

PRESS RELEASE
4 December 2014

'Independence' and Foetal Alcohol Poisoning

The Court of Appeal has today ruled that a child born with foetal alcohol syndrome is not legally entitled to compensation after her mother drank excessively while pregnant.

It seems that the Court of Appeal has based its judgment in this case on the lack of 'independence' of the unborn child (of course, referred to here as 'foetus' – just to make it seem less human).

But this is absurd; that is to say, it leads to absurd conclusions.

Yes, the unborn child is totally dependent on another human being, his mother. The newly born child is equally dependent on others (in most cases mainly the mother). Indeed, all children are completely dependent on others for several more years.

If dependence means that the dependant is unprotected by the law, the person(s) upon whom newly born children – indeed children up to the age of, say six or seven – depend can do what they like to those in their care. They can abuse, beat, starve, etc – and the Court of Appeal will acquit them on the ground that the victims were not yet independent.

This clearly absurd. There cannot be one law for dependent unborn children and another for dependent born ones.

The plain fact is that dependence imposes duties on the person depended upon regardless of the latter's age, not rights over the dependant, not dominance, not freedom to do what one likes to that dependant.

Quite the contrary.

One must hope that the Supreme Court will overturn this perverse decision.

END

For further media comment please call the LIFE Media Hotline on 07867 744502

LIFE is a pro-life charity that supports anyone facing a crisis pregnancy, pregnancy loss or after an abortion, and strives to engage, inspire and inform the next generation.