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# Scholarly Response to (Followed by Logical Analysis of) the United Nations' Human Rights Committee's revised draft "General comment No. 36 on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the right to life,"

# Prepared by the Non-Governmental Educational Organization *Human Rights and Freedoms Forever!*

(Utilizing quotations from the new book *DEMOCRACY 101: A Voter’s and Politician’s Manual for LASTING Democracy*, by William Baptiste, Founder and Director of *Human Rights and Freedoms Forever!* <https://www.createspace.com/7000249>*)*

The United Nations has asked both governmental and Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) to provide their feedback or commentary on this Draft, which has very weighty political consequences for the whole world of humanity, because it represents changes to International Law regarding the *human right to life* itself, changes which, if this draft is adopted, will be binding on all the very many countries which have already signed the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. No change to such binding legislation concerning something as vital as the human right to life should be undertaken lightly, and most certainly, these proposed changes must be subjected to scrutiny against the high standards of science and logic, and must be mindful of the history of Human Rights, and mindful of the UN's own history in which it helped to wonderfully establish Human Rights worldwide with the magnificent 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights.*

*Human Rights and Freedoms Forever!* is a new non-profit educational NGO which exists to educate the world's citizens in the historical and logical foundations underlying all Human Rights and democratic freedoms, to make sure they last forever on the firm historical, scientific and logical foundations they were built on and need to last long-term, against certain disturbing trends of 'Creeping Totalitarianism' in which many of today's politicians are actually (if unwittingly) following totalitarian Soviet and Nazi precedents and in their simple ignorance of key elements of Human Rights history, science, and logic, are unwittingly dismantling democracy from its foundations (still being voted into office because voters also simply lack education in democracy's foundations).

Having worked for academic libraries while doing formal studies up to the Ph.D. level, having access to a vast easily searchable scholar's electronic library with millions of pages of scholarly reference works including hundreds of thousands of pages of primary historical documents, and having been professor of a university course covering the First Millennium, during which time these foundations were laid, the founder has for years been examining the history of Western thought and has used his genius-level intelligence to discern from the vast tangled webs of historical details the "golden threads" woven throughout history, starting in the 4th Century, which ultimately by logical development gave us our modern Human Rights and modern democracy (the principles laid in the 4th Century ultimately coming to maturity and culminating in the magnificent 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, which is the astounding achievement of the United Nations in its formative years). He has thus identified from Human Rights history, the biological science of human life, and the Formal Science of Logic (which he has also taught), just what are ***The Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy***, which must be vigilantly maintained without compromise for *lasting* democracy worldwide. The founder has also identified the trends in Western thought since the late 18th Century which also in a logical development have ultimately come to a head in recent trends of 'Creeping Totalitarianism' undermining democracy's foundations. All of these are detailed in the founder's new book *DEMOCRACY 101: A Voter's and Politicians Manual for LASTING Democracy* (<https://www.createspace.com/7000249> ; or e-mail democracystore@yahoo.com for information)

*DEMOCRACY 101* was crafted in accordance with a great familiarity with and huge respect for the UN’s 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in its original 1948 context which does much to clarify its intended meaning. What follows is first a selection of excerpts from DEMOCRACY 101, followed by a logical analysis of the UN’s proposed draft "General comment No. 36 on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the right to life," in the light of the Human Rights history, biological science of human life, and the Science of Logic, as laid out in those excerpts from DEMOCRACY 101.

Considering this below logical analysis, in the view of *Human Rights and Freedoms Forever!*, the UN’s proposed draft "General comment No. 36” shows a distinct lack of logical consistency, mixing together wonderful statements in keeping with both the spirit and the letter of the 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* with unwitting elements of the disturbing current trend of 'Creeping Totalitarianism.’ Moreover, one will note that when one reads a certain article of the UN’s proposed draft changes to International Law *after* reading the excerpt on The Testimony of the Science of Logic, it is extremely easy to see that the UN’s draft in that article commits nearly all of the logical fallacies described therein, and thus is simply invalid and unsound. So, to save the integrity and the reputation of the United Nations, *Human Rights and Freedoms Forever!* recommends that the proposed "General comment No. 36 on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the right to life," must either be abandoned or else must not be adopted by the UN unless these latter elements ultimately destructive to lasting Human Rights and democratic freedoms are purged from the final draft.

Thus, *Human Rights and Freedoms Forever!* offers for the Human Rights Committee’s consideration the following excerpts from DEMOCRACY 101’s *Pledge* **Articles 1-5, 13, 14, and 42**, followed by a logical analysis of the Committee’s revised draft in the light of these Articles.

**Beginning of Excerpts from DEMOCRACY 101: A Voter’s and Politician’s Manual for LASTING Democracy (**<https://www.createspace.com/7000249>)**:**

**DEMOCRACY 101’s Document 2 (Central Document) THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO DEMOCRACY (and The Antidote to Any Degree of *Creeping Totalitarianism*)**

© 2017 William Baptiste, Founder and Director, *Human Rights and Freedoms Forever!*

**From:**

**PLEDGE PART I (Articles 1-12):** *The Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy* and *The Core Principles of Lasting Democracy*

# *Pledge* Article 1:

## I Pledge Allegiance to Democracy and its Foundations

I pledge allegiance to Democracy, and to the implicit foundational principles on which Democracy is historically and logically built and which it needs to explicitly restore in order to survive currently escalating 21st Century worldwide trends of ‘Creeping Totalitarianism’ and last long-term (I pledge allegiance to ***The First Principles of Democracy*** or ***The Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy***)

# *Pledge* Article 2:

##  FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY #1

## (In Brief: Every Human Life without Exception is EQUAL and PRECIOUS)

**Every human life without exception, without discrimination and “without distinction of any kind” is *SUPREMELY* and *EQUALLY* valuable and precious, *OBLIGATING* governments to protect and serve *ALL* precious humans who have “inherent . . . equal and inalienable [human] rights,”** which is the only reason governments stopped exploiting, enslaving and killing humans and eventually started giving every human a democratic vote or say in his or her own governance in the first place (Note that the first quoted phrase is from Article 2 of the 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights;* the second quoted phrase is from the first sentence of the formal *Preamble* of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* which begins by declaring an essentially similar truth to **Foundational Principle of Human Rights and Democracy #1** in the different words: “recognition of the *inherent* dignity and of the *equal* and *inalienable* rights of *all* members of the *human family* is the *foundation* of freedom, justice and peace in the world”); and I recognize . . .

# *Pledge* Article 3:

##  The Inherent Human Right to Live

Because of this *intrinsic* human preciousness each human without exception has ***Human Rights*** beginning with ***the Inherent Human Right to Live***, the necessary foundation of all other Human Rights without which “Human Rights” is a meaningless term, and

# *Pledge* Article 4:

## CORE PRINCIPLE OF LASTING DEMOCRACY #1

## (In Brief: Lasting Democracy Requires Uncompromising Legal Recognition of the *Inherent Human Right to Live*)

This means *killing humans is intrinsically wrong*and thus no government has legitimate authority to kill either its own or another government’s human citizens/subjects, nor to legally allow human lives wherever they are to be killed for any reason except in extreme cases when necessary in the defence and protection of always-precious human lives from criminals or aggressors (see Pledge Article 9). No government has legitimate authority to legally *devalue* any human lives it exerts power over, which always precedes grave injustice and the compromise or loss of Democracy, as happens whenever some humans are legally denied human *personhood* or full citizenship so they may be legally enslaved or legally killed or otherwise legally denied the full equal *Human Rights* which logically must *intrinsically* inhere in *every* human life or else they *intrinsically* inhere in *no* human life (in which case there would be no inherent superiority of free democracy over oppressive totalitarianism which does not recognize nor respect Human Rights). Thus, I recognize the **CORE** **PRINCIPLE OF LASTING DEMOCRACY #1: Lasting Democracy requires full and uncompromising legal recognition of *The Inherent Human Right to Live* and the traditional Western belief expressed in the simple maxim *killing humans is wrong*, because *Human Rights are for All Humans* or else they are meaningless** (if being human is not enough to have them).

# *Pledge* Article 5:

##  FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY #2

## (In Brief: Every Human Must be FREE from Government Coercion in Matters of Belief So They Can Without Impediment Learn the EQUAL HUMAN PRECIOUSNESS that Grounds Human Rights and Democracy)

(Following logically from Principle #1)**:**  That *because* every human life without exception is precious **every human life without exception must be FREE from all government coercion in matters of belief (they must have *freedom of thought*; *freedom of religion*) so that they may without impediment *FREELY* seek and find this wonderful Truth foundational to Democracy, that their human lives are *supremely* and *equally* valuable and precious** (without government interference; without government telling or teaching the humans governed any differently; and without government treating humans any differently, in violation of their *Human Rights*).

I recognize these two foundational principles together are the implicit underlying *First Principles* or logical starting point of both Human Rights and Democracy as we know them(As described in PLEDGE PART II below, the essence of these here-maturely-articulated principles was first adopted by the West in the 4th Century when the *Inherent Human Right to Live* was first legally protected by the government starting in 318 AD; I recognize these principles slowly but logically developed over the centuries into modern Human Rights and were at least implicitly assumed at the formation of all of our modern democracies). I recognize that although the term “Human Rights” entered the language in the 1940s, culminating in the newly-formed United Nations’ 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, the essential concept of Human Rights in *equal human preciousness which must be protected* enters Western history dramatically in the early 4th Century, marked by the essential *Inherent Human Right to Live* being first protected in law precisely 1630 years earlier, in 318 AD.

I recognize that these *Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy*, when recognized and taught to citizens, guarantee Lasting Democracy and make governmental totalitarianism *unthinkable* in a way *nothing else can*.

. . .

**From:**

**PLEDGE PART II** **(Articles 13-45):** The Scientific and Historical Facts Underlying and Logically Undergirding All Western Human Rights and Democratic Freedoms; The Current Worldwide Reality of ‘Creeping Totalitarianism’ Due to Widespread Uneducated Ignorance of These Facts; The “Three Wrong Turns” on Western Civilization’s Path Which Have Brought the West into the Current ‘Creeping Totalitarianism’ Now (in varying degrees in different countries) Threatening Human Life, Religious Freedom, and Democracy Itself Worldwide

# *Pledge* Article 13:

## The Testimony of the Science of Human Life

I recognize that the Science of Biology confirms beyond dispute that any human life is the same unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle from zygote (fertilized egg) to senior adult, and regardless of any disorder or disability (genetic or acquired) they suffer, and *thus there is no scientific justification to deny legal human personhood to nor to legally allow the killing of* humans who suffer any particular handicap or medical condition or who are at any particular age and stage of their human life-cycle (senior adult; adult; adolescent/ teenager; child; toddler; baby; newborn; fetus (Latin for "little one," that is, “little human;” embryo; zygote/fertilized egg) and *any attempt to do so falls under the above category of legally devaluing human lives (removing the government’s obligation to always protect human lives)* which in history always precedes grave injustice and the loss of Democracy/beginning of Totalitarianism *because it legally denies the intrinsic human preciousness and the Inherent Human Right to Live* which is the implicit historical and logical foundation of Democracy. Lasting Democracy requires that where a human life exists he or she is so precious that the State/government is always *obligated* to protect and serve his or her precious human life, and *every oppressive and totalitarian State denies this principle and finds excuses to legally kill humans or to legally allow humans to be killed*. I recognize that all of the excuses and “arguments” used to “justify” the legal killing of humans, which violates the above simple maxim that *killing humans is wrong,* by *de-criminalized* legal abortion or *de-criminalized* legal euthanasia, are fantastically short-sighted, grossly ignorant of the history and the logic of Western thought which gave us Human Rights and Freedoms in the first place, and worst of all are *fundamentally anti-human* and *fundamentally anti-democratic* because they eradicate the legally recognized *Inherent Human Right to Live* (legally recognized since the 318 AD *criminalization* of human-killing abortion) on which all Human Rights and Democracy historically and logically depend and thus legal human-killing abortion and legal human-killing euthanasia eradicate any government’s fundamental *obligation* to protect and serve human lives *just as surely as in any Totalitarian State*. In fact, I recognize (as Pledge Article 14 on the Science of Logic will indicate), that ALL of the arguments proposed so far for the legal abortion-killing of preborn humans fall into the category of what the Science of Logic calls *Fallacies of Distraction*, which in intellectual dishonesty DISTRACT from the key vital question and AVOID asking or answering the truly most pertinent question at the core of the abortion debate, “do humans have human rights or not.” Indeed, it is no mere coincidence but by a simple logical progression that the two Totalitarian States responsible for the two biggest genocides of humans in history, the 1932-33 *Holodomor* (Soviet forced starvation of 7-10 million Ukrainian humans) and the *Holocaust* (Nazi extermination of 6 million Jewish humans plus handicapped and other humans), before they committed mass-murder of millions of adult humans were *the first two modern nations to de-criminalize human-killing abortion* which had been outlawed by law or custom since 318 AD (Soviet Russia in 1920 and Nazi Germany in 1934). *De-criminalized abortion* had already established in the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany that there was NO LONGER any legally recognized *Inherent Human Right to Live* protected by law, and our current Western democracies have foolishly followed this precedent of Totalitarian States (and introduced *Creeping Totalitarianism* into Western democracies) by similarly de-criminalizing abortion which similarly removes any government *obligation* to always protect and serve human lives.

I recognize that the “Pro-Choice” parental “right to choose” to either raise one’s child or to legally kill him or her by abortion is not new, only the name is new. Before the 4th Century it was NORMAL for parents to legally choose to kill their unwanted human children by abortion (or infanticide – which some of today’s “Pro-Choice” philosophers similarly advocate for, calling it “after-birth abortion”). It was also NORMAL for governments to legally enslave or kill their human citizens at will, for exactly the same underlying reason – THERE WERE NO LEGALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS, including no legally recognized *Inherent Human Right to Live*, the most basic Human Right without which all others are meaningless. Governments felt no necessary obligation to either protect or serve human lives for exactly the same reason that parents felt no obligation to necessarily raise their children but could “choose” to kill them by abortion – human life was considered *cheap not precious*. Parents could sell their children into slavery or abort them because there were *no recognized Human Rights*. I recognize that the “Pro-Life” principle that every human life without exception is not cheap but precious, and equally precious, such that governments are obligated to protect all human lives, is also not new but ancient (only the name is new), a specifically Christian principle which the West first adopted in 318 AD, only five years after Christianity was legalized (and ceased to be brutally persecuted by the brutal ancient mindset Christianity gradually replaced) in 313 AD. This Christian, “Pro-Life” principle was first given practical expression when for the first time the *Inherent Human Right to Live* became legally recognized and protected by law with the 318 AD *criminalization of abortion and infanticide* specifically because human life was no longer considered cheap, to serve the greater State, but from now on precious, and the State was since then obligated to protect precious human lives from the womb (who then became known as precious *persons* – the very word and concept of *personhood* is rooted in the Christian doctrine of the One God in Three *Persons* who lovingly made humanity “in God’s Image.” So as long as *any* humans have been called “persons,” *preborn* humans have been called “persons” – with legally recognized Human Rights). This “Pro-Human-Right-to-Live” or “Pro-Life” principle gradually changed the whole way humans were governed. Before this, Western governments were judged by their civic accomplishments, often on the backs of their cheap human subjects (1/3 of whom were slaves). After this, Western governments were judged by how well or poorly they treated the precious human *persons* (from the womb) they ruled.

I recognize that generally speaking in the West, since the 318 AD *criminalization of abortion and infanticide* human life was protected in the womb by either law or custom *because* it was generally recognized that *killing humans is wrong*, until the oppressive Soviet and Nazi regimes first de-criminalized abortion in the 20th Century. It is true that *antiquated* science which mistakenly held for centuries that human life began at "the quickening," which science now knows is only when the *new unique human individual living biological organism (like YOU)* who began at conception is *big enough* that his or her mother can *feel* him or her moving, did however mean that *early term* abortions might be *tolerated* or not pursued as crimes. But in these cases, the principle that *killing humans is wrong* still applied, and only *antique* and *incorrect* science, which for most of history knew nothing of microscopic sperm or ova or of the new, unique living human embryos formed by their joining (with absolutely unique human DNA, like YOU when you were that age), allowed the occasional killing of preborn humans. The 19th Century formal legal criminalizations of abortion *before* or after "the quickening," were based on a *more accurate Science of Human Life*, and merely *affirmed the long custom of protecting human life in the womb* on the principle that *killing humans is wrong,* in or out of the womb, that had been *normative* since the original 318 AD criminalization of abortion *because* human life then started to be recognized as *precious not cheap thus governments are always obligated to protect precious human lives*.

I recognize that history’s worst derogation from the governmental obligation to protect human lives happened during the Second World War (1939-1945), and that in the aftermath of that most terrible of wars, three important things happened in 1948 specifically intending to make sure anything like the de-humanizing Nazi atrocities that denied Human Rights to some humans *never threatened Democracy and Human Rights again*, three things which specifically restored and affirmed the long Western custom since the original 318 AD criminalization of abortion of protecting preborn human lives still in the womb:

1. The Nuremberg War Crimes Trials condemned the Nazis for *Legal Abortion they encouraged mothers to ask for*, describing Legal Abortion as “an inhumane act,” an “act of extermination” and a “crime against humanity” because
2. (as the newly-formed UN’s *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* declared the same year) Human Rights are for ALL humans “without distinction of any kind” because “recognition of the *inherent* dignity and of the *equal* and *inalienable* rights of ALL members of the *human family* is the *foundation* of freedom, justice and peace in the world” (The first quoted phrase is from *Article 2*; the second quoted phrase is from the very first sentence of the *Preamble* of The 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Despite the unfortunate wording of Article 1 which reads “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights,” there is no reasonable, nor logical, nor legitimate way to interpret the whole text of the *Universal Declaration*, especially not in its 1948 historical context, as if it intended to exclude preborn humans from having any human rights so they could be legally aborted; if it did, it would mean human rights are neither “inherent,” “equal,” nor “inalienable” after all, and the whole *Declaration* is meaningless. It would absurdly mean preborn humans are somehow NOT members of the “human family” that has “inalienable rights,” and therefore none of us have “inherent” nor “inalienable” rights after all, since all of us started our human lives as preborn humans who could be legally killed by abortion. Pledge Article 42 below discusses in more detail how de-criminalized abortion is literally a betrayal of everything the 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* intended to accomplish to protect humanity from totalitarianism for the long-term; Pledge Article 14 below demonstrates that literally ALL of the arguments proposed to justify the legal abortion-killing of preborn humans violate principles of sound logic and are in fact what the Formal Science of Logic calls mere “fallacies of distraction” or other errors in logic).
3. The 1948 Declaration of Geneva, in response to the Nazis de-criminalizing both human-killing abortion and human-killing euthanasia in violation of the 2500-year Hippocratic Medical Tradition that *doctors do not kill patients*, similarly reaffirmed the Hippocratic Oath Tradition in the doctor’s promise, “I will maintain *the utmost respect for human life, from the time of conception*; even under threat, I will not use my medical knowledge contrary to the laws of humanity.”

I recognize that in 1948 the West knew *killing humans is wrong* (and that doctors do not kill patients) *because* humans have *inherent* Human Rights, and that at Nuremberg the West realized everyone has a human *responsibility* to *recognize* and *support* those rights in *other humans* or else totalitarianism and atrocities happen. While the Nazi atrocities which degraded and devalued human life in so many ways were still fresh in everyone’s minds, everyone recognized that *de-criminalized abortion and euthanasia*, which the Nazis would have *forcefully imposed* on the Free West if the *Nazis* had won World War II, were a consistently logical part of the whole anti-human Nazi approach to human life and so treated them as “crimes against humanity.” In any country where the equal precious value of every human life or equal “Human Rights for all humans” is not a *given* but considered a matter of “opinion” and “politics” rather than as *the very foundation of Human Rights and democracy which it is* – like in 1930s Germany concerning Jewish humans and like today concerning preborn humans – that country has already lost its democratic soul and (like in 1930s Germany) its democracy simply cannot last. *If you did not know this fact and you are “Pro-Choice” (that is, “Pro-Choice-to-Kill-Humans”), this fact alone should make you re-think your position for the long-term safety of all humanity.*

# *Pledge* Article 14:

## The Testimony of the Science of Logic

 (and the Current Widespread “Intellectophobia” Which Seeks to Enforce Currently Popular but Intellectually Indefensible Positions Against Democracy’s Traditional Foundations Through Intimidation Tactics and Political Pressure Shutting Down Intellectually Honest, Respectful, Rational, Scientific and Logical Debate Which the Holders of these Now-Popular Anti-Traditional Positions Would *Lose*)

NONE of the “Pro-Choice” arguments ever engage the simple and perfectly logically and scientifically sound syllogism: *All humans have Human Rights.  Preborn humans are humans. Therefore, preborn humans have Human Rights.* Instead, ALL OF THE TOP ARGUMENTS FOR THE DE-CRIMINALIZED ABORTION-KILLING OF HUMANS ARE INTELLECTUALLY DISHONEST USE OF WHAT THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC CALLS “FALLACIES OF DISTRACTION’

ALL of the top “Pro-Choice Abortion” arguments are calculated (with intellectual dishonesty) to AVOID and DISTRACT FROM ever asking or answering (or even thinking about) the MOST PERTINENT questions of the Abortion Debate, “do humans have Human Rights or not” and “are Human Rights for all humans or only for some humans.” This is because it is obvious that Lasting Human Rights and Free Democracy (without any human slavery) can only ever exist if the question “do humans have Human Rights or not” is answered “yes,” and if the question “are Human Rights for all humans or only for some humans” is answered “*Human Rights are for all humans*” (logically the term “Human Rights” is meaningless if it does not apply to all humans). In using their “top arguments” the way they do, “Pro-Choicers” not only do not prove their case for de-criminalized abortion; they prove that they do not know how to argue logically nor honestly at all.

“Pro-Choice” (that is, literally, *“Pro-Choice-to-Kill-Humans”*) Supporters of Abortion (literally, *Human-Killing Abortion*), Have Always Firmly Held the “Moral Low Ground” for Effectively Denying that *Killing Humans is Wrong*; and They are Now Exposed as Firmly Holding the “Intellectual Low Ground” As Well: The Only Reasons Anyone is Ever “Pro-Choice” is because They are Either 1) *Uneducated*; 2) *Unintelligent*; or 3) *Evil* (and Intellectually Dishonest). “Pro-Choice Abortion” Supporters can No Longer Pretend that Their Position is Remotely Intellectually Justifiable.

### *Pledge* Article 14-A

### The Most Perfectly Sound Logical Syllogism: *All Humans Have Human Rights. Preborn Humans are Humans. Therefore, Preborn Humans have Human Rights.*

I recognize that one perfect, valid, sound logical syllogism is:

All humans have Human Rights.

Preborn humans are humans.

Therefore, preborn humans have Human Rights.

In the science of Formal Logic, there are 256 “Forms of Syllogisms,” that is, 256 possible ways to arrange the elements of a logical syllogism, only a couple dozen of which yield a valid argument. The above syllogism has the form known as an “AAA-1” syllogism, which is the first of the relatively few valid forms of logical argumentation.

If any Pro-Choice politician or voter denies the first statement (the *major premise* in this *categorical syllogism* of *formal logic*), they place themselves in the category of all slave-owning or Nazi bigots and of every evil criminal who like them *denies that all humans have equal human rights* including the *Inherent Human Right to Live*. If any Pro-Choice politician or voter denies the second statement (the *minor premise* in this *categorical syllogism* of *formal logic*), then they place themselves in the category of the uneducated and ignorant and anti-scientific who like them do not even understand that preborn humans are human (did they fail science class from Grade 3 through high school and university?  Do they not understand the human life-cycle? Do they not understand if two humans have an offspring, the offspring is human - at any age?). If any Pro-Choice politician or voter denies the third statement (the *conclusion* of this *categorical syllogism* of *formal logic*), then they place themselves in the category of the unintelligent, illogical, or mentally deficient, who like them are incapable of following the perfect logic of this perfect, sound syllogism which reaches the perfectly logical and sound conclusion that preborn humans have human rights by reasoning soundly from sound premises. So the only possible reasons that anyone is ever ‘Pro-Choice’ is because they are either uneducated/ignorant; unintelligent/illogical; or selfish/evil (and intellectually dishonest). Every “Pro-Choicer” from now on has to ask themselves, "which one am I and do I really want to stay that way now that any human-rights-educated person can ask me the same embarrassing question?"

I recognize that to put a finer point on it, one should consider the following more detailed syllogism using the same valid logical form and yielding an equally sound logical conclusion:

All humans have *intrinsic human rights their government did not give them*.

Jewish, Black, and Preborn humans are humans.

Therefore, Jewish, Black, and Preborn humans have *intrinsic human rights their government did not give them*.

Anybody past or present who has denied Jewish humans, Black humans, or Preborn humans their *intrinsic human rights* or *equal human rights* with other humans is thinking and behaving illogically (and inconsistently, and with great bigotry).

Consider this expanded syllogism also using the same valid logical form as the above perfectly logical categorical syllogism:

All humans have *intrinsic human rights their government did not give them* (so government laws and policies which deny human rights to some humans must be opposed for the safety of all humanity).

Jewish, Black, and Preborn humans are humans.

Therefore, Jewish, Black, and Preborn humans have *intrinsic human rights their government did not give them* (so government laws and policies (*past or present*) which deny human rights to Jewish, Black, or Preborn humans must be opposed for the safety of all humanity.

*There is no valid nor reasonable way to reject the logic of these valid, sound syllogisms and approve of legal human-killing abortion without making yourself look silly and bigoted and intellectually dishonest, if not outright evil*, like all the slave-owners and Nazis and so on who also *deny human rights to some humans*. In fact, as discussed more below, ALL of the “arguments” proposed to “justify” de-criminalized abortion (which follows the totalitarian Soviet and Nazi precedent of de-criminalizing abortion which was *first criminalized* back in the 4th Century in the *first legal recognition of HUMAN RIGHTS*) fall under the category of what the Science of Logic calls “fallacies of distraction.” A “fallacy of distraction” is an argument that confuses and DISTRACTS FROM THE MAIN ISSUE by pointing to information that is actually irrelevant to the conclusion of the main issue, which in the abortion debate is the issue of HUMAN RIGHTS which start with THE INHERENT HUMAN RIGHT TO LIVE – an issue that is rationally settled with the valid and sound logical syllogism All humans have human rights.  Preborn humans are humans. Therefore, preborn humans have human rights (and therefore killing preborn humans by abortion violates their Human Rights – which should come as no surprise to anyone who accepts the traditional Western maxim that *killing humans is wrong*).

### *Pledge* Article 14-B

### Only Illegitimate Word-Play of the Ignorant and Bigoted Who Do Not Know the Meaning of Terms Tries to Justify Human-Killing by Pretending “Humans” are Not the Same as “Human Beings” or “Human Persons” *(Only bigots have ever admitted the indisputable scientific humanity of any group of humans (Black humans, Jewish humans, preborn humans etc.) without admitting their human personhood (and thus denying their equal Human Rights)*; Only Illegitimate Word-Play of the Ignorant and Bigoted Who Unscientifically Misuse Biological/Medical Terms Tries to Justify Human-Killing by Pretending that “Fetuses” and “Embryos” or “Pregnancies” to be “Terminated” are Not Humans (when scientifically speaking each such “pregnancy,” “embryo,” and “fetus” (just like YOU at their age) is *a unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle* from zygote (fertilized egg) to senior adult, and if they do not have an *inherent* Human Right to Live for being human, then logically neither do YOU, who began YOUR human life just like them, have an *inherent* Human Right to Live)

I recognize that only bigoted people who are ignorant of the history and meaning of the words “being” and “person” would even try to claim that despite being undisputedly human according to any scientific criteria, preborn humans are somehow not “human beings” or “human persons,” and that this mere word-play somehow “justifies” the abortion-killing of preborn humans. This is exactly what was claimed by bigoted people in the past (even in legal documents!) to justify denying equal Human Rights to Jewish humans, Black humans, Native Americans and female humans. *Only bigots have ever admitted the indisputable scientific humanity of any group of humans without admitting their human personhood* (and thus denying their *equal Human Rights*). Moreover, I recognize that in historical fact as long as *any* humans have been called *persons*, preborn humans have been called *persons,* with protected Human Rights in the womb by law or custom since the 4th Century (more on this term’s history below). The term “being” just means “existence,” and the “human existence” of a preborn human has never been in doubt. Preborn humans are human beings; they are certainly not feline beings (cats), canine beings (dogs), bovine beings (cows), nor elephantine beings (elephants), and only the ignorant and/or intellectually dishonest would use mere word-play to claim otherwise. “Pro-Choice abortion” advocates are just too uneducated to know that the terms “humans,” “human beings,” and “human persons,” by etymology, by history, and by logic, are synonymous terms – all three terms referring (scientifically speaking) to biological human lives during their natural human life-cycle, from conception to natural death – and there is no scientific basis to make the *distinction* between “precious and protected” humans or “valueless and legally killed” humans which Pro-Choicers make by not treating these terms as synonyms. Also note that by making any such *distinctions*, Pro-Choice abortion advocates are violating any sensible and logical (and historical) interpretation of *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* which clearly says in Article 2 the Human Rights it describes are for everyone (obviously, every *human*) *“without distinction of any kind”*).

I recognize that Pro-Choice abortion advocates (displaying the same level of ignorance of the meaning of words) also use mere word-play to justify killing humans as if calling a preborn human a “pregnancy” that can be “terminated” somehow justifies killing humans; or as if calling a preborn human a “fetus” somehow justifies killing humans. The scientific term “fetus” does not even tell us what *species* a life-form is, it only tells us what *age* it is – a fetus can be a cat fetus, a dog fetus, or an elephant fetus, and so on. So, in the context of the abortion debate, it is a grossly unscientific and an intellectually dishonest misuse of the term “fetus” to claim (as “Pro-Choice Abortion” proponents frequently do) that a “fetus” is somehow not human or somehow “less than human” (as Nazis claimed Jewish humans were “less than human”) and therefore the abortion of a fetus should be legal. This is illogical and ultimately nothing more than age-bigotry. It would be logical to rather say:

Killing humans is wrong.

Fetal-age humans are humans.

Therefore, abortion-killing fetal-age humans is wrong.

To be a *human* fetus is simply to be a human individual (like YOU) in a prenatal stage of the human life-cycle between the embryonic stage and birth (like YOU when YOU were that age). I also recognize that biological science makes no clear scientific distinction between an embryonic-age human (like YOU when YOU were that age) and a fetal-age human (like YOU when YOU were that age). Both the scientific terms “embryo” and “fetus” refer to an individual member of a vertebrate/mammal species in the stage of the lifecycle of their species before birth, but the term fetus generally implies an age in which the individual has developed to the point of a basic recognizability as a member of their particular species, without clearly defining just when this basic “recognizability” happens. I recognize this is significant because, as photographs of aborted human fetuses (aborted fetal-age humans), by showing the ugly truth of the abortion-killing of young humans (making it more easily recognizable as a *crime against humanity*) have made more people disinclined towards aborting their fetal-age human child, recently chemical abortions of embryonic-age humans have become more widespread.

It is unconscionable that several countries have recently approved medical use of the chemical so-called “abortion pill” one takes at home for several reasons, including the fact these chemical pill abortions are always painful and distressing for the mother taking them, and prone to complications where the mothers end up in hospital anyways, and some mothers have died from these complications (for this reason even some high-level abortion advocates have stated the “abortion pill” is not good for women). But most of all, of course, the intellectual objection to the recently increased use of chemical abortion-killing of embryonic-age prenatal stage humans to make up for the recent reduction in the surgical abortion-killing of fetal-age prenatal stage humans as more abortion clinics close due to increased EDUCATION in why abortion is a crime against humanity, is that it is only intellectual deficiency or dishonesty that makes people “feel better” about killing embryonic-age humans than about killing fetal-age humans – an intellectual cowardice that has nothing at all to do with science or logic which affirms that any human life is the same unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle. Scientifically YOU were the same individual human when YOU started YOUR HUMAN LIFE as a human zygote (fertilized egg); YOU grew into an embryonic-age human; then a fetal-age human; YOU became a newborn human (neonate) when YOU were finally born; YOU continued growing as baby human; YOU grew into a toddler-age human; a child-age human; a teenage human, and eventually become an adult human (and YOU will still be the same human when YOU are a senior-age human, if you are not already there).

Thus I recognize that only “age-bigots” who do not think scientifically nor logically would think that the abortion-killing of embryonic-age humans is any less *human-killing* than the abortion-killing of fetal-age humans (or than the war-killing or criminal-killing of toddler, teen, or adult-age humans); but I sadly also recognize that no-one is less used to thinking scientifically or logically than *Pro-Choice abortion advocates* or “Pro-Choicers,” as demonstrated by their own “top arguments” used to “justify” legal abortion, discussed below.

###

### *Pledge* Article 14-C

### “Pro-Choice Abortion” Advocates – The Masters of Logically Fallacious Thinking

I recognize that “Pro-Choicers” who approve of the abortion-killing of humans *for any reason* are “kings and queens” of the logical fallacies. First of all, NONE of the “Pro-Choice” arguments ever engage the simple and perfectly logical syllogism: *All humans have human rights.  Preborn humans are humans. Therefore, preborn humans have human rights.* ALL of the top “Pro-Choice Abortion” arguments are instead calculated (with intellectual dishonesty) to AVOID ever asking or answering (or even thinking about) the most pertinent questions of the abortion debate, “do humans have human rights or not” and “are human rights for all humans or only for some humans.” This is because it is obvious that Lasting Human Rights and Free Democracy (without any human slavery) can only ever exist if the question “do humans have human rights or not” is answered “yes,” and if the question “are human rights for all humans or only for some humans” is answered “human rights are for all humans” (logically the term “human rights” is meaningless if it does not apply to all humans). IF “Pro-Choicers” had any interest at all in being intellectually honest, consistent and logical, they would have to engage this perfect logic – and concede to it, because to deny the first statement makes them just like slave-owning or Nazi bigots who *deny all humans have human rights*; to deny the second statement makes them just like any uneducated or ignorant, anti-scientific person who would deny the biological science of the human life-cycle and so *deny preborn humans are humans;* to deny the concluding third statement makes them just like any unintelligent or mentally deficient simpleton who is incapable of following logical arguments from sound premises to sound conclusions and so is *just too mentally incompetent to see that therefore, preborn humans have human rights*. If “Pro-Choice abortion” advocates were intellectually honest, consistent, and logical, and truly believed in Human Rights and truly desired Lasting Democracy, they would have to concede to this logic (or at least attempt to *engage* this logic in an honest *attempt* to justify their “Pro-Choice” (literally “Pro-Choice-to-Kill-Humans”) position. Do they? NO – instead, with gross intellectual dishonesty and much bigotry, they AVOID even *thinking* about the central Human Rights issue which is the crux of the abortion debate, and instead do everything they can to DISTRACT debate attention away from this central issue with less pertinent and less relevant side issues, using logically fallacious “reasoning” or logical fallacies. In anti-scientific fashion they do everything they can to DISTRACT attention away from the indisputable scientific reality that abortion kills living, growing humans who are each unique living individual biological human organisms with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from their parents at every age and stage of their human life-cycles.

I recognize there is simply no way the Pro-Choice (literally “Pro-Choice-to-Kill-Humans”) side can win the abortion debate if the debate is conducted scientifically and logically and in the context of Democracy that recognizes Human Rights at all (remember, abortion was first de-criminalized only in Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, an anti-human and oppressive, totalitarian context which did not recognize any Human Rights). But instead of conceding to science and logic and the founding principles of all Human Rights and democratic freedoms, by becoming genuinely “Pro-Human-Rights,” that is, “Pro-Human-Right-to-Live” or “Pro-Life,” instead “Pro-Choice abortion” advocates still espouse the Pro-Choice position which can only be defended with logical fallacies (hoping no one will notice their sloppy thinking skills, or more likely for most, *completely unaware of how sloppy, inconsistent, and illogical their thinking actually is*). More specifically, the three top arguments proposed for legal abortion are what the Science of Logic calls “fallacies of distraction”in the form of mere emotional appeals to sympathetic side cases which do not even apply to most abortions, side issues that DISTRACT from the most pertinent HUMAN RIGHTS issue; and the most recent “Pro-Choice” approach of "women's reproductive rights" is a fallacy of distraction of the type sometimes called "fallacy of diversion" or "red herring." “Hey – look over here! Look at this RED HERRING of “women’s reproductive rights”! (whatever you do, DON’T look over there at the actually most important and vital issue of *whether humans have HUMAN RIGHTS or NOT*, because “women’s reproductive rights” that include a “right to abortion-kill their human babies” and HUMAN RIGHTS which start with the *Inherent Human Right to Live* logically are mutually exclusive; they cannot both logically co-exist and so I will lose my “Pro-Choice” argument if you look at HUMAN RIGHTS, so instead LOOK OVER HERE at the RED HERRING of “women’s reproductive rights” INSTEAD OF LOOKING AT HUMAN RIGHTS”).

In brief review before dealing specifically and logically with legal abortion’s typical “three top arguments”:

In the science of Logic, a "fallacy of distraction" is an argument introduced (invalidly and/or with intellectual dishonesty) to *distract* from the *main* argument; an argument that *confuses* the issue at hand by emphasizing information that is actually *irrelevant* to the main issue and irrelevant to its conclusion. I recognize it is very important to realize THAT ALL OF THE STRONGEST ARGUMENTS FOR DE-CRIMINALIZED ABORTION ARE WHAT THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC CALLS "FALLACIES OF DISTRACTION." There are several sub-categories of fallacies of distraction. The "fallacies of distraction" most used in the so-called "strongest" Pro-Choice arguments are *emotional appeals* or the above-discussed *diversion* or "red herring" ("hey - look at the red herring" - instead of looking at the most pertinent and relevant facts and arguments). To answer the practical question "should the current abortion-on-demand (or any form of abortion) be legal or not," the most vitally important and relevant question to definitively answer is "do humans have human rights or not?" If the answer to this question is "yes, humans have human rights" – which is an essential foundation of Democracy – the next most pertinent question to answer is "are human rights for all humans, or only for some humans?" The latter answer, that human rights are *not* for all humans but only for *some* humans, is illogical and is the position of every prejudiced racist, misogynist, slave-owning or Nazi bigot, and must be avoided in any Lasting Democracy.

### *Pledge* Article 14-D

### “Pro-Choice(-to-Kill-Humans)” *Logically Fallacious* “Top 3 Arguments” for Legal Human-Killing Abortions - #1: “Medically Necessary Abortions” (In Brief: It is ONLY Necessary to Acknowledge that *Sometimes* the Medical Profession is UNABLE to Save BOTH Precious Human Mother AND Precious Human Baby; There is no need to legally eradicate the *Inherent Human Right to Live* by de-criminalizing abortion in order to cover this unfortunate case; and it is in any case logically a *non-sequitur* – “it does not follow” – to jump from “medically necessary to save the precious human mother” to “abortion on demand killing human babies for any reason” )

This *fallacy of distraction* via emotional appeal to a rare sympathetic situation that applies to hardly any of the abortion-killing of humans now regularly committed not only cannot possibly justify current “abortion on demand,” and not only is an irrelevant *distraction* to *avoid* the key question of *Human Rights for all humans;* it is actually completely unnecessary to offer abortion as a “solution” to this difficult and sympathetic set of rare circumstances. It is only necessary to remember that the precious-human-life-affirming foundations of Democracy regard it as always a *tragedy* when the medical profession is unable to save a human life despite its best efforts, *because human life is always precious*.

Further, many ‘Pro-Human-Right-to-Live’ doctors and surgeons affirm that there is no such thing as a "medically necessary" abortion to save the mother's life, simply because any medical procedure undertaken *for the purpose of saving the mother's life* which *the baby is not likely to or cannot survive* does not *need* to specifically target the human baby for death the way an abortion does. **The so-called "difficult medical cases" used to “justify” abortion are not that difficult as long as the *Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy* are kept in mind. It is always a human *tragedy* when the medical profession is unable to save the life of *either* the human mother *or* the human baby *both* of whom are always precious in any genuine and lasting democracy, which is built on the *Foundational Principle of Human Rights and Democracy* that every human life without exception and *without discrimination* (including the *age-discrimination* of abortion) is supremely and equally precious.**  Whenever *either* mother or baby die in pregnancy complications (whichever one the doctors are unable to save), that loss of human life is properly seen as a *tragedy* to be mourned. But if the baby does not have an *Inherent Human Right to Live* and is automatically targeted for abortion-killing without even any agonizing over the terrible decision of “which precious human life to try to save,” then logically neither does the mother have an *Inherent Human Right to Live,* and neither does anyone else, if the *Right to Live* does not *inhere* just in being human: but Democracy assumes as *First Principles* that *every* human life is so *inherently precious* that he or she deserves not only protection from death, but a vote.

So, I recognize that nothing could be more illogical than saying that “abortion has to be legal in order to cover the difficult medical cases where it is necessary to kill the baby to save the mother’s life.” **What rubbish from what infantile thinkers! We most certainly do NOT have to legally eradicate the *Inherent Human Right to Live* which is the foundation of all Human Rights and Democracy by legalizing abortion, and thereby logically unleash ‘Creeping Totalitarianism,’ in order to save a mother’s life threatened by complications in pregnancy. We only need to mourn ALL those times when the medical profession is UNABLE to save BOTH the PRECIOUS HUMAN LIVES of BOTH *PRECIOUS HUMAN BABY* AND *PRECIOUS HUMAN MOTHER* but have to make the terrible decision of *which* precious human lives to save when they simply cannot save all – a terrible decision not uncommon in the medical profession, especially in emergency medical facilities in disaster or war zones. But I recognize that “Pro-Choice abortion” advocates prove again that they have no familiarity with either logical thinking or with *The Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy*, whenever they advocate for legal abortion when supposedly “necessary to save the mother”** (but not actually necessary, since the mother can be saved and the baby die – or vice versa – merely as part of the limitations of the medical profession, without legally cancelling the *Inherent Human Right to Live*), and at the same time they support legal “abortion on demand.” It is completely illogical, in logical terms a “non sequitur” (“it does not follow”) to go from “abortion must be legal in cases where necessary to save the mother (even if this were true, which it is not)” to “abortion should be legal in all cases for any reason (the now-common “abortion on demand).” But the most ardent “Pro-Choice abortion” advocates have repeatedly proven themselves either so uneducated or unintelligent they have been completely duped by vapid Pro-Choice philosophy; and/or driven primarily by personal selfish convenience; or (for the actually well-educated and intelligent ones) just too *intellectually dishonest* to let facts and logic get between them and whatever they selfishly gain by being Pro-Choice (which for a lot of these is just money, in the big-money abortion industry that like the Slave Trade before it profits highly from *denying equal Human Rights to some humans*). Really dedicated Pro-Choicers, especially those like the abortionists themselves or those in the big-money abortion industry who directly profit from human-killing abortions, tend to be intellectually dishonest and thus not swayed by things like biological science or sound logic or the history of Human Rights and Democracy which all together prove *Pro-Life=Pro- Democracy* (as indicated above: the only reasons anyone is ever “Pro-Choice” is because they are either 1) uneducated/ignorant – which is hopefully the majority of “Pro-Choicers,” who can hopefully then be easily corrected merely by exposure to a sound *Human Rights Education* such as that provided in *DEMOCRACY 101*; or 2) unintelligent/ illogical/ mentally deficient (which cannot be many of them); or 3) selfish/evil; this category includes those Pro-Choice abortion leaders who are otherwise intelligent and otherwise educated enough that they should know that *killing humans is wrong* and should be capable of grasping the logic that this is strongly related to Lasting Democracy, but have fooled themselves into buying their own vapid and *intellectually dishonest* logical fallacies, probably for selfish reasons).

[Aside: In keeping with the precious-human-life-affirming foundations of Democracy, which regard it as always a *tragedy* when the medical profession is unable to save a human life despite its best efforts, *because human life is always precious*, it should be noted: Investing in proper *palliative care* to ease the suffering of those at the end of their lives, in the actual active stages of dying due to natural causes (instead of euthanasia / “assisted suicide” *killing by doctors*), respects the *equal precious value of every human life without exception* which is still celebrated as a *gift worth taking care of until the end* and not merely a *burden to be removed* – and maintains the Human Rights foundations of Democracy that *killing humans is wrong*; and keeps doctors as *healers not killers* according to the 2500 year Hippocratic Medical Tradition which in its oldest form explicitly forbids abortion because the Traditional Hippocratic Oath was the basis of doctor/patient TRUST that guaranteed *doctors do not kill patients*. One of the most obvious examples of the ‘Creeping Totalitarianism’ unleashed into the West specifically by de-criminalizing abortion is that now in some jurisdictions doctors are no longer *allowed* to “conscientiously object” to killing humans by abortion or euthanasia – they have had their democratic freedoms of conscience and free speech truncated in order to “ensure patient access” to *human-killing* procedures like abortion and euthanasia: in some places doctors now MUST at least “effectively refer” people to human-killing “services” or else lose their licences to be doctors; because of the ‘Creeping Totalitarianism’ naturally unleashed into the West by following the totalitarian Soviet and Nazi precedent of de-criminalizing abortion, doctors are now given the anti-democratic and totalitarian choice “be involved in killing humans against your conscience or lose your job and livelihood” – reminiscent of Nazi Germany.]

### *Pledge* Article 14-E

### “Pro-Choice(-to-Kill-Humans)” *Logically Fallacious* “Top 3 Arguments” for Legal Human-Killing Abortions - #2: “Abortion in Case of Rape” (In Brief: A 100% Irrelevant Distraction from the Central *Human Rights* Issue, Which Fails on Several Logical Grounds, including this *Non-Sequitur*: This "Pro-Choice abortion" argument is ultimately that we should follow the precedent of the oppressive Soviet and Nazi regimes and actually undermine the whole fabric of our entire free and democratic way of life by legally eradicating the *Inherent Human Right to Live of all of us* by de-criminalizing abortion, and kill millions of humans worldwide every year, just because a tiny percentage of those humans were not conceived consensually and thus not wanted by their mothers.)

In fact, all of the ‘Pro-Choice’ mentality’s arguments, all of which dishonestly distract from and avoid dealing with the primary Human Rights issue, ultimately fail against the standard of the *Inherent Human Right to Live* on which all Human Rights and Democracy historically and logically depend. If you would not kill a toddler-age human whose father was a rapist, there is no more reason to kill a fetal-age human whose father was a rapist, and if you do you deny the *Inherent Human Right to Live* [Note: the author has met now-adult babies conceived in rape, and challenges anyone to look them in the eye and tell them *they* deserved the death penalty for *their father’s* rape]. All we have to do is THINK and it is easy to realize that we would not kill a toddler-age human just because his father was a rapist *because* the toddler is human and *humans have Human Rights*, the first and primary of which is the *Inherent Human Right to Live*. And the fetal-age human is just as human and so has just as much of an *Inherent Human Right to Live* (if this right was not *inherent* to a fetal-age human because of his or her humanity, then neither would it be *inherent* to a toddler-age human because of his or her humanity). The rape argument is 100% the logical *fallacy of distraction*, a merely emotional appeal to the genuinely sympathetic situation *that applies to hardly any of the abortion-killing now commonly done*, of someone pregnant through no fault of their own who does not wish to be, which is still completely *irrelevant* to the vital question of *do humans have Human Rights or not*? Moreover, the social problem of the crime of rape is not made any better by the crime of killing innocent young humans and thus denying the *Inherent Human Right to Live* as surely as does any totalitarian State. It is completely illogical, again, in logical terms a “non sequitur” (“it does not follow”) to go from “some people are pregnant from rape, which is no fault of their own, and this gives us emotional sympathy for someone in that unfortunate position” to “therefore we should have abortion on demand.” To put a fine point on how illogical the Pro-Choice “abortion in case of rape” argument is, let us rephrase it in light of the undisputed facts of the historical and logical development of Democracy revealed in DEMOCRACY 101. In this factual light the "Pro-Choice abortion" argument is that we should follow the precedent of oppressive and totalitarian Soviet and Nazi regimes and actually undermine the whole fabric of our entire free and democratic way of life by legally eradicating the *Inherent Human Right to Live of all of us* by de-criminalizing abortion, and kill millions of humans worldwide every year, just because a tiny percentage of those humans were not conceived consensually and thus not wanted by their mothers. Unbelievably, this fallacious logic is considered one of the “strongest” arguments for legal abortion, and the one that led to the de-criminalization of abortion in many countries like the U.S. (and “Roe” in the historic “Roe vs. Wade” decision that legalized U.S. abortion even later admitted she lied about being raped thinking she would have a better chance of getting a legal abortion. The saddest thing is that she was right that U.S. legislators were that ignorant and untrained in logical thinking).

### *Pledge* Article 14-F

### “Pro-Choice(-to-Kill-Humans)” Logically Fallacious “Top 3 Arguments” for Legal Human-Killing Abortions - #3: “To Avoid Dangerous Illegal Abortions” (Fallacious Logic Offensive to the Whole Fabric of the Law Which Protects Everyone’s Rights – The underlying argument is the ridiculous assertion that “because people sometimes feel desperate enough to commit crimes for sometimes sympathetic reasons, we should de-criminalize the crimes so anyone – desperate or not – can legally commit crimes for *any* reason.”)

I recognize that the third “major” argument for legal abortion is also just another logical *fallacy of distraction* and mere *emotional appeal* that applies to few abortions *that completely ignores*, avoids and distracts from the central issue of *Human Rights for All Humans* and is just another example of sloppy "Pro-Choice abortion" thinking (one cannot call it "logic” unless “fallacious logic”) that is revealed as being as absurd as it is just by knowing all the actual facts underlying Human Rights: Pro-Choicers’ effectively claim it was worth eliminating the *Inherent Human Right to Live* for everyone and unleashing the current ‘Creeping Totalitarianism’ undermining Democracy into the West "because some pregnant women get hurt or die from illegal abortions." **This "reasoning" (if one can call it that) was actually used in the de-criminalization of abortion in many countries, even though it is exactly like saying "because some people get *desperate* enough to commit crimes for sometimes *sympathetic* reasons, we should de-criminalize the crimes so anyone - desperate or not - can legally commit crimes for *any* reason."** This is a particularly unintelligent non-sequitur. We would not legalize stealing just because some people get criminally desperate enough to steal for sympathetic reasons (like feeding their poor family – even *if* cat-burglars sometimes *hurt themselves* by falling out of an upper-storey window *while committing their crime*), and it makes much less sense to legalize human-killing of innocent preborn humans on a massive scale for *any* reason just because (comparatively very few) people sometimes get *criminally desperate* enough to be tempted to kill their own human children in the womb that they would *risk harm to themselves*. **The whole fabric of the Law which guards the Human Rights (and property rights) of everyone is offended by this "reasoning."**

Any rationally thinking person would realize the solutionis to address the social issues that make some desperate enough to commit a crime; the solution to stealing or killing for sympathetic reasons cannot be to legalize the crime. This can only make *many more innocent human victims*, because it only motivates many more people, who are NOT criminally desperate, to commit the same crime as the *few* who are criminally desperate. **The solution has to be to uphold the law which protects the rights of everyone (the right to life or the right to property) but seek social reforms and social support programs *that lessen people’s temptations to become desperate enough to commit a crime,* whether a crime against humanity or a crime against property.** And of course, only bigots who (like Nazis) deny Human Rights to some humans, who are far too ignorant of science or logic to accept that Human Rights must be for *all* humans or else they mean nothing at all, could ever think it could be a *solution* to human harm, to legally eradicate the *Inherent Human Right to Live*, the foundation of Democracy, by de-criminalizing human-killing abortions.

Whether speaking of how the few who are criminally desperate might hurt themselves while committing a *crime against humanity* (which is what the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials called *legal abortion* in Nazi Germany!); or speaking of the issue of rape, or speaking of the inability of doctors to save both baby and mother in all cases; all three are *IRRELEVANT* to the fundamental Human Rights issue of *whether or not humans have human rights*, or whether or not ALL or only some humans have human rights, and whether or not *killing humans is wrong*, which are the most pertinent and relevant questions to answer before any intelligent (and intellectually honest) person would ever even consider de-criminalizing human-killing “abortion on demand” or de-criminalizing human-killing abortion in *any* circumstances.

### *Pledge* Article 14-G

### Red Herring: The Latest “Pro-Choice(-to-Kill-Humans)” Logically Fallacious Argument for Legal Human-Killing Abortions: “Women’s Reproductive Rights” (Which Logically Can Only Exist INSTEAD of HUMAN RIGHTS, Since it Literally Means “Women’s Reproductive Right-to-Kill-Humans”)

So, there is no valid nor intellectually honest way for Pro-Choicers to win a logical argument on the central, essential, vital *Human Rights* question which is MOST PERTINENT to the question of whether or not currently popular "abortion-on-demand" - or any form of abortion - should be legal. So, does the Pro-Abortion side concede to undeniable facts and clear, sound logic and recant their position for "abortion-on-demand?" NO –instead, as above, they resort to what the Science of Logic calls "fallacies of distraction." The above “top three” biggest arguments most used to "justify" de-criminalizing abortion are the kind of "fallacy of distraction" which the Science of Logic calls "emotional appeals." The more recently popular "women's rights" or "reproductive rights" argument or approach is merely what the Science of Logic calls the "fallacy of distraction" of "diversion" or "red herring" -- DISTRACTING from the central, core, HUMAN RIGHTS question with the much less pertinent and much less relevant question of "woman's rights" or "reproductive rights," which, IF they are granted, are granted at the EXPENSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS, because any woman's "right to kill" their preborn human child is fundamentally incompatible with and REPLACES the *Inherent Human Right to Live* of their child, which is the most basic and fundamental of all Human Rights, without which Human Rights cannot truly exist at all. IF "women rights" somehow go beyond the equal Human Rights to safety and so on which everyone else shares, and include a *right to kill humans* by abortion, THEN logically humans do NOT have any *Inherent Human Right to Live* at all.

So, any society has to decide *which* it wants to recognize: "women's reproductive rights" OR Human Rights. They cannot recognize both, because they are logically exclusive. If a woman has the "women's reproductive right" to kill her human child, then logically NONE OF US HAVE AN *INHERENT HUMAN RIGHT TO LIVE*, the fountain of all other Human Rights, because all of us could have been legally aborted by our mothers "women's reproductive rights" which have effectively and logically *cancelled out our HUMAN RIGHTS*. Any society that is so colossally stupid as to choose "women's reproductive rights" over the Human Rights that simply cannot logically co-exist with “women’s reproductive rights” is logically guaranteed to ultimately lose its democracy which is based on the genuine Human Rights which are completely incompatible with “women’s reproductive rights.”

Politicians who insist on parroting the ridiculous idea of “women’s reproductive rights” will soon find themselves in the embarrassing situation of having to justify why they deny that *killing humans is wrong*, and why they deny *Human Rights for all humans*, when EDUCATED voters are no longer distracted by the silly (and logically fallacious) "smoke and mirrors" of "women's reproductive rights" which logically cannot exist side-by-side with Human Rights, but replace them.

### *Pledge* Article 14-H

### “Pro-Choice” (that is, literally, “Pro-Choice-to-Kill-Humans”) Supporters of Abortion (literally, *Human-Killing Abortion*), Have Always Firmly Held the “Moral Low Ground” for Effectively Denying *Killing Humans is Wrong*, and are Now Exposed as Firmly Holding the “Intellectual Low Ground” As Well – And Now Even Destroying Free Speech and Democracy Directly in the Cause of Keeping *Human-Killing Abortion* Legal

I recognize that Pro-Choice abortion supporters already clearly firmly held the *moral low ground* for not believing that *killing humans is wrong* because they approve the legal abortion-killing of preborn baby humans. Now it is clear that Pro-Choice (literally “Pro-Choice-to-Kill-Humans”) abortion supporters also firmly hold the *intellectual low ground*, because their “Pro-Choice” position ignores the science of human life, sound logic, and their arguments consist of nothing but logically fallacious thinking. It is really true that the only reasons anyone is ever Pro-Choice is because they are either 1) uneducated; 2) unintelligent; or 3) evil. *“Pro-Choice abortion” supporters can no longer pretend that their position is remotely intellectually justifiable.*

I recognize that the entire Pro-Choice abortion approach is one of intellectual cowardice. *All* of the arguments Pro-Choicers use are intellectually dishonest. If it was not for intellectually dishonest logical *fallacies of distraction* Pro-Choicers would have no arguments at all, because they cannot win – and they do not even try – to win an honest argument over the question which is the actual *crux* of the abortion debate: *Do humans have human rights or not?*Nor do Pro-Choicers ever honestly even try to acknowledge or engage the perfectly valid and utterly scientifically sound logical syllogism *All humans have Human Rights. Preborn human are humans. Therefore, preborn humans have Human Rights*. Fallacies of distraction, dishonestly attempting to avoid even engaging the central, most pertinent question of the abortion debate, is literally the best Pro-Choicers can do; it is all they have. *So, when Pro-Choicers spout their best arguments, not only have they not proved their case for legal abortion, they have in fact proved they do not know how to argue logically nor honestly at all.* Intellectual honesty would require them to at least acknowledge and address the other side's strongest facts and arguments, such as the *Top 6 Facts of Human Rights History Which Prove Pro-Life=Pro-Democracy* (see the Appendix) and the above perfect logical syllogism, but Pro-Choice politicians and voters never do.

I acknowledge that Human Rights and Democracy cannot last as long as ignorant, illogical or evil *Pro-Choice-to-Kill-Humans* politicians and the voters who vote for them are allowed to get away with their illogical and intellectually dishonest thinking. Why should Pro-Choice politicians be allowed to destroy democracy and Human Rights just because they lack a proper education in Human Rights history, the biological science of the human life-cycle, and in logical thinking? All humans have *intrinsic* Human Rights which the government did not give them and which governments cannot legally define away and violate without grave injustice – and governments recognizing this is what best makes governmental totalitarianism and oppression *unthinkable*. In practice, it is already evident that governments denying the *Inherent Human Right to Live* by de-criminalizing human-killing abortion is directly and logically leading to more and more totalitarian-style government in the West. In some places, already democratic freedoms of conscience and free speech to object to killing humans are being taken away from doctors and others *specifically* to ensure human-killing “abortion access” unimpeded by the pesky morals of people who believe that *killing humans is wrong* – just like in any totalitarian State. Already in many places Human Rights advocates peacefully decrying human-killing practices like abortion no longer have free speech to advocate for human life near human-killing abortion clinics, and some jurisdictions are seeking to greatly expand these “no-free-speech” zones where *you can be arrested for peaceful Human Rights advocacy* around abortion clinics (it should scare any *thinking human* that for some time in many countries you can already be arrested for *peaceful Human Rights advocacy* – only totalitarian States or those well on the way to becoming totalitarian States would do such a thing).

### *Pledge* Article 14-I

### Possibly The Most Bigoted and Least Intellectually Honest People Ever are “Pro-Choicers”

I recognize that Pro-Choicers are quite possibly the most bigoted people ever, because regular bigots only deny equal human rights to *some* humans, and maybe only to *enslave* or *deny a vote* to *some* humans but not kill them. In contrast, Pro-Choicers actually have *deadly* bigotry, like the Nazi bigots, but, *worse* than the Nazi bigots (who only killed Jewish and handicapped and some other humans their ignorant bigotry considered “inferior” or “less-than-human” despite being indisputably human scientifically), Pro-Choicers actually deny the *Inherent Human Right to Live* to *anyone* indisputably human scientifically (Jewish; Gentile; handicapped; healthy; male; female; Black, White or any shade) as long as they are young enough to not yet have been born. Their Pro-Choice abortion age-bigotry is actually the bigotry against the *entire human race*, because the Pro-Choice abortion they insist on logically cancels out any intrinsic Human Rights for *every* human, because none of us born since human-killing abortion was de-criminalized ever had a legally recognized *Inherent Human Right to Live* because any of us (Black, White, Jewish, Gentile, male, female, handicapped, healthy) could have been legally killed before we were born.

All bigotry is based in ignorance, which may be enhanced by low intelligence or self-serving dishonesty. So it is no surprise that in addition to being among the biggest bigots ever, Pro-Choicers are also possibly the most intellectually dishonest, because they only use logical *fallacies of distraction* to justify their human-killing bigotry and they refuse to answer the core Human Rights questions according to hard science and rigorous logic, a process which would end with the perfectly sound logical syllogism *All humans have Human Rights. Preborn humans are humans. Therefore, preborn humans have Human Rights.*

### *Pledge* Article 14-J

### Deficient Education: Abortion is Only Legal Because Logic is Not Taught in Regular Schools; and Pro-Choicers’ Routinely Use the Genetic Fallacy/”Bulverism” to Invalidly Discount the Pro-Life Position of Those with (Democracy-Grounding) Traditional Western Values

I recognize that it is a serious deficiency in public education that the Formal Science of Logic is not taught in regular schools (except perhaps in the most progressive, where it is an option hardly anyone takes), and few of those who go to university ever take a course in Formal Logic or otherwise get any formal training in logical thinking and avoiding logical fallacies. Although a proper education in Human Rights history (such as that in *DEMOCRACY 101*) coupled with at least an introductory education in Logic would be even better, just people being formally introduced to thinking logically would do a great deal to reduce the number of people silly enough to hold a “Pro-Choice” position (though intellectual honesty is also key – there are those who have been taught Logic who misuse it and still rationalize any number of self-serving positions, if they are not intellectually honest).

In any case, the seriousness of this educational deficiency of the failure to teach Logic is proven by the fact the West (as shown below) is now teetering on the brink of losing all pretense of democracy and genuine Human Rights to ‘Creeping Totalitarianism’ as a direct result of abandoning the traditional Western *Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy* by de-criminalizing human-killing abortion starting about 50 years ago – at which time, and still today, ALL of the arguments presented in favor of legal abortion logically-speaking are mere *fallacies of distraction* which utterly fail to even address the perfectly sound logical syllogism *All humans have Human Rights. Preborn humans are humans. Therefore, preborn humans have Human Rights*. All of the arguments presented in favor of the legal abortion-killing of humans ignore hard science and are logical *fallacies of distraction* calculated to *distract* any rational mind from considering or answering the most pertinent question at the very crux of the abortion debate (answered in the syllogism): *do humans have Human Rights or not*? But with the current deficient educational standards, rigorously logical thinking is so foreign to most that vast numbers of people consider themselves “Pro-Choice” without having any idea how logically fallacious and intellectually indefensible their reasons are.

Yet schools with democracy-grounding Traditional Western Values including the *Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy*, such as Christian high schools (even middle schools) and Christian homeschools, often teach Formal Logic to older children - because those with traditional Western, Judeo-Christian values have nothing to fear from clear, logical thinking and sound argument. But the recent, currently popular anti-traditional values which are right now actively dismantling democracy worldwide have everything to fear from rational, scientific, rigorously logical thinking which cannot justify currently popular policies against the traditional Western values Human Rights and Democracy were historically and logically built on (and need to last).

Whether I am Christian or not, I recognize that the majority of avid “Pro-Lifers” (and those who generally hold Traditional Western Values) are Christians, not surprisingly, given the 1650 years of Western *Christian* Civilization from the 4th Century to the 20th before the West started to abandon this heritage. And I recognize that in response to this fact, huge numbers of “Pro-Choicers” routinely add to their logical *fallacies of distraction* what the Science of Logic calls *the genetic fallacy*: when Pro-Choicers are having a hard time with a Pro-Lifer’s argument for *equal human rights* for preborn humans, Pro-Choicers often fall back on something like "You just believe that because you are a Christian." As if that somehow makes it merely a difference of *opinions* of equal weight; and as if that alone means non-Christians can simply discount a Christian position and not examine the merits of the facts and logic underlying their Pro-life position. Pretending Christians only are Pro-Life because they are Christian and therefore non-Christians can ignore or discount their Pro-Life position as wrong is the logical fallacy known as “Bulverism,” which combines circular reasoning with the *genetic fallacy*. In the Science of Logic, the *genetic fallacy* means one invalidly discounts one’s opponent’s position not after examining the facts and logic supporting it but merely because of the "genetics" of where they think the person holding it happened to get it; merely on the basis of where the likely source of that position was. In this case, if someone is likely Pro-Life because they have a Christian background which taught them Pro-Life values, Pro-Choicers committing this fallacy discount their opponent’s Pro-Life position merely on that basis and ignore the vast weight of Human Rights history, science and logic which in fact support the Pro-Life position.

Whether I am Christian or not, I understand that this *genetic fallacy* (and “Bulverism”) which discounts Christian “Pro-Life” positions merely out of anti-Christian bigotry is particularly silly – and particularly dangerous for the West – because, as discussed more later in PLEDGE PART II, all Western Science and Technology and all Western Human Rights and Democracy are rooted and grounded in *First Principles* (logical starting points) which the West first learned from the Judeo-Christian Bible. The philosophical foundations of Science and Logic itself were first articulated in Aristotle’s *First Principles of Being* (“First Principles of Existence”), which define the nature of existence as we know it (such as *The Principle of Non-Contradiction: Something cannot both be and not be at the same time and in the same respect*). These *First Principles* can be traced to the fundamental insight of the Greek philosophers of the Socratic School (to which Aristotle belonged), who are generally recognized as the first Scientists, that the universe is an *ordered cosmos* and not a *random chaos* – an insight which can be traced to the Greeks of this school’s considerable exposure to the Jewish Bible, the Christian Old Testament, which first testified to this insight. Indeed, the modern university system itself literally grew out of the medieval Cathedral Schools which were originally formed for intense scholarly study of the Bible, and then branched out into all the other fields of knowledge with the typical and traditional Judeo-Christian *scholarly search for truth in all its forms* – another reason why, despite the gross *ignorance* of these historical facts shown by anti-Christian bigots, Christian schools frequently are happy to teach Logic while anti-Christian bigots defend their ridiculous and democracy-destroying *Pro-Choice-to-Kill-Humans* position only with logical fallacies because they are just too uneducated in Logic to reason any better.

. . .

### *Pledge* Article 14-L

### “Pro-Choicers” Need to Realize that their Pro-Choice Position Logically Implies Other Things About Them They Probably Do Not Wish Others to Think of Them (Which is the Result of Foolishly Associating Themselves with a Position/Opinion that Involves Killing Humans without First Thinking It Through Scientifically and Logically)

Being Pro-Choice logically means you do not believe that killing humans is wrong (so you are like evil and violent criminals and dictators)

Being Pro-Choice logically means you do not believe in equal Human Rights for all humans (so you are like every bigot or slaveowner)

Being Pro-Choice logically means you do not believe in the science of human life nor the science of logic, since science confirms preborn humans are humans, and logic confirms they therefore must have Human Rights (so you are like the uneducated and ignorant)

Being Pro-Choice logically means you do not know how to think scientifically nor logically (suggesting you may be like the unintelligent or mentally deficient)

When you say, "I believe in a woman's right to CHOOSE to have her baby (or terminate her pregnancy)" you do not realize you are saying you do not actually believe in Human Rights (which are incompatible) and you do not realize you are saying you do not know how to think consistently nor logically (or else you would know they are incompatible)

Your Pro-Choice position says a lot of awkward and embarrassing things about you that you did not realize you are advertising whenever you say that you are Pro-Choice. From now on, get used to EDUCATED people calling you on it and embarrassing you if you are ignorant, unintelligent, or evil enough to stay Pro-Choice after exposure to DEMOCRACY 101.

. . .

# *Pledge* Article 42:

## The United Nations’ 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (Under the Direction of a Serious Christian) was the Logical Mature Development and Flowering of the Previous 1630 Years of Western *Christian* Civilization Since Human-Killing Abortion Was First Criminalized in 318 AD *Because Christianity Then Taught the West Human Life is Precious Not Cheap*

## De-Criminalized Abortion Literally Follows the Totalitarian Soviet and Nazi Precedent of De-Criminalizing Human-Killing Abortion and is a Betrayal of Everything the 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* Intended, Right After the Nazi Holocaust, in Order to Protect Humanity from *Bigoted Nazi-Style Attitudes to Human Life* that *Deny Human Rights to Some Humans*

I recognize that the United Nations’ 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* is specifically the mature flowering of the previous 1630 years of the logical development within Western *Christian* Civilization of the above “Pro-Human-Right-to-Live” or “Pro-Life” *Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy* introduced into the West by Christianity. Starting from the 318 AD criminalization of abortion (and infanticide) shortly after Christianity was adopted by the West (because the Christian Church then taught the West that every human life without exception was *precious not cheap and the government is OBLIGATED to protect precious human lives right from the womb*), this logical process of development culminated in the 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* produced by the still-Christian Western nations which won the Second World War and formed the United Nations (because the atheist Soviets, with their regimes oppressive to human life and freedom, had been Allies with the traditionally Christian West against Hitler’s Nazis even though they were “Godless Communists,” Soviet-Bloc nations also helped formed the UN, but they had no part in *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* – they abstained from the final vote on it because their atheist sensibilities could not stand the State being *obligated* to anything *higher* than the State government which – if there is no God, as atheists believe – is truly the highest existing authority. In the delicate post-war balance these oppressive atheist nations with their specifically anti-Christian values and violent persecution of the Christian Church then proceeded to plunge the world into an almost 50-year “Cold War” threatening nuclear annihilation because these atheists did not accept God; nor God’s Love for Humanity created in God’s Image; nor *Foundational Principle of Human Rights and Democracy #1* that every human life without exception is EQUAL and PRECIOUS such that governments are OBLIGATED to protect always-precious human lives; nor *Foundational Principle of Human Rights and Democracy #2* that every human life without exception must be FREE from government coercion (freedom of thought/freedom of religion) so that they may FREELY seek and find the truth that every human life is EQUAL and PRECIOUS and must be treated so). In 1948 no-one spoke about a “post-Christian” Western culture but the majority were still baptized Christians and Church attendance was still high, despite the inroads of atheism already undermining Western democracies – atheism whose mature flowering is already seen in every State where atheists control the government, which are always oppressive totalitarian States (like the Soviet Union and North Korea) just because the *Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy* are utterly Christian in origin and utterly foreign to atheism. As most of the major social reformers throughout history were serious Christians attempting to get the society around them to *better put into practice* the extremely high and difficult Christian ideals of LOVE for every human life equally precious to the God who IS Love, *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* was, naturally, produced under the direction of a seriously committed Christian, Eleanor Roosevelt, the widow of U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) and the U.S.’s longest-serving First Lady, and the Chair of the UN’s first Human Rights Commission, who understandably later considered *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* her single greatest public achievement in a long career of public service. She had devout Christian habits of regular prayer and Church attendance and Bible-reading, and before chairing the Human Rights Commission she even published a book *The Moral Basis of Democracy*, revealing her mature Christian sensibilities, in which she wrote that “we must acknowledge that the life of Christ was based on principles which are necessary to the development of a Democratic state” and said that if we “develop the fundamental beliefs and desires which make us considerate of the weak and truly anxious to see a Christ-like spirit on earth . . . we will have educated ourselves for Democracy” (see in the Appendix a longer excerpt from the article “God and Mrs. Roosevelt” by Mary Ann Glendon, the Learned Hand Professor of Law at Harvard University).

Even without knowing this specifically Christian context of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* [which this author did not know when writing the following analysis of the text itself], on a purely historical, logical, and scientific basis it can be said that:

Despite the unfortunate wording in its Article 1 which reads “All human beings are *born* free and equal in dignity and rights,” the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in its 1948 historical context cannot be reasonably (mis)interpreted (as it has been by the current UN) to mean it *intends* to *exclude* preborn humans from having any Human Rights (logically eliminating any *Inherent Human Right to Live*), because in the very same year of 1948 the Nuremberg Trials condemned Nazi Germany specifically for *legal abortion* which was at the time described as “an inhumane act,” “an act of extermination,” and “a crime against humanity,”[[1]](#footnote-1) and in the very same year of 1948 the Declaration of Geneva (in response to the Nazi practice of legal abortion) reaffirmed the whole Hippocratic Medical Tradition for doctors to protect preborn human life in the womb, in the oath “I will maintain *the utmost respect for human life, from the time of conception*; even under threat, I will not use my medical knowledge contrary to the laws of humanity.” So the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* does not more *explicitly* include preborn humans *only* because in 1948 preborn humans had been protected in the West by law or custom since 318 AD and only anti-human oppressive Totalitarian States like Nazi Germany which had that year been condemned for it would even *think* of de-criminalizing abortion! In fact, the *Declaration*’s Article 2 powerfully expresses the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights’* intention to be *all-inclusive*: “Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, *without distinction of any kind*.” To exclude preborn humans (including each one of us before we were born), who had been protected by law or custom since 318 AD, would most certainly be age-discrimination, denying Human Rights to *some* humans on the basis of age, developmental stage in the human life-cycle or location (in the womb), and *the Universal Declaration of Human Rights clearly and explicitly intends to exclude no human*. The formal *Preamble* to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* starts by explicitly confirming that “recognition of the *inherent* dignity and of the *equal* and *inalienable* rights of *all* members of the *human family* is the *foundation* of freedom, justice and peace in the world” – which in different words expresses the essence of this *Pledge of Allegiance to Democracy*’s above *Foundational Principle of Human Rights and Democracy #1*, *“*that every human life without exception, without discrimination and ‘without distinction of any kind’ (quoting the *Declaration’s* Article 2) is *SUPREMELY* and *EQUALLY* valuable and precious, *OBLIGATING* governments to protect and serve *ALL* precious human lives” who have "inherent . . . equal and inalienable [human] rights" (quoting the *Declaration’s* Preamble). Legal human-killing abortion was one of the “barbarous acts” born of “disregard and contempt for Human Rights”[[2]](#footnote-2) which the *Declaration* *intended* to prevent in the future, because legal abortion *alienates* preborn humans from the “*inalienable* rights” that belong to “*all* members of the human family,” “without distinction of any kind,” as Article 2 declares. The *Declaration* cannot possibly intend to exclude preborn humans (whose living biological humanity is indisputable) from being part of the “ALL members of the human family” which the Declaration states has “*inherent* dignity” and “*equal* and inalienable rights.” For this would mean *none of us* began our actual human lives (in the womb) as *members of the human family who have inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights*; it would mean being human is not enough to be a member of the human family, making the whole concept of a human family meaningless and making human dignity not *inherent* in *anyone* after all. To exclude *some* members of the human family – those who are not yet born, a condition that EVERY born human once shared – would logically mean that human dignity is NOT “inherent” after all, if it does not inhere in some members of the human family who have no rights (the preborn); and would logically mean that Human Rights are not “inalienable” after all, if they can be alienated from preborn members of the human family so that they can be legally killed by abortion; and would logically mean that all members of the human family do not have “equal” Human Rights after all, if preborn humans do not have an equal *human right to live* with born humans (who themselves must then have NEVER had any “*inherent* human right to live,” since they could have been legally killed by abortion when they were preborn age). Legal abortion literally makes a mockery of the entire *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and makes all of its wonderful phrases about “inherent,” “equal” and “inalienable” human dignity and rights effectively meaningless. If the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* does not apply to or protect preborn humans (and therefore does not apply to ALL humans who were once preborn), then it protects *no-one* from totalitarianism – *and this is exactly why all states which de-criminalized human-killing abortion are now suffering from ‘Creeping Totalitarianism’* gradually eroding away everybody’s Human Rights and democratic freedoms. Legal abortion is precisely the kind of “disregard and contempt for Human Rights” which the *Declaration* explicitly intended to combat. The 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* clearly intended to *expand* Human Rights to be *All-Inclusive of every human “without distinction of any kind*,” not to take Human Rights *away* from preborn humans (like each one of us when we were their age) who had been protected since 318 AD except in oppressive Totalitarian States like Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union which in 1948 had the only governments with so much “disregard and contempt for Human Rights” that they de-criminalized abortion. Rather, the 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, because of the unprecedented atrocities of the Second World War (which it described as “barbarous acts”), and recognizing that several categories of humans even before Nazism and the war had at times been denied some of their Human Rights, specifically intended to (and did) declare that Human Rights are for “everyone” (in context meaning “every human”) “without distinction of any kind” (Article 2), whoever and wherever they are, *intending* to ensure that the massive-scale unjust *denial of Human Rights to some humans* as in the Nazi Regime (which included *legal abortion* of preborn humans) *never happened again*. The current United Nations, simply because their key member nations[[3]](#footnote-3) ignorantly and foolishly de-criminalized the abortion-killing of humans following the evil Soviet and Nazi precedent, now allows and actually encourages human-killing abortions. But there is no reasonable and no logical way to interpret the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, even without its original 1948 historical context, that justifies de-criminalized abortion. Rather, legal human-killing abortion, which negates any legally recognized *Inherent Human Right to Live* which is the necessary foundation of all the other Human Rights described in the UN’s 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, is a betrayal of everything the Free West fought the Second World War to protect from totalitarianism, and a betrayal of the underlying principles the United Nations was originally formed to protect nations from losing as they lost in Nazi Germany (and it even also ignores and contradicts more recent UN legislation based on the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, such as the *United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child* and the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* which both recognize that “the child, by reason of physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection *before* as well as after birth”).

**End of Excerpts from DEMOCRACY 101: A Voter’s and Politician’s Manual for LASTING Democracy** (<https://www.createspace.com/7000249>)**:**

**DEMOCRACY 101’s Document 2 (Central Document) THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO DEMOCRACY (and The Antidote to Any Degree of *Creeping Totalitarianism*)**

© 2017 William Baptiste, Founder and Director, *Human Rights and Freedoms Forever!*

# Logical Analysis of the United Nations' Human Rights Committee's revised draft "General comment No. 36 on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the right to life"

In the light of the above testimony of Human Rights History (including the history of the UN), the testimony of Biological Science, and the especially the testimony of the Science of Logic, Articles 2 and 9 of the UN Human Rights Committee’s "General comment No. 36 on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the right to life," will be reproduced below, with *Human Rights and Freedoms Forever!*’s commentary and analysis in **[bold square brackets].**

At the outset, it must be remembered that a prerequisite for logically valid and sound reasoning is that terms have to be defined, and used consistently. Since the topic of this UN legislation is the *Human Right to Life*, what the term “a human life” means (or more simply what the term “a human,” means, presuming one that is living, not dead) must be defined. Biological Science (the Science of Life) is the best and most objective standard and source for a definition of what “a human life” is, so that we may then be able to explain that “humans” have a “right” to their life, and a precise biological definition of “a human life” (or simply “a human”) is:

*a unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle.*

Measured against the standard of Biological Science, the UN's proposed draft, as indeed the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* which it references, should be read with this purely scientific, biological definition of individual human lives in mind.

Note that Biological Science has definitively identified the human life-cycle of every individual human progresses from zygote (fertilized egg) to senior adult (the human life-cycle repeating when a human mates and becomes a parent of a new *unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle*). Biological Science also undisputedly confirms that every individual living human walking on earth right now, who has *inherent Human Rights*, was a human (and not a canine nor anything else) at every stage of his or her human life-cycle, and therefore, if his or her Human Rights are *inherent*, then logically he or she had Human Rights at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle. Since the context of the draft is Human Rights, not animal rights nor any other kind of rights, when the text says "everyone" it must of course be understood as "every human" (not every animal or anything else); and "every human" should be understood according to the above precise scientific definition - "every *unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle*.*”*

Note also that to vary the language, pronouns and synonymous terms are sometimes used to replace the main subject term of the *Human Right to Life* which is “a human life” (or simply “a human”), replacement words or terms which may be more general (like “everyone” or “no one” or “individuals”) or more specific (like “human beings” or “human persons,” which terms were discussed above); but to be scientifically and logically consistent and precise (and to avoid logical fallacies, including equivocation, wherein the defined meaning of a term is not consistent throughout the argument) the same underlying precise scientific definition of “a human life” or “a human” should be understood whenever a pronoun or synonymous term is used. The term “human being” simply and literally means "human existence;" every human has a human *existence*, and therefore is a human *being*, and therefore is not canine being (a dog); nor a feline being (a cat); nor a bovine being (a cow), nor an elephantine being (an elephant), but every *human* is a *human being*. The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* said “everyone” (in context, “every human”) has the Human Rights it describes, “without distinction of any kind,” and indeed, neither the etymology/history of the terms, nor the Biological Science of Human Life, give any basis to make any *distinctions* between the synonymous terms “a human,” “a human life,” “a human being,” or “a human person.” All of these terms are scientifically defined as *a unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle*; all of these terms are also synonymous with terms from medical science (or custom) which simply refer to a unique individual human life at a *particular* age or stage of his or her human life-cycle, such as senior adult; adult; adolescent/ teenager; child; toddler; baby; newborn; fetus (Latin for "little one," that is, “little human”;) embryo; zygote/fertilized egg). Note also that the terms “human,” “human life,” “human being,” “human person” are also all synonymous with the medical term “pregnancy;” when speaking of either “a pregnancy coming to term” or “a pregnancy ended or terminated,” scientifically and precisely speaking what is being referred to is *a unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle*.

# Excerpts **[with Commentary in Square Brackets]** from revised draft "General comment No. 36 on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the right to life"

**From Article 2**

 2. Article 6recognizes and protects the right to life of all human beings **[which, to be scientifically accurate and logically consistent, must be understood as *unique living individual biological human organisms with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from their parents at every age and stage of their human life-cycles*].** It is the supreme right from which no derogation is permitted **[yet, in a blatant logical inconsistency built on the inconsistent use of terms warned of above, a derogation is defined below in Article 9, and in Article 10]** even in situations of armed conflict and other public emergencies. The right to life has crucial importance both for individuals and for society as a whole **[DEMOCRACY 101 shows that this *Inherent Human Right to Live* – without any exceptions – is essential to the *Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy*].** It is most precious for its own sake as a right that inheres in every human being **[which, to be scientifically accurate and logically consistent, must be understood as “a right inhering in every *unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle”*],** but it also constitutes a fundamental right, whose effective protection is the prerequisite for the enjoyment of all other human rights and whose content can be informed and infused by other human rights. The right to life is a right which should not be interpreted narrowly **[Yet inconsistently, in Article 9 and 10 below, it is interpreted narrowly, and instead of being “inherent” and “inalienable,” exceptions are made to which humans have a right to life and which humans may be legally killed, a fact which is merely covered up by intellectually dishonest use of terms which should be synonymous with the term “human being” and with the scientific definition of human life as “*a unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle”*].** It concerns the entitlement of individuals to be free from acts and omissions intended or expected to cause their unnatural or premature death **[to be scientifically accurate and logically consistent, “individuals” here should be read “ the entitlement of *unique living individual biological human organisms with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from their parents at every age and stage of their human life-cycles* to be free from acts and omissions intended or expected to cause their unnatural or premature death” – such as the abortion-killing of humans in the prenatal stages of the human life-cycle],** as well as to enjoy a life with dignity. Article 6 guarantees this right for all human beings, without distinction of any kind **[which is why it is completely intellectually dishonest, entirely illogical, and unacceptable that Article 9 below makes distinctions and exceptions for young humans before their birth]**, including for persons suspected or convicted of even the most serious crimes. **[so why are *innocent* humans condemned to death in Article 9?]** Paragraph 1 of article 6 of the Covenant provides that no one **[which, to be scientifically accurate and logically consistent, must be understood as *“no unique living individual biological human organisms with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from their parents at every age and stage of their human life-cycles, including the stages before birth”*]** shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life and that the right shall be protected by law **[so why does Article 9 allow for exceptions that deprive some humans of their lives and do not protect some humans in law?]** . It lays the foundation for the obligation of States parties to respect and to ensure the right to life, to give effect to it through legislative and other measures **[so why does Article 9 remove this “obligation” by allowing States to kill humans and pass laws which allow them to kill humans?],** and to provide effective remedies and reparation to all victims of violations of the right to life.

 **From Article 9**

9. Although States parties may adopt measures designed to regulate terminations of pregnancy **[This is the intellectually dishonest, deceitful, and logically inconsistent use of terms described above; the term “pregnancy” here is substituting for the term “human” and the term “terminations” is substituting for the term “killings;” therefore AN INTELLECTUALLY HONEST READING OF THIS ARTICLE IS THAT “STATES PARTIES MAY ADOPT MEASURES DESIGNED TO REGULATE KILLINGS OF HUMANS;” which of course, violates both the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and *The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. As with every “Pro-Choice abortion” argument, it never intellectually engages but only seeks to deceitfully distract attention away from the perfectly logical and scientifically sound syllogism *All humans have Human Rights. Preborn humans are humans. Therefore, preborn humans have Human Rights* which is described in Pledge Article 14-A above. Article 9 represents the grossest intellectual dishonesty, and it should be immediately stricken from the draft]** , such measures must not result in violation of the right to life of a pregnant woman or her other rights under the Covenant, including the prohibition against cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment. Thus, any legal restrictions on the ability of women to seek abortion must not, inter alia, jeopardize their lives or subject them to physical or mental pain or suffering which violates article 7. States parties must provide safe access to abortion to protect the life and health of pregnant women, and in situations in which carrying a pregnancy to term would cause the woman substantial pain or suffering **[There really are no other arguments for legal abortion than the logically fallacious ones debunked as such above. Here the draft uses the so-called “medically necessary abortion” argument which is thoroughly discredited in Pledge Article 14-D above]**, most notably where the pregnancy is the result of rape **[Here the draft uses the “rape” argument thoroughly discredited as a logical fallacy and non-sequitur in Pledge Article 14-E above]** or incest or when the foetus **[notice again the intellectually dishonest use of terms for the deliberately deceitful purpose of justifying human-killing – though technically medically accurate, this term is here substituting for “human” and for the scientifically accurate definition “*unique living individual biological human organism with absolutely unique human DNA utterly distinct from his or her parents at every age and stage of his or her human life-cycle*]** suffers from fatal impairment. States parties may not regulate pregnancy or abortion in a manner that runs contrary to their duty to ensure that women do not have to undertake unsafe abortions**. [Women NEVER “have to” undertake unsafe abortions when the *Inherent Human Right to Live* is protected by law or custom as it was since 318 AD when Human Rights were first protected in law by the original criminalization of abortion. Unsafe abortions are a *choice* of the criminally desperate, and the solution that protects BOTH precious human mother AND precious human baby is to reduce the reasons some people start to feel criminally desperate. Here, and below, the draft refers to the “unsafe abortion” argument – which is thoroughly discredited as a logical fallacy in Pledge Article 14-F above; in addition to ignoring the Human Rights of the child, this approach includes “Fallacious Logic Offensive to the Whole Fabric of the Law Which Protects Everyone’s Rights – The underlying argument is the ridiculous assertion that “because people sometimes feel desperate enough to commit crimes for sometimes sympathetic reasons, we should de-criminalize the crimes so anyone – desperate or not – can legally commit crimes for *any* reason.”) Obviously, the solution is to create social supports that protect BOTH precious mother and precious baby]**  [For example, they should not take measures such as criminalizing pregnancies by unmarried women or applying criminal sanctions against women undergoing abortion or against physicians assisting them in doing so, when taking such measures is expected to significantly increase resort to unsafe abortions]. Nor should States parties introduce humiliating or unreasonably burdensome requirements on women seeking to undergo abortion **[ like what? Like telling them that both they and their baby have an *Inherent Human Right to Live* that is part of the *Foundational Principles of Human Rights and Democracy*, and therefore they must not have an abortion? Surely social supports to prevent women from getting criminally desperate enough to kill their own human child at risk to themselves is much better than legally eradicating the *Inherent Human Right to Live* by de-criminalizing abortion]** . The duty to protect the lives of women against the health risks associated with unsafe abortions **[they keep repeating this one, because there really are no other arguments than these for legal abortion, and these are all logical fallacies of distraction dishonestly AVOIDING the issue of the Human Rights of the human baby]** requires States parties to ensure access for women and men, and, in particular, adolescents, to information and education about reproductive options, and to a wide range of contraceptive methods. States parties must also ensure the availability of adequate prenatal and post-abortion health care for pregnant women.

**Conclusion**

Note that Article 9 demonstrates that it really was true when DEMOCRACY 101 above indicated that Pro-Choice abortion advocates never intellectually engage the issue of *Human Rights for all Humans* but only deceitfully attempt to distract attention away from it using logical *fallacies of distraction*, and specifically the “top 3 logically fallacious arguments” of the mere emotional appeals of the so-called “medically necessary abortion,” rape, and unsafe abortions. DEMOCRACY 101 above was obviously correct in claiming that if it were not for logical fallacies, “Pro-Choice abortion” advocates would have no arguments at all. Because even the United Nations could not come up with any better excuses to justify human-killing abortions than the same old logical fallacies.

I repeat the brief synopsis at the top of Pledge Article 14:

**NONE of the “Pro-Choice” arguments ever engage the simple and perfectly logically and scientifically sound syllogism: *All humans have Human Rights.  Preborn humans are humans. Therefore, preborn humans have Human Rights.* Instead, ALL OF THE TOP ARGUMENTS FOR THE DE-CRIMINALIZED ABORTION-KILLING OF HUMANS ARE INTELLECTUALLY DISHONEST USE OF WHAT THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC CALLS “FALLACIES OF DISTRACTION’**

**ALL of the top “Pro-Choice Abortion” arguments are calculated (with intellectual dishonesty) to AVOID and DISTRACT FROM ever asking or answering (or even thinking about) the MOST PERTINENT questions of the Abortion Debate, “do humans have Human Rights or not” and “are Human Rights for all humans or only for some humans.” This is because it is obvious that Lasting Human Rights and Free Democracy (without any human slavery) can only ever exist if the question “do humans have Human Rights or not” is answered “yes,” and if the question “are Human Rights for all humans or only for some humans” is answered “*Human Rights are for all humans*” (logically the term “Human Rights” is meaningless if it does not apply to all humans). In using their “top arguments” the way they do, “Pro-Choicers” not only do not prove their case for de-criminalized abortion; they prove that they do not know how to argue logically nor honestly at all.**

**“Pro-Choice” (that is, literally, *“Pro-Choice-to-Kill-Humans”*) Supporters of Abortion (literally, *Human-Killing Abortion*), Have Always Firmly Held the “Moral Low Ground” for Effectively Denying that *Killing Humans is Wrong*; and They are Now Exposed as Firmly Holding the “Intellectual Low Ground” As Well: The Only Reasons Anyone is Ever “Pro-Choice” is because They are Either 1) *Uneducated*; 2) *Unintelligent*; or 3) *Evil* (and Intellectually Dishonest). “Pro-Choice Abortion” Supporters can No Longer Pretend that Their Position is Remotely Intellectually Justifiable.**

Therefore, to save the intellectual integrity and respectability of the United Nations, the draft “General Comment No. 36” Should be adjusted so that it is logically consistent, and no longer addle-pated and logically fallacious, expunging all logically inconsistent elements, especially those which logically compromise *The Inherent Human Right to Live* which is the ultimate foundation of all Human Rights and democratic freedoms. The simplest way to do this is to *remove Article 9* (and 10 which also ridiculously seeks to justify legal human-killing), which is an embarrassment to the United Nations in every sense, especially when one considers in addition to the above logical analysis the Human Rights history above, including the UN’s own history in Pledge Article 42 above. In 1948, since 318 AD only totalitarian States like the Soviet and Nazi regimes had had a low enough estimation of human life to de-criminalize abortion, and thus legal abortion was condemned as “a crime against humanity” in 1948 when the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* was written to make sure the totalitarian thinking that justified human-killing never threatened the West again. If the UN adopts this draft “General Comment 36” it will literally become the totalitarian-oriented monster the United Nations was originally formed to fight.

1. Records of the United States Nuremberg War Crimes Trials, United States of America v. Ulrich Greifelt Et Al (Case VIII), October 10, 1947 March 10, 1948; The National Archives, Washington, D.C.: Microfilm Publication 894, Roll 6 (Trial Vols. 10 & 11), pp. 3952-53, 4024, also M894 R 31, pp. 27-28, 4866. This is the complete record of the trial. Cited in the paper ***The Abortion and Eugenics Policies of Nazi Germany*** by Professor John Hunt, Ph.D. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. These quotations are also from the *Preamble* to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. It is worth remembering that the totalitarian Soviet Union which first de-criminalized abortion in 1920 was a founding member of the UN because it was one of the victorious Allies against Hitler’s Third Reich. Yet in 1948 abortion was criminal once again even in Soviet Russia because Stalin re-criminalized abortion in 1936 after realizing abortion was not good for Mother Russia (he was aborting his workforce and his army). The totalitarian Soviet Union de-criminalized abortion once again in the 1950s, and it is inexplicable that the free democracies in the 1960s and 1970s totally forgot what they well knew in 1948, that de-criminalizing abortion is something only oppressive totalitarian States which have no respect for Human Rights do, which is why in 1948 the Nuremberg Trials condemned the Nazis for legal abortion as “a crime against humanity;” and why the doctors in the 1948 Declaration of Geneva reaffirmed the value of human life in the womb “from the time of conception;” the human-killing abortion mindset was one of the reasons the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* was written, to prevent totalitarian human-killing thinking in the future. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)