

Submission
No 10

**INQUIRY INTO REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CARE
REFORM BILL 2019**

Organisation: Name suppressed

Date Received: 12 August 2019

Partially
Confidential

12 August 2019

The Chair
Reproductive Rights Bill Committee
NSW Legislative Assembly
Parliament House
Macquarie Street Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

RE: Reproductive Rights Bill 2019

Dear Sir,

As an organisation we recognise that the freedoms that Australians enjoy as citizens of a liberal, capitalist state are those provided to us on the basis of the Judeo-Christian values which underpin Western society.

I want to present to this committee in unemotive terms some facts that are incontestable that are relevant to the current debate. More focus on facts and less on emotion seems like a good approach to the current highly charged debate.

Firstly, the idea of taking human life without legal sanction, particularly of children, is not new. In pre Christian times the taking of human life, particularly child sacrifice, was commonly practiced across several cultures.

Secondly, the sanctity of life is a uniquely Christian concept, based on the belief that life was created by God and cannot be taken by man except under circumstances approved by Him. The current protection of unborn children and the inclusion of abortion in the Crimes Act in NSW is linked to our past Judeo-Christian heritage.

200 years ago, before the ideas of Charles Darwin regarding human evolution became widespread, the idea of a women's right to abortion was inconceivable. All life was sacred and started at conception. The reason was that life was an invention of God. DNA, the basis of all life, was designed by him and cannot be interfered with without his permission

Thirdly, with the widespread adoption of a belief in human evolution, as published by Charles Darwin. came the idea that there is no creator of life and therefore that man has the right to make such decisions around human life.

Eventually these ideas crept into our legal system and there began a movement which began to replace Judeo Christian ethics with an ethics system based on humanism and the idea that there is no God.

Fourthly, as a result of scientific breakthroughs of the early 21st Century associated with Intelligent Design, the understanding of cellular design, and the advances in our understanding of DNA, the ideas of Charles Darwin and human evolution were discredited. So complete was this rebuttal of human evolution that the immediate past universal head of Atheism, Antony Flew, when presented with the evidence of Intelligent Design declared that indeed it was likely there was a God. He eventually became a Christian and wrote a book about it. *“There Is a God: How the World’s Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind,” published in 2007”*.

“Antony Flew, an English philosopher and outspoken [atheist](#) who stunned and dismayed the unbelieving faithful when he announced in 2004 that God probably did exist...

Mr. Flew, the son of a Methodist minister, embraced atheism as a teenager. “It just seemed flatly inconsistent to say that the universe was created by an omnipotent and perfectly good being,” he told The Sunday Times of London in 2004. “Yet there were evils in abundance which could not be put down to a consequence of human sin.” ...

In 2004, however, he announced on a DVD titled “Has Science Discovered God?” that research on DNA and what he believed to be inconsistencies in the Darwinian account of evolution had forced him to reconsider his views. DNA research, he said, “has shown, by the almost unbelievable complexity of the arrangements which are needed to produce life, that intelligence must have been involved.”

In “There Is a God” he explained that he now believed in a supreme intelligence, removed from human affairs but responsible for the intricate workings of the universe. In other words, the divine watchmaker imagined by deists like Isaac Newton, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin.

In a letter to The Sunday Telegraph of London in 2004, he described “the God in whose existence I have belatedly come to believe” as “most emphatically not the eternally rewarding and eternally torturing God of either Christianity or Islam but the God of Aristotle that he would have defined — had Aristotle actually produced a definition of his (and my) God — as the first initiating and sustaining cause of the universe.”

New York Times, APRIL 16, 2010

(<https://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/17/arts/17flew.html>)

The current head of universal atheism, Richard Dawkins, was presented with the same evidence as Antony Flew, and while refusing to admit there was a God, did concede no one knows how life started. He suggested that life was probably started by an advanced alien civilization bringing life to Earth.

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BoncJBrrdQ8>.)

These facts are a matter of either established history, in respect to one and two, and current public record in respect of three and four. Clearly people have different views around the sanctity of human life and have done so since the beginning of time. Some debate is therefore required in a democracy, especially around such an important topic.

Our main reason for making this submission is that the world's three major Semitic religions, which together encompass over 55% of the world's population, each maintain injunctions against the taking of life, including unborn human life. This fact that a majority of the world's population still believe in the existence of a God who created life and provided rules by which protect human life mean that extensive consultation is warranted when making any changes in this area. The current bill has been rushed with minimal, if any meaningful public consultation.

One significant area of concern is that this bill will inevitably lead to pressure on individual doctors to refer or perform abortions against their conscience and belief. It will also almost certainly lead to pressure to perform abortions in hospitals and medical centres built and owned by Christian investors. In the longer term we fear it will lead to the creation of a society with no or little respect for human life except for its utility.

We encourage this committee to embrace reforms which will strengthen our society's understanding and respect for our cultural and spiritual foundations and reject this bill until a full and proper public consultation process is undertaken. The speed of its passage through this parliament and the lack of community consultation will leave Parliamentarians open to accusations of enabling reforms that could put our civilization in peril.