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I

THE TACTICS OF THE WORLDWIDE ABORTION-EUTHANASIA DEATH MOVEMENT

The logic of abortion demands euthanasia. The logic of euthanasia demands abortion. Ethically, abortion and euthanasia are inseparable twins, pagan gods engraved on either side of the same evil coin, for both of them directly attack the same value — the inherent worth of every human being. Legally, wherever abortion has been elevated to public acceptability, euthanasia lies just below its surface, waiting for the next flip of the coin. Sooner or later, the society which welcomes the right to kill its children will demand the right to kill its parents.

It is no accident that Uruguay, the abortion paradise of the world (unless Japan shares that dubious title), offers its sick, old, and infirm the world's worst legal protection; that suicide and death camps have been discussed in Scandinavia ever since the advent of abortion in the 1930's; that euthanasia was widely debated in Japanese universities a few years ago, and by English university professors more recently. Of Japan, a country of massive abortion, with many oldsters and too few workers and youngsters, an observer says, "A shocking aspect is the
number of newly born children found in vinyl bags in lockers at railroad stations" 1.

The worldwide abortion-euthanasia movement is a cleverly organized, well financed machine propelled by the powerful and ever-present mass media. Its success is measurable by at least two-thirds of mankind who now live in countries where the historic law protecting the unborn has been repealed or relaxed.

The movement may strike initially at either end of the abortion-euthanasia spectrum. Thus, the medical, legal, and intellectual forebears of Hitler’s Germany, with their concept of lives «devoid of value», lives «not worth living», «absolutely worthless human beings», influenced the thinking of a whole society and prepared the way for the institutionalized killing voluntarily administered by the next generation of professionals. In more modern times, the movement has struck first at the unborn. There is a hideous parallel between the Nazi victims who left the death camp by way of the chimney and the unborn child who leaves the uterus by way of the suction curette.

The abortion-euthanasia controversy has a metaphysical, not a biological, basis. Most life-scientists agree that human life begins at fertilization; however, the value to be placed on that life is a different matter. Thus, Justice Harry Blackmun, handing down the infamous U. S. Supreme Court decision of January 22, 1973, could acknowledge the Court’s familiarity with «the well-known facts of fetal development» and yet authorize virtually unrestricted abortion throughout pregnancy on the grounds that the fetus was not a person in any «meaningful» or «whole» sense. Thus, too, an American biologist could write: «The fetus, given the opportunity to develop properly before birth and given the essential early socializing experiences and sufficient nourishing food during the crucial early years after birth, will ultimately develop into a human being» 2. And listen to this comment by Nobel-Prize-winner Dr. James D. Watson: «If a child were not declared alive until three days after birth, then all parents could be allowed a choice that only a few are given under the present [permissive abortion] system... The doctor could allow the child to die if the parents so chose...».

1. Personal communication from social scientist Neal Lawrence, March 21, 1974. For the evidence of the parallelism between pre-Hitler times and today, see Frederic Werthem, A Sign for Cain, N. Y. Paperback Library, 1969, especially chapter 8-9.

What is man? What is his nature? What is his destiny? These questions are being asked again today in the context of the abortion-euthanasia debate, and on their answers hangs the future of civilization. Man is born to ask why he was born. Viktor Frankl suggests 5.

If man loses sight of his meaning and eternal destiny, if he does not live in harmony with his God-given reason and dignity, he will soon use reason to make himself worse than a beast, besmirching all around him, including the noble profession of medicine. A truly human, vital medicine is possible only if the true value and dignity of man are properly appreciated.

HOW KILLING IS RATIONALIZED

There are two ways to introduce into civilized society the principle of killing innocent human beings. The first way is through the back door, by convincing the public that the victims are not human, or at least not fully human. This tactic of pre-Hitler Germany was easily adapted to contemporary abortionism. The unborn child is called a mere fertilized ovum, a "blob", a "parasite"; he is said to be not alive, not a human being, not a person.

The second way of introducing the killing principle into society is through the front door, by admitting the humanity of the victims, at least implicitly, but claiming that their death is desirable or even necessary. Its acceptance demands a devaluation of life itself. Thus, "quality of life" becomes superior to quantity, and a woman's freedom of choice becomes superior to her unborn baby's right to life.

The inversion of our traditional hierarchy of values under the pressure of the abortion movement is conceded in an astonishingly candid editorial which appeared in the September 1970 issue of California Medicine. Its author, Dr. Malcolm Watts, wrote this: «The traditional Western ethic has always placed great emphasis on the intrinsic worth and equal value of every human life regardless of its stage or condition. This ethic has had the blessing of the Judeo-Christian heritage and has been the basis for most of our laws and much of our social policy. The reverence for each and every human life has also been a keystone of Western medicine... This traditional ethic is still clearly dominant, but there is much to suggest that it is being eroded at its core...».

Watts admits that to produce the "quality of life" he describes, "It will become necessary and acceptable to place relative rather than absolute values on such things as human lives." He continues: "The process of eroding the old ethic and substituting the new has already begun. It may be seen most clearly in changing attitudes toward human abortion. In defiance of the long held Western ethic of intrinsic and equal value for every human life..., abortion is becoming accepted by society as moral, right, and even necessary."

And this final passage explains the abortionists' refusal to concede that abortion kills babies. Watts says: "Since the old ethic has not yet been fully displaced it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing, which continues to be socially abhorrent. The result has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact, which everyone really knows, that human life begins at conception and is continuous whether intra- or extra-uterine until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forth under socially impeccable auspices. It is suggested that this schizophrenic sort of subterfuge is necessary because while a new ethic is being accepted the old one has not yet been rejected." 4.

PROPAGANDIZING FOR ABORTION-EUTHANASIA

History, it has been said, turns no sharp corners. That theory can be challenged today, however, given the opinion-making power of the mass media. Such power in the hands of a dedicated group can quickly condition society. Jacques Ellul has written: "The tendency toward psychological collectivization is the sine qua non of technical action... The problem is to get the individual's consent artificially through depth psychology, since he will not give it of his own free will. But the will to give consent must appear to be spontaneous." 5.

The tactics of propagandizing for abortion-euthanasia fall into four broad categories, the four M's of money, media, manpower and manipulation.

Money to oil the wheels pours in from individuals, organizations, foundations, government agencies, the media (Playboy magazine, for instance), and manufacturers of contraception— and abortion-related products. One example: International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) gives free vacuum curettage machines to Latin American medical clinics, ostensibly for "legitimate D and C's" wherever abortion is illegal.

The mass media— television, radio, and press — are sympathetic to the abortion-euthanasia movement and give it great coverage, meanwhile minimizing pro-life information. The metropolitan newspapers of the state of Iowa will no longer print any commentary on abortion, claiming that it is a dead issue; several college newspapers, including the St. Cloud State Chronicle in Minnesota, have adopted the same policy. One American organization planted propaganda for vasectomy and abortion in a popular TV comedy series by offering prize money for the best script about population control.

Manpower is recruited at both grass-roots and professional levels. Most importantly, several worldwide movements— women's liberation, the sexual revolution, and population control— have accepted abortion as a major means toward their various goals.

Manipulation of people and their attitudes by the abortion-euthanasia machine is an immense subject. Let me explain, first of all, that I do not consider it manipulation to use such legitimate forms of persuasion as appeals to reason and appeals to genuine human emotion (as distinguished from emotionalism).

Changes in attitudes begin with trial balloons and discussions. The minute you engage in "dialogue" on any subject, you admit the possibility of changing your own viewpoint. Therefore, any discussion at all of a change in abortion laws was destined to strike an immediate blow at the status quo. The movement has exploited this fact, keeping the issue constantly before the public through magazine and newspaper articles and letters to editors, and through the introduction of legislative resolutions and bills even when there is no present chance of their passage.

It has employed to the full the familiar propaganda techniques of repetition, suppression, and distortion. An uncritical public which hears repeatedly of the need for abortion "reform" begins to accept it as fact. Suppression of information— for instance, about the effect of legal abortions on women and their subsequent pregnancies— has contributed to public ignorance. Distortion of the truth, as well as outright lies, has manipulated attitudes on a basis of falsehood. Abortionists claim that legal abortions are safe ("as harmless as pulling a bad tooth"), that mora-
licity cannot be legislated, that battered children are the result of unwanted pregnancies, and so on.

The appeal to *emotionalism* exploits the compassion which each man should feel toward the unfortunate. The celebrated abortion performed in 1938 by Dr. Alec Bourne on the hysterical victim of rape was totally distorted for maximum gain. Euthanasia propaganda draws a pathetic picture of patients condemned to a painful existence by a cruel law. Fear, too, is exploited, as in the dire warnings about future «standing room only» in the world.

One of the most successful tactics has been the portrayal of abortion as an issue of *Religion* (Catholic) rather than of public morality. In an undisguised appeal to bigotry, abortionists imply that Catholics are incapable of opposing abortion for any rational reason. Catholic pro-life legislators are identified by religious affiliation, and the formation of such organizations as «Catholics for Free Choice» and «Catholics for Abortion» is reported with glee. When it serves their purpose, abortionists apply a religious veneer to their own enterprises; hence, the vast network of abortion referral agencies bearing names like «Clergy Consultation Services». After years under another designation, the chief pro-abortion group in my home state selected a new name whose initials spell out the word *moral*.

Public-opinion *polls* are used to mold, rather than to reflect, attitudes. Often a question is phrased in a way suggesting an answer favorable to the movement; purported changes in opinion are often manufactured by the pollsters. At crucial times in the American debate, Gallup would issue a poll showing a swing toward permissive abortion. Identical questions were asked in the first three polls. But in the fourth poll, the questions were changed to elicit a larger pro-abortion sentiment, which was then reported as if it had resulted from the same questions as previously. The report, of course, made its way into every hamlet.

The art of *semantics* is the abortionists’ chief tool, changing attitudes while discouraging thought. The ultimate aim of «Newspeak», Orwell wrote, was «to make articulate speech issue from the larynx without involving the higher brain centers at all» 6. Just as language can corrupt thought, so can thought corrupt language; the circle is vicious.

The movement’s *euphemisms* include «termination of pregnancy».

«back-up contraception», and «just another means of birth control» for abortion; and «pregnancy advisory services» for abortion referral agencies. Among the slogans are «the right to control one’s own body», «every child a wanted child», and even «the right not to be born». Its value-weighted words reflect social approval of progress, science, efficiency, and freedom. Thus, abortionists wish to «reform» or «liberalize» abortion laws. Their approach, they say, is «modern» and «progressive», while ours is «archaic», «outmoded», «Nineteenth Century», or «reactionary». Life in utero is «the products of conception», an «embryo», or a «fetus» —cold, scientific terms which tend to dehumanize. Reference to polls of pro-abortion doctors enhances the scientific appeal, while «amniocentesis», «vacuum aspirators», and «clinical sterility» lend an aura of modern efficiency. «Freedom of choice», «freedom of conscience», «freedom from compulsory pregnancy», «emancipation from child care»—these strike a responsive chord in our permissive societies, especially when the opposition is «authoritarian», «repressive», or «absolutist».

The pro-death movement has manipulated not only attitudes but persons as well, the obvious victims being, of course, the millions of unborn babies whose lives are snuffed out each year. The usual targets of government-assisted research and clinics are the poor, the young, and the retarded. Planned Parenthood deceives the poor of Honduras by giving them so-called vitamin tablets which are really birth-control pills. Much experimental contraceptive and abortifacient research is carried out on college campuses. Black welfare recipients in the U. S. have been sterilized without their informed consent. South Africa provides abortion mills for blacks but not for whites. In September 1973, Des Frost, chairman of Prime Minister Ian Smith’s ruling party, called for the creation of a ministry of birth control to curb the growing black population in Rhodesia, «a ministry with teeth that can dish out benefits to those who conform and penalties to those who refuse to see the problems they create for future generations».

Government officials connive with drug companies, scientists, and abortion groups to subsidize, at public expense, such activities as fetal experimentation and research into new abortion techniques, including ultrasound and microwaves. Only three months ago, U. S. congressional hearings on a family planning and population control bill were rigged to exclude almost all pro-life testimony while a whole litany of anti-life agencies, Planned Parenthood and Zero Population Growth among them, were allowed to air their views. The birth-control establishment is the same the world over
ABORTIONISM AT WORK IN EUROPE

Now let us look at the tactics in various countries.

The abortionists' cardinal rule for effective public relations is to take one step at a time, to know how much to ask for at each stage, to conceal their true aims, and to know when and where to strike. The Abortion Law Reform Association in England numbered fewer than a thousand members in 1967 when they rammed the Abortion Act through Parliament. But they had laid the groundwork well.

In preparation, they played up the hard cases which make bad law but good propaganda. They identified the issue as sectarian, reviving old prejudices so successfully that the English Catholic hierarchy chose to remain silent.

The abortionists exaggerated the population problem and the deaths from backstreet abortion. Key leaders delivered the message in high places, saying that a "termination of pregnancy" removed only a piece of tissue or a "glob of protoplasm". They even called the original bill the "Medical Termination of Pregnancy Bill", despite opposition to it from three prestigious medical associations.

They cited pseudo-polls and praised the relaxation of laws in Eastern Europe, the very laws which are now undergoing drastic revision. Their timing was right, and in April 1967 Britain suddenly had virtually an abortion-on-demand law.

In Belgium the abortionists will soon make their fourth attempt at revision. Their propaganda has emphasized the case of a Belgian doctor who recently was acquitted after aborting a retarded teenager.

In Switzerland, agitation for abortion began when Die Schweizer Arbeitsgruppe für Bevölkerungs Frage, claiming that the Swiss must abort in order to give a good example to the under-developed nations, gathered signatures forcing the government to sponsor the forthcoming national referendum. Last February the Swiss Society for Family Planning conducted a meeting featuring a number of speakers for and against abortion; the only ones presented without opposition were proabortionist biostatistician Christopher Tietze and pro-abortionist Josephine Barnes of England.

Germany followed the pattern. In 1965 a popular magazine published pictures of pre-borns in the womb with the commentary, "He who looks at these pictures will know that every abortion is a most serious attack that borders on murder". Six years later 374 prominent women proudly announced in the same magazine: "We have aborted". Unbelievably, pro-
pagandizing continues throughout Germany, a nation with the lowest birthrate in Europe and 2.6 million guest-workers! As in every other country, abortionists inflate the number of illegal abortions, claiming some one million annually, whereas the country's most competent authority on the matter, Professor-Dr. med. Heinz Kirchhoff, estimates between 75,000 and 100,000. And, as elsewhere, the figure cited by the abortionists as to the number of deaths from illegal abortion exceeds the total number of women who die from all causes during the childbearing years 15-44.

Italian abortionists quote figures of 1.2 million abortions with perhaps 20,000 maternal deaths. However, Dr. Columba, world-renowned demographer of the University of Padua, estimates that the very maximum abortion figure, including those abroad, is 100,000, while the annual number of deaths of women in the childbearing years is just under 11,000.

Three hundred and ninety doctors signed a statement favoring a change in the French law. It was found that a number of them were still medical students and that others were not even on the medical register. French girls returning from London after their killings give glowing accounts of the experience over radio and TV.

ABORTIONIST TACTICS IN THE UNITED STATES

And that brings us to the American scene, where the abortionists encountered stubborn resistance, ultimately triumphing only because of the Black Monday decision.

American abortionism took its first major step in 1961, when the American Law Institute's Model Penal Code proposed: «A licensed physician is justified in terminating pregnancy if he believes there is substantial risk that continuance of the pregnancy would gravely impair the physical or mental health of the mother, or that the child would be born with physical or mental defects, or that the pregnancy resulted from rape, incest, or other felonious intercourse...».

In 1967 Colorado became the first state to fashion a new law patterned on the ALI model. After fourteen more states had eased their restrictions, right-to-life groups started reversing the trend. By the end of 1972 they had defeated 123 bills.

United States abortionists had available to them money, media, and the support of medical specialties. Three large groups figured prominently in the strategy: Planned Parenthood and the Population Council, both of which are financed by large foundations as well as the national govern-
ment, and the Association for International Development, a wing of the U. S. foreign service whose pro-abortion activities I observed last summer in Latin America.

They preached freedom of conscience, making abortion a Catholic issue. They proclaimed that legal abortion was necessary to control population, to remedy contraceptive failures, to prevent the deaths of thousands of women, to remove discrimination against the poor.

They created school literature, audio-visual aids, and films for every level, degrading the large family and praising the small; extolling contraception and condoning abortion as a back-up. (German abortionists used the same tactic).

One children's book, published by Scholastic Book Services, features a sketch of two zeroes representing children in the womb; the caption reads: «Once there were two nothings. The one was a girl nothing. The other was a boy nothing. Then they were born».

Linauer Associates publishes a widely used college biology textbook typifying the anti-life attitude of many authors around the world. «Abortion, it says, is the most effective method of population control... At what point a fetus becomes a human being is a controversial biological and ethical question. The moral dilemma is further complicated by the knowledge that in many cases a particular fetus will be seriously defective or unwanted by its parents. Born with such a handicap, a child is likely to lead a troubled life and add a heavy burden on an already overpopulated society...».

The success of this subtle indoctrination of youth in hedonism and the ultimate sexual abuse, abortion, is reflected in a recent Canadian survey revealing that half of the Planned Parenthood clientele in Canada and the United States are young or unmarried.

The abortionists' slogans and euphemisms were classic: Abortion was «emptying the uterus» or «termination of pregnancy» or «post-conceptive family planning». It would lead to «reproductive freedom» and implement the «right to privacy». With little opposition from theologians around the world who tend to live in Cocones and away from scientific and other realities, conception and pregnancy were re-defined to admit early abortions disguised as contraception; thus: the «morning-after» pill, «menstrual extraction», «menses induction», and «endometrial aspiration».

The use of slogans for birth-death control is perhaps best exemplified by the Planned Parenthood Association of Thailand, established only three years ago Shirts, disnes, silk screcons, packaging, and consumer products carry this message; top sports teams wear it on their uniforms. Film stars and traditional traveling entertainers are recruited as bearers of the message, reaching on audience of seven million. Solon the enter-
tainers will personally dispense birth control methods. Abortion is the next step.

The abortionists also misrepresented the origin of the American abortion laws, saying they were passed not to protect the child but solely to protect the mother. They called abortion harmless and simple, like removing a clump of cells. They never conceded the serious medical sequelae of abortions. They sneered at "male celibates" and "friends of the fetus". (And in their current battle to prevent erasure of the Supreme Court Decision, they refer to their opponents as "Compulsory Pregnancy People").

Various organizations promoted the cause with a crusader's zeal: "Pregnancy Advisory Services", "Pregnancy Help Line", "Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights", and dozens more.

Meanwhile, the elite, the professors, the law profession, and many big-name doctors either took a neutral position or actually supported the anti-life movement, just as their counterparts did in pre-Hitler Germany. No more than three faculty members of prestigious Harvard University stood up to defend the unborn.

And that is how a determined group used money, media, manpower, and manipulation to condition a nation for the fatal decision of seven Supreme Court justices. Thus did the United States enter the third world war, the war on the unborn.

Today, each day, 6,000 babies are killed in the world's richest nation with the lowest birthrate in its history. That amounts to almost two million annually, twice as many lives as were lost in all the official wars fought in its first 200 years of existence.

EUTHANASIA TACTICS

Since both abortion and euthanasia stem from the surrender of the Judeo-Christian ethic emphasizing "the intrinsic worth and equal value of every human life regardless of its stage or condition", it is not surprising to find the same tactics and largely the same people in both movements.

In England and the United States the abortionists met such strong opposition that they were forced to deny the link between abortion and euthanasia. Perhaps that is why an abortion victory had to precede any nationwide agitation for euthanasia in either country. At any rate, ten months after the English had passed the Abortion Act, a euthanasia bill
appeared in Parliament. In the United States, some ten state legislatures discussed
euthanasia in the year following the Black Monday decision; this year some seventeen states will deal with the subject.

In other countries, such as Holland and Germany, the press for permissive abortion and the euthanasia debate go on almost simultaneously.

Euthanasia, literally "the good death" but actually suicide and murder, will be much harder to fight than abortion. More people are living to old age than formerly; and making the distinction between ordinary and extraordinary means for preserving life becomes ever more difficult in an advancing medical technology. Moreover, there is much opportunity for exploiting the confusion between passive-negative and active-positive euthanasia, and the gray areas in between. Appeal to the emotions will be even more effective. The press for fresh organs for transplantation may generate hurried declarations of death.

Listen to the slogans and euphemisms: The right to die with dignity, assisted death, Socratic death, private euthanasia. And the German «Recht auf Leben, Recht auf Tod»; «Wer das Recht hat zu leben, Hat auch das Recht zu sterben»; «Gnadenntod auf Wunsch»; «Sterbehilfe»; «Recht auf leichten Tod»; «Einschlafung»; «Sterbehilfe auf Verlangen». How easily «Recht über meinen eigenen Bauch» becomes «Recht auf den eigenen Tod»!

One pro-euthanasia organization in the United States calls itself «Good Death Fellowship». Then there are the American Euthanasia Society, the American Euthanasia Foundation, and the Euthanasia Educational Council, which has distributed tens of thousands of copies of a «Living Will» which is really a contract for death. These groups have counterparts in England.

They launch a two-pronged attack, one prong educational and the other political. There is the softening-up process through TV, radio, and press, with polls appearing periodically. There are the staged conferences and the stirring up of discussion in widely read magazines. And there is the repeated re-introduction of bills.

Religion and religious figures are used whenever they help to justify the program, as when the Euthanasia Educational Council quotes Pius XII's instruction that there is no obligation to use extraordinary means. A popular American columnist gave this organization wide publicity when she printed its «Living Will».

Worldwide attention has been paid to the report that John Hopkins Hospital allowed a mongoloid baby to starve to death, and to Yale's report of forty-three defective babies permitted to die over a 2 1/2 year period. Newspapers of the world have publicized test cases involving the
deliberate killing of the hopelessly ill; to my knowledge, not one such killer has been incriminated.

One expects the German medical profession to be sensitive to the dangers of euthanasia. And yet, when they met last October in Munich, they passed an anti-abortion resolution which would allow abortion for eugenic reasons!

WHAT CAN WE DO?

What countermeasures can we take to meet the anti-life challenge? Since our goal must be the protection of all life, we must work tirelessly to prevent or overturn permissive abortion legislation. Indeed, England's Society for the Protection of Unborn Children has found that its continued vigorous opposition to abortion has prevented an all-out push for euthanasia in that country.

We must use virtually the same methods as the anti-life groups, but with a total honesty. The Good Book reminds us that we have much to learn from the devil. Therefore, we must be simple as doves but sly as foxes. Above all, we must not underestimate the enemy. We are not grappling merely with human forces and men but, as St. Paul warns, with "the spiritual forces of evil" as well.

Let me briefly outline the tasks we need to accomplish:

1. Massive education on every level and the production of literature embodying the latest scientific information.

2. Political action, from the grass roots to the pinnacle of government. This means learning the political process, parliamentary procedure, and lobbying to restore the law to protect all.

3. Learning public relations, the process of disseminating ideas, the intricacies of opinion-making. We must get our pro-life message across in an anti-life world.

4. Setting up positive programs of action and help for women and girls burdened with problem pregnancies; and working out positive programs for the old and infirm.

5. As to abortion, we need to teach and exemplify a loving chastity, a reasonable human self-control, a God-oriented human existence — without apologies. The glories of true human freedom and the clarification of individual human rights are the fruits of a lived Christianity.
6. We desperately need to prepare the young for marriage and family life. Marriage is the only profession in the modern world in which amateurs are allowed to ply their trade!

7. We must have religious and spiritual renewal. I think I would oppose abortion and euthanasia just as vigorously if I were an atheist. The issues, after all, are not just religious but supremely human; and as a sociologist, I know we cannot solve our problems by institutionalized killing. Yet I know, too, that the anti-life tactics, skillful as they were and are, would have been no match for a society which had not already sunk into a materialism equalled only by its ignorance and apathy. Dostoevski observed: «If God is not, then nothing is morally wrong». And if each man is not a unique creature of God, then there is no moral principle that can command us to treat all human beings as equal. An old Uruguayan gynecologist who has unsuccessfully fought the abortionists for more than twenty-five years, when asked for the solution, shot back: «Evangelization!».

Finally, I have a real empathy with those who say that Christianity has to start all over again. I know that «the timid hide in crowds; the courageous walk in single file». To many, the tasks may seem overwhelming, the courage lacking. Let me tell them what David Riesman once said: «Only a crazy man would be hopeful, but only a self-indulgent man would give up».

II

THE END OF LIFE

About three-fourths of mankind now live in countries which have abandoned the historic protection of the unborn. Logic compels one to believe that if you can kill somebody, you can kill anybody. Once human beings begin to be thought of as having no intrinsic value, it is only logical to lose respect for the aged, the handicapped, the disadvantaged, the retarded, and the undesirables in general. We are playing with Hitler's concept of «useless eaters», and euthanasia is already on this side of the horizon.

The United Nations estimates an annual forty to fifty million abortions
worldwide, but they are only the tip of the euthanasia iceberg. For once the Hippocratic Oath and the sacredness-of-life tradition is discarded, medicine flounders aimlessly, without a guiding ethic.

It is not surprising, then, that many countries have already gone far beyond so-called passive euthanasia — which is not euthanasia at all, for euthanasia nowadays means the direct and painless killing of a human being for supposedly humanitarian reasons. The modern preoccupation with death has already surpassed that which led to the Nazi nightmare. We find it exemplified in the rising rates of suicide, in the escalating number of abortions, in the widening attempts to pass «death with dignity» bills, and in the intellectual and social climate of the Western world.

Nobel Prize-winners who condone infanticide, scientists who conduct barbaric fetal experimentation — such people merely give expression to the Zeitgeist, the spirit of the times. Abortion and euthanasia, infanticide and senicide, are four walls of the same coffin, constructed from the same pseudo-humanitarian, nihilistic utilitarian philosophy of man and his destiny.

In the Bible we read that there is nothing new under the sun. Abortion, suicide, and euthanasia appeared very early in man’s history. Abortion was legally condemned twenty centuries before Christ in the oldest law code we know. In a great progressive move, the father of modern medicine, the Greek doctor Hippocrates, condemned abortion and euthanasia in the fifth century before the Christian era, giving his name to the Oath that doctors in civilized society took for at least twenty-two centuries. As anthropologist Margaret Mead has pointed out, the medical profession became possible when a distinction was made between killing and curing.

It is obvious, however, from the history of medicine in Greece and Rome that many physicians did not abide by the strict stipulations of the Hippocratic code. During antiquity, suicide was considered by many to be the ultimate expression of man’s freedom. Thus, while the word «euthanasia» was coined in the seventeenth century, the practice is an ancient evil.

The phenomenal rise of Christianity gradually changed the entire approach to suicide and euthanasia. The Hippocratic Oath eventually became the ethical standard of the whole profession.

In the Old Testament life is regarded as the greatest good and death

as the worst evil. In the New Testament the continuous emphasis on life shifts from the physical to the spiritual, looking toward another life for which, although by no means ignored, this world is a preparation.

In the modern era we see stark and shocking contrasts. In countries where abortion has not yet been fully legalized, the clamor for euthanasia may not be quite so evident: the diabolically clever death-pushers know just how fast and far to go and when to begin.

No country has yet legalized euthanasia. Some non-English-speaking countries—Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Italy, for instance—have in recent years legally recognized compassionate motive as an extenuating circumstance in mercy killing and assisted suicide, prescribing punishment less than that for murder. The Swiss may limit punishment to three days' imprisonment or a fine. In Uruguay and Peru a person who abets a suicide from an altruistic motive is exempt from penalty. Czechoslovakia's code seems to leave punishment of merciful homicide to the determination of the judge. In 1962 a Japanese court laid down six guiding principles for legal euthanasia.

In the English-speaking world the withdrawal of extraordinary means or the giving of drugs to reduce pain even if this treatment may shorten life unintendedly, a phenomenon badly called passive euthanasia, is rightly considered good medical practice. To my knowledge, fewer than ten legal actions have been taken against doctors in the Western world for "mercifully" ending a life. Defendants were either acquitted or given very minor sentences. In nearly every court case, however, a surprising number of doctors in the community defended active euthanasia and admitted practicing it.

Attempts to pass death-with-dignity bills and the frequently voiced plea that no extraordinary means should be used to prolong life are really preliminary to the real goal—active euthanasia, or one's 'right' to decide when and how he will die. We will understand our times better if we compare present efforts to legalize mercy killing with the intellectual and cultural history of pre-Hitler Germany.

In 1920 two professors, a doctor of jurisprudence and philosophy, Carl Binding, and a doctor of medicine, Alfred Hoche, wrote a short treatise entitled The Unleashing of the Destruction of Lives Devoid of

---

Value³. This little book and the arguments it fostered were blamed by both the prosecution and the defendants in the Nuremberg trials for the deterioration of ethics resulting in the Nazi euthanasia holocaust. This blueprint of the firsts subtle steps to the ultimate catastrophe one can find duplicated again and again in modern literature and proposed legislation.

Even the terms and euphemisms of today’s propagandists for euthanasia are found repeatedly in the German document—words like «death with dignity», «merciful release», «medicated death», «the right to die», «death assistance» or «assisted death», «quality of life», and many others. In Binding and Hoche, as well as in American and English literature and bills, one finds the same raw utilitarian philosophy, the same blatant disregard for human life, and the same propagandistic, step-by-step gradualism in attempts to destroy lives ‘devoid of value’—always in the name of compassion and mercy.

Binding, like his American and English and other counterparts, speaks of unselfish suicide and of charitable disposal of «complete idiots» and other social burdens — ‘ballast’ as he calls them. Death merchants have an amazing ability to abuse language. The modern pro-death terminology and philosophy stands in such impressive accord with pre-Nazi rhetoric that one could believe they were written by the same persons ⁴.

Again, in the literature of both eras we are confronted with the same committees and panels to decide on behalf of the person who is unconscious, uncertain, or incompetent. One sees the same impatience to implement the pro-death philosophy. Binding and Hoche along with other intellectuals actually expressed regret that it would take many years to change the thought patterns of society. And yet, in fact, it was to take only about thirteen years. If things continue at their present pace the new holocaust will soon be upon us. Remember that it took less than ten years for the United States to achieve abortion-on-demand at any time.

---


in the nine months of pregnancy. This is the least protection for the un-born in the world unless Sweden can now claim that disgrace.

Binding said that suicide is one of the first fundamental rights in natural law. Pro-abortionists speak of a right to control one’s own body and of a constitutional right to privacy which supposedly justifies private killing. Just recently the Euthanasia Society of America changed its name to the Society for the Right to Die, Inc., because of legislators’ reluctance to deal with «euthanasia».

Binding mentions several burdensome categories of people who must be eliminated, with or without their consent. First, those who desire complete relief because of sickness or injury, pain or despair. Perhaps, he suggests, these irretrievably disabled persons will ask to be killed by another person because they lack either physical strength or an effective means or freedom from supervision —or even will power. These very points are discussed in detail in current American and English official euthanasia literature. Why, it is asked, should it be necessary to create special legislation for those desiring death? Can’t they just start the car in a closed garage? Slit their wrists? Take an overdose of sleeping pills or pain killers? The official answer: Everybody does not own a car; razor blades, although readily available, needlessly inspire fear of pain; sleeping pills are hard to stockpile, especially in a nursing home. At one Euthanasia Educational Council conference a doctor specified the exact amount of morphine required and the amount of thorazine which should precede it in order to eliminate nausea.

Incurable «idiots», as they were called, are another of Binding’s categories of burdensome people to be eliminated. He includes those who have become «idiots» through misadventure or coma. «Their death creates no vacuum», he states, because they are a mere «caricature of true man». He suggests the extension of equal «charity» to those born severely deformed. And we all know well this brand of «charity» which has been doled out generously to defective babies born in high-class American and English hospitals, and which is sanctioned by notable theologians, if not by law.

Binding suggests that in the unconscious patient, consent «may be presumed if the sick person would have given it if he had been able to regain consciousness». This presumption of consent is found in a proposed Florida bill allowing three doctors and a judge to decide the fate of an «incompetent» person without next of kin. The same presumption is found in the new American guidelines permitting certain experiments on babies during and following their abortion.
The sacrifice of the individual for society comes through again and again in the literature of yesterday and today. As Binding remarks, «One painfully realizes how we uselessly invest manpower, patience, and money to preserve life not worth living». Similarly, the forty million dollars that the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare paid last year for the abortions of 280,000 women, most of them poor and members of minorities, was hailed as a bargain in view of the future welfare expenditures eliminated.

Careful estimates of financial savings to be made by doing away with the mentally retarded and other unproductive people in pre-Nazi Germany have their counterpart on the contemporary American scene. Representative Walter Sackett of Florida has carefully calculated how the nation could save billions of dollars by doing away with its mongoloids.

Children in Nazi Germany were given problems to solve which indoctrinated them in the utilitarian euthanasia philosophy. A typical problem in a German mathematics book of the time reads: «The construction of an insane asylum requires six million Reich Marks. How many settlement houses at fifteen thousand Reich Marks could be built for this sum?». In the materials used in American schools today one can see similar propaganda for contraception, abortion, euthanasia, population control, and the like. One widely distributed pamphlet asked students to determine the guilt or innocence of Pope Paul VI, placed on trial in a hypothetical world court for contributing to worldwide misery and starvation through Humanae Vitae.

Raw utilitarianism again is evident in Hoche's remark that to interfere with human life for scientific reasons is justified if the research results in the saving of many lives and therefore serves the «higher good». The arguments that the research helps many and that there is no other way of getting information are the very rationalizations used by the committee sanctioning the present American guidelines for fetal experimentation.

In all euthanasia literature past and present there is the appeal to conscience. Thus, sometimes one must act quickly to put a suffering person out of his misery. The possibility of error, says Binding, must be risked for the benefit of society as a whole. «We doctors know», Hoche assured his readers, «that in the interest of the whole human organism, single, less valuable members have to be abandoned and pushed out». He continues: «One of these days maybe we will come to the conclusion that elimination of the mentally dead is a permissible and necessary act». We have seen the same progression of thought in modern attitudes to-
ward sexuality, divorce, and abortion (to name only three areas of concern); attitudes which were once unthinkable became permissible, then desirable, and finally essential. As Alexander Pope wrote in *Essay on Man*:

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too often, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

Thus German social «parasites» and «empty shells» were forerunners of the U. S. Supreme Court’s non-persons, i.e. those unborn whom the Court declared to be «not persons in the whole sense».

Hoche’s arguments for disposing of the mentally retarded because they lack self-awareness or cannot establish contact with their environment remind one of some theological arguments for abortion.

It is astounding to find that Hoche should in 1920 discuss insurance arrangements in connection with those who commit suicide or who are given the benefit if being killed with mercy. Practically no American euthanasia bill is without similar reference, nor without protection against malpractice suits.

If the German propagandists spoke of *Lebensraum*, their American and other counterparts speak of population explosion. Now that zero population growth is within sight in the U. S. and already a reality in most of Europe, some fanatics have changed their goal to negative population growth.

Abortionists in America got national abortion-on-demand from the Supreme Court after failing through the legislatures. The euthanasiasts of today will undoubtedly take the judicial route again. The American *Humanist* magazine actually proposed this in 1974. Meanwhile, model bills and manuals for lobbying are available. And at the same time, public opinion polls are again used more to create public opinion than to reflect it.

Amazingly, all the German killing began and escalated without any change in the law. The only document authorizing euthanasia in Nazi Germany was a restrained, unpiblicized letter written on Hitler’s personal stationery in the fall of 1939. And something similar is the case today. In any number of countries, I have been assured on the best medical authority that active euthanasia is practiced. In fact, in America it is urged that the law must change in order to reflect the actual situation. In his *Sign for Cain*, an expose of violence, German psychiatrist Fredric Wertham remarks that «human violence comes from above, from
the distinguished and wealthy and more intelligent members of society». It is the morally crippled and handicapped like Rending and Hoche who wreak most of the havoc on society, not the mentally ill or deficient. No mongoloid was ever kicked out of the White House for Watergate crimes! It is the intellectuals, the morally crippled, the amoral elite in high places, who often promote permissive abortion and active euthanasia.

Let no one say it cannot happen again, because it has happened and is happening. There is not a great deal of difference between the Nazi medical experiments and those going on now in high-class medical schools and elite research centers. Can one say of America —after the giving of placebos to VD victims in an experiment, after the sterilization of young girls without informed consent, after the starving to death of American babies by physicians, after the injection of live aborted babies with a virus in order to make a serum, and after the authorization of abortion-on-demand throughout the nine months of pregnancy— can one say that the American system precludes a repetition of something closely resembling the German experience? We would do well to heed the prosecution’s opening statement at the Nuremberg trials: «The perverse thoughts and distorted conceptions which brought about these savageries are not dead... They must not become a spreading cancer in the rest of humanity. They must be cut out and exposed».

Perhaps progressive Hippocrates realized that medicine could not survive with honor through the ages unless it was associated with a sound moral philosophy undergirded by deep religious convictions. Even though the law teaches, restrains, and reminds, only the moral integrity of doctors will prevent abortion and euthanasia from taking over the earth.

Medical advances and breakthroughs have given rise to difficult ethical problems which defy easy solutions. Many propose to solve them with outright killing. Attitudes toward life-death issues depend, of course, on one’s personal Weltanschauung, one’s outlook on the world.

For those espousing a Christian ethic the task seems to be one of «beginning all over again». We are living most certainly in a post-Christian age, where everything is challenged in the name of expediency and utilitarianism. We are contending not only with the materialism and paganism of the masses but also the high-flown, materialistic sophistry of popular philosophers and theologians. Abortion-euthanasia will flourish so long as the tentacles of man’s thought reach no farther than the confines of this life.

And there lies the heart of the matter: The creature man has inalienable, inviolable value only in the light of a Creator whom centuries
have called God. And in the words of Malcolm Muggeridge, when people stop believing in God, they don't then believe in nothing; they believe in anything.

According to Professor Paul Ramsey, an eminent Protestant ethicist, we are always obliged to care for sick persons. However, the requirements of care alter with the condition of the patient. Normally, caring for the patient requires attempts to cure his disease. But once a patient begins to die, the obligations of family and physicians shift, the obligation to cure being gradually displaced by the obligation to provide companionship and every reasonable sort of human comfort for the dying patient. Dr. Richard Lamerton, associated with a London hospice, says that the question of euthanasia is simply irrelevant. «Proper care is the alternative».

Paul Ramsey maintains that current «death with dignity» campaigns to naturalize, romanticize, beautify, or dignify death serve only to heap indignities — insults — upon dying people. Enthusiasts for «death with dignity» appreciate neither the meaning and dignity of life nor the significance of death. We cannot convey dignity to the dying simply by withdrawing tubes and stopping respirators or by not thumping hearts. But by tender Christian care we can at least convey the liberty to die with human dignity. Because it is an evil, insists Ramsey, death really never comes easy. The trite remark that «death is simply a part of life», found in much euthanasia literature including the Living Will, is only one more whistle in the dark, one more declaration designed to quiet the legitimate fear of death which the Christian believer handles best. There is more than wisdom in the Anglican prayer that one be «delivered from a quick and unprepared death».

One can see some of the hypocrisy in the promotion of «negative» euthanasia in the United States in the fact that Joseph Fletcher, the chief crusader for suicide and active euthanasia, has acknowledged, «The plain fact is that negative euthanasia is already a fait accompli in modern medicine». Why, then, all of these attempts to pass passive euthanasia

5. All of Ramsey's books and other writings give evidence of the keenest mind working at the growing edge of bioethics. See his articles in the reports of the Institute of Society, Ethics, and the Life Sciences at the Hastings Center, and especially STUDIES, II (May, 1975).


bills in some twenty American states if it is already well understood that no extraordinary, inappropriate, unreasonable means need to be used and that doctors using their best judgment are not in danger of malpractice suits or a court conviction? In 1938 Charles Nixdorff, then the treasurer of the Euthanasia Society of America, supplied the answer when he said that public opinion is not yet ready to accept the broader principle of putting to death non-volunteers beyond the help of medical science.

Legislation and attempted legislation in the U. S. has taken four different approaches — first, the redefinition of death; second, so-called passive euthanasia; third, active euthanasia on a supposedly voluntary basis; and fourth, active euthanasia of unconscious or incompetent persons on an involuntary or compulsory basis, as in legislation proposed in Florida. Because of new technological powers to sustain the signs of life in the severely ill and injured, determination of death is sometimes difficult. Pacemakers and respirators may conceal the traditional criteria of death, the cessation of spontaneous heart beat and respiration. The matter is complicated by the growing interest in organ transplantation and the argument that donor organs must be kept in primo condition through the artificial maintenance of vital bodily functions.

In 1968, in an admitted attempt to bring the determination of death into line with new and prospective techniques for organ transplantation, an ad hoc committee of Harvard University drew up new criteria including what is rather loosely known as "brain death". Briefly, their criteria are these: unreceptivity and unresponsivity to stimuli, absence of spontaneous muscular movements or breathing, absence of reflexes, and a "flat" electroencephalogram (which they call of confirmatory value for what is in fact a clinical diagnosis). The committee recommended that a patient should be declared dead before the respirator is disconnected, in order to give legal protection to the doctor. The committee believed that

8. For a digest of euthanasia bills introduced in the U.S., see Paul Marx, DEATH WITHOUT DIGNITY: KILLING FOR MERCY Minneapolis: Fort Life, 1975.
no statutory change in the law should be necessary, since the law treats this question as essentially one of fact to be determined by the physician.

However, bills to include irreversible coma or «brain death» in the recognized criteria for death have been introduced in a number of American states and have been passed in three. Opponents have maintained that it is the whole person who dies, and that the concern for the sanctity of life should not be replaced by sole concern for the function of life. Ominously there are others who are beginning to suggest that the proposed change does not go far enough. They want to update the Harvard criteria to eliminate the requirement of «total» brain death, substituting instead the partial, «neocortical» death of the higher brain centers. They argue, in other words, that an individual who still is able to breathe spontaneously should be considered dead if a flat EEG demonstrates his loss of all capacity for consciousness. Their viewpoint is a logical extension of the U. S. Supreme Court’s finding that unborn babies are not persons in any «whole» or «meaningful» sense, and there is every reason to believe that definitions of death would be «updated» still further.

In the view of Alexander Capron and Leon Kass, language that applies only to transplantation has no place in a statute on the determination of death. Hans Jonas opposes even the Harvard criteria of total and irreversible brain death. This situation, he believes, is complete justification for disconnecting the machines and allowing the patient to die, but not for declaring him dead. He pays the Catholic Church a tremendous compliment in saying, «The Catholic Church had the guts to say under these circumstances, let the patient die — speaking of the patient alone and not of outside interests (society’s, medicine’s, and so on)». 

Jonas warns that if the machines can be kept turned on until doctors are ready to excise an organ for transplantation, they can be left on for other more ghoulish purposes. After all, by definition the ex-patient is now a corpse. With the respirator still connected, scientists could keep in a Bioemporium or organ farm the bodies of the deceased on call, known as «neomorts» or the «living dead», using the body as an organ bank, a plant for manufacturing hormones or other compounds, a
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self-replenishing blood bank, or a complacent object of surgical and grafting experiments, immunological explorations, experimental infections, amputations, and so forth. As Jonas points out further, we do not know with certainty the borderline between life and death, and a definition cannot be a substitute for knowledge. He insists, «Nothing less than the maximum definition of death will do — brain death plus heart death plus any other indication that may be pertinent — before final violence is allowed to be done».

The second type of attempted U. S. legislation is based on variations of the «Living Will» distributed by the tens of thousands by the Euthanasia Educational Council. Its inspiration comes from Great Britain, where it is known as an «Advance Declaration». The Living Will is, first of all, vague. It speaks of the situation in which there is no «reasonable expectation» of recovery from «physical or mental disability». But what is a «reasonable» expectation, and what degree of «disability» is envisioned? The patient requests ahead of time that he «not be kept alive by artificial means or ‘heroic measures’», implying that «artificial» means need not be restricted to «heroic» but could be broadly interpreted to include manmade therapy — the injection of insulin, for instance — which is quite commonplace. The most obnoxious feature of the Living Will, however, is the irrational fear it creates with regard to «the indignities of deterioration, dependence, and hopeless pain», which are not at all the inevitable alternatives to a sudden death. Today’s medicine can mitigate so-called unbearable pain, and no country in the world has ever required the doctor to do all he can to preserve life up to the last gasp.

More legislation of the Living Will type, under consideration by at least nine states this year, provides for the execution of documents to be registered at some government office. In order to provide for the convenient death of subjects who would lack the foresight or competence to execute such a document, a Florida legislator, Dr. Walter Sackett, tried for years to get legislation empowering relatives or even a committee of doctors to assume the consent of unconscious or incompetent patients — the mentally retarded, for instance. More recently, Sackett has resigned himself to working for his legislation in three gradual stages.


13. See Sassone, HANDBOOK ON EUTHANASIA, passim.
Living Will legislation adds nothing to a patient’s already existing rights to refuse medical treatment nor to a doctor’s already existing obligation to consider the total welfare of his patient in declining to initiate or continue inappropriate treatment. Thus, it is legally superfluous and serves only to soften public attitudes toward active euthanasia. Besides, prognosis is the most fallible of all the medical arts.

Several American states like England have in recent years considered legalizing active euthanasia for those who have requested it in some living-will type of document. The Montana bill, which was defeated in committee by only a one-vote margin, would have permitted “medicated death” to be administered by a doctor, a nurse, or even by relatives. A person may revoke his declaration—but only once. That is, if he later makes a second declaration, he “may make no second revocation.” Thus far, all proposed legislation for active euthanasia (with the exception of Florida’s earlier bill) has stressed that it is voluntary, but as has been convincingly argued by Yale Kamisar, a renowned American professor of law, voluntary euthanasia is a legal fiction14.

CONCLUSION

It is impossible to be too much concerned about the alternatives and positive responses to the modern, worldwide regressive death movement. I suggest the following for your consideration:

1) For the terminally ill we need to establish more hospices like St. Christopher’s in London, where staff members practice the best of geriatric medicine in making dying patients as comfortable as possible, handling them with dignity and love and working out individualized methods of treatment in the management of pain. Death comes but once let it be easy, said Carl Sandburg.

2) We need homes where the elderly, the most alienated members

of our society, can engage in activities appropriate to their age. We have learned how to increase their years; we have not yet learned how to help them enjoy their days.

3) At all costs the Hippocratic Oath and tradition must be retained, or restored where it has been given up: Ending life is not the business of medicine. *Alevare, Sedare, Sanare*: «To cure sometimes, to comfort often, and to care always» — that is the vocation of medicine.

4) Instances of overtreatment must be eliminated, because these medical abuses precisely give euthanasians an excuse to push for the legalization of mercy killing. Just as allowing «selective» abortion ends inevitably in virtual abortion-on-demand, so no law can be written for «voluntary» euthanasia which would not occasion massive abuses.

5) We must engage in intensive and comprehensive educational pro-life programs at every level. Hard evidence shows that the advocates of killing lose when the public is educated; for example, the jury in the Ede-lin case had not realized that babies are aborted.

6) We must engage in organized, large-scale political action and lobbying, from the lowest precincts to the highest echelons of government. No one must vote for any office-seeker without knowing where that candidate stands on pro-life issues. We must also develop a much needed pro-life rhetoric.

7) As Dostoyevski said, «If God is not, nothing is morally wrong». Thus, there must be a revival of religion, with renewed emphasis on the Christian philosophy and theology of redemptive suffering and dying. Albert Schweitzer said that if you wish to avoid suffering, embrace it. In the past, three moral forces were bulwarks of public morality — religion, medicine and law. But today in many countries the religious forces stand alone, often divided and weakened in their influence. Propagandists for death have successfully employed the Hitler-Goebbel's tactic of privatizing Christian institutions and Christian believers, making it seem that the disposition of human life is a matter of religious belief and personal morality to be governed by the individual conscience without recourse to universal norms. As Ramsey has clarified, «Unless we think of man's life in terms of his worth to God, we have already in principle justified his possible murder for the sake of the 'greatest happiness of the greatest number' or some other quite reasonable earthly goal».

8) Five years ago Bioethics was not even a word. Biomedical technology has catapulted society into a revolution of ethical dilemmas. For
all medical and health care students we must urgently develop special educational programs in medical and biomedical ethics responding to the new questions and problems generated by fast-moving medical advances. In every large hospital there should be a highly competent committee for medical ethics from several disciplines. I see no reason to regard physicians as experts about values and their priorities.

9) Legalized killing of the innocent is a unique threat to modern society. Nevertheless, we must strive for consistency in our pro-life stance. What about capital punishment? What about an adequate theology of war? And what about discrimination and poverty, anti-life social injustices which destroy enormous numbers of lives throughout the world?

10) Watch the death-definers who would inflict on us a Procrustean definition of death or a definition with a vested interest. What is their motivation? Particularly in matters as supremely important as life and death, our technological society must assume that what is not explicitly forbidden will eventually be done — and soon. Fragile are the membranes of society. The line between freedom and compulsion is a perilously thin one.

11) Because the twin evils of abortion and euthanasia are really inseparable, stemming from the same disregard for human life and the same refusal to love all of God’s children unconditionally, the best way to fight euthanasia is to continue fighting the legalization of free-and-easy abortion and even to continue fighting the promotion of contraception, that subtle origin of the killing mentality as a solution to human problems.

Let me conclude with the words of St. Augustine at the end of his *The City of God*: “Let those who think I have said too little, or those who think I have said too much, forgive me; and let those who think I have said just enough join me in giving thanks to God. Amen.”