

From:
To: [abortionlawreform](#)
Subject: Abortion law reform submission
Date: Thursday, 30 June 2016 6:57:57 AM

To the The Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee of the Queensland Legislative Assembly,

My name is Thomas and I am a Brisbane citizen, seriously concerned and wishing to voice opposition, and reasons thereof, to the Pyne Abortion Law Reform.

It is my objective in this email to present to you, as a committee under the Queensland Government, and protectors and law makers for the people of this state, that you have a responsibility to keep Abortion illegal under the criminal code. In fact, I wish to convincingly inform you that you must increase the legislation that criminalises abortion. To do this, I wish to bring you back to first principles.

The debate and legislation around abortion is, no doubt, an intensely emotional and political issue. I therefore seek to look at this rationally- not coldly or to ignore emotions; but rationally.

It is my conviction that it is the fundamental responsibility of the State to rule justly by force. That is, they are to rule by making and passing laws to inform how the nation works.

They are to do so justly, or righteously. Legislating what is right, and ruling for the good of people.

And by force, since no law is law if it is not enforced. Without enforcement, laws become advice. Only when laws are enforced by police, and consequences etc, are they effective.

Government is do just that- govern. But they are to do so justly, righteously, and according to moral standards. When just laws are enforced, virtuous people benefit and the corrupt people should fear punishment. When just laws are not enforced, virtuous people do not benefit and the corrupt benefit. But when unjust laws are enforced, the virtuous come to fear the government's power, and the corrupt flourish. In summary- "When a government acts unjustly, it becomes a terror to the good, and those who pursue virtue have every reason to fear its awful power."(1)

I want to prove that it abortion is an unjust act and thus ought to be considered criminal. To decriminalise a corrupt and unjust act is to fail to govern justly. Thus, my conclusion will be that to decriminalise abortion, or allow it to continue, would be unjust, and a failure of the responsibility of the government. Let me begin.

Murder is the unlawful killing of another person (2). Does this apply to the termination unborn children? Let's define terms.

- "Person"(or another) here obviously refers to a human person who is alive. The mother who is pregnant is clearly a human, as is the fetus, or unborn child. It has 23 Chromosomal pairs of human DNA and 2 human parents.. So it's a human. Let's not spend long on this. And the unborn child is alive. It's organs are forming, and are less developed than ours, but so are children's'. One is not "less alive" because they have less developed organs, they are simply less stable, that is, weaker. This includes children, elderly and disabled- they may be less developed (in a sense) like the fetus, but they are still persons- alive humans. If someone wishes to decriminalise abortion, they must prove that the unborn child is not a human, AND not a person. NOT either or (although neither can be convincingly argued against).

- “Killing” here refers to the taking of another's life. This is precisely what occurs in abortion, where the brain waves of a baby are stilled, the heart beat is ceased, and the breath is wilfully stopped. Any attempt to decriminalise abortion must first decriminalise the stopping of another person’s brain waves, heart beat and breath. Alternatively, if one is to argue for abortion to be decriminalised, they must prove that abortion does not kill the human unborn child. Or they must decriminalise murder.
- “Unlawful” here means in a situation that does not count as manslaughter, or where the deceased did not lawfully deserve the death penalty. (I could say that it also includes the situation where the deceased did deserve the death penalty but were not killed according to policy, but we do not have the death penalty in QLD so this would be futile). In other words, for the killing of a person to be “unlawful” they have to be innocent of the death penalty. If one seeks to decriminalise abortion then they must prove that the unborn human child is deserving of the death penalty. This is an argument that cannot be made.

So murder occurs when one person “unlawfully kills another”. In other words, murder is the taking of INNOCENT HUMAN LIFE. An unborn child is these things; innocent, human and alive. Therefore, to kill them is murder, under the QLD code of law.

So the question now is: IF ABORTION IS UNLAWFUL KILLING, CAN YOU MAKE IT LAWFUL?

By doing that, abortion would no longer be considered as murder, since murder is “unlawfully kill[ing]”.

But to do so would be to foster the killing of countless more innocent human lives; genocide, or in this case: infanticide.

This, dear committee, would be the very height of “unjust”. You would be unjustly ruling and thus disastrously failing at your responsibility to ‘govern justly’. You must not do that.

“A fundamental concern of law is the protection of the weak against the strong and powerful. Such weakness is vividly seen in the utter helplessness of the unborn baby. The unborn have no voting rights and no physical power to avert their destruction. If their interests are to be served and protected, it must be by adults in general and by government in particular.”(1)

If abortion is decriminalised, or continued to be allowed under the “R v Bayliss and Cullen” case exception, the weakest and most in need of your protection will be legally destroyed by the thousands. Do not allow this. Despite all of the other emotion cries and arguments for “pro-choice”, do not let this happen.

Of course, I appeal to you as a citizen. And I believe that any citizen ought to hold what I have thus argued. I do, however, hold to conservative Protestant Christian beliefs. I hold to them first and foremost, and offer you this submission according to what the Word of God says. However, I, and most Christians, when asking you to prohibit abortion, are not asking for a join , or even a little mixing between church and state. Many people cry out, “Religion stays out of politics”, or “Religious convictions cant become law”, and to a point I agree. But this is not what I ask of you. I'm not asking you to make Christian ideas the law, or to make religious practices the rule. I have been appealing to you on common and secular terms because what I am asking you to do, is act according to your common human morals and natural law. I think R C Sproul says it best:

“When the church calls on the state to prohibit abortion, the state is not being asked to establish a religion. Nor is the state being asked to be the church. The church is simply asking the state to be the state. If it is the role of the state to protect, sustain, and maintain human life, and if it is the conviction of the church that abortion involves the destruction

of human life, then it follows that the church has the right to call the state to outlaw abortion. The church is not asking the state to baptize human beings, but to protect the lives of unborn humans.” (1)

This is not a submission to ask for a church state – don’t hear that. It is a call for you to be the government you ought to be and protect your youngest and most vulnerable citizens.

Let me make one last appeal to your humanity on the basis of love .

Love informs all that we do, because no man or woman is without it. And having it, no one is unaffected by its drawing power, its staying power and its abilities to drive us to any cost to manifest it. It is the Christian conviction that love sums up the law (both divine law and civil law). That is, if everyone loved perfectly, there would be no need for law- as everyone's highest joy and delight would be to do good for their fellow people. Since we do not all love perfectly, we need laws. Laws to guide and protect, to inform and to punish when the common good and the good of individuals are not met. So laws are to facilitate and enable just legislations that help the people act less hateful and more loving (to put it simply), or to act more civil, in other words.

Well, the most fundamental expression of love is care for, concern for, and protection of human life. The foundational obligation of all government is to protect, sustain, and maintain human life. This is the very reason for the existence of government. That's the first reason government came into being, and it's the whole reason it still exists today. Do not fail on this by refusing to legislate rules that absolutely prohibit the murder of unborn children.

Thank you,

In hope of great men, and great change

Thomas.

(1)- RC Sproul, (2010). Abortion.

(2)- Queensland Criminal Code Section 302:

http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/qld/consol_act/cc189994/s302.html

Thomas Foord