contemplated. The doctor would not say to a woman who was joyfully anticipating confirmation of her pregnancy, "I have good news for you, you are expecting a foetus".

Nor would he say to her, "Let me examine you in order to see how big your foetus is" or "Let us work out when your foetus is due". The doctor always calls the unborn child "Your baby!", unless he wishes to obscure the humanity of the child, as when the child is destined to be exterminated by abortion.

When a doctor performs an abortion he does not say to the mother, "I am going to kill your baby", but he uses a panoply of euphemisms such as: "I am going to remove the contents of the uterus". "I shall interrupt the pregnancy"; "I will perform a termination of pregnancy", (this killing is marked on the operating theatre list as a "T.O.P."); Other euphemisms are; "The contents of your womb will be evacuated."; "I shall regulate your menstrual cycle"; "I will bring on your period"; "I shall perform post-conceptive family planning"; "should provide you with retrospective fertility limitation".

The latest additions to this encyclopaedia of deceit and obfuscation, is to refer to RU486, the "French do-it-yourself abortion pill"), as "the French miscarriage inducing pill"; to describe its abortive action as contraceptive and to refer to the human being before implantation in the womb as a "pre-embryo".

Among the many other terms which are used in attempts to dehumanize the unborn child and to deceive the population the following expressions are common; "the uterine contents"; "a clump of cells"; "a blood clot"; 'contraceptive failure'; "a parasite"; "tissue"; "a blob"; "products of conception" and "pregnancy tissue". The term "pre-embryo" is now commonly applied to tiny human beings before they have implanted themselves into the wombs of their mothers. This has been done in order to persuade people that experiments on these "pre-embryos" are not experiments on very young human beings and that consequently these experiments do not infringe intrinsic human rights, but these experiments are performed on a sub-human entity and therefore they are ethically acceptable. It appears that experiments on tiny human beings are being viewed in medical circles as being more acceptable than experiments on animals, because experiments on animals cause angry reactions from animal rights organizations, who might picket or even burn down the experimental facilities.

Concerning the expression which is used most commonly to disguise the killing of an unborn child, namely "The Termination of Pregnancy", Robert Evangelisto, a student of the language used by the promoters and friends of abortion, asks why the expression "Termination of Marriage" - should not be used to describe the murder of a spouse, "The termination of a business partnership" - not be used to describe the murder of a business partner and 'The Termination of Employment' - not be used when an employee is killed by his employer. Evangelisto

remarks that there are only three ways to terminate a pregnancy; (1) kill the baby, (2) kill the mother,- and her unborn child, or (3) allow childbirth,- which kills neither. He further observes that " birth terminates pregnancy, but abortion exterminates the child".

Feminism and abortion.

Forms of false feminism have been of considerable importance in promoting the killing of unborn infants, and it is noted that radical feminists in this country are attempting to convince the Government, and the population in general, that abortion is exclusively a "women's issue" and that no male has any right to attempt to protect unborn children and their mothers, from the evil deed and consequences of abortion. These feminists further assert that no male should be permitted to make laws which concern women.

Radical feminists go even further by stating that no male should be allowed to even comment on abortion. It has been further contended by these feminists that no male be permitted to be part of any commission which might be set up to examine the subject of abortion. However the opinions, advice and assistance given by males towards increasing the scope and scale of killing the unborn - including the support for abortion given by those male abortionists who actually kill unborn females - are always warmly welcomed by these feminists.

This spurious variety of feminism contends that the grave moral and social issues inherent in the legal extermination of unborn children, is exclusively a woman's issue; and that the freedom to kill unborn children is essential for" the restoration of the dignity of women", as it allows them to be liberated from the "slavery of childbearing and motherhood", and from being "poor, pregnant and powerless'. It is claimed by feminist that abortion "empowers them".

Abortion is the ultimate form of exploitation of women as it destroys the conscience of women, by turning them into murderesses of their own children. It is of interest that abortionists and "family planning" organizations further exploit women by making them pay hard cash for the elimination of the unborn children, however much they claim that they were in sympathy with the "tragic social and financial problems" of the pregnant woman.

Abortion allows women to be sexually exploited by males in order to gratify male lusts, and when the woman is with child, - because of the availability of abortion, - the male feels that he is free to abandon the mother of his child, often by denying that he is the father of the child or by advising her to have the baby scraped out of her womb. (Abortions are commonly called 'A Scrape', by abortionists.)

Often the male, who concedes that he is the father of the child, will show his generosity and will " do the decent thing" by making all the arrangements for an abortion and by paying for the assassination of his child by an abortionist. This 'quick fix' for an "unwanted pregnancy", allows the male and the aborting female to go on to the next sexual adventure without the encumbrance of a child and without commitment and responsibility to their new sexual partners.

Radical feminists have been successful in preventing fathers, from attempting to stop their wives or their sexual partners, from killing the. unborn babies. These false feminists have been active in the prosecution of women of different attitude, - who themselves have had abortions

and have been seriously injured by abortion, - from attempting to prevent other women from making the same frightful mistake of killing their unborn infants.

At present some of the most rapidly growing and vigorous groups involved in pro-life activities, have been founded by women, many of whom themselves have had abortions, and whose membership consists exclusively of women. These groups of " pro-life" women who uphold the fundamental right to life of unborn children, and who provide care and support for the mothers of these children, are particularly detested by, and litigated against by "authentic" feminist organizations such as the "National Organisation of Women", in the U.S.A. False feminists do not offer any alternatives to abortion, nor do they offer any assistance to women who have been mentally, physically and spiritually ruined by abortion. However these false feminists are only too ready to help and to activate women to kill their preborn babies and to denigrate and vilify the alternatives to abortion which are provided by pro-life organizations throughout the world. The factual evidence of the help given directly to women and their children and indirectly to all society by organizations which offer help to a pregnant woman, such as the magnificent services provided by "Life" in the United Kingdom and by "Alternatives to Abortion International" and "The Pearson Foundation" in the United States and who in so doing are despised by the promoters of abortion and radical false feminists. Mr. Bob Pearson has been the victim of law suits brought against him and the organization he founded by Planned Parenthood who co-conspired with various feminist civil liberty organizations and the owners of private abortion clinics, in attempting to stop this noble word Christian love. Similarly Human Life International has been legally threatened by Planned Parenthood, National Organization of Women, and the American Civil Liberties Union, for its alleged involvement peaceful, prayer demonstration in front of a Planned Parenthood abortuary in Florida, U. S.A. in April 1990.

In South Africa, the help offered to pregnant women by Pro- Life, Victims of Choice and Project Rachael, is likewise hated by the abortionists and their supporters. Many organizations which offer alternatives to abortion are established in South Africa such as The Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Birthright, Pregnancy Crisis, Huis de La Rey, Die Vroue Federasie, The Catholic Women's League, The Society of Saint Vincent de Paul and Catholic Adoption Society.

Despite the existence of these alternatives to abortion - and many other organizations which give help to women and families, and the fact that adoption societies in South Africa have long and unfulfilled waiting lists I adoptive parents - Pro-Life of South Africa is frequently challenged by the abortion movement who demand that because Pro-Life opposes abortion then it should be made legally responsible for the care of all "unwanted babies". During a recent South African debate on abortion broadcast by Bophuthatswana Television on the 31 July 1990, the representative of the Abortion Reform Action Group (ARAG) Ms Jenny Wilde, a Durban attorney, who admitted during the program that she herself had procured an abortion, challenged Dr. Claude Newbury of Pro Life South Africa to accept all the unwanted children in South Africa. Dr. Newbury willingly accepted the challenge personally and on behalf of Pro-Life and additionally he advised the audience that many other organizations and individuals in South Africa existed in order to help a pregnant woman in distress. In particular, Dr. Newbury named The Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Birthright, and Pregnancy Crisis. However after his offer to adopt all unwanted children in South Africa, neither he nor any of the other above-mentioned organization received a single request arising from the

program, to adopt a child, nor any request for financial or other assistance from pregnant women.

Similarly during a debate on "Good Morning South Africa" televised by The South African Broadcasting Corporation, on the 8 July 1990, Glenys Newbury of Victims of Choice and Pro-Life of South Africa and Eileen Adams of "Victims of Choice" advised the audience of the help that is available to pregnant women in distress as an alternative to abortions and also of the help offered to women who have had abortions and who have been harmed by this experience. This was in response to the claims by Dr. Marj Dyer, the President of the Abortion Reform Action Group, that there were many women who had unwanted children. Following this program six telephone calls were received, by the two pro-life organizations involved in the debate, two of these calls were from women who told how their lives had been ruined by abortion; three callers were most anxious to adopt children but had been told by various adoption agencies that no children were available for adoption; and one caller who favoured abortion spewed hatred for the help given to women and their unborn children.

The statement that Pro-Life of South Africa is willing to love and care for all "unwanted children" that are put into its care, has been made by Mrs. Glenys Newbury during each of the many radio debates with members of the abortion industry that she has been involved in and most recently during the debate with the Abortion Reform Action Group which was broadcast by Capital Radio on 25 August 1990. This open offer has always been made in response to the rhetoric that South Africa is teeming with "unwanted babies". Each time that she has made this offer - even directly to callers who challenged her during these debates by saying that they themselves had unwanted children - no such children have been given to her!

Leaving aside the mindless rhetoric and hatred that the feminists, the abortionists and their friends, show for the gift of life and the work of pro-life agencies, it is clear that in South Africa their statement that there are large numbers of "unwanted babies" is a gross lie. This has been the constant experience of Pro-Life, following the many radio and television programs on abortions, during which help was offered by pro-life speakers to women in distress, and following articles on abortion in newspapers and in women's magazines. This is also the experience of the many adoption agencies who are unable to find children for adoptive parents. The abortionist and their co-conspirators the feminists, seem not to understand the essential and vital difference between selfish and unloving parents and unwanted babies".

A conflict of feminist rhetoric is seen in the attacks of radical feminists on John Paul II, because of his defense of unborn children. These feminists have declared that the Pope, as a male, has no right to interfere in what is, in their view, "a women's affair". However when the most famous and beloved woman in all the world, Mother Teresa of Calcutta supports the Pope by speaking out against abortion, and clearly names abortion as 'murder' and "the greatest evil which now afflicts mankind", the same feminists respond by insulting Mother Teresa, and by saying that she, as a celibate nun, has no right to comment. Among the slogans that they have hastily fabricated in attempts to rescue their tattered schizophrenic rhetoric in this situation are, "If you don't play the game, don't make the rules" and "Take your rosaries off our ovaries".

The guise of feminist solidarity and support for other women, which is effected by "feminist" organizations such as the National Organisation of Women (N.O.W.) is dropped while unborn females are being murdered by male abortionists. No appellation of "Male chauvinist pigs" are

given to male abortionists by "feminist" organizations - only adulation for the abortionists and expressions of appreciation and gratitude for how much the killers of unborn children have done to liberate women from the "slavery of pregnancy". In this situation the full sympathies of the feminists lie with those who promote the murder of their unborn sisters and with those who actually inflict fatal injuries on unborn females. So much for the "feminist" defense of the rights of women!

While showing their murderous hatred for powerless unborn females, and incidentally for unborn males, which latter attitude might have been anticipated, feminists simultaneously talk about the urgent need to "empower women" and to correct and to prevent injustices and crimes perpetrated by men on women, such as rape. So much do these "feminists" hate men, - with the exception of male abortionists, Congressmen, Senators, Justices of the Supreme Court and Members of Parliament who support abortion - that they even find the use of male terms for the depiction of persons, events and concepts in the Bible to be offensive and demeaning.

The promotion of abortion by false feminists frustrates the fundamental maternal instincts of women, destroys the meaning of love and responsibility, ignores the reproductive nature of sexual union, perverts and destroys the meaning and purpose of sexual intercourse, and promotes the massive slaughter of unborn children, which feminists see as a keystone, in a odiously counterfeit edifice of "women's liberation".

Some feminists claim that abortion is essential for the improvement of the "quality of life" of women. On the contrary abortion has physical, emotional and spiritual sequelae which invariably ruin the "quality of life" of women who have killed their babies by abortion. In reality, far from being a liberating process for women, abortion turns the womb into a bloody, tomb and turns women into walking graveyards; it binds the unrepentant aborting woman to the most frightful bondage of all, by binding her for all eternity, to the utter misery and torment of the everlasting outer darkness which is populated by demons, and where there is much wailing and the gnashing of teeth.

Rhetoric and the killing of the unborn.

Those who promote abortion are referred to by the media as being "Pro-Choice", instead of "Pro- Abortion", while those who are in favor of life and are thus "Pro-Life", are referred to by the Media as "Anti- choice", and "Anti-abortion". The consistent and with few noble exceptions the blanket support given by the American media to abortion., as well as their almost totally successful attempts to cover up the evils and horrors of abortion - including the finding of legally aborted babies in municipal trash and rubbish dumps - was described by Dr. Paul Marx O.S.B. in 1971, two years before the legalisation of abortion on request into that country.

The significant and continually growing involvement of pro- life organizations in providing help to women and their unborn children, - particularly when pregnant women who are in difficult circumstances are contemplating abortion as an "easy" solution to their problems, - is totally ignored or misrepresented. Even the psychiatric and spiritual support and assistance given by pro-life organizations to women who have had abortions and as a result are afflicted with psychiatric illness and spiritual remorse and anguish, is callously and frivolously dismissed

by those who promote abortions, - as "interference with women", or "sending women on guilt trips" and "mental cruelty".

The showing of pictures of bloodied and mangled animals such as baby fur seals, whales, rhinos, and elephant are considered to be essential in order to expose the "cruelty" and "barbarity" and "brutality" of killing animals. However the rhetoric which underpins abortion, discounts and labels pictures which show how abortions are performed, and the bloody, mangled, pickled, burnt and mutilated bodies of aborted babies that are found in garbage bins and in trash dumps, as "exaggerated", "emotive", "highly offensive", "uncivilised", "unchristian, un-loving", "pornographic" and "despicable".

This rhetoric holds that the use by pro-life organizations of photographs of aborted babies is a "cruel exploitation of the aborted babies, used at the expense of the unborn to traumatize the desperate parents who are contemplating abortion", shows lack of proper respect for the dead; and is done in a malicious attempt to cause guilt and sorrow in women and others who support abortion.

Although it is considered valid to call the culling of baby seals, "Murder", those who kill unborn children and who support this killing, hold that to refer to the abortion of a child as 'murder' is totally impermissible, for a fact, all, as they point out, one can only murder "persons", and they hold, against all the evidence of biology, the unborn children can by no stretch of the imagination be called persons.

Often the same people who demonstrate against the slaughter of animals in abattoirs, even by Kosher killing, are those who unhesitatingly support "an inalienable right to abortion. While it is considered to be acceptable, - even to be a moral duty, - to harangue in public, women who wear fur coats, and to throw pails of blood and red dye over them, because the women who wear them are considered to be insensitive to the suffering of dumb innocent animals, the abortion movement holds that pro-life demonstration outside places where abortions are performed reveal that pro-lifers hold the rights of other people and especially those of women who support abortion in contempt, and that these "anti-choice hooligans" show no sympathy for the finer feelings of women, or for the woman's "right to choose".

It is considered to be essential in order to maintain "civilized standards", to endanger the lives of sailors on whaling ships by ramming them and dangerously manoeuvring across their bows; to fire-bomb and otherwise destroy shops where fur coats are sold; to bum down and bomb establishments where animals are kept for experiments -naturally after releasing the animals. However promoters of abortion demand severe penalties and punishments for those who show their love for unborn children and the mothers of these children by blockading abortuaries with their bodies and by praying outside these barbarous establishments. Abortionists demand that pro-life demonstrators who so visibly reject the murder of unborn children, are extremely dangerous to society and should be sentenced to long term imprisonment. Promoters of abortion strenuously oppose the burial of the mangled remains of aborted babies which are taken by pro-lifers out of the trash-cans of abortuaries, and label such burials as cheap attempts by pro-lifers to get some publicity and to send women who have had abortions on guilt-trips.

Abortionists have constructed the tortuous rhetoric which holds that "pro-lifers" have no right to attempt to stop abortions unless and until "pro-lifers" are willing to financially support all

pregnant women and their families and to take care of all the "unwanted children" of the world. It would be very difficult to use the sort of reasoning embodied in this rhetoric in order to stop theft or drunken driving. In these, comparatively speaking minor transgressions compared to the evil of abortion - the use of this type of reasoning would require that those who not approve of theft and drunken driving should be responsible for driving all drunkards home and for supporting all thieves and their families.

Dr. Siegfried Ernst, eminent German Lutheran philosopher, poet, author (F Ernst. Siegfried. 'Man The Greatest of Miracles" Martin Verlag/Walter Berger, Buxheim. Allgau 1976) and physician and opponent of the Nazi described the tactics of the Nazis in destroying respect for human life as follows:-

1. Liquidate political opponents.
2. Choose scapegoats, first Jews, then certain ethnic groups, and finally Catholics.
3. Systematically obliterate the public conscience through propaganda.
4. Promote as an act of neighbourly love the another's suffering through killing them in the womb
5. Develop the concept of protecting children from a future unhappy life by killing them in the womb.
6. Promote abortion as an act of neighbourly love. Dr.Siegfried Ernst observed during the 1974 conference of The World Federation of Doctors who Respect Human Life that these tactics, with the sole exception of the persecution of the Jews, were also the tactics of the abortion movement. Dr. Siegfried Ernst has frequently researched and disclosed the close links between Planned Parenthood, which was at that time known as the American Birth Control League, and the Nazis. Dr. Siegfried Ernst has in particular emphasized the close relationship between Margaret Sanger, foundress of Planned Parenthood and Dr. Ernst Rudin who was Hitler's director of genetic sterilization and a founder of the "Nazi Society for Racial Hygiene". Dr. Rudin became the chief Nazi eugenicist and protagonist of the Nazi Master Race Plan.

Dr. Siegfried Ernst researched and disclosed the savage racism of Margaret Sanger, and her attempts to eradicate " human weeds" and " inferior races" and who believed that " social regeneration would only become possible if the sinister forces of the hordes of irresponsibility and imbecility" were repulsed. This promiscuous woman, much revered as a modern saint by the Population Control lobby longed for the end, promised by the Socialists, of the Christian "reign of benevolence" when the "choking human undergrowth of morons and imbeciles would be segregated and sterilised". (FGrant. G., Grand Illusions. The Legacy of Planned Parenthood. Wolgemuth and Hyatt. Brentwood. Tennessee). (Human Life International Reports. Vol. 7, No. 12 December 1989). (Drogin. E., Margaret Sanger. Father of Modern Society. 1986., CUL Publications., New Hope Kentucky)

Concerning the repetitive use, by those who conspire to promote abortion, of the phrases "unwanted children", 'unplanned pregnancies' an essential question must be asked - Does God not know about these so-called unwanted children, and are these little ones not enfolded by His eternal love? To answer this question very briefly, were are regularly and lovingly informed by Holy Scriptures and by the Saints, that God knew and loved us individually from all eternity.

The words:- cruelty; pain; suffering; torture; distress; barbarity; flay; starve; mistreatment; thirst, poisoned; are frequently used in courts of law and in public debate concerning the abuse of animals. Abortion rhetoric forbids the use of such words in any discussion of abortion and strong protest is made that there is no way of knowing what an unborn child feels as it is being burnt, disembowelled, having its eyes enucleated, its head crushed, and its limbs torn off during the process of abortion.

While courts of law assisted by observations and common sense freely concede that animals do feel pain, and use this certainty in order to prosecute individuals for cruelty to animals, the language of abortion, holds that, as the experience of pain depends on advanced intellectual and neurological development and is a very subjective matter there is no "proof" that babies feel pain as they are being killed. Obviously unborn infant victims are not able to relate their feeling while they are being dismembered, they never live to tell the tale of how innocuous they found the process of dismemberment, disembowelment and being flayed alive.

Even the vigorous purposeful movements that an unborn child makes to escape and evade the abortion instrument just prior to the abortionist catching hold of the child and ripping it apart (recorded by ultrasound ensuring an actual abortion in "The Silent Scream" - which if observed in the case of an animal would unhesitatingly be interpreted as terror and a frantic attempt to escape, is dismissed by abortion rhetoric as mere passive movements similar to the movements of a billiard ball when it is struck. The opening of the child's mouth in what appeared to be a scream, totally different from a yawn which is easily recognized on ultrasound, and the frantic flailing of the child's limbs, was spurned by abortionists, as 'mere reflex movements'.

It is difficult to understand how doctors who perform abortions and who also deliver 'wanted babies' are able to show the mothers and fathers of wanted and planned children the vigorous movements of their babies on the ultrasound machine which most modern gynaecologists have in their consulting rooms, while denying that babies of the same age who are being aborted are incapable of movement.

Among the many terms which pro-abortionists use to depict and negate pro-life views are the following: biased, controversial, unbalanced, extreme, one-sided, emotional, anti-feminist, insensitive, fascist and unfeeling.

In any discussion concerning the evils of 'the holocaust' there would be no support for allowing the Nazi view. No debate concerning such obviously behaviour would be seemly or permissible. Any suggestion that the Nazi viewpoint should be given a fair hearing - preferably by a Nazi who had gained wide personal experience through active employment at Auschwitz or Treblinka, - in order to give balance to what would otherwise be a very one-sided program, would be greeted with revulsion. Such a suggestion would be instantly interpreted as support for "The Holocaust" and thus support for the savage murder of helpless human beings. However, concerning the matter of abortion, the media insists on and ensures that the views of those who promote the killing of unborn children, and even the views of those who personally kill these children them, must be fairly represented in all articles and debates and must be accorded due and proper consideration as is required in all civilized debate and discussion.

It is emphasized by the media that a balanced view is essential in "debate" and discussions, and often in their desire to demonstrate how "open minded" they really are, the time and space which they allocate to the abortion view invariably exceeds by far the time and space allocated to pro-life views. Frequently the pro-life position is not allowed representation at all. It is not infrequent to find the chairman debates on abortion enjoining battle on the side of the abortionists.

Evaluation of the reasons considered sufficient, by the Abortion and Sterilisation Act 1975, to justify killing of unborn children

Where the continued pregnancy endangered the life of the woman or constituted a serious threat to physical health. Section 3 (1) (a). In all pregnancies, the doctor is dealing with two patients, the mother and baby. This reality is not altered by the severity of any illness of the mother or of her unborn infant.

Most of the serious complications of pregnancy which affect the mother, occur during the last three months of pregnancy, when the child is capable of surviving outside of the womb with good medical care, - if the premature delivery of the child is essential to save the life of the mother.

The amazing advances in medical treatment which have been made during this century, and especially since the end of the second world war, have made pregnancy and childbearing so safe that the death of a woman during pregnancy is so unusual that its announcement is greeted with stunned amazement. At present the maternal mortality rate in the United States of America, is about 1.6 per 10,000 live births. The maternal mortality rate South Africa between the years 1980-1982 was found to be about five times higher at 8.3 per 10,000 live bill Boes.F.E. "Maternal Mortality in Southern Africa".,S.A.M.J., 7 Feb.1987.

Advances in medicine have been such, that even a woman without kidneys can be successfully carried through her pregnancy by the use of an artificial kidney. The most serious complications during pregnancy are caused by surgical interventions. Operative deliveries by the use of obstetrical forceps and manoeuvres, are especially dangerous for both mothers and their children.

Abortions, performed after the first three months of pregnancy are extremely dangerous for the mother, and become progressively more dangerous for her when performed later during pregnancy. Abortions which are performed because of serious illness of the mother, are particularly dangerous. Illness associated with the pregnancy usually only becomes a serious threat to the woman, well after the first twelve weeks of pregnancy.. example, serious heart disease only reaches its peak of severity, about the 28th week of pregnancy, at which time the child has been viable for about eight weeks.

As a rule chronically sick women experience great difficulty in becoming pregnant and very seldom conceive a child, however should such a patient become pregnant then the skills of good medical care are invariably able to bring her safely to term or to a stage of pregnancy when the child could be prematurely delivered and have a good chance of survival. There are no absolute medical indications for abortion, and situations where abortion might be considered to be helpful to the life of the mother are so rare, that most obstetricians have never seen such a case, nor are they even able in theory to indicate such a case. In practice it

is impossible to think of such a situation where abortion is necessary for the physical health of the woman.

Dr. Alan Guttmacher, President of Planned Parenthood and a promoter of world-wide abortion said the following in 1967: "Today it is possible for almost any patient to be brought through pregnancy alive, unless she suffers from a fatal illness such as cancer or leukaemia, and if so, abortion would be unlikely to prolong, much less save her life.' Guttniacher.A.F. "Abortion-Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," The Case for Legalized Abortion Now. Berkley, Calif, Diablo Press, 1967.

Since the publication of this statement, almost a quarter century ago, there have been such dramatic further advances in medicine, that diseases which were considered to be untreatable at that time, are now frequently cured, for example leukaemias and many forms of cancer. Chorio-carcinoma is just one such cancer which was previously considered to be invariably fatal and which is now commonly cured.

The treatment of children, while still in the wombs of their mothers, is a rapidly developing, specialized branch of medicine, which focuses on the fact that the child in the womb, is in every sense of the word, as much a patient as the child's mother.

The doctor is obliged to do his best for his patients and never to injure or harm them. This obligation is clearly formulated in the Hippocratic Oath. In most cases where the mother is profoundly, and even terminally ill, the doctor would be obliged to do his best for both his patients, the mother and her child. Any decision concerning their treatment should not favor the life of the mother over the life of her child, nor should the interests of the child take precedence over those of the mother.

Clearly in cases of very premature, pre-viable babies it is not possible at present, for the child to survive outside the womb of the mother. Consequently there would be no question of favouring the life of the child over the life of the mother. Obviously if the child is to have any chance of survival at all, it is essential to do everything possible to preserve the life of the mother, and to sustain her for as long as possible, and by so doing give her baby a fair chance of survival as well.

However, if pragmatic decisions were allowable as to which patient has the better prognosis and thus the greater objective theoretical right to life saving treatment, it is clear that in the case of viable infants who have the likelihood of long and useful lives ahead of them, a dispassionate pragmatist would give preferential treatment to the child, possibly at the expense the mother who is terminally, and who has a very short remaining life expectancy.

When abortions are performed in those extremely, rare cases where there is a serious risk to the life of the mother, these abortions are done with the deliberate intention of killing the child. The definition of Abortion in the Abortion and Sterilisation Act clearly reveals this intention to kill the child in abortions.

The malevolent attitude of the doctor towards the child in all abortions, and this same attitude in those exceptionally, rare abortions which would be of assistance to the health of the brother, differs totally from the benign and healing attitude towards the child which exists, when a doctor who is forced to prematurely deliver the child - in order to alleviate the medical

condition of the mother - does everything that he possibly can to deliver the child safely and to ensure that the child is given the very best care and consequently the best chance of survival.

Obviously the excellence of the care which the doctor is able to give the child depends on his own skills and his attitude to the child, on the skills of other doctors and nurses; and on the medical equipment and facilities available for the treatment of very premature or very sick babies. The age of viability may be defined as that age at which it is possible for a premature child to survive outside of the womb, with the help of extraordinary medical and nursing care.

At the time of the passage of the British Abortion Law in 1969, the age of viability was considered to be 28 weeks of gestation. At present the British Parliament, - because of the fact that very premature babies who are afforded good medical care, are able to survive from as early as 20 weeks of gestation, and regularly survive from 24 weeks of pregnancy with an excellent chance of future normality and health, - has accepted 24 weeks as the present legal lower limit of viability.

Concerning the viability of premature children, the rapid advances in medicine in general and the dramatic advances in the field of neonatal medicine, have allowed doctors to preserve the lives of very premature babies, even those born before 20 weeks after conception. If, as is most likely, advances in technology and skills continue to occur, it will undoubtedly be possible in the future, to save the lives of even younger babies, with fewer adverse consequences of their prematurity at the time of their births being evident as these babies grow up.

In the future it might even be possible to maintain new human beings in a totally artificial environment outside the womb, right from the time of conception, in an "glass or steel womb", and if mothers wish to get rid of the unborn children it might be possible for these children to be delivered from their human wombs and brought to maturity in artificial wombs.

In speaking about children who at the time of their delivery are not yet viable, Professor Paul Ramsey of Princeton University said: "Here we have an entity, too alive to be dead, not mature enough to be a viable baby, yet human enough to be specially protectable". (The Ethics of Fetal Research. P. Ramsey., Yale University Pre: 1975)

As most of the very serious medical complications occur during the last three months of pregnancy, after the 28th week of pregnancy, by which time the child if born prematurely would have an excellent chance of normal survival, - in cases where life threatening complications of pregnancy do occur, - the doctor can prematurely deliver the baby and thus give both his patients; the mother and her baby, the best chance of life.

Where the continued pregnancy constitutes a serious threat to the mental health of the woman concerned. Section 3 (1) (b).

Abortion is not a psychiatric treatment. If abortion was considered to be necessary for the treatment of psychiatric disorders, then psychiatrists would not be able to treat women who are not pregnant, and worse still, they would never be even able to offer men any possibility of help.

On the contrary abortion is very harmful to the peace of mind of a woman, because no woman who has a abortion is so insensitive and so uninformed as to imagine that she has not killed her baby. She knows that she has killed her baby, and the killing of babies is not a recommended method of achieving psychiatric health. In reality, women who would most easily be granted abortions on psychiatric grounds, are the very women whose mental condition is most likely to be aggravated or even made untreatable and irreversible by the abortion. 'The more severely ill the psychiatric patient, the worse is her post-abortion psychiatric state'. Sandberg. E. "Psychology of Abortion" Comprehensive Handbook of Psychiatry, 3rd Edition Kaplan and Friedman 1980.

The shallowness of the justification for the use of psychiatric reasons in granting legal abortions, is demonstrated by the lack of continuing psychiatric treatment for women after they have had abortions. Post psychiatric treatment for women is rarely started. In situations where post-abortion psychiatric care is provided by the State - usually by the same psychiatrist who approved of the abortion on the grounds of serious psychiatric illness, - it is remarkable how this care is invariably spurned by the very women who had requested, and we granted, abortions for these " serious psychiatric reasons".

The failure of women to continue psychiatric care after abortions which are performed for psychiatric reasons, is a tacit acknowledgement by them, of how invariably superficial and transient their psychiatric conditions were, if present at all, - which they in collusion with their psychiatrists, exploited to provide them with legal abortions. The failure of women to continue psychiatric treatment after abortions, is a recognition by these women that because the psychiatrists involved were not perceptive enough to uncloak their ruses, or worse still, - that the psychiatrists often colluded and conspired with them in obtaining abortions on trivial or non-existent psychiatric grounds, - that these psychiatrists would not be able to help them in the event of real and frequently severe psychiatric distress and disease, which they invariably, suffer after abortions, - which is frequently permanent and which often engenders suicidal tendencies.

It is most remarkable that psychiatrists - who are very much aware that women fail to continue psychiatric treatment after those abortions which were granted on the grounds of "severe psychiatric illness" - then do not pursue these women after their abortions in order to give them treatment for the psychiatric illnesses which they were so certain was afflicting these women before their abortions. It is then even more remarkable that many of these psychiatrists, should then confidently assert that psychiatric complications caused by abortions, are not commonly reported in psychiatric and other scientific journals.

Although the threat of suicide is used by women, often on the advice of their doctors, as a ploy to obtain abortions, the facts reveal that suicide is an extremely rare event during pregnancy. To illustrate this point, between 1938 and 1958, over 13,500 Swedish women were refused abortions, - of which number three committed suicide. Ottosson. F. "Legal Abortion in Sweden," Journal of Biosocial Sciences, Vol. 3, 1971, p.173. In Birmingham, England, in seven years, 119 women under 50 committed suicide. None of these women were pregnant. Sim. M. "Abortion and the Psychiatrist" British Medical Journal, vol. 2, 1963.

However suicide does occur amongst pregnant unmarried Indian women for whom the birth of an illegitimate child brings great shame and disgrace on the whole family. On the

contrary however suicide is common amongst women who have had abortions. A report of "Suiciders Anonymous" to the Cincinnati City Council, Sept.1, 1981, revealed that of 4000 women who had attempted suicide, 1800 of these women had undergone abortions. Another report describes cases of attempted suicide by teen-age women on the anniversaries of the dates on which their aborted babies would have been born. Tishler. C. "Adolescent Suicide Attempt: Anniversary Reaction," Pediatrics, vol.68, 1981.

Frequently doctors, and even more frequently, ministers of religion, are confronted by the profound and life-long psychiatric and spiritual harm which is caused by abortions. This evil arises out of both legal and illegal abortions and seriously afflicts women who have procured abortions, and often destroys their peace of mind and soul for the rest of their days.

In Japan, the Aichi survey of women who had undergone abortions, found that 73% of these women felt anguish about what they had done. In Japan, a study by Dr. T.Kaseki determined that 59% of aborted women experienced abortion as "very evil", and only 8% of aborted women considered it to be acceptable.

In 1969, a major survey which was conducted by the Office of the Japanese Prime Minister found that 88% of women considered abortion to be "Bad". These reports from Japan, which reveal the great anguish suffered by women after they had procured freely available, legal, abortions, could not be ascribed to these women being made to feel guilty by a society in which Judeo-Christian values and laws prevailed. In Japan one is able to visit the many shrines which are devoted to aborted babies, in which Japanese women place effigies of their aborted babies, and put in front of these effigies gifts, incense, and pathetic messages beseeching the aborted baby to forgive his mother for the evil done to him. The mothers and fathers of these aborted babies enter into contracts with Buddhist priests to have memorial services performed for the dead child. The cost of such contracts varies in price from as low as \$320 to \$2,100 each year, which in South African financial terms is between 1400 to 9200 rands each year. In some of these shrines which are dotted about the Japanese landscape memorial slats are erected in memory of the murdered child for a period of a year after which they are ceremoniously burnt. In the shrine of Adashino Nenbutsuji in Kyoto, between 10,000 and 20,000 of these slats are erected each year. Performances of religious rites for the aborted babies has increased dramatically since 1975 when an actual rite was televised. Rev. Fr. A. Zimmerman. Sorrows Reward. January 1989. Human Life International. Gaithersburg. Maryland.

In the United States of America a report on the psychological aftermath of abortion, was presented in September 1987 by four eminent psychologists to Dr Koop, the U.S. Surgeon General, in response to his request for evidence concerning the psychological effects of abortion. This scientific study detailed the prevalence of the Post Abortion Syndrome. The Psychological Aftermath of Abortion, A White Paper. V.M.Rue, A.Speckhard, J.L.Rogers, W.Franz. Office of the Surgeon General. Dr. Koop, had been instructed -by President Reagan to investigate and report on the psychiatric aftermath of abortion. Dr. Koop covered up this report, which was the only written scientific study presented to him, although 27 other groups had given oral evidence. Dr. V. Rue, the main author of the above mentioned report, revealed in a publication devoted to healing women who have been injured by abortion, how Dr. Koop had deceived President Reagan, by saying that he had not been informed about harmful effects of abortion. Sorrows Reward. Human Life International. Gaithersburg. Maryland. vol 2., no 1. 1990. Dr.V. Rue had exposed the

scientific flaws and the statistical errors of the 1985 study by Dr. Brenda Majo of Syracuse University, which was often quoted by the anti-life lobby as purporting to show no harmful psychological effects of abortion.

Even the accidental loss of a child through miscarriage often results in profound grief and depression, and in some women, severe psychiatric problems, which beset her and which adversely affect her relationships with members of her family, including any other children which she may have and children which she may bear in the future. The reality of this grief and psychiatric distress after miscarriage is recognized and treated by the psychiatric services which are offered to these women. Women often feel that their accidental miscarriages were in some way caused by their neglect to properly protect their unborn babies.

While it is possible, through abortion, to destroy the child in the womb of the mother, it is not possible to eradicate that child from the mind and heart of that mother, who for the rest of her life will remember, and bear the awful burden of the fact that she killed her baby.

Dr. Susan Stanford, in " Will I Cry Tomorrow", a book which is devoted to attempting to heal the wounds caused to the mind of the woman who has aborted her child, reveals how extensive the emotional damage caused abortion really is. Stanford. S.M. " Will I Cry Tomorrow"? Sir Thomas More Marriage and Family Publications Professor Wanda Poltawska, of Poland, detailed, during a conference in Yugoslavia which was organised by Human Life International, the vast and evil extent of emotional and psychiatric harm caused by abortion in her country. Professor Poltawska reported that Dr. Ekblad of Sweden had found, after studying 479 women who had undergone abortions four years earlier, that all of these women suffered guilt feelings. Sorrow's Reward. Human Life International. April 1987.

Dr. Paul Marx O. S.B., of Human Life International, remarked during a recent visit to South Africa that "It is possible to scrape a baby out of the mother's womb but it is never possible to scrape that baby out of the mother's heart".

Men, in increasing numbers, are profoundly spiritually and psychiatrically harmed by their wives or female sexual partners killing their unborn children. Often these abortions are procured by women against the wishes of the fathers of these children, who are willing to adopt and to support these children and their mothers. Invariably before and after abortions the father of the child is ignored medically, psychologically, spiritually and legally and that these men are often seriously and permanently damaged by their experience of abortion. Iglesias A M. Human Life International Reports. October 1990.

As increasing numbers of women have abortions, the numbers of women who are mentally damaged by abortions correspondingly increases, and a specific psychiatric syndrome, called the "Post Abortion Syndrome", is more frequently encountered. The American Psychiatric Association considers the following to be prominent features of the Post Abortion Syndrome; recurrent recollections, dreams, disinterest, detachment, hostility, depression; diminished ability for feelings.

In Denmark it has been found that "The highest rates of admission to Danish psychiatric hospitals is found amongst those women who are separated, divorced or widowed whether they delivered or obtained abortions. The rates are considerably higher, however, among

women who have obtained abortions (63.0 per 10,000 admissions) than among those delivered (16.9 per 10,000). 'David H. Post abortion and post partum psychiatric hospitalisation. Abortion: Medical progress and Social implications. CIBA Symposium 115 Pitman. 1985.

Obviously the mental and spiritual health of children and the stability and strength of families is dependent on the psychiatric health and stability of wives and mothers and on their spiritual strength. The strength and stability of families is the fundamental requirement for the establishment of a good society. As greater numbers of women undergo abortions and are spiritually morally and psychiatrically damaged or destroyed by these abortions, there is an ever growing number of women who are unable to function as wives and mothers and are unable to establish happy homes. As a result of the moral impoverishment and psychiatric devastation of these women, they will not be able to ensure loving, stable families. The detrimental effect of abortion on their families will result in the emergence of morally undeveloped or unsound and psychiatrically unbalanced children which will be tot he inestimable detriment of the nation.

A documentary film which shows some aspects of the psychiatric damage caused to women by abortions entitled "April and November" contains personal testimonies from women who have had abortions.

A documentary film entitled "Meet the Abortion Providers", in which doctors, nurses, laboratory workers, and social workers who had been employed in the abortion industry, describe the personal and social damage, which their involvement in the practice of killing unborn children had brought about in their own personal lives. This film has been produced by Joseph Scheidler of Pro-Life Action League, Chicago. U.S.A.

A documentary film entitled "The Eclipse of Reason" which shows all aspects of abortion and an actual D and E abortion, also contains the personal testimony of a clinical psychologist who has suffered serious psychiatric damage from her own abortion. Copies of these films are available from Pro-Life of South Africa.

Where a serious risk existed that the child to be born would suffer from a physical or mental defect. Section 3 (1) (c)

Abortions performed under this clause, constitute a grave threat to the lives of all handicapped persons, both born and unborn. This attitude of killing human beings because of their mental and physical deficiencies and inadequacies, has profoundly devalued the lives of handicapped people and has cheapened all human life.

A murderous attitude towards the handicapped in Germany, during the 1920's, was first advocated by Dr. A. Hoche and Dr.K.Binding in their book which justified the killing of handicapped children and others. "The Release of the destruction of life devoid of value" A Hoche and K. Binding, Published by Felix Meiner. Leipzig 1920. This contempt for handicapped persons subsequently gave rise to the German Euthanasia Program and ultimately to the Nazi death camps. "A Sign for Cain: An Explanation of Human Violence"., F.Wertham., Macmillan New York

These well documented atrocities came about because of the acceptance of the evil idea that it is possible to consider certain human persons to be less than human and therefore not worthy

of life. Hitler is reported to have called these handicapped persons, "useless eaters", and "oxygen wasters".

By means of the skills and technology which have been developed in Fetal Medicine it is now possible to correct many defects and diseases in unborn children, such as defects of the heart, bowel, kidneys, diaphragm and abdominal wall, brain and spinal cord, and many cosmetic defects. These operations can be performed on children while they are still in the womb.

This speciality owes a great debt of gratitude to Professor Sir Albert William Liley, who pioneered the treatment of unborn children. Professor Liley performed intrauterine blood transfusions in order to save babies whose lives were threatened by Rhesus Factor disease, and it is due to his love and concern for unborn children that the intrauterine treatment of unborn children is now routine in good hospitals. 'The Unborn Patient. Prenatal Diagnosis and Treatment'. M. Harrison, M. Golbus, R. Filly. Publishers. Grune and Stratton 1984. 'Prenatal Diagnosis and Surgical Treatment of Congenital Malformations' A. Pachi, A. Calisti, G. Astrei. Publishers. Piccin and Butterworths 1984.

The rapidly expanding discipline of prenatal treatment has highlighted the identity of unborn children as full patients, and has emphasized that the same ethical obligations must apply to treating them, as apply to treating their mothers.

It is only when performing legal abortions that doctors are permitted by South African Law to kill their patients. Section 3(1)(c) of the Abortion and Sterilisation Act, promotes the idea that it is acceptable to 'treat' the disease or disability from which the child suffers before birth - by killing the child.

The merciless killing of the unborn child is sometimes passed off as a kindness to the child, whereas in reality by killing the child the doctor deprives the child of any treatment which is currently available and which could be given to the child after birth, in order to alleviate diseases, correct defects and assist the child to compensate for the disability from which it suffers. This attitude of "killing as treatment" is especially evil because doctors are assisted enormously in their efforts to treat children, by the amazing healing and compensatory mechanisms which are such a consistently remarkable feature of very young patients.

By killing the child before birth, the doctor deprives the child of treatments which are certain to be developed in the future, some of which would totally cure many disorders, diseases and genetic defects. Genetic engineering is now commonplace in other fields of biology, and it is only a matter of time before genetic engineering will be used to cure humans who are ill as a result of defects of their chromosomes and genes.

To kill children in the womb, when certainty of diagnosis is impossible, merely because there is a serious risk that these children might possibly suffer from mental or physical defects, is much more barbaric than killing the same children when their defects have been more accurately diagnosed and evaluated after birth.

It is extremely rare that modern medicine will be unable to offer any form of treatment to a handicapped child. It is remarkable how handicapped children are able to compensate for extreme defects or if compensation is not possible, how these children accept the defect and enjoy the many delights and consolations that human love and care is able to provide.

Clearly the most accurate diagnosis and prognosis is only possible after the child is born, when the child can clearly be seen, felt, sounded, and subjected to various sophisticated tests and examinations which are impossible to perform while the child is still predominantly inaccessible in the womb. The willingness of doctors to kill healthy babies in order to eliminate possibly unhealthy babies is clearly evident in the killing of the unborn children of mothers who have AIDS, despite the fact that the babies of mothers with AIDS, have only about a 40% chance of getting the virus in the womb.

If treatment by the administration of death were to be acceptable for ill or handicapped children, then it would be much more logical and fair to wait until the child can be thoroughly evaluated after its birth, and then to kill it if it fails to pass its tests. A suggestion of such a nature would be repulsive to many people who unhesitatingly approve of the killing of unborn children whose condition or possible defects are not able to be diagnosed with certainty before birth.

What is horrifyingly clear is that doctors who support the killing of their unborn patients are invariably not interested in giving the child the benefit of any doubt about the severity of its condition or about the possibility of treating it. If this attitude were to be applied by judges in courts of law, the accused would not be given the benefit of the doubt, when any such doubt exists, and many innocent persons would be found guilty and wrongly sentenced to death.

It happens with disturbing frequency that doctors recommend abortion on the grounds that the child will be grossly deformed and diseased after birth, even that the child will be born "a monster". The mother then gives birth to a normal, happy, healthy, new-born child because she fortunately had rejected the lethally incorrect advice of the doctor and by refusing all recommendations that she should kill her baby before its birth. Conversely, on occasion when mothers take the advice to abort children, who they are informed, are grossly handicapped, it is discovered, after the abortion, that the child is normal. In these circumstances the aborting doctor with the cooperation of the nursing staff, invariably conceals the truth from the mother. The doctor justifies his deceitful concealment of such an unnecessary tragedy, by using the reason that such a revelation would be too mentally damaging for the mother, and out of compassion for her feelings and psychiatric health, he does not wish her to know the truth. Obviously the real reason that the aborting doctor attempts to conceal the stark fact that he killed a healthy child, is because he fears litigation, and he hopes by deceit to avoid damaging legal action.

Conversely, tests which are performed on children before birth, may be interpreted as being normal, only to have deformed and sometimes grossly handicapped children delivered. It is impossible to evaluate the mental capacity of children in the womb. Indeed it is impossible to evaluate mental handicap until some time after birth and in the case of IQ tests these can only be done many years after birth.

Doctors are not infallible. As a result of their own limitations and the limitations of their instruments and tests doctors make mistakes, - as the increasingly frequent cases of litigation against doctors affirm, - and they often give fatally wrong advice and treatment in all fields of medicine. Medical practitioners in the field of obstetric genetics and Pediatrics are not uniquely immune from making incorrect diagnoses, from giving unsound prognoses and from giving wrong advice and treatment.

About 450 years before the birth of Christ, Hippocrates the wise and good physician who is universally revered as "The Father of Medicine" said, "Life is short and the art of medicine is long, experience is fallacious and opportunity is fleeting.'

Amniocentesis and the less commonly performed chronic villus biopsy, are dangerous both for the child and the mother. Amniocentesis is usually done when the child is about 16 weeks old and doubles the risk that the child will be lost by miscarriage. When this happens the vast majority of the babies that are lost are normal.

Among the many reported complications of Amniocentesis are the following; sensitisation of the mother to her baby's blood by cross transfusion of blood, with the increased danger of the transfer of AIDS from mothers who have this virus to their babies; haemorrhage into and behind the placenta and into the amniotic fluid and bleeding to death of the child; infection of the amniotic fluid; persistent leak of amniotic fluid; the failure of the lungs of the child to develop - which frequently causes the death of the child after birth if it is not killed before birth by abortion - and deformities of the limbs of the child. The lack of development of the lungs of the baby and the limb deformities are caused by a lack of sufficient amniotic fluid and is a result of the test. Medical Research Council Working Party on Amniocentesis. British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. vol 85. 1978.

Tests performed on the amniotic fluid take about one month before the results are known. This means that by the time the doctor has the results the child is about 20 weeks old, and with good neonatal care babies of this age are viable. At this stage the killing of the child is considered to be distasteful for the mother, for the abortionist, and for the nursing staff, and it is more dangerous for the mother to abort her at such an advanced stage of pregnancy. It has been calculated that, in preventing 555 spina bifida births a year in England and Wales, screening would result in 120 dead or damaged normal infants. Chamberlain. J. The Lancet, 16 December 1978. As a result of these factors the chronic villus biopsy test is now becoming more popular. This test can be performed when the child is about 8 to 10 weeks old, and the results are usually available within the space of a few days, making it possible to kill the child at a much earlier age than those killed after amniocentesis. This is considered by the abortionist to be an advantage as the exterminated child is not so large and so undisguisably a child, and as a result the nursing staff who collect and dispose of the remains of the child are not so liable to be shocked. Because the mother has not yet at this stage felt the movements of the baby in her womb, because it is too small to make its mother aware of its movements, she may not yet have fully "bonded" to the baby. The abortionist is at great pains to prevent her from seeing, on the ultrasound screen, the baby's heart beating and the baby jumping about in her womb, because if she sees her baby, she invariably immediately "bonds" to it.

More often than not the child is killed, not because of any, deformed sense of pity on the part of the doctor who recommends the killing or who actually kills the child, but in order to "treat" the mental stress, expense, inconvenience, and embarrassment to the child's parents and siblings, and the burden on society that the birth of a handicapped child would cause. The child is killed so as not to involve the state in the unnecessary costs and inconvenience involved in its care. In South Africa the Department of National Health and Population Development subsidises and makes available in various centers the skills and laboratory facilities which enable these tests to be done. The State advertises these services and takes

pride in them. The handicapped child is thus prevented from interfering with the "quality of life of those who are morally responsible to love and to care for the child.

The "cure" administered by the doctor to the handicapped child, is death. By the use of "cures" such as this it would be easy to "treat" every disease and disability, not least amongst which would be the otherwise incurable, and ever-increasing number of AIDS cases, who are presenting a staggering burden on society. It is often claimed that the handicapped child is killed in order to improve the "quality of its life". The logical contradiction to be found in this statement and in the practice of killing patients" in order to improve the quality of their lives", is obscene.

The "quality of life" of all ill and handicapped persons, depends predominantly on the love and care that the person is given. Obviously by killing ill or handicapped persons, the relatives and those who have the immediate responsibility for caring for them as well as the rest of society which is responsible to assist individuals and families in their needs - will be relieved of their responsibilities. However while they will escape their tempo responsibilities they will at the same time be deprived of the God-given opportunity to show unconditional love to the sick and handicapped child and thereby depriving themselves of the opportunity to grow in love, grace and goodness, and not least of all, to forego the opportunity to store up for themselves infinite treasures in Heaven. It seems to be forgotten by a materialist generation that the "Quality of Life", to be desired and aimed for in our earthly pilgrimage, is the "Quality of Eternal Life", which is tearfully jeopardised by permitting a sick handicapped child or adult to be killed, by abortion, infanticide or by euthanasia.

The eugenic killing of defective children, is even considered by some to be good "preventive medicine". Fatal discrimination against handicapped or potentially handicapped unborn children and the extension of this murderous attitude to handicapped and seriously ill children after birth has resulted in the growing practice of infanticide, whereby handicapped and gravely ill children are abandoned by their parents and by medical and nursing staff, and are left to die of starvation, thirst, exposure and neglect. A modern equivalent of the abandonment by the ancient Greeks and Romans of babies who were weak or handicapped, who were strangled, buried in dung heaps or left to be eaten by animals.

The acceptance of killing handicapped and sick unborn children, and handicapped born children has led to the steadily increasing practice of killing handicapped and incurably sick adults by adult euthanasia. "Whatever Happened to the Human Race?" F. Schaeffer and C.Everett Koop, Revell. "Ethics at the Fringes of Life" Ramsey., Yale University Press.

The fact that handicapped and defective children and adults do not complain about their lot in life, and those who are able to communicate are usually happy and contented and make the most of life, seems to have escaped the notice of those who enjoy sound, healthy, and beautiful bodies, and quick and nimble minds, but who are profoundly handicapped in their souls, which are selfish, unkind, un-loving and frequently murderous.

Mother Teresa of Calcutta remarked during her visit to South Africa, that, " Children, because they are incapable of offending God, provide a shield of protection for all of mankind from the just anger of God at the evil deeds of mankind, and especially the despicable evil of abortion. God tells us, that he hates the spilling of innocent blood and that this is a sin which cries to Heaven for vengeance. The innocent children in our midst protect us from the anger of God,

who for the sake of the innocent, does not destroy the guilty. By aborting these children we removing the umbrella of protection that these innocent ones provide."

Where the foetus was alleged to have been conceived in consequence of alleged rape or incest. Section 3 (d). And Where the foetus is alleged to have been conceived in consequence of unlawful carnal intercourse with a female idiot or imbecile in contravention of section IS of the morality Act. Section 3 (1) (e).

The British Abortion Law, which permits abortion on demand for almost any reason, including social reasons does not recognize the concept of allowing abortion for rape, because the lawmakers contended that it would be virtually impossible to prove rape when the woman was already pregnant.

Pregnancy as the result of genuine rape is fortunately not very common. However pregnancy as the result of statutory rape, when the woman is too young to be able to give her legal consent to sexual intercourse is becoming increasingly common. Especially because the State and others in the field of "family planning", freely supply underage children with contraceptives, thereby making them available for sexual exploitation by other minors and by adults who commit statutory rape in these circumstances.

In those cases where the woman is pregnant as a result of genuine assault rape, the killing of her child does not 'un-rape' the mother. Rape is the crime of sexual intercourse with a woman without her consent. This crime which is often violent, is not corrected or erased by killing her child. Killing the child by abortion is an attempt to correct the crime of rape by the far more evil crime of murder of her unborn child. The child conceived in the circumstances also belongs to the mother. The presence of the child in the womb and all the circumstances of the conception of the child, is known in infinite detail by God, who encompasses with infinite love the child, as well as the parents of the child. The innocent child, like the mother, is also a victim of the rape and often suffers, if allowed to live - throughout life from the absence of a loving father, and should abortion be performed the innocent child is violently, dispassionately and scientifically executed for the crime of his or her rapist father, who if the present moratorium on the execution of those sentenced to death for the crime of rape becomes the norm, would allow the rapist, after conviction for rape, to escape the death sentence and to be freed after some years in prison, for "good conduct" while in prison.

"In the majority of these cases, the pregnant victim's problems stem more from the trauma of rape than from the pregnancy itself". Makhorn and Dolan, "Sexual assault and Pregnancy." New Perspectives on Human Abortion. University Publishers of America. 1979.

"As to what factors make it most difficult to continue her pregnancy, after rape, the attitude and beliefs of others close to her were most frequently cited; in other words, how her loved ones treated her." "As socially inappropriate as incestuous pregnancies are, their harmful effects depend largely upon the reaction of others." Maloof. G. "The Psychological Aspects of Abortion. University Publications of America. 1979.

It is the experience of pro-life workers that by giving loving care and assistance to women who have been raped or who are victims of incest, and by guiding them to reject abortion, results in a far better outcome for them than the great spiritual and psychiatric harm which befalls them when they kill their babies by abortion. It is remarkable how tragically identical,

is the grief of the mother over the accidental loss of a child who was conceived in rape, when compared to the loss of a child who was conceived in wedlock.

Should the mother not wish to keep the child after its birth, she has the option of giving the child up for adoption and she will be assisted and supported during her pregnancy and during and after the process of adoption, by pro-life organizations. Other than the better outcome for the mother which results from this compassionate life-living approach, the benefits for the child, the new adoptive parents and society as a whole, is the incomparable difference between life and death.

[Editor's Note: Document too long and repetitive to continue all]

The inability of the medical system of South Africa to deal with existing medical demands and the overwhelming further demands that legal abortion would make on this system

The medical services of this country are seriously inadequate in meeting the existing needs for essential medical services. Further demands on these over-extended services, which would be caused by providing abortions, would result in still further overloading of medical services and in an ever declining standard of essential care for seriously ill adults and children.

Providing abortions would thus cause further serious obstacles to the national efforts to improve health, such as efforts to reduce the high mortality rate for infants.

If the monetary costs of abortions, modestly estimated at R1,000 per abortion, is used for calculations then 200,000 legal abortions each year, based on the often quoted number of back street abortions that are reputed to be performed, will in direct monetary terms alone, cost the nation about R200 million each year.

While those who promote abortion, to correct "contraceptive failures", emphasise that abortions are needed because people do not have adequate access to contraceptive services, which the State is unable, in their view, to adequately supply - it is a great puzzle to understand how the much more difficult and expensive task of supplying the population with abortions will be achieved.

Conclusion

Abortion is the deliberate killing of a totally innocent unborn child. The deliberate killing totally innocent human being, whether born or unborn, is murder.

The first responsibility of the government of a country is to increase the moral goodness and virtue of all subjects and to bear in mind that all authority comes from God.

The government exists in order to serve the needs of the people, to protect and assist the weakest members of society, and in particular to protect and defend innocent life.

The unborn child is the most innocent and helpless of all human beings and consequently unborn children most deserving of protection. For the government of a country to fail to

protect unborn children, or worse still, to co-operate in their murder by legalized abortion, is to contemptuously disregard God; to hideously fail in its divinely granted duty to rule justly and by allowing abortion to lose and destroy its moral authority, and withdraw itself from the protection and guidance of the Almighty.

Should the majority of the citizens of such a country accept the murder of children by legal abortion then the whole country itself, and not just its government and the instruments of its government calls down upon itself fearful punishments from God in this world, and eternal punishment in the next world for those who responsible for the murder of innocent unborn children, and who fall to repent for this unspeakable crime.

In view of the total evil of abortion through its murder of unborn children, thereby denying them the fundamental human right which is the right to life, through its destruction of morality, by its perversion and destruction of marital and parental love and responsibility; by its destruction of the powers of procreation, by its exploitation of women, by its destruction of the moral authority of the law; by its destruction of the moral basis of the medical and nursing professions; but its dependence on deceit and lies for its existence; because of its brutal scientific violence; for all these reasons abortion must be totally forbidden.

One should keep in mind the obstacle the obscene violence of Legal Abortion presents to efforts to establish peace in this country; and particularly by its monstrous offense to Almighty God, it is therefore requested that abortion be totally forbidden by the Government and that those who promote abortion and those who perform abortions should receive the most severe punishment that the Government is able to administer. Those who promote violence against the unborn and those who actually kill the unborn should be dealt with in the same manner as the Government would deal with those who promote violence and who kill human beings after birth.

In view of the factual information and logical argument, which is contained in the body of this submission, which shows that abortion has no medical, social, economic, or demographic justification, we respectfully request that the Government take urgent steps to protect unborn children and to protect this country by repealing the Abortion and Sterilisation Act in its entirety.

Signed on behalf of unborn children, and in defense of Medical and Moral values

CLAUDE E. NEWBURY
NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF PRO-LIFE SOUTH AFRICA

Also representing in this submission
Human Life International
Victims of Choice
The World Federation of Doctors who Respect Human Life