

## CRIMINAL CONFRONTATION FOR ASSAULTING FERTILIZED Ova "Destruction of fertilized Ova as a model"

Rami Omar Aburukba<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Saddam Awaysa<sup>2</sup>

### *Abstract*

*Scientific and medical development simulates reality and reflects its image as a natural inevitability and a necessity of life. However, the misconduct or abuse of the right that some biologists who specialize in this field may commit, or what is practiced by specialized doctors during their application of the technique of human reproductive fertilization, such as negligently or deliberately manipulating reproductive cells or destroying them, without adhering to observing the legal controls and ethical rules of the social system, which raises thorny and complex problems that result from criminal acts, which entail criminal liability. What requires creating a balanced relationship, caring for scientists and doctors, for the clear humanitarian services they provide and taking into account the application of the legal and Sharia rules that control and regulate them, in a manner consistent with the ethical system of society. This necessitates issuing a special law dealing with all these matters by stating what is permissible or not, with an indication of the penalties that are applied against the person who misbehaves in this field.*

*Keywords: criminal confrontation - fertilized Ova - destruction of Ova - assault on Ova.*

### **Introduction**

This study deals with the search for the extent to which the right of the fetus to life outside the womb can be protected, and the possibility of the crime of abortion in the case of attacking the fertilized Ova inside the tube. Especially since the beginning of the life of the fetus begins from the moment of intrauterine vaccination and fertilization, which is also achieved inside the tube outside the uterus. The crime of abortion presupposes the beginning of the existence of a pregnancy (fetus) residing in the mother's womb, because in traditional jurisprudence it was not envisaged that the fetus could exist except

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor of Criminal Law- Faculty of Law- Al-Ahliyya Amman University, r.aburukba@ammanu.edu.jo

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor of Administrative Law - Faculty of Law - Al-Ahliyya Amman University, s.awaisheh@ammanu.edu.jo

inside the mother's womb. Thus, the application of the elements of the crime of abortion to the concept of destroying the ovum attached outside the uterus does not achieve any significant crime. Given that the reproductive fertilization process does not always bear fruit from the first attempt, the success rate is 10 to 15%, and due to the technical accuracy it requires, those in charge of the procedure fertilize several Ova in the test dish. This is because they give the woman certain medications, the aim of which is to ovulate more than one Ova – three or four, then implant a number of them in the woman's uterus, which explains the increase in twin births in reproductive insemination. In anticipation of failure, the doctor keeps a group of fertilized Ova, chilled and frozen. If the first attempt fails, the ball returns, but the problem arises about the fate of the frozen Ova or embryos when the first attempt succeeds. In spite of the penal laws criminalizing the act of assaulting the fetus in the mother's womb from the moment of fertilization of the Ova until birth, to grant penal protection to preserve its right to life (Amir, 2005:115), However, the legal position differed in describing the act of destroying the surplus fertilized ovum (the fertilized Ova) outside the uterus, as a result of performing one of the forms of reproductive insemination techniques. While the other trend went to legalize the act of destruction, the first trend, which criminalizes the act of destroying the surplus vaccine outside the womb, is consistent with the direction issued at the fourteenth conference of the International Association of Penal Law and the recommendations issued by the scientific symposium regarding the discussion of medical methods and penal law that was held in Egypt and the symposium on the beginning and end of human life, which was held in Kuwait (Salama, 1985:81) in which the legislative authority demanded the enactment of a law criminalizing acts of assault against tube fetuses outside the mother's womb resulting from one of the forms of human reproductive insemination techniques between spouses, whether by destruction or any other act. While the second trend went to the permissibility of the act of destroying the surplus inoculum outside the uterus, and this trend was represented by what was issued by the Human Fertility Law and English Embryology. (Gillian, 1991:67)

That the provisions of the crime of abortion do not apply to the fetus except from the beginning of the attachment of the fertilized ovum (the fertilized Ova) to the wall of the mother's uterus, which is the beginning of the pregnancy stage, and accordingly, penal protection cannot be granted to surplus fertilizations outside the uterus. (Zahra, 2008:451) Contrary to what is prescribed to protect the fetus residing in the mother's womb. Likewise, the recommendations issued by the French National Ethics Committee, which include the impermissibility of keeping surplus vaccines outside the uterus for a period exceeding

one year from the moment the in vitro fertilization technique was performed, and if it exceeds this period, it must be destroyed. (Zahra, 2008:175) In this direction, the state of Victoria in Australia has authorized the instructions it issued to get rid of surplus vaccines outside the womb.( Al-Khouli, 1997:139) In all cases, these embryos placed in tubes must be tested to find out the causes of infertility in both spouses. There are those who rely on explicit, insightful consent to permit disposal of attached Ova placed in the test tube, i.e. outside the uterus, provided that this consent is from the parties to the process and the owners of the fertilized Ova (i.e. the man and the woman). (Ibrahim, 1987:451) Based on what was mentioned, this study will be divided into two themes . In the first theme, we will discuss the types of crimes committed against fertilized Ova, and we will show in the second theme the extent to which the crime of abortion applies to the crime of destroying fertilized Ova.

The first theme: Types of crimes committed against fertilized Ova; There are several attacks on fertilized Ova, which we will mention in detail below:

The first type: the crime of destroying human embryos formed in tubes to conduct medical experiments and scientific research:

Frozen embryos are embryos in their early stages that are kept in special refrigerators at a certain temperature, and in special liquids that preserve their life so that they remain without growing until demand.

If the demand comes for it, it is taken out of the refrigerator and allowed to grow, and there are several purposes for which these frozen embryos are used, including if the process of implanting the inoculum in the uterus fails, the woman is given another vaccine at another suitable date, and so the process is repeated several times until the desired pregnancy occurs. These early embryos are also secured and the processes of division, reproduction and heredity, hereditary diseases, and chromosomal diseases are studied.( Al-Khouli,1997:142) The English legislator was offended (Gillian, 1991:32) and the French legislator's (Paragraph (18) of Article (511) of the French law on respect for the human body issued in 1994) behaviors of actions carried out by a doctor or a researcher, which includes the formation of human embryos in tubes using one of the forms of human reproductive fertilization techniques, to conduct medical experiments and scientific research on them, which leads to their execution (destroying them), without committing to applying the conditions and legal texts that bestow penal protection on test tube

embryos, namely outside the womb, and being the first stage in human formation).

The Fourteenth International Conference of the International Association of Penal Law stipulated that medical experiments and scientific research should be conducted only on in vitro embryos surplus from conducting human reproductive insemination techniques, provided that two things are taken into account:

That these experiments and research be conducted in a way that benefits the treatment of infertility diseases and cases related to reproductive technology issues. And that the age of the tube embryo on which experiments and research are conducted does not exceed fourteen days from the moment of fertilization, as this period does not show any human features, but the formation of the backbone begins after the fourteenth day from the moment of fertilization.

Whereas, the Warnok Committee in the United Kingdom and the Advisory Committee on Professional Ethics in the United States of America stipulated the availability of two conditions to permit conducting experiments and medical research on surplus tube embryos: (Zahra, 2008:177 & Ali,1994:326) The couple's satisfaction based on their clear insight to conduct medical experiments and research on their surplus tube fetuses. And that the age of these embryos does not exceed a period of two weeks from the date of fertilization, for the same reasons that we explained above, The Warnke Committee called on the relevant authorities to impose criminal penalties on those who violate these conditions, i.e. that the inoculations of tube embryos must be protected outside the womb.

In 1985, the Chilean Minister of Health issued instructions to impose penalties for those who violate the regulations and instructions regulating the conduct of experiments and research on test tube embryos. (Gillian,1991,38). In 1984, associations concerned with reproductive issues appealed for medical assistance, such as the American Fertility Society and the Medical Association of Belgium.

The Society of Gynecology in Japan requires the competent authorities to adhere to the conditions related to conducting experiments and medical research on tube embryos that exist outside the mother's womb, regardless of their stages of development and wherever they are located.(Doreammkoreing,1988:1262) As seen by most of the members of the first international conference on controls and ethics in human reproduction research in the Islamic world. (Recommendation Ten of the recommendations of the First International Conference on Regulations and Ethics in Human Artificial Reproduction Research in the Islamic World, held at the International and Islamic Center for Population Studies and Research at Al-Azhar University, 1991)

The need for three conditions to be met for authorization of research and medical experiments on surplus tube embryos, represented by the consent of both spouses obtained with their valid and informed consent. Likewise, the experiment or research to be conducted should be with the aim of finding a better treatment, and that no harm would result in deformation of the fetus.

We conclude from the foregoing that it is not permissible to conduct medical experiments and scientific research or to dispose of tube embryos outside the mother's womb except after fulfilling the conditions required by the legal and Sharia position. In line with the weighting of the most important, a balance should be made between protecting these embryos on the one hand, and the positive results envisaged for conducting these scientific and medical experiments on the other hand. A question arises here: What is the ruling on such extra Ova that are fertilized externally, and which are found in sperm banks and embryos designated for this?

Especially if the husband or wife or both of them have died or they have separated, or they are still related but they do not need those Ovas?

In this and other necessary cases, as recommended by the participants in the Fifth Jurisprudence Symposium in Kuwait (Zahra, 2008:445) held on October 24-27, 1989 (by leaving the fertilized Ova alone for natural death instead of destroying it or using it in scientific research or to gain material profit, and the ideal situation is that there is no surplus of them, and that is by continuing the scientists in their research by keeping the unfertilized Ova and not fertilizing them except when they are needed, while finding a method that preserves the ability for them to be fertilized after that. (Al-Sambati, 2001 :211)

The second type: unlawful conduct of human reproductive cells experiments with animal reproductive cells:

The British Human Fertility and Embryology Act of 1990. Conducting experiments mixing human reproductive cells with reproductive cells of any animal and (creating mythical beings), as well as criminalizing the technique of implanting a human vaccine in the uterus of an animal, Because it is a manipulation of genetic traits and an assault on human dignity, whoever conducts these experiments has been punished with imprisonment for a period not exceeding a maximum of ten years, or a fine, or both. (Fathi, 2002:350)

German law also criminalized conducting any experiment that mixed human sperm with the sperm of any animal, and punished those who did it with five years imprisonment. (Al-Salhi, 2001:292)

The Preparatory Committee for the Fourteenth International Conference on Penal Law stressed the need to criminalize those who experiment with techniques in which human reproductive cells are mixed with animal reproductive cells. (Al-Khouli,1997:87)

The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe also objected, in the recommendations it issued in 1986, to the experiments conducted using techniques of mixing human reproductive cells with animal reproductive cells. Which leads to the birth of a diverse creature, as well as experiments with techniques in which the human vaccine is implanted in the womb of an animal, or vice versa, i.e. implantation of the animal vaccine in the womb of a woman, and this association called for criminalizing these acts and punishing the perpetrators. (Amir,2005:238)

The French National Committee for Occupational Diseases also rejected the experiments of mixing human sperm with animal sperm, and called for criminalization and criminal accountability for the perpetrators. (Al-Khouli,1997:89) The Islamic jurisprudence considers (Sheikh Gad Al-Haq Ali Gad Al-Haq, Fatwa No. (63), issued by the Egyptian Dar Al Iftaa on 3/13/1980) the implementation of such experiments corrupts the creation of God Almighty, and acts that are forbidden, and the perpetrators must be punished. And we agree with those who see from jurisprudence (Zahra:136 & Al-Khouli:87& Al-Salihi:292), the necessity of issuing a law criminalizing the actions carried out by doctors or biologists by experimenting with techniques in which human reproductive cells are mixed with the reproductive cells of any animal, which represents a flagrant attack on human dignity and humanity, as God Almighty honored him and favored him over many creatures.

The third type: the crime of trading in reproductive cells and human vaccines (vitro embryos) to gain material profit:

The French Law No. 654 of 1994 regarding the protection of the human body is one of the most important modern bioethical laws in conferring penal protection on the most important elements of the body represented by human reproductive cells. It criminalized the acts of assault against them by dealing with them as tangible objects that can be traded and used in the biological industries. (Fathi,2002:317)

The forms of trafficking crimes revolve around the multiplicity of the nature of these cells, whether they are reproductive cells or zygotes, as well as based on the type of criminal act, whether it is the act of selling, buying, or mediating in business for these reproductive cells or vaccines, or it is the act of conducting a technique (synthesis of human vaccines, for commercial purposes). This law provided for two criminal

models in the field of criminalizing acts of aggression against human reproductive cells.

One of them: the crime of doing business with human reproductive cells:

Paragraph (9) of Article (511), which criminalizes the practice of commercial business represented in mediating, buying and selling human reproductive cells for the purposes of using them in biological industries, and punishes the perpetrators with a penalty of imprisonment for a period of five years and a fine of five hundred thousand francs.(Fathi,2002:329 & Al-Khouli,1997:86)

And the second: the crime of creating human vaccines for commercial purposes:

Paragraph (17) of Article (511), which criminalized the practice of the technology of creating human vaccines for commercial purposes, represented by the acts of selling human vaccines to entities specialized in biological industries, and stipulated a penalty of imprisonment for a period of seven years and a fine of seven hundred thousand francs for anyone who conducts this procedure. technology and in order to trade it for the purpose of gaining financial profit. (Al-Khouli,1997:86)

It is sufficient to criminalize the perpetrator if he performs in one of the roles involved in the industrial and commercial business of sperm and human vaccines, and he who sells reproductive cells and human vaccines to a biotechnology factory is considered the perpetrator of this crime. That is, the application of the penalty for this crime does not require that the offender perform all the acts of commercial business with it, but the perpetrator is considered to have committed the crime of trafficking if he participates in the marketing process without manufacturing, or the manufacturing process without selling. The British Human Fertility and Embryology Act of 1990 also criminalized business with sperm and human vaccines and punished those who engage in buying and selling and commercial mediation, with a penalty of imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months or a fine. (Heikal, 2006:444)

And Islamic jurisprudence prohibited disposing of human vaccines (vitro embryos) outside the mother's womb through commercial activities, because it is illegal and contradicts human dignity. (Ismail,1992:23)

As for our opinion, it is represented by the invalidity of these actions on human reproductive cells and vaccines (vitro embryos) in commercial business for the purpose of earning material profit, because they are inconsistent with the rules of Sharia and the law, as they represent an assault on the provisions of public order and public morals as they affect the human value of man and the sanctity of his

dignity. This is on the one hand, and on the other hand, these actions violate the rules of the law, that is, the legal inadmissibility of financial and commercial dealings on the human body, due to its departure from the circle of dealings, as (things that are outside dealings by virtue of the law are those that the law does not allow to be a subject of financial rights ). (Zaal,1995:61)

And based on the nature of the biological function of human reproductive cells, including what God Almighty entrusted in them the secret of human life represented by the creation of man, as “created humans from a clinging clot.”. (Surah Al-Alaq, Verse 2)

Therefore, it is forbidden for us to describe the cells of human creation and its biological origin as things that are subject to material dispositions by buying and selling, which requires the legislative authority to expedite the issuance of a law criminalizing these behaviors and actions, in order to punish the perpetrator and those who contributed with him to the practice of these illegal actions, because they are actions that violate the provisions of Islamic law. And the rules of public order and public morals.

The second theme: Destruction of fertilized Ovas; In this part of the research, we will show the extent to which the material element and the moral element of the crime of abortion apply to the act of destroying zygote (tube embryos) outside the womb, in the following two items:

First: The extent to which the material element of the crime of abortion applies to the act of destroying fertilized zygote (tube embryos) outside the womb:

The material element of the crime of abortion is achieved when the perpetrator uses any means that leads to the ejaculation of the fetus before the time of its natural birth, whether the means is by beating, administering medical drugs, or by any act that achieves the criminal result.. (Amir,2005:235)

Just as the act of abortion does a positive action, it can also be a negative action (Al-Hadithi, ,2007:251), Such as the doctor's refusal to treat a pregnant woman to prevent her miscarriage.

The physical act of the crime of abortion was defined as (every expulsion of the fertilized ovum) (Al-Saeed,2006:349), or (intentionally ending the pregnancy before the date of natural delivery). (Abdel Sattar,1996:491)

Accordingly, the physical act of the crime of abortion is achieved by any means that leads to the criminal result that the perpetrator wanted, and that the development in biological sciences, especially in



vitro fertilization (human reproductive insemination), showed a great jurisprudential debate about the criminalization of the destruction of fertilized Ova outside the womb. Let everyone agree that the reason lies in the need to protect the fetus at the moment of its life, whether inside or outside the womb. However, there are those in jurisprudence who believe that there is no need to pay attention to the destruction of fertilized Ova, as they are in no way live embryos.

On the path of the first trend, the developed countries went in their laws to decide on protecting the right to the private life of the fetus, and this is what the United States of America and England adopted, as the legislator decided to protect the fetus by simply returning the inoculation to the wall of the uterus after fertilization had taken place in the tube. Thus, the Human Fertility and Embryology Act issued in England in 1990 does not establish any protection for IVF( In-vitro-Fertilization) children before returning them to their mothers' wombs, and based on the principle of legitimacy (there is no crime or punishment except by a text), the course of Arab legislation, including the Jordanian and Iraqi legislators, consider that the assault on pregnancy is Test tubes positively or negatively does not constitute an abortion crime and does not constitute another crime, and therefore there is no one to attack it.

As for the second trend, it believes that the fusion of the sperm with the Ova leads to the creation of the embryo and leads to the integration of the elements of its life, which proves its existence. Any assault on him constitutes a breach of the right to life in its natural course, and results in a crime according to the nature and type of assault, and justifies that in the fact that the concept of life cannot differ from the two cases. This is because the embryos perform the same functions, whether inside or outside the uterus, especially since the artificial conditions inside the tube are the same conditions provided by the uterus. (Al-Azza, 2002:283)

In our personal opinion, the dependence of legislation on traditional models of criminalization and its confinement to specific forms of criminal behavior, which represents assault on the fetus inside the womb, is the main reason for the inadequacy of these legislations in the face of scientific developments. And the emergence of new images of assaults should not be ignored in any way, as IVF and the fertilized Ova inside IVF are embryos that cannot be assaulted.

It is clear to us that the causes of these problems are the failure to single out legislation specific to human organs as well as to derivatives and other products of the body from non-organs, and not to deal with them according to the same logic.

As the forms of material behavior of attacking some body parts such as wounding, beating and giving harmful substances, if they are true

of those organs, then they cannot be true of what we mentioned previously of derivatives and products specific to the body, the most important of which are pollen, gametes and fertilized embryos.

To prove this, we find modern legislation issued by the French criminal legislator for its new Law No. 653/94 on 29/7/1994. Through which he expressed his realization of the necessity of distinguishing between the body's organs and other derivatives and products through his members by special legislation for the transfer of organs and special legal texts related to the body's derivatives and products. (Jean larati: [www.artb.com/info/aucunliste](http://www.artb.com/info/aucunliste) & Zahra:121)

Based on what was mentioned, we see that attacking the Ova inside the tube is a crime of abortion, because the reason for determining protection is life, and that life is available in all its elements, including that fertilized embryos perform the same functions as embryos inside the womb.

The evidence is the growth of these fertilized Ova and their transformation from a sperm into a leech and then into an embryo. These are the same stages of formation of a natural fetus. Therefore, we call on the Jordanian and Iraqi legislators to intervene to protect the children of human reproduction after having authorized the internal reproductive insemination processes.

Therefore, we find that the elements of the crime of destruction are achieved by destroying it or breaking the tube that contains it, and here we are talking about the presence of a fertilized Ova and the will to achieve the result by destroying it, with the necessity of a causal relationship between the act of destruction and the death of the fetus at the end of fertilization by eliminating the medium prepared for it.

Second: The extent to which the moral element of the crime of abortion applies to the act of destroying vaccines and tube embryos outside the womb:

The legal texts regulating the crime of abortion have indicated that it is an intentional crime. (Articles 321 and 322 of the Jordanian Penal Code. And Articles 417, 418 and 419 of the Iraqi Penal Code in force. and Articles 541, 542 and 543 of the new Lebanese Penal Code), Through these legal texts it is clear to us that the criminal intent is available to the offender, if he is aware of the criminal act he is committing associated with directing his will to achieve the criminal result, then the offender is asked about his commission of the crime of abortion. If he knows that his assault is against a pregnant woman, and otherwise he is not questioned about the crime of abortion, but he justifies his criminal act by describing one of the forms of the crime of abuse or any criminal description according to the criminal result

that was achieved, depending on the circumstances. (Nammour, 2020 :183)

Therefore, the crime of abortion is not committed against the perpetrator unless he knows that he is assaulting a pregnant woman and his will is directed towards the criminal result represented by the termination of the life of the fetus inside her womb. If his knowledge and will are denied, he is not questioned about having committed the crime of abortion, to select one of its elements. (Al-Hadithi,2007:215)

And as far as our topic is concerned, the criminal intent of the crime of abortion is the act of destroying (destroying) the zygote (tube embryos) outside the womb, which is achieved through the element of the perpetrator's will represented by its direction to achieve the criminal result of ending the life of the fetus (i.e. the act of abortion). We see that this will is identical in the case of the presence of the fetus inside the mother's womb with the presence of the fertilization (the tube fetus) outside the uterus, as the achieved result is the same, which is the termination of the life of the fetus in the two cases mentioned.

As for the element of the perpetrator's knowledge, that the subject of the act of his assault is on a fetus in the womb of a pregnant woman, there are two issues for this issue: the first is based on the jurisprudential approach that described the fertilizations outside the uterus formed by one of the methods of reproductive insemination as embryos, i.e. (tube embryos),

The knowledge of the perpetrator, when he commits an act of destruction (execution), the fertilization (tube fetus) outside the womb is available, which must criminalize the act of assaulting the (tube fetus) as a crime of abortion. As for the second, which is the availability of the perpetrator's knowledge that there is no pregnant woman with this fetus, but rather it is a fetus in a tube outside the mother's womb, there are opinions among them that go with the jurisprudential trend that qualifies them as fetuses, so it is considered the criminal intent of the crime of abortion. It is available with the racism of the knowledge and the will of the perpetrator when he commits the act of destroying (destroying) the embryos of tubes outside the womb, and because they are covered by the penal protections that the Penal Code bestows on them.

While the other opinion goes with the jurisprudential trend that requires that these vaccines be implanted in the woman's womb in order to be described as fetuses, the act of destroying (destroying) these vaccines outside the womb is not described as abortion. That is, the crime of destruction is not achieved because the legal model for this crime is not complete, which requires that the act conform to this model in order for it to be subject to this text according to the usual

matters in the natural cases in which the fetus is inside the mother's womb. And based on what we have shown above, we see that attacking the Ova inside the tube constitutes a crime of abortion, because the reason for determining protection is life, and life is available in all its elements, including that fertilized embryos perform the functions of embryos themselves inside the womb. The evidence is the growth of these fertilized Ova and their transformation from a sperm into a clot and then into an embryo, which are the stages of formation of the natural fetus itself.

## **Conclusion**

After an in-depth study of the criminal confrontation for assaulting fertilized Ovas, "damaging fertilized Ova as a model, we reach several findings and recommendations, the most important of which are summarized as follows:

First: Results

1. We found that the Jordanian and Iraqi penal texts are sufficient to protect the fetus that arises naturally inside the mother's womb, but the abuse that the fetus is exposed to outside the womb through reproductive insemination is still outside the criminalization and punishment circle. Until the Jordanian and Iraqi legislature intervened to explicitly stipulate the criminalization of this assault and set the appropriate punishment for it.
2. Based on the principle (there is no crime or punishment except by text), the Arab legislation, including the Jordanian and Iraqi legislation, considers the assault on carrying tubes positively or negatively that does not constitute an abortion crime and does not constitute any other crime, and therefore the responsibility of those who assault it is denied.
3. The inadmissibility of conducting medical experiments and scientific research or disposing of in vitro embryos outside the mother's womb except after fulfilling the conditions required by the legal and Sharia position. In line with the weighting of the most important, a balance should be made between protecting these embryos on the one hand, and the positive results envisaged for conducting these scientific and medical experiments on the other hand.
4. The invalidity of dealings with human reproductive cells and zygote (vitro embryos) in commercial activities for the purpose of gaining financial profit, as they are inconsistent with the rules of law and Sharia. As it represents an assault on the provisions of public order and public morals, as it affects the human value of man and the sanctity of his dignity.

5. The dependence of legislation on traditional models of criminalization and its confinement to specific forms of criminal behavior that represent assault on the fetus inside the womb, and the failure to single out legislation specific to human organs. As well as the derivatives of the body and its other products that are not organs, and not dealing with them according to the same logic, are the two main reasons for the inadequacy of these legislations in the face of scientific developments. And the emergence of new images of assaults should not be ignored in any way, as IVF and the fertilized Ova inside IVF are considered embryos that cannot be assaulted.

Second: recommendations

1. The need to criminalize the techniques of human reproductive insemination, between the sperm of the two spouses, in the event that the consent of one or both of them fails. As a result of the doctor who performed this technique not being fully aware of all the confirmed and potential results of this vaccination. This exposes the doctor and his assistants to criminal liability if they do not comply with the required controls and conditions in performing these operations. The need to pass a law criminalizing the actions of doctors or biologists by experimenting with techniques in which human reproductive cells are mixed with the reproductive cells of any animal. With what it represents of a flagrant attack on human dignity and humanity, as God Almighty honored him and favored him over many creatures.

2. We propose to the Jordanian and Iraqi legislators, through the legislative authority, to expedite the issuance of a law criminalizing the behavior of human reproductive cells and vaccines (test tube embryos) in business for the purpose of gaining material profit, as it is inconsistent with the rules of law and Sharia. As it represents an assault on the provisions of public order and public morals due to their prejudice to the human value of the human being and the sanctity of his dignity, and because these actions violate the rules of the law by the inadmissibility of financial and commercial dealings on the human body because it departs from the circle of dealing by law.

3. We propose to the Jordanian and Iraqi legislators to add texts to the texts on abortion that criminalize acts of attacking the life of fertilized Ovas (fertilized Ovas in tubes) before they are re-implanted in the woman's womb.

4. Focusing on international efforts and the need to enact legislation that protects fetuses from the dangers of abuse, whether they are formed inside or outside the womb, or when they are destroyed.

## Bibliography

- Abdel Sattar, Fawzia (1996), Explanation of the Penal Code, Special Section, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo.
- Al-Azza, Salih Fathy (2002), criminal protection of the human body in light of modern medical trends, New University Publishing House.
- Al-Hadithi, Fakhry Abdul-Razzaq (2007), Explanation of the Penal Code, Special Section, Dar Al-Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution, Amman.
- Al-Khouli, Mohamed Abdel-Wahhab (1997), The Criminal Responsibility of Doctors, a study on the use of modern methods in medicine and surgery, 1st edition.
- Al-Saeed, Kamel (2006), Explanation of the Penal Code (crimes against humans), 2nd Edition, Dar Al-Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution, Amman.
- Al-Salhi, Shawqi Zakaria (2001), Artificial insemination between Islamic law and man-made laws, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo.
- Al-Sambati, Atta Abdel-Ati (2001), Sperm and Embryo Banks, Comparative Study, 1st Edition, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo.
- Amir, Amira Adly (2005), Criminal Protection of the Fetus in Light of New Technologies, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Jamei, Alexandria.
- Ibrahim, Mamoun Al-Hajj (1987), fertilized Ovas superfluous, what to do with them - Islam and contemporary medical problems, third, the Islamic vision of some medical practices, Kuwait.
- Ismail, Muhammad Abd al-Shafi'i (1992), Criminal Protection for the Hidden Pregnancy between Sharia and Law, 1st Edition, Dar Al-Manar, 1992.
- Recommendations of the First International Conference on Regulations and Ethics in Human Artificial Reproduction Research in the Islamic World, held at the International and Islamic Center for Population Studies and Research at Al-Azhar University, 1991
- Salama, Abdullah (1985), human life inside the womb, its beginning and end - Islam and contemporary medical problems, symposium on the beginning and end of human life, Kuwait.
- The scientific symposium on medical methods and criminal law, which was held at the Faculty of Law - Cairo University, in the period 23-24 October 1993.
- Doreammkoreing (1988); united states of americanational report, revae international droit penal.
- Fathi, Muhannad Salah Ahmed (2002), Criminal protection of the human body in light of modern medical trends, New University Publishing House, Alexandria.
- Gillian dougls (1991); lawferlity and repoduc on, London,sweet Maxwell.
- Heikal, Hosseini (2006), The legal system for artificial insemination between positive law and Islamic law, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, 1st edition..
- Jean larati: le regimejuridigue des produits issus des corps humains, [www.artb.com/info/aucunliste](http://www.artb.com/info/aucunliste)

- Lankennedy and Rewgrubb (1989), medical law, txt and materials, butter worth, London.
- Nammour, Muhammad Saeed (2020), Explanation of the Penal Code Special Section (crimes against persons), Dar Al Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution, Jordan.
- Zaal, Hassan Odeh (1995), Illegal disposal of human organs in criminal law, a comparative study, PhD thesis, College of Law - University of Baghdad.
- Zahra, Mohamed Morsi (2008), artificial reproduction, its legal provisions and legal limits, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo.