

"Writing the truth
as I see it;
trying not to
offend
those who will
disagree."

The truth as I see it™

Idaho Common Sense™



Craig L. Bosley, MD

Is there a life not worthy to be lived?

November 19, 2007

In the United States we have had access to legal abortions for nearly 25 years and access to euthanasia in Oregon where it has been legal for 10 years. Some might question discussing abortion and euthanasia together but isn't abortion just a form of euthanasia – involuntary euthanasia? What does the future hold for these procedures? If we look at Great Britain and the Netherlands we can get an idea of the natural progression. In both countries abortion and voluntary euthanasia are already legal with the Netherlands also endorsing involuntary euthanasia meaning the physician can terminate your life without your consent! The British Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynecology is now advocating expanding euthanasia to the "active euthanasia of seriously disabled newborn babies", another practice already legal in the Netherlands. Quoting John Harris, professor of bioethics at Manchester University, "We can terminate for serious fetal abnormality up to term but cannot kill a newborn. What do people think has happened in the passage down the birth canal to make it okay to kill the fetus at one end of the birth canal but not at the other". In the footsteps of the Royal College, the Nuffield Council on Bio-Ethics recommended that "children who are born alive at less than 22 weeks gestation not have a birth certificate and be classed as pre-viable and incapable of sustaining life." In other words the child is viewed as if he/she was born dead rather than alive and as if he/she never existed!

Our country's own American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology recommends that all pregnant women be offered testing for Down syndrome. This is to help a woman make decisions about her pregnancy and is done in early pregnancy so she has the option of abortion. If she elects to keep a baby with Down syndrome this allows her to

receive counseling prior to birth. Although subtle, the underlying message is similar to those of the Netherlands and Great Britain. There are babies that perhaps should not be born.

The Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education in the United States requires all teaching hospitals to make available abortion training to their residents. The Illinois governor issued a mandate forcing pharmacists to dispense any legal drug (the morning after pill) regardless of their personal beliefs. California has filed suit against the United States government claiming the unconstitutionality of the Weldon Amendment which prohibits government agencies from taking any action against physicians or institutions that do not offer abortions. Are we going to make criminals of medical professionals who refuse to abandon their beliefs? Are the pro-choice advocates the only people with the right of choice?

How does a society evolve to the status of the Netherlands with their progressive, tolerant values? How do you transform the physician from a healer and protector of patients to the patient's executioner? It must be done methodically. First you need a subtle shift in physician and public attitudes. Both groups need to understand and accept abortion as well as euthanasia of the severely chronically ill, the terminally ill, the obviously brain dead, etc. This naturally leads to accepting "there is a life not worthy to be lived". The next step is to accept euthanasia of "seriously mentally and/or physically disabled" newborns along with the involuntary euthanasia of adults.

Are we really very far behind the Netherlands? We have accepted involuntary euthanasia of babies prior to birth, i.e. abortion. We are becoming more accepting of voluntary euthanasia

of adults. We have not yet embraced the involuntary euthanasia of adults and the euthanasia of seriously disabled newborn babies. Are we, as a nation, going to subjectively decide whose life is worthwhile? Consider for a moment the critical first step in this process. You must get the physicians and the public to accept "there is a life not worth living". That quote came from a 1949 article in the New England Journal of Medicine discussing how Hitler carefully introduced euthanasia into the Third Reich. It was a designed progression to understanding the need to euthanize an entire race because of their perceived inferiority. The Jewish race was determined to be "lives not worthy to be lived". Once we remove the Down syndrome babies with ongoing abortions what unacceptable condition will be next? Is our logic really that different from Hitler's? Or is it absurd and inappropriate for me to compare what we are discussing today with what Hitler did yesterday? But aren't we discussing making a judgment on the value of a human life just as Hitler did? Isn't the only real difference how far we take it? Who decides which human beings are acceptable and which are not? Where do you draw the line? Who's the judge?

If you would like to read the article about euthanasia and other medical experiments in the Third Reich go to:

http://www.restoringourheritage.com/articles/nej_medicaldictatorship.pdf