

**Ravinder k**

## **Abortion**

This question is like ones that we have encountered before to do with the seven commandments: If a man's family is starving and there is an unattended lorry filled with food outside his house should he steal from the lorry to feed his family, but in doing this break a commandment. Or should he leave the food so his family dies, but he does not break the commandment. One type of thinking would say that the commandments say "thou shalt not steal" so you should not steal. Another type of thinking would ask the question "which would bring about the greater good, him stealing the food or not?", and once they had looked at the individual circumstances they would probably come to the conclusion that the greatest good would come about him stealing the food.

If this way of thinking is then applied to the title, then having one strict law would be like having the commandment and should under no circumstances be broken. Having each request for abortion be judged on its own merits would be the one where someone asks the question "what would bring around the greatest good, this woman having abortion or not?"

So if each request for abortion is going to be judged on its own merits then someone has to make the decision. Someone has to make a decision. Who? Has a special court got to be set up in order to decide whether or not people can have abortions or not. This would not work because by the time the court had made a decision the mother would probably be in labour.

Is it up to her G.P. to decide. This practice already has enough pressures of its own is it really fair to add another one to it. Also would the decision made by the G.P. be one on sound medical reasons or would it be made on personal views of the G.P. in question. How could the doctor prove that the decision they made had a sound reason? If the decision were made by the G.P.s personal views could not a woman just go to another G.P. if the first one turned her down. If the women still did not get permission in years to come she may go to the tabloids with headlines such as "The decision that ruined my life" or might even try to sue if they could not properly afford the child. The decision should not be made by the G.P.s. I do not believe that there is anyone who would want to take it or be "qualified" to take it so this is obviously not the right path to take. Even if there were a neutral person willing to make the decision they

might be called up in court for decisions that other people thought were no wrong.

So if the decision can not be made by someone judging it on its merits, then how about making one strict rule? This seems fine in theory but it would not work in practice because you would always find exceptions. Like I did with the commandment "Thou shalt not steal". Hold on a minute thou even if this is an impractical solution it was suggestible so has some good points. For example this way there would be no pressure on anyone, as the law made could just be applied and then the decision would be an easy one.

Taking in to consideration all of these factors then I would have to say that a combination of both of these rules is necessary to deter discomfort from all parties concerned. A set of rules which determines what is to be done. This rules should be flexible in the sense that an appeal to a special court should be available.