

United for Life

Raising greater awareness of human life issues

22 Moreton Close, Bishops Cleeve
Cheltenham, GL52 8AW
www.unitedforlife.com
info@unitedforlife.com

31st July 2006

Director
Sightsavers International
Grosvenor Hall
Bolnore Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 4BX

Dear Sir or Madam

In June 2005 and again on the 10th October 2005 United for Life wrote to **Sightsavers International** to ask them to join our Make Abortion History campaign. However United for Life has not yet received a reply from **Sightsavers International**. In our previous letters to **Sightsavers International** United for Life demonstrated that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights protects the right to life of '*all members of the human family*', and that, since the unborn are members of the human family the UDHRs protects the right to life of the unborn.

United for Life also demonstrated that the Declaration on the Rights of the Child applies to the unborn, which states that, '*...the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, **before** as well as after birth.*'

United for Life has written to an increasing number of organisation to ask them to join the Make Abortion History campaign. Some organisations claim they do not work on abortion and would not join the Make Abortion History campaign while others claim they work for the elimination of other human rights abuses worldwide in accordance with the definition of international human rights instruments.

United for Life would like to demonstrate to **Sightsavers International** and other organisations how the killing of children by abortion, contraception, sterilisation, human embryo experimentation, human cloning, IVF and related activities, violate international human rights instruments, are modern forms of slavery and destroy the environment; and should therefore be addressed by national and international human rights programmes and campaigns.

We will do this by demonstrating:

- that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and UN Conventions such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the Slavery Convention apply to '*every organ of society*' regardless of 'remit' or 'mandate'
- that the definition of slavery applies to the unborn including embryonic children threatened with being killed by abortion, human embryo experimentation, human cloning, IVF and related activities
- that the 'right of property over another' and 'non-person' arguments used to justified slavery and the slave-trade '*...in all their forms...*' are also used to justify the slavery of killing children by abortion, the slavery of human embryo experimentation, the slavery of human cloning and IVF, and the 'trafficking' of these human lives

- that the banning of child-sacrifice whether practiced for religious, cultural, secular or any other reason applies to the unborn including embryonic children
- that the killing of children by abortion is genocide
- that rooting out the cultural slavery of killing children by abortion is to root out the 'culture of death' within society and that slavery takes many forms in modern society
- that both environmental and population groups use population and environmental degradation arguments to impose the killing of children by abortion, contraception and sterilisation agendas on governments and their peoples
- that the womb (and the fallopian tubes) are the natural environment and the natural habitat of the unborn, including embryonic children, and therefore require protection
- that human embryos have human rights
- that women are safer in countries where abortion is not legal
- that the leaching of estrogens and other chemicals from contraceptives into the environment, especially into the water supply and the soil, is an environmental issue
- that the killing of children by abortion, contraception and related activities are environmentally destructive and that Natural Family Planning is eco-friendly, woman friendly and does not destroy a human life
- that Human Rights are based on the principle of protecting the weak from the strong and that Human Rights must be applied correctly and equally by all

1. Every organ of society - regardless of remit

The Universal Declaration proclaims that '*...every organ of society... shall strive by teaching and education ...to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance ...among the peoples of Member States.*'

Therefore every organ of society, regardless of 'remit', shall strive to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance. No 'organ of society' can excuse itself from the requirements and obligations under the Universal Declaration on grounds of 'remit' or any other grounds.

The Universal Declaration proclaims these Rights as universal, inherent, and inalienable; universal because they are for all (members of the human family), inherent because they are not given, and inalienable because they cannot be taken away. If a particular group of human lives are being excluded from universal protection, such as the unborn, then, '*...every organ of society ...shall strive by teaching and education ...to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance ...without distinction.*'

It is right therefore that United for Life should call upon **Sightsavers International** and other organisations to commit themselves to implement ***in full*** the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child ***in regard to the unborn***, which states that, '*...the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth.*'

2. The definition of slavery

All United Nations Conventions must be read in the light of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including the Slavery Convention and Supplementary Convention, which apply to *'all members of the human family without distinction.'*

According to international human rights instruments the definition of slavery is *'...the status or condition of a person over whom any or all the powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised...'*. The exercise of 'ownership' includes the disposal or destruction of the object of ownership not wanted by the owner. When a child is killed by abortion this is exactly what happens; a tiny human life is treated as 'property to be disposed of'. To treat human lives as if they are owned or as if they are 'property' is the bench mark definition of slavery. This is what happens to the unborn when he or she is killed in an abortion and to human embryos created for research and for IVF and other related activities. The modern slave-trade consists of such practices.

On contemporary forms of slavery the UN claims *'...there are no clear distinctions between different forms of slavery...'*, and declares *'...slavery and the slave-trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.'* United for Life agrees.

3. Non-persons

The claim that some human lives are 'not persons' or 'have no legal status' or 'have no rights to protect' have been used to justify slavery and the slave-trade, the Nazi persecution of the Jews and others, the persecution of indigenous peoples and of women who, for instance in Canada, had the status of 'non-persons' up until 1925. Recourse to claim that others are 'non-persons' is used to remove the moral and social obstacles for committing acts of violence.

In the USA in 1881 legal scholar George F. Canfield claimed *'...an Indian is not a person within the meaning of the Constitution'*, and that *'Congress may prevent an Indian leaving his reservation, and while he is on a reservation it may deprive him of his liberty, his property, [and] his life...'*. The State, in exercising ownership over the Native American Indians, demonstrates that slavery includes depriving others of their life. To claim that some human lives, including the unborn, are not persons or are 'non-persons' in order to defraud them of their *'right to life'* or to claim they have no rights or to claim they have no right to legal protection or for any other reason, is prohibited by Article 6 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states that, *'Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.'* All human life including the unborn are protected by the UDHRs and cannot be treated as 'non-persons' void of the universal, inherent and inalienable *'...right to life...'* before the law.

The Declaration on the Rights of the Child proclaims that the child *'...needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth.'* This is because the child, before as well as after birth, needs **more** protection not less, because before birth the child is **more** vulnerable from being used or destroyed by abortion and by human embryo experimentation, including IVF and human cloning. In fact, in March 2005 the United Nations banned all forms of human cloning as did the European Council in 1998.

4. Slavery - depriving others of their life

We have already illustrated above that the 1881 Native American case shows that slavery includes killing. Anti-Slavery International claims that *'...the word 'slavery' now covers many practices which would not immediately be associated with it, such as the killing of persons for organ trafficking...'*. This shows that killing is an act of enslavement.

According to a Virginian Jamestown website, a 1669 law represents the loss of legal protection *for a slave's life* in Virginia. The Act states in its 17th Century style of language,

'Be it enacted and declared by this grand assembly, if any slave resist his master (or other by his masters order correcting him) and by the extremity of the correction should chance to die, that his death shall not be accompted ffelony, but the master (or that other person appointed by the master to punish him) be acquit from molestation, since it cannot be presumed that pre-pensed malice (which alone makes murther ffelony) should induce any man to destroy his owne estate.'

This is how abortion law works, at least in the UK. The abortionist will not be prosecuted for the killing of the unborn child.

The joint NGO statement on the draft European Convention against trafficking in human beings had, by November 2004, been signed by over 160 organisations including Anti-Slavery International. The NGO statement claims that, *'Trafficking is an abuse of human rights. It results in the abuse of the human rights of trafficked persons including... [their right to] ...life'*.

Clearly, those being trafficked have a *'right to life'* and trafficking can involve the taking of human life. Pro-abortion law legitimises violence against the unborn as pro-slavery law legitimised violence against slaves which has included the killing of slaves.

5. The slave-trade today - trafficking in human lives

Modern forms of slave-trade includes among other practices:

- the killing of children by abortion whether surgical or chemical (medical)
- creation, use and destruction of human embryos for experimentation or IVF
- the use of aborted foetal tissue for experimentation
- the use of aborted foetal tissue for commercial products including cosmetics and other health care products including vaccines
- human cloning
- abortifacient 'contraceptives' such as the Pill, IUD, Norplant, Morning After Pill, Depo Provera® and abortion inducing drugs such as RU486
- child sacrifice and the sale of children including killing children by abortion, human embryo experimentation, IVF, human cloning and other related activities
- the term 'trafficking in human lives' includes those who deal in killing children by abortion, human embryo experimentation, IVF, human cloning and other related activities
- FGM - female genital mutilation and sterilisation

6. Child sacrifice and the sale of children - a form of slavery

In an abortion a tiny human life is torn apart and thrown away. By 2006 over six and a half million (6,500,000) children have been killed by abortion in Britain since the 1967 Abortion Act came into force. An additional 180,000 children will be killed by abortion each following year using current figures. Every week in Britain, 3,500 children are deliberately killed by surgical or chemical abortion, including the use of RU486, and an untold number of tiny human lives are killed because they were unable to implant in their mother's womb as a consequence of their mothers taking the Pill or the 'morning after pill' (otherwise known as 'emergency contraception'), or because their mothers were using IUD's, Norplant or Depo Provera. Still further tiny human lives are killed during IVF

and human embryo experimentation, including human cloning and embryonic stem cell research. In the United States, since abortion became legal in 1973, over forty five million (45,000,000) children have been killed by abortion.

United for Life believes that any nation, charity, organisation or individual that supports, advocates or carries out the killing of children by abortion violates the human rights of the unborn, violates the Declaration and Convention on the Rights of the Child, violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on Slavery and a number of other Conventions.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) protects the child *'before as well as after birth.'* Article 24 (3), goes on to declare, *'States Parties shall take all effective and appropriate measures with a view to abolishing traditional practices prejudicial to the health of children.'*

The killing of children by abortion is a traditional practice exercised both in ancient and modern times. The killing of children by abortion is *'prejudicial to the health of children'* - the child is killed. The unborn are by definition *'under 18 years of age'* and the unborn are defined as children both **before** as well as after birth by the Convention.

With the unborn being defined as children both **before** as well as after birth by the Convention, the UN's Convention on the Sale of Children, Article 2 (a), goes on to define the sale of children in the following way:

'Sale of children means any act or transaction whereby a child is transferred by any person or group of persons to another for remuneration or any other consideration.'

Killing children by abortion is clearly an *'...act ...whereby a child is transferred by, ...[a] ...person or groups of persons to another for remuneration or any other consideration.'* In addition, killing children by abortion for 'economic reasons' is the economic exploitation of the unborn and such exploitation applies likewise to other grounds on which the killing of children by abortion are applied.

Article 7 of the Convention on the Sale of Children provides for the *'...seizure and confiscation ...of ...goods, ...materials, assets and other instruments used to commit or facilitate offences under the present protocol ...[and to] ...take measures aimed at closing, on a temporary or definitive basis, premises used to commit such offences.'* Clearly this outlaws all facilitation of all forms of killing children by abortion as described and listed by United for Life in this document.

Child sacrifice and the sale of children, including the killing of children by abortion and the sacrifice of unborn embryonic children, whether for religious, cultural, secular or any other reason, is a violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and a number of UN Conventions.

7. How the slavery of killing children by abortion is genocide

We have already established that slavery includes the act of depriving someone of their life. The UN Convention on Genocide describes genocide as the intention *'...to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.'* To destroy part of a national group is defined as genocide. The unborn are part of a national group. The unborn are also a group within a national group.

Clearly the killing of children by abortion destroys part of that unborn group. The UN Convention defines genocide as *'...killing members of the group...'* and *'...imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group.'* The killing of children by abortion is a measure *'intended to prevent births within a group.'*

Clearly the UN Convention on Genocide protects the right to life of the unborn from acts of being killed by abortion or any other acts intended to prevent the birth of the unborn. In addition, contraception and sterilization are also ‘...*measures intended to prevent births within the group.*’

8. Rooting out cultural practices

The Baltimore Anti-Slavery website states that ‘*Contemporary slavery is not always easy to identify or root out because much of it is accepted within a culture.*’ Killing children by abortion, contraception, IVF, human embryo experimentation, and related activities are claimed by some to be cultural practices now imbedded in society. Such practices form the ‘culture of death’ gripping Britain and the rest of the world. This means that since the killing of children by abortion is ‘rooted’ and even ‘*accepted within [our] culture*’ it will be difficult to root it out. However, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other UN Conventions, including the Slavery Convention, call for such cultural changes to take place.

9. Human embryos have human rights

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights declares these rights for ‘*all members of the human family ...without distinction of any kind such as ...birth or other status.*’ Clearly human embryos are members of the human family and therefore the Universal Declaration of Human Rights protects the right to life of human embryos.

Throughout history ‘non-person’ arguments have been used to justify acts of violence and the use of humans as property, and this is no less the case for human embryos. Human embryo experimentation is simply the exploitation of a vulnerable human life. Like other members of the human family human embryos may not be subjected to ‘*inhumane and degrading treatment*’, or treated as ‘property’. Human embryos are unborn members of the human family. They are embryonic children which the Convention on the Rights of the Child declares have the right to ‘... *legal protection, **before** as well as after birth.*’

United for Life believes that any nation, charity, organisation or individual that supports, advocates or carries out human embryo experimentation, violates the right to life of human embryos, violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Conventions on Slavery and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

10. Female genital mutilation - FGM - a form of enslavement

Dr John Fleming, a foundation member of UNESCO’s International Bioethics Committee which developed the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights (adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO on 11 November 1997), shows in his paper entitled: ‘*What Rights, If Any, Do The Unborn Have Under International Law?*’, that it is a UN principle of international law that no-one may place themselves or their dependence into slavery because this would legalise the slave-trade. This is important because it relates to all forms of slavery and is reflected in Article 6 of the Supplementary Convention on Slavery.

As a form of enslavement female genital mutilation (FGM) is a traditional practice of mutilating the genitals of females and is carried out in many parts of the world.

United for Life opposes all forms of FGM. Sterilisation whether surgical, chemical or by device (i.e. contraception) is female genital mutilation - an act of violence against women and their bodies whether self-inflicted or inflicted by others. The activity of removing or incapacitating normal healthy organs or body parts is not only unethical in itself but bad medicine whatever part of the body is being mutilated. Self-mutilation is always unethical and no-one may place themselves or their dependence into this or any other form of slavery.

11. The UN's lack of care for women

Despite years of international activity and funding for contraception and for the killing of children by abortion the care of women giving birth has little priority. Dr Robert Walley, founder and director of MaterCare International '*...blames lack of international funding for maternal care for high rate of death among Third World women. While billions are spent on birth control programmes, very little goes to the provision of emergency obstetric care.*' A C-FAM article about Dr Walley shows that the UN cares little about women and that UNICEF confirmed this as a '*...conspiracy of silence...*'.

The human rights organisation C-FAM, reporting on the UN World Mortality Report 2005, shows in their report entitled: *UN Data Show Banning Abortion Doesn't Increase Maternal Mortality*, that countries with legalized abortion have higher maternal deaths and that countries where abortion is illegal have lower maternal deaths. C-FAM, in another report on a meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women, March 2006, states that the meeting '*focused almost solely on sexual and reproductive health*' until the meeting was presented with the WHO's 2002 World Health Report which showed that, '*1.9 percent of women's deaths [were] on maternal conditions*', and that, '*89 percent of deaths of women and girls are attributable to causes unrelated to sexual and reproductive health ...forcing states to begin discussions on the other health care needs of women.*'

12. Women are safer in countries where abortion is not legal

According to a report entitled: '*False Notions About So-Called Safe Abortions*' by the *National Right to Life Coalition*, the United Nations own demographic evidence shows that women are safer in countries where abortion is not legal. For instance, in countries which have similar healthcare standards such as Britain and Ireland, the country where abortion is legal, that is Britain, has a three and a half times higher maternal death rate than Ireland.

The NRLC's report states,

'Intimations that high maternal mortality rates are related to abortion's illegality are contradicted by examples from the United Nation's own database. Neighbouring countries such as the United Kingdom... where abortion on demand has been legal for some time, and the Republic of Ireland, which has long banned the practice, provide an interesting contrast.

According to the 1990 UN Demographic Handbook, it was Ireland, not the UK, that reported the lowest maternal mortality rates for 1988 - - some three and a half times lower than that reported for the British. At least in these two countries, mothers appear to be safer in the country where abortion is not legal.

The idea that there is a necessary correlation between abortion's illegality and higher maternal mortality rates is also challenged by government statistics from Poland. Poland banned abortion in 1993 after decades of abortion on demand as a Soviet satellite.

Since then, not only has the number of legal abortions dropped considerably, from 59,417 in 1990 to 151 in 1999 (these were for rape, problems with the fetus, or threats to the mother's life or health), but so has maternal and infant mortality. Maternal mortality, recorded at 15.2 per 100,000 live births in 1990, dropped to 7.3 per 100,000 by 1999. Infant mortality also showed a steady decline, from 18.1 in 1991 to just 8.9 in 1999 (and dropped again to 8.1 in 2000).

The evidence confirms that the world would be a safer place without abortion. Not only would millions of innocent unborn lives be saved, but so would the lives of many of their mothers. This would especially be so if the international agencies which have

invested so much money and energy into promoting abortion would drop that death campaign and put the same effort into improving overall medical conditions in the developing world.'

United for Life agrees with NRLC that national and international agencies must invest their money and energy in improving overall medical conditions in the developing world and we encourage **Sightsavers International** and other organisations to lobby for such action and change in order to save women's lives.

13. Environmental and population control groups

The killing of children by abortion, contraception and sterilization form part of the practice of population control programmes and have at times been implemented by force or by coercion although for the unborn all chemical and surgical abortions are 'forced abortion'. The environmental pressure group ECO campaigns with OPT for human population reduction.

According to a review by ECO entitled: *Population, Environment and Development - seeking common ground (updated 16 March 2003)* Friends of the Earth '*...agreed that environmental groups should campaign on population issues...*' and that Friends of the Earth accepts that '*...in order to reduce the environmental impact of our lifestyles, a range of restraints might have to be **imposed** * on people....*', but that Duncan McClaren, Sustainable Research Officer of Friends of the Earth, is quoted as saying that, "*I think this is closer to interfering with basic human rights....*".

** (United for Life's emphasis)*

Clearly then human rights is an issue which some environmental organisations have been concerned about not violating. United for Life calls upon **Sightsavers International** and other organisations to support the right to life of the unborn as a basic human rights issue.

14. The natural environment and natural habitat of the unborn

The natural environment in which unborn children live is constantly under threat by national and international governments, organisations and individuals. The womb, together with the fallopian tubes during the first 5 or 6 days of life, is the natural habitat of the unborn, yet the womb has become one of the most dangerous environments on earth for children to inhabit since the unborn often have little or no legal protection. To live in an environment where little or no legal protection exists for the smallest and most vulnerable human lives is a situation we must all take responsibility for. In Britain alone such environmental degradation destroys 3,500 children by surgical abortion every single week and over six and a half million (6,500,000) children have been killed by surgical abortions since the 1967 Abortion Act.

Polluting the natural environment of the unborn, especially the environment of embryonic children, is often the first assault on early human life and often in the form of chemicals including estrogens from the Pill and other contraceptives. One of the ways in which the Pill works is by making the lining of the womb, the natural habitat of the unborn, hostile to implantation. The environment of the womb becomes uninhabitable and the new human life dies.

If the new human life manages to survive this environmental attack the Morning-After-Pill, which is 50 times the dose of the normal contraceptive pill, is designed as the next line of environmental destruction by also preventing implantation. The next line of chemical attack on the lives of the vulnerable is the drug RU486 designed to kill the unborn child up to 9 weeks gestation by breaking down the lining of the womb after the embryo has already implanted. The number of deaths of these early human lives has to be added to the number of surgical abortions to understand the extent of the environmental destruction taking place.

For further information on the impact of the Pill on implantation, and the concern of the Pill as an abuser of human rights, view research by Prof. John Wilks *B.Pharm. MPS MACPP* entitled: *'Impact of the Pill on Implantation'* and *'The Pill - How it Works and Fails'*, also view his book: *'A Consumer's Guide to The Pill and Other Drugs'*.

In addition to abortion destroying the unborn, research by Professor Joel Brind, (President of the Breast Cancer Prevention Institute) and others over the past 50 years or so shows that abortion is linked to breast cancer. The effect on the environment from chemotherapy and other drugs used in the treatment of cancer has to be considered.

See our website for further information on the link between abortion and breast cancer: *Abortion and Breast Cancer - Is There A Link?* by Dr Greg Gardner of the Christian Medical Fellowship.

15. The leaching of estrogens from contraceptives and other sources into the environment

The leaching of estrogens from contraceptives such as the Pill into the water system and into the soil is yet another consequence of environmental irresponsibility. The world's leading scientists have developed these environmentally destructive and life threatening drugs which are now raising both national and international concerns.

The European Commission is now funding research by EDEN into the disruptive effects of estrogens in the water supply. In May 2005 EDEN produced *The Prague Declaration on Endocrine Disruption*, which states that,

'Fish exposed to the contraceptive pill ingredient at concentrations found in European rivers showed disturbed sexual development and impaired reproductive capabilities at the adult stage, including reduced or inhibited egg production and egg fertilisation, hindered release of semen and lower survival of their offspring.'

Regarding unborn human life the Declaration continues,

...'Genital malformations, testis cancer, and some cases of reduced sperm quality arise early in life, even during development in the womb. These conditions have common causes during reproductive organ development in the foetus, which is controlled by hormones. The concern is that endocrine disrupters may interfere with these processes to disturb male genital development during pregnancy. Similarly, hormonal dysregulation may lead to the formation of breast cancer in women and abnormal pubertal development in girls.'

The Prague Declaration has been signed by over 100 scientists to bring attention to this very serious environmental issue.

The BBC On-line News article, 10 July 2004, entitled: *Pollution 'changes sex of fish'*, states that, *'Hormones in the sewage, including those produced by the female contraceptive pill, are thought to be the main cause'* and that, *'A third of male fish in British rivers are in the process of changing sex due to pollution in human sewage, research by the Environment Agency suggests.'*

These reports show how the killing of children by abortion, contraception and sterilization lifestyles impacts on the environment and why **Sightsavers International** and other organisations should be working to oppose such environmental and human rights abuses.

16. Natural Family Planning is eco-friendly, woman-friendly, human-life-friendly

Contrary to popular myth contraception and sterilisation are ***not*** required for the number and spacing of children.

WOOMB International, the natural family planning organisation, in its statement to the United Nations in June 2001, states that,

*'Women have embraced the Billings method regardless of their socio-economic status, culture or religion. It is easily understood by all - the blind, the illiterate, those living in absolute poverty and those members of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups identified in the Habitat Agenda. There is no cost to health or purse in the teaching or practice of this natural, **eco-friendly** method. Women and governments are free of the costly complications of contraception.'*

Contraceptives treat women's natural menstrual cycle as if it is a disease to be prevented by attacking her body with carcinogenic environmentally destructive chemicals. However, natural family planning is eco-friendly, woman-friendly and does not destroy a human life.

United for Life urges **Sightsavers International** and other organisations to embrace WOOMB's eco-friendly outlook on human life which is in keeping with the environmental claim of Friends of the Earth to *'...make life better for people.'*

For further information on how natural family planning helps people to live with nature view our website links: WOOMB, NAOMI, Billings Ovulation Method, The London Center for NaPro Technology & FCCA - NaProTECHNOLOGY®.

17. A sliding scale of 'human value' violates human rights

Concern over the 'policy of killing children by abortion' of some charities, human rights and even by some Christian organisations, is demonstrated by the following.

According to the Methodist Church 2005 Conference reply to a question on lowering the number of weeks when the killing of children by abortion can be carried out, they state that,

'...A Methodist Statement on Abortion (1976) and the Conference report of 1990 on "The Status of the Unborn Human" both affirmed that there is never any moment from conception onwards when the foetus totally lack human significance. However the degree of this significance manifestly increases through the pregnancy.'

The basic principle of human rights law is that the law protects the weak from the aggression of the strong. It must protect the innocent and vulnerable from exploitation of any kind. The weaker and more vulnerable a human being is the **more** protection they require. They don't require 'more rights' for we all have equal rights, but they do require **more** protection.

The concept of degrees of human significance is alien to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and contradicts it directly since basic human rights are '*universal*', that is, they are for '*all members of the human family*' which include the unborn. Article 7 of the UDHR's states that, '*All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law.*'

The Methodist Church 2005 Conference reply continues,

'The belief that humans are made in God's image make abortion on "demand" unpalatable, however the obligations of love require that the needs of the pregnant woman are also recognised. It was the result of this that the Methodist Conference supported the legislation of abortion in certain circumstances.'

Loving our neighbour (*the mother*) includes loving our *unborn* neighbour. Mother Teresa once said, *'Abortion stops a mother learning how to love.'* The truth is that loving women does not mean killing their children and United for Life urges **Sightsavers International** and other organisations to oppose the killing children by abortion.

18. Poverty, abortion and the Millennium Development Goals

Sightsavers International and other organisations need to be aware that United Nations bodies and many non-governmental organisations (NGOs) advocate and support the killing of children by abortion in what United for Life has shown to be a violation of the UDHRs and the CRC's as outlined above. The human rights organisation C-FAM works to expose what is happening at the United Nations on issues such as population, development and the environment reporting on these regularly in their 'Friday Fax'. Media organisations such as LifeSiteNews and WorldNetDaily also provide regular updates. WorldNetDaily reported on United for Life's *Make Abortion History* campaign which they titled: *'Make Abortion History' challenges U.N. - Group combats 'Make Poverty History' effort pushing population control'* .

In reply to United for Life's Second Make Abortion History Letter, 10/10/05, the Methodist Church claimed that, *'As members of the Make Poverty History Coalition, it would be inappropriate for us [the Methodist Church] to be associated with a campaign heading that takes this brand to raise a single issue, and ...hoped that United for Life would reconsider its use of the 'Make Abortion History' slogan.'*

However, the Make Poverty History slogan is the working name for the United Nations Millennium Project in the UK for which the UN's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were developed and to which all are invited to make their contribution whatever their field of work. In C-FAM's report entitled: *UN Excludes Pro-Life Groups from Important UN Meeting*, they show that some very well known non-governmental organisations (NGOs) clubbed together at the United Nations funded by a number of national governments to pressurise the United Nations into accepting (*the killing of children by*) abortion as part of the MDGs.

According to a C-FAM report entitled: *UN Steps Up Vigorous Call for Universal Access to Abortion*, the UN Secretary-General himself called for 'reproductive health services' to be included in the Millennium Development Goals. It was claimed by the NGOs that poverty could not be eradicated unless (*the killing of children by*) abortion was made accessible to all. C-FAM claims that, *'In UN parlance, sexual and reproductive services refer to abortion'* .

The pro-life organisation SPUC (Society for the Protection of Unborn Children) has produced a very important paper entitled: *The International Finance Facility, the Millennium Goals and Abortion*, in which they claim that the World Health Organisation *'defines the term 'reproductive health' to include abortion on demand'* and that *'maternal health' can and would almost certainly include reproductive health.'*

The SPUC document exposes a number of organisations as working to ensure that the killing of children by abortion is incorporated in the Millennium Development Goals including the Department for International Development (DfID), International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), International Women's Health Coalition (IWHC), UN Division for the Advancement of Women (UNDAW), UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), Safe Motherhood Inter-Agency Group, International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), and the European Union.

LifeSiteNews reports that UNFPA is '*pitching abortion as a means to reduce child poverty*' at the UN's annual economic meeting.

In the opening paragraph of United for Life's Make Abortion History campaign we claimed that,

'We need to remind ourselves that the 'right to life' is the fundamental right upon which all other rights are based. The right to education, food, health care, clean water or housing for instance, are meaningless if there is no 'right to life'. To make poverty history we have to realise that the nations with legalised abortion are the poorest of nations.'

Together with international campaigner for the world's poor and Nobel Peace Prize winner, Mother Teresa, we stated that,

The great destroyer of peace in the world today is the crime against the unborn child.'

Child-poverty is addressed by the Millennium Development Goals. Child-poverty includes child-abuse. The ultimate form of child-abuse is the killing of children. In an abortion a child is torn apart and thrown away. It is right therefore that United for Life should claim that to make poverty history, we must make abortion history. In fact the campaign name 'Make Abortion History' has a much earlier history in the pro-life movement itself. In 1996, a well known pro-life book was published entitled: '*Make Abortion Rare*'. However, although well received the reaction of at least some pro-lifers was, '*I don't want to make abortion rare, I want to make abortion history*', and this is what pro-lifers have been working for ever since the killing of children by abortion was legalised.

19. The G8 Summit 'Force Abortion on Africa'

The G8 Summit held at Glen Eagles, Scotland in June 2005, was lobbied hard by the Make Poverty History campaign and yet one of the results of the G8 Summit was to force the killing of children by abortion on African nations. *LifeSiteNews* produced an important report on the Glen Eagles Summit entitled: *G8 Summit Push to Force Abortion on Africa*, in which it claims that the G8 working document '*...encourages aid being made conditional on Africans accepting abortion.*'

20. Parents Right's and the killing of children by abortion

Acknowledging yet again that the Convention on the Rights of the Child proclaims that the child needs special '*...legal protection both **before** as well as after birth*', it should be noted that the Declaration on the Rights of the Child '*...calls upon **parents**, upon men and women as individuals, and upon voluntary organisations, local authorities and national Governments to recognise these rights and strive for their observance.*'

Further the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is clear on the rights of parents. Article 26 (3) states,

'Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.'

Parents clearly have an obligation to protect children both before as well as after birth. Parents also have the '*prior right*' in the '*kind*' of education that their children shall receive. This includes the education of their teenage children. However, parents right's are seriously threatened and undermined by the State in the arrangements that the State makes for the law, for schools, for youth leaders and social workers, doctors, nurses and others, where the ideology of removing from parents their right to bring up their children as they see fit, is promoted. In addition to the promotion of contraception, abortion and explicit sex education both in schools and elsewhere, there has been a

great effort to remove parental rights in this area of their children's lives in order to promote even greater use of contraception, the killing of children by abortion and sex education.

It should be noted that the removal of parents right's is specifically aimed at issues of sexuality, sex education and disciplinary activity reinforced by issues of confidentiality. The excuse often used is that, 'parents do not have the right to know' or, 'do not care enough', or 'do not understand their own children', and should not have responsibility for this area of their children's lives. Recent court cases have re-emphasised this stance. The present system, in Britain at least, does not trust the parents in this area of their children's lives.

In his book, *Lessons in Depravity*, Dr ES Williams states that, *'If the purpose of sex education has been to protect young people against the damaging consequences of sexual activity, then it has been a spectacular failure. However, if the real purpose of sex education has been to promote the sexual revolution, as I argue in this book, then it has been remarkably successful.'* Under the section Parental Responsibility he continues, *'...it is the responsibility of parents, Christian and non-Christian alike, to teach their children a moral framework on which to build their lives ...those children who have been taught about chastity and self-control gain no benefit from being told about contraceptive techniques and how to 'be prepared' for sex.'*

21. Defending human rights equally

United for Life has already demonstrated that it is a basic principle of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that, regardless of remit, *'every individual and every organ of society'* is required to promote human rights equally. This is confirmed by the UN Special Representative of the Secretary General on Human Rights Defenders, in his information entitled: *About Human Rights Defenders*, in which he states that,

'Human rights defenders must accept the universality of human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A person cannot deny some human rights and yet claim to be a human rights defender because he or she is an advocate for others. For example, it would not be acceptable to defend the human rights of men but to deny that women have equal rights.'

In an e-mail to United for Life someone claimed that, *'Women's reproductive rights are also a human rights issue, and if the two are in opposition then I support the rights of the sentient being, the woman, above one which is only potentially sentient.'*

United for Life's reply was that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights declares these rights *'...for all members of the human family.'* Clearly the unborn are members of the human family. Regarding the rights of the mother and the rights of the unborn the e-mailer claimed that the *'two are in opposition'*. However, the concept of the *'two are in opposition'* is alien to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and contradicts it directly since basic human rights are *'universal'*, that is, they are for *'all members of the human family'*, which include the unborn. The first line of the Universal Declaration declares these rights as *'equal'* We hold these rights 'equally', not in opposition with each other. There is no such thing as 'opposing rights' in the Declaration since they are 'equal rights.'

Article 7 of the UDHR's states that, *'All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law'*, and Article 6 declares, *'Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.'*

The definition of a human rights defender as provided by the UN Special Representative of the Secretary General means that it would not be acceptable to defend the human rights of women but to deny that the unborn, including human embryos, have equal rights. For human rights to be applied correctly and equally as proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and by the Convention on the Rights of the Child, men and women as well as **Sightsavers International**, must defend the right to life of the unborn, including the right to life of embryonic children.

22. True liberty - what is it?

United for Life does not endorse any political party. The notion of liberty is a factor of most if not all political parties in democratic countries. The Libertarian Party, founded in 1971, is the third largest political party in the United States. It may come as a surprise to many who consider themselves liberal but an organisation called Libertarians For Life shows how (*the killing of children by*) abortion is not only a violation of liberty but that (*the killing of children by*) abortion is in fact a threat to liberty itself. Their document entitled: '*Abortion and rights; applying libertarian principles correctly*', skilfully undermines any notion or argument that liberty requires the killing of children by abortion.

23. Conclusion

United for Life believes that it has demonstrated to **Sightsavers International** and other organisations that the killing of children by abortion, contraception, human embryo experimentation, IVF, human cloning and other related activities, violates the right to life of the unborn, violates international human rights instruments, are modern forms of slavery and destroy the environment, and should therefore be addressed by national and international human rights programmes and campaigns.

We therefore ask **Sightsavers International** whether or not they are committed to implementing *in full* the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child *in regard to the unborn*, which states that, '*...the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth.*'?

We await your considered response.

Yours faithfully

Chris Mason (Mr)
Co-ordinator
United for Life
www.unitedforlife.com
info@unitedforlife.com

Enc

United for Life's 'Make Abortion History' Commitments - 2006

The commitments we want from charities and others

United for Life has written to a large list of charities, organisations and government bodies to urge them to make abortion history. United for Life also urge them to ensure that their partner-organisations and any programmes which they or their partner-organisations support, make abortion history by making the following commitments:

1. to oppose all forms of abortion
2. to separate international, governmental and NGO aid, including health aid, from being given on condition that [recipients](#)** accept forced or coercive abortion, sterilisation or contraception (***recipients: including governments and individuals*)
3. to promote, support and fund natural family planning as authorised by the official NFP authorities such as [WOOMB](#) and [FertilityCare.org](#)
4. to have a department or section within the charity, organisation or government body dedicated to opposing all forms of abortion
5. to produce a policy document committing the charity or organisation to oppose all forms of abortion
6. to oppose all forms of pro-abortion legislation
7. to remove the term '[reproductive health](#)'*** and '[reproductive rights](#)'*** from all documents, policy and practice if 'reproductive health' or 'reproductive rights' means and/or includes abortion, sterilisation or contraception
8. to lobby governments to withhold funding of UNFPA and IPPF and other population control organisations on the grounds that they fund abortion activities
9. to oppose any method of contraception which works by preventing a tiny human life from implanting in their mother's womb, ie the Pill, IUD, Norplant, morning-after-pill, Depo Provera et al
10. to ensure that in financial and economic terms human lives, from [conception](#)**** to natural death are not considered as 'burdens' or 'commodities' but as 'potential customers' of goods and services with the right to life

We call upon all charities, organisations and government bodies to protect men, women and children from all forms of abortion.

** recipients: including governments and individuals.

*** Western countries and their organisations, now referred to as '*The North*', have exported abortion, sterilisation and contraception to the poorest of the world, often coercively linked to aid and under the guise of 'reproductive health' or 'reproductive rights' where untold numbers of tiny humans have been killed by abortion, and where thousands of adults have been sterilised, but where records are not as diligently kept as in more developed countries

**** Conception is when a human sperm fertilises a human ovum.