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One good reason why we have tended to go from 6 issues a year to frequent double issues is that our circulation is so disappointingly small, and having fewer issues and mailings saves much money. However, we also have had other reasons, such as unanticipated events putting us behind in our schedule.

One topic on which we have fallen badly behind is deathmaking, so this will be the major theme of this issue. Dealing with the deathmaking issue is not only a depressing and oppressing task at best, so to speak; but on top of it all, we have so much copy on it that merely selecting what to include and what to put unreported into our archives is an overwhelming chore. Therefore, even within the broad deathmaking domain, we decided to concentrate mostly on a few highly-selected themes, some of which are not often highlighted elsewhere.

Deathmaking: The Construct of "Death Alliance"

Many people—mostly because of a misformed or as yet defective worldview—refuse to believe that individuals, groups, parties, organizations, movements, ideologies, systems, states, nations, etc., can enter into de facto death alliances. They may do this by committing their very identity to the promotion of death in the world (or at least in their domains), or they may enter into alliances (even if unexplicated) with other parties that have made such commitments, and enter into the goals of those other parties.

Many countries or societies in history appear to have allied themselves deeply with death. Such alliances can be inferred from patterns of actions that are either extraordinarily intense or, more commonly, of a long-term nature, and that are apt to include an array of behaviors such as the following.

The planning of/for, and working toward, future wars—and not just a single or simple war, but "programmatic" war.

Engaging in frequent wars that are either offensive in nature, or motivated by economic enrichment.

Patterns of genocide of other nations, societies, or races, which may include wars against these.

The invention or production of new weapons and other means of destruction, particularly if these are more massive in their deathmaking capacity than previously existing weapons.
Oppression and impoverishment of other peoples and nations, even if carried out by means other than war, e.g., through colonization or economic policies.

A history of having conquered and taken possession of many foreign lands, as in imperial colonization.

Large-scale and cruel slavery.

The setting of peoples against each other, as by inciting racial hatred.

Domestic oppression, persecution, and deathmaking of devalued segments of the society's own populations, and especially the creation, mistreatment, and oppression of a large under-class.

Large-scale systematic destructiveness toward the environment and the life-carrying capacity of the earth.

Legitimization, and even legalization, of deathmaking on a large scale, as via capital punishment, abortion, infanticide, suicide, euthanasia.

The embrace and exaltation of values which are counter to altruism, e.g., selfishness, competition, power-grabbing, materialism.

Granted, some death alliances are more explicit, more intense, or more direct or more active than others, but once entered into one, it usually leads to more of all the above.

*In World War II, while involved in an external war, Germany conducted an internal war against the handicapped and the Jews. Today, our society carries out internal war against the handicapped, the poor, the elderly and the unborn.

The TIPS editor has been predicting since the early 1970s that we would see an ever-decreasing demand for legitimization of various forms of "euthanasia." Around 1990, these developments took a quantum jump, in that 1990 and 1991 have seen vastly more such developments than in most single previous years other than 1973.

As is often the case when one has been right in general outlines in predicting an evil, one sometimes fails to anticipate the exact form that the evil will take in its vast ingenuity. For almost 15 years, I had assumed that one of the major forms that "medical euthanasia" would surely take would be the one it had always been, namely the administration of poisons, or at least of a medicinal drug in deadly doses. While this has certainly come about, it really had not occurred to me that one of the most prominent modes of "euthanasia" would be the systematic planned starvation and dehydration to death that is not only already being practiced now, but for which there is a massive demand. I again remind people that 20 years ago, the general public that now largely endorses this would have recoiled in horror at this idea, and even the most ardent "euthanasia" advocates would have vehemently protested that they had nothing this cruel in mind.

As deathmaking proceeds down its slippery slope, what happens over and over is that yesterday's extreme deathmaking proposal becomes today's "middle-of-the-road" position, often also honored with adjectives such as rational, unemotional, reasonable etc.

The death alliance of our society might as well be promoted and celebrated by one of the battle cries of the loyalists during the Spanish Civil War, "Viva la Muerte" ("long live death").

*A reader said in US News & World Report (30/10/89) that the US Congress and White House are acting in such a fashion that one gets the impression that they are agents of a foreign power "bent on weakening and finally destroying this nation." We would say that this reader perceived the death alliance of our society and its leaders.

*The murder capital of the US also happens to be its political capital, which of course is highly symbolic.
It was rather amusing to read in Time (22/1/90) that it considers "preposterous" the idea of American Negro leaders that there is a "white-orchestrated genocide plot" against them. What we find so amusing is that despite everything that we have learned, people still believe that a de facto genocide policy needs to be consciously devised and conspiratorially implemented. We point out over and over, in TIPS and our TI teaching, that some of the most overarching and systematic policies, developments and strategies can be in operation, as if ceaselessly and ingeniously coordinated by a never-sleeping high intelligence, without people being aware of what is going on, and with no one claiming to agree to it.

Some people speak of genetic engineering as the Auschwitz of biology.

Deathmaking: Advocacy For & Against It

Deathmaking Advocates

Here is a little inventory of people who have played prominent public roles in the promotion of abortion, "euthanasia," or suicide.

Dr. Virginia Abernathy is a Vanderbilt philosopher-psychiatrist who, among others, promoted a "delayed personhood" construct that would allow the killing of infants.

Pieter Admiraal is a Dutch physician who has promoted really big-time deathmaking of elderly and impaired people, not only in the Netherlands, but all over the world.

David Callahan and Father Richard McCormick are among the Catholic spearheads of deathmakings along the above lines. The "bio-ethicist" Callahan (and probably others as well) have been using the phrase, "life-extending care," in those instances where the phrase "life-saving care" would be more appropriate. When you pull a drowning person out of the water, you are not "extending" the person's life but saving it, and we give life-saving rather than life-extending awards to such heroes. When an elderly person has a life-threatening disease and one gives life-saving treatment, then calling this "life-extension" conveys the impression to others that this person has received something extra, rather than what other people might receive under the same circumstances—and yet it is precisely in connection with elderly people that Callahan has been using this euphemism. Not surprisingly, Callahan also referred to the elderly as a financial black hole, or at least so we were told.

Dr. Ronald Cranford, a US neurologist, is one of the prominent promoters of deathmaking of people on life-supports. He coined—or at least made prominent—a new deathmaking phrase, "creatures of modern-day medicine." This phrase is used to refer not only to the people of impaired mentality who are being kept alive by high-tech equipment, but even by rather basic nursing care. He has claimed that they "lack personhood," and have no rights or interests to be protected (NRLN, 11 Feb. 91). His deathmakings include some very close to home, since he admitted hastening his mother-in-law's death with morphine, and dehydrating to death some of his patients who still had consciousness and awareness of their environment. However, he is quite logical in deriving his actions and advocacies from a rejection of metaphysically-based moralities.

Francis Crick and James Watson are Nobel Prize-winners from Britain who have supported all kinds of deathmakings, as has prominent heart transplant pioneer Christian Barnard.

Dr. Raymond Duff was among the first medical people to admit (in the early 1970s, together with A. Campbell) to systematic deathmakings of impaired infants, at Yale-New Haven Hospital.

Barbara Bush, the president's wife, has begun to come out in bits and pieces in favor of various forms of deathmaking. For instance, she had reminisced about a beloved dog that had to be "put down" and said that she "would certainly hope someone would do the same thing for me" (TAETF Network Update, 11/90).
Dr. Joseph Fletcher (recently deceased) started as an Episcopal priest, theologian—then ethicist who has advocated the above deathmakings for many decades, in many works. He designed the endlessly-cited "indicators of humanhood." Caution: he has a name-sake who has published along similar lines.

Dr. R. Gross achieved prominence by making dead all the children with spina bifida under his care in a university hospital in Oklahoma, and promoting more of the same.

Derek Humphry is the most visible promoter of suicide, suicide assistance, and acts of suicide assistance that are really killings.

Dr. Jack Kevorkian is the "inventor" of a do-it-yourself suicide gadget, sometimes grandiosely called a suicide machine.

Ann Landers has consistently promoted abortion and "euthanasia," and we would be amazed if not also infanticide. Her views are more or less the same as those of her sister, advice columnist Abigail ("Dear Abby") Van Buren, who used to be on the board of directors of the Society for the Right to Die. No wonder the latter's enormously influential advice column has consistently promoted several forms of deathmakings (IAETF Update, 5 & 6/91).

Jeff Lyons has a retarded brother and, seeing how bad life was in institutions, began to promote the deathmakings of afflicted infants, as in his book, Playing God in the Nursery.

Dr. Henry Morgantaler has been one of the most intensive establishers of abortion clinics, especially in Canada. Like several deathmaking activists, he is a Holocaust survivor!

Dr. Plum (from Cornell) has been going around trying to talk life-supports away from people, such as Nancy Cruzan.

Dr. Anthony Shaw, a medical professor, has long promoted medical infanticide, and invented the phony deathmaking formula \( QOL = NE(H+S) \).

Peter Singer is a world leader for animal rights and for all the above deathmakings. His parents escaped the Holocaust, but he learned nothing from this. He works out of Australia, as does another prominent deathmaking proponent of German origins, Helga Kuhse. Together, they also called for being honest about killing handicapped children, that it should be called "murder"—and that such murder should be legalized.

Dr. Glanville Williams has called for the de facto elimination of all afflicted humans—at least at the beginning of the life span.

A major new deathmaking leader forging the philosophies and moralities of deathmaking is a German woman by the name of Ursula Wolf who is a professor in Berlin. Much like Peter Singer (one of the world's other leading deathmaking philosophers who is also a leader in the movement that equates animals with humans and asks for rights for animals that in some instances would exceed the rights of humans), Wolf is also one of these "animal people." From what we have read about her, she sounds very much like Singer. We have also seen her being interviewed on a TV show, and noted to our surprise that she looks like what she is.

All the recent leaders of Planned Parenthood (PP) and of the National Organization of Women (NOW) have been big-time promoters of abortion, at the least: Faye Wattleton (past executive of PP), Molly Yard (past president of NOW), and Patricia Ireland (current president of NOW).

The above list is by no means complete. It is only a sampling of some of the names that have been more prominently in view in recent years. It is becoming apparent that when one looks upon the background of leading proponents of "euthanasia," many of them have been proponents, or even leaders, in abortion for many decades.

One sign of a death alliance (see introductory section) is that those who have made one somehow find each other, and gang up. Along these lines, we have noted that people committed to deathmaking somehow also find each other. Cutler's (1969) book, Updating Life and Death, is yet more evidence of that: as early as 1968, many of the people who later turned out to be major promoters of deathmaking (such as Fletcher) had been found, and had found each other, to contribute to this book.
One of our friends recently made the astute observation that if some big funder issued an RFP (a call for grant applications) to promote or conduct some form of genocide, all sorts of groups would submit proposals, including a great many universities. If the genocide were to be aimed at retarded people, then the so-called university affiliated mental retardation centers might be found among the applicants.

The two largest "euthanasia" organizations in the US, the Society for the Right to Die and Concern for Dying, merged in 1990 into a single National Council on Death and Dying, with its headquarters in New York City.

A 1990 Gallup poll found overwhelming approval among the US population for various forms of suicide, suicide assistance and "euthanasia" (Update, 2/91).

A survey conducted by Internal Medicine World Report found almost unanimous agreement among its 1900 respondents in favor of the killing of people said to be in a co-called persistent vegetative state (IAETF, 5/90).

In a poll of physicians, 49% approved of use of suicide machines, or of some form of active "euthanasia" (Medical Tribune, 7/90).

One group of people who appear now to be coming out ever more strongly in support of de facto forms of "euthanasia" are hospital administrators. An overwhelming majority appear to favor various forms of "euthanasia" (IAETF Update, 5 & 6/91). This is because they are intensively oriented to cost issues, and see the deaths of debilitated and long-term patients as highly cost-efficient. Apparently, they are too foolish to realize that the large-scale practice of "euthanasia," as in the Netherlands, would put them out of business. Should they begin to run out of inmates, they would probably all turn against "euthanasia" again, and pass noble-sounding resolutions.

We were told by Philip French that in one respite program in Australia, parents who brought their handicapped child there were given advice on how to "euthanize" the child. That would certainly be a way for the family to have permanent respite! This vignette also illustrates how even positive, and positive-sounding, programs can and do participate in deathmaking.

The United Church of Christ in the US endorsed "euthanasia" and suicide in 7/91, and invoked the "choice" watchword, stating that choice is a God-given right to each person. A survey at about the same time found that only 18% of mainline Protestant ministers thought that "euthanasia" was morally wrong (IAETF Update, 7 & 8/91).

Whenever someone is called an ethicist these days, then in virtually every single case, this means that the person is promoting some kind of (medicalized) deathmaking. The TIPS editor, who vociferously and consistently has spoken against the deathmaking of handicapped and devalued people for almost 20 years, has never been called an ethicist.

Deathmaking Dupers vs. Dupes

The people we listed above are what we call deathmaking dupers, i.e., they dupe other people (often less clever ones) into endorsing or committing deathmaking. Many people who ended up as dupers started as dupes, but underwent a profound conversion which, combined with certain talents that they had, turned them into dupers. A large percentage of the American public is now such dupes. This is exemplified by the following. The moral insanity, and total loss of capacity for rational moral analysis among the people of modernism is dramatically underlined by the fact that life/death responses in US opinion polls show dramatic differences to
tiny nuances in the wording. For instance, when a national sample of Americans was asked whether there should be "an amendment to the constitution prohibiting abortions," 67% were opposed; but when they were asked whether there should be "an amendment to the constitution protecting the life of the unborn child," 50% approved (USN&W, 9 July 90).

Flawed Opposition to Selected Forms of Deathmaking

*In 6/88, the board of directors of the Mental Retardation Division of the Council for Exceptional Children approved a position paper endorsing the right of retarded children to life-sustaining medical care and treatment. In the 3/89 lead article in the Division's journal, Education and Training in MR, which covered the background of the position statement and included a modest bibliography, not one word was said about the TIPS editor's plenary presentation in 1976 to the American Association on Mental Deficiency, predicting the kinds of developments that made the Division's 1988 position statement necessary, even though that address was the first major statement on the danger at hand made to a major MR professional conference. Nor were any of the publications of the TIPS editor on this issue mentioned, even though for several years, his were the only papers on the issue in the professional MR-related literature warning of, or announcing, this child deathmaking. But Buron Blatt once told the TIPS editor, "The one thing they will never ever ever forgive you for is having been right." One other likely reason for this silence is that the connection of the Baby Doe type of killing to other forms of deathmaking was neither addressed nor mentioned in the above article, and this characteristically modern segmentation of issues (pretending they are not connected) would be difficult to maintain if the TIPS editor's warnings and formulations were brought in.

*Yet another incoherent opposition to infanticide occurred in a recent article by Coulter in the Summer 1988 issue of the TASH Journal. The author concluded that the killing of infants with anencephaly "is undesirable and should be prohibited in order to safeguard the rights of all persons with severe neurological disabilities."

*USA Weekend of 9/3/90 carried a listing of prominent names from the entertainment world that promoted various causes. For instance, 7 names were listed as supporters of abortion rights, and only 3 names as opponents of abortion, including Charlton Heston. Not far away there was a listing of gun rights advocates, but with only a single name—that of Charlton Heston. To which Griff Hogan, who furnished this item, commented: "Is there a holster in your seamless garment?"

*One of the grossest stories of incoherency on life and death is told by a woman who was handicapped by polio in childhood (Past Due: A Story of Disability, Pregnancy and Birth, by Anne Finger, 1990) who became an abortion counselor, and an advocate of "disability rights" and of the "lives of the disabled." She had one abortion herself when her pregnancy did not go well, and then a second pregnancy which she unwisely decided to deliver at home, but things went wrong and it ended up as a crash Caesarean delivery of an extremely compromised, and possibly severely brain-damaged, baby. Some feminists just love this book, but to us it gives the willies (source item from Rannveig Traustadottir).

*Rice, C. E. (1990). No exception: A pro-life imperative. Notre Dame, IN: Tyholland Press. This book is written from a Catholic viewpoint by a professor of law at Notre Dame. Despite the promising title, the book addresses only the issues of abortion and "euthanasia," and does not touch on the questions of war, other deathmakings, or violence in general. The "no exception" in the title refers to the common exceptions to the banning of abortion, namely, health and life of the mother, pregnancy due to rape or incest, and impairment of the unborn.
Unfortunately, Rice does make exceptions for ectopic pregnancies and a cancerous uterus, explaining that these are permitted in Catholic moral teaching, and are not direct abortions, only indirect ones. Another problem is that Rice admits from the beginning that from a secular perspective, the abortion battle has been lost—but then proceeds to talk about "legislative options," implying that one should pursue legal solutions. Thus, the book is very disappointing.

Rice (1990) is one of the few works that makes the connection between contraception and abortion, pointing out that the demand and the decision control of things—including of when and if sexual intercourse will lead to pregnancy—underlies so much of both.

*It is very disappointing that a brochure entitled Christian Affirmation of Life: A Statement on Terminal Illness (1984 edition, first published 1974) by the Catholic Health Association focused primarily on termination of life supports rather than on the risks of deathmaking in the contemporary medical context.

*In England, a team had been set up to investigate physical abuse and unnatural deaths of mentally handicapped people, but never in its reports between 1976-1984 was any reference made to such deathmakings (Speakout, 1/87).

Other Opposition To Selected Forms of Deathmaking

*Killing of impaired people by Christian services always surprises us a bit more than killing by secular services, though it should really cease to do so. As long ago as in 1985, a nurse in a nursing home owned by CRISTA Ministries (which is what its name suggests, a Christian nursing home) refused an order to remove the feeding tubes from terminally ill patients, and was fired. She sued, but after a series of court decisions, the Supreme Court of the state ruled in 4/91 in favor of the nursing home. The nurse has since left the profession (IAETF Update, 5 & 6/91).

*Nat Hentoff, editor of the Village Voice, and liberal convert to the war against deathmaking, said that so-called bioethicists are a "new priesthood," and that many "have gardens in which they cultivate only euphemisms" (Village Voice, 6 Oct. 1987).

*A World Federation of Doctors who Respect Human Life has been formed that adheres to traditional medical values, embraces the Hippocratic oath, and reminds physicians that their sole purpose is to serve healing and health, never the induction of death, and that the alleviation of suffering cannot take precedence over the defense of the sanctity of human life. Accordingly, the federation rejects abortion (we are not clear whether in all circumstances) and seeks to support health personnel who get in trouble for upholding the medical and Hippocratic tradition.

Deathmaking Advocacy Through the News or Entertainment Media

*The Chicago Tribune (3 Nov. 91) endorsed euthanasia by stating that "patients should not be left to endure severe, chronic pain," and while it opposed the Washington State euthanasia initiative, it also said, "this is a time for debate and consensus-building," meaning that a euthanasia law right now was premature, but not once further public opinion groundwork had been laid.

*A 1992 novel, Critical Care, revolves around a physician of a hospital intensive care unit. It portrays the intensive care patients in a harsh and unsympathetic fashion, thereby consciously or unconsciously further blowing air onto the fires of "euthanasia."
Don't throw Momma off the cliff! In 1991, several ABC prime-time TV cartoon program episodes of "Dinosaurs" centered on a society in which elderly members are hurled over a cliff and into a tar pit on their 72nd birthday, with the son-in-law eagerly looking forward to pushing grandmother off. The plot compromised a bit by the woman's offspring deciding to postpone the hurling for a while.

...Nor off the train! A 1987 comedy film was entitled, "Throw Momma from the Train," and revolved around a timid man trying to do away with "his overbearing hag of a mother."

...And don't trample her to death. An Australian man trampled his mother to death while listening to his idol, Bob Dylan, sing "One more cup of coffee for the road," but because he was judged insane (what sane man would do such a heinous deed while listening to such a song?), the shrinks who guarded him let him out for a night to see his idol, Bob Dylan, perform. This item is not so much about deathmaking advocacy in the media as it is on music to make dead by.

Deception and Deathmaking Promotion

One of the most important wisdoms of life is that violence (hence all forms of deathmaking) is always attended by deception of some kind, even if no more than cover-up.

*From the very first moment that people formed organizations to legalize the killing of handicapped, impaired or inferior persons, they decided to deceive the public in regard to their real aims by two means. The first means was the manipulation of language so that their aims would be couched in terms that the public might find appealing. For instance, in the 1938 meeting that constituted the National Society for the Legalization of Euthanasia (in the US), the organizers decided to frame their goals in terms of "voluntary euthanasia," even though what they wanted was "euthanasia" regardless of whether it was voluntary or not.

The second pattern of manipulative deception consisted of revealing only part of their agenda to the public. Again, the above meeting serves as an example. The assembly agreed that there should be "euthanasia" of "incurable idiots," but decided that while this was their ultimate aim, they would not include this goal on the legislative bills that they would publicly pursue. (Source material from Peter Lindley.)

*A late 1990 mass mailing from the Society for the Right to Die is a good example of many deceptive strategies being combined. First, the logo of the society is a version of the caduceus, the symbol of the medical arts, thus attempting to gain medical legitimacy for its goals. Also, although the main body of the 4-page letter purports to ask readers to make out a "living will" for themselves, the first 1½ pages is about a father who shot his brain-damaged son in a Chicago hospital, and several similar incidents. Thus, the promotion of the taking of the life of another is wrapped into a debate about what medical treatments one would and would not want for oneself. The letter also invokes all sorts of slogans which numb people's minds and consciences, and disable rational moral analysis, e.g., "irreversibly comatose," "knowing one's rights," "abuses of medical technology," and "connected to a machine that does nothing more than prolong dying." The letter even invokes a "right to determine treatments for a loved one," but this is only invoked in connection with making treatment decisions that end with the death of that "loved one."

The appeal is also an example of what we have referred to as pre-legal deathmaking. Namely, the letter says that people do indeed have the right to determine "treatment" for a loved one, but that this right has simply not yet been recognized in law. In this case, the trends are indeed such that we can expect legalization of widespread, and fairly wanton, withholding/withdrawing of medical treatments from people via family fiat.
Just as we have predicted, and as those who argue that there is a "slippery slope" of deathmaking have claimed, the same arguments and detoxifying language that have been used to endorse and advance one form of deathmaking are also adopted and used to advance another form of deathmaking. Namely, just as a so-called "right" to abortion was advanced with the argument that women have the "right" to "control over their bodies," so now, those who advocate "euthanasia" have used the very same language. For instance, the (US) National Hemlock Society, which supports active "euthanasia," says that "It is up to the individual to do what is right for them. They can do what they want to do with their bodies." And a lawyer was quoted as saying, "When it concerns the control of their body, the person has the right to refuse treatment" (Catholic Sun, 3-9/10/90).

Those who have endorsed the fallacious "control over one's body" argument for abortion will now find they have implicitly also agreed to not only "euthanasia," but also to the legitimization of suicide, and probably other deathmaking forms as well. We are apt to see other movements for not-yet-legal forms of deathmaking also capitalize upon the arguments that have been successful in legitimizing such deathmakings as abortion, capital punishment, and warfare.

One remarkable ploy of conferences, workshops and media forums on deathmaking is that an extreme advocate of deathmaking gets paired to debate someone interpreted as being on the other side—but who in actuality is a moderate advocate for deathmaking. By implication or explication, the audience is left to conclude that some reasonable middle or common ground was arrived at when both parties agree to at least some kinds of deathmaking, and that extremes were repudiated when the more moderate party did not accept some of the more extreme proposals of the other party.

Profoundly revealing as well as ironic is a statement by the chairman of the ethics committee at Pittsburgh's Presbyterian University Hospital. He said he did not know one physician at his hospital who would advocate continued life support for people who have been for some time in a co-called "persistent vegetative state" (IAETF, 8/90). This is the hospital that is one of the high-tech meccas of the world, to which people come from all over the world to have not just multiple, but often even repeat, organ transplants requiring just about the most heroic commitment on the part of a patient. Thus, having several of your organs transplanted, and some of them several times in a row, and living in a state of pervasive dependency on high technology medicine for years on end at horrendous costs, is deemed as highly desirable, while the very low-technology and comparatively low costs of keeping people on long-term life supports is deemed inexcusable. There is a double irony in the fact that many people are rushing to sign such things as living wills for the very reason that they do dread the kind of high-tech patienthood that so much of medicine today just loves.

An article in the New York Times of 12 May 1991 proclaimed that "euthanasia...demands careful consideration...", thus invoking the language of rationality.

We were startled to read an advertisement for another of those deathmaking books that comes with all the code words (hard decisions, sensitive treatment of a most difficult issue, etc.), and that referred to the withdrawal of nutrition and hydration as a "new technology." Also distressing was the fact that this book was published by a Catholic publishing house, Sheed & Ward.

Jack Yates has pointed out a newspaper headline, "The Right to Die Restricted." Why, oh why, does the Supreme Court not simply abolish the right to die so that we might all live eternally?
PERVERSION ALERT--There is the possibility the Planned Parenthood (PP) is trying to infiltrate the handicap area by giving workshops on sexuality of/by handicapped people. (Source material drawn to our attention by John Morris.) Since PP is fundamentally committed to abortion, and largely also to unrestrained but "safe" sex, such conferences could provide PP with a springboard for carrying its ideologies into the handicap field.

The Promotion of Deathmaking of Elderly People

*Alarmist articles and cartoons that decry the benefits received by elderly people have appeared in virtually every news-related periodical since the mid-1980s, sometimes in waves. Within a single year, there were such in the Wall Street Journal, Scientific American, Atlantic Monthly, New Republic, and American Demographics. Commented the Gray Panther Network, "as generational tensions mount to an unprecedented level, the battle may well be played out on the streets."

*Robert J. Samuelson, who has written a regular economic column in Newsweek, is not sympathetic to disadvantaged people. Under the guise of a reasonable proposal to tax social security income of the wealthy, he has hidden proposals to cut the cost-of-living increase to the elderly poor. Such a cutback would be absolutely devastating for the older poor, of which there are a great many. It might dramatically increase the homeless, or push elderly people into nursing homes, which, of course, would cost more than the money saved by this measure. We are apt to see a great deal more of proposals to bash the elderly poor disguised as reasonable proposals to reduce the benefits of the affluent elderly. These developments, as we pointed out, are an expression of the growing resentment between age groups, of yet one more division in our society, and of resultant deathmaking of the elderly who are increasingly interpreted as unreasonable burdens on the younger people, particularly yuppies.

*A very nasty, indeed deadly nasty, organization is Americans for Generational Equity (AGE) founded in 1986, which advocates for what it considers to be economic justice for young adults, and which interprets older people as mean, ruthless people stealing from young folks' hard-earned tax dollars to buy mink coats, golf carts and condominiums. The organization has considerable conservative support because it would curtail benefits for the elderly (CG, 3 & 4/87). This organization wants to systematically divert resources from the elderly and toward the more favored younger adults--one might almost suspect toward yuppies. It is hard to believe that people would have the time, energy, motivation and money to actually devote to such an ultimately deathmaking enterprise, particularly considering that it contributes to division between the generations, and that those younger people who want it all now will themselves have an overwhelming chance to become aged.

*One of the leading cancer specialists in the US said in 1989 that the cost of treating cancer in an aging population could overburden the nation's health care budget (SHJ, 30/11/89). We should note the deceptive phrasing of the problem, because one could equally have said that any other social issue costing the same amount of money would have the same effect, such as paying for our school system, eating more than one needs, the expense of buying video tapes, or bailing out the failing savings-and-loan banks. Thus, we can be almost certain that the speaker was indirectly promoting the deathmaking of the elderly.

*The campaign against the elderly is in fact assuming such perverse proportions that some of its proponents argue that the elderly are the major cause of the budget deficit in the US (NEJHS, 1988 (8), p. 8).
A Relativistic Materialistic Utilitarianism
as a Major Contemporary Motive for Deathmaking

Utilitarianism—especially of a relativistic type unconnected to a higher worldview other than a materialistic one missing—there is both much sentiment in support of a population utilitarianism (e.g., fewer old people is good for everyone else), and an individualistic one (e.g., a baby is a jinx on my career; grandmother is getting to be too much trouble to our family).

*In 1991, we heard for the first time somebody referring to elderly people as being "past their shelf life," which is a classic illustration of how modernistic minds interpret human beings in materialistic, utilitarian and commercial ways as commodities which have utility to others for only a short period of time.

*An article in Contemporary Long-term Care (3/91) by a nurse who is now a "health care consultant" (Costa, 1991) discussed the conflict between prolonging life for the elderly, and containing medical costs. It was illustrated by a drawing of a hand unplugging a plug from an electric socket ("pulling the plug"), and contained various misinterpretations and supposedly rational cost-benefit detoxifications of the deathmaking of the elderly. She said that the nurse "must remain objective and not interpose her value system" in treating such patients, communicating with their physicians and families, and even deciding to withdraw medical treatment, or even carrying that out. (Source item from Rod Braun.)

*We have always opposed the idolatry of high technology in medical care, but we do not approve of what amounts to systematic deathmaking health strategies. As of 1990, in Britain, hemodialysis is not given to people over the age of 55; and in France, no one over 70 can be admitted to an intensive care unit.

*The 1989 Oregon plan for reorganizing the Medicaid system has drawn attention worldwide, aside from being apt to be imitated widely in the US. If only it were based on positive ideologies, it would have much to commend itself. Among other things, it attempts to ration health care, which would not be immoral if such rationing dealt with high-technology or unproven treatments, or did not discriminate against devalued groups merely because they are devalued. However, one must increasingly doubt the motives behind the scheme. For instance, it would deny coverage to patients with AIDS in their terminal stages.

*Aside from saving money every time a baby is aborted, insurance companies are very much aware of the fact that they make more money if people die before they get sick, or soon after they get sick. They particularly do not like it when people require medical services for a long period of time. Therefore, they have begun in their various advertising campaigns to exalt the construct of "quality of life" in a big way, and have also promoted so-called living wills in every way possible (AAI 1 & 2/92).

PERVERSION ALERT--A move is underfoot (including proposed laws) to offer lower medical insurance rates to people who sign "living wills" and "advance directives" that permit the termination of their life supports (e.g., IAETF Update, 5 & 6/91).

*More and more, it is becoming obvious that many instances of deathmaking are fueled by the deathmakers' desire to preserve financial assets, or to gain such, as via inheritance. An early 1990 court decision in New York State ruled that nursing homes that contest a family's attempt to render their impaired relative residing in the nursing home dead—often in order to gain or protect an inheritance—may not get reimbursed for the cost of the impaired person's care. This forces the staff and administration to go along with the deathmaking actions by families, or suffer serious financial consequences. As TIPS readers are well aware, we are no friends of institutions, including nursing homes. However, in several recent
well-publicized cases of deathmaking, nursing home personnel have argued on behalf of life, testified to the value and worth of the lives of even some very seriously impaired people, and fought efforts to make them accomplices to deathmaking. If this decision is upheld, it could unleash even more deathmaking than we are already seeing.

*A dramatic instance of conflicts of interest by close relatives of a 77-year old man occurred in Florida. According to the man's prenuptial agreement, his younger second wife was to receive $100,000 on the couple's upcoming second wedding anniversary, and his step-son from a previous marriage was to receive a million dollar estate upon the man's death. When the old man became debilitated, the son, who was his guardian, opted for withdrawal of life-support, while the wife opposed this, and there was an ugly court battle (IAETF Update, 7 & 8/91).

*Many US papers contain a national advice column by Jane Bryant Quinn. In 5/91, she advised that people who have term life insurance and who are being "kept alive artifically" should have life supports withdrawn "before their life insurance policy becomes worthless," and that to do otherwise would be "foolish" (IAETF Update, 5 & 6/91).

*In order to apply cost/yield and risk/benefit analysis to pollution, some kind of value must be placed on human life. This is commonly done by valuing people's lives in terms of their lifelong earning power. One consequence is that a poor person's life is worth less than a rich person's. Therefore, one logical outcome of these kinds of reckonings is that poor people may be exposed to more pollution than rich ones. This is precisely what has been happening in the US where the health costs of siting waste incinerators and landfills have been falling disproportionately on the poor (Greenpeace, 9 & 10/89).

*According to the evacuation plan for the Seabrook Nuclear Reactor in Mass., there is a 10-mile evacuation zone around it in case of a nuclear mishap—except for bedridden elderly people who would be left behind, and at most be hastily administered a potassium iodide dose which, of course, offers only a small measure of protection. The discovery of this plan made the people of the Rowley Nursing Home very unhappy because they are within the zone where they would be left behind. (Hampton Union 6 Oct. 89; source item from Karen Barker).  

*Traditional western values dictated that a crime be punished in accordance with its moral nature, rather than on the basis of what its victim thought about it. Now there is a strong push on that the victims of crime should play a major role in the sentencing process. Beginning in 1978, one state after another (now up to 47) allowed some form of so-called victim impact statement to be included in the sentencing phase of criminal trials. For instance, if a family testified that it was particularly hard hit by a murder of one of its members, the killer would get the death sentence, where without such a testimony (e.g., in the case of the slaying of a prostitute on whose behalf there may be no or little tear-jerking testimony), only a prison term (or less) would be imposed. The Tennessee Attorney General even spelled it out that killing the President "creates much more social harm than taking the life of the homeless person" (Time, 27/5/91). What all this does is (a) to further undermine the traditional belief in the equal worth of all human lives, and (b) to further contribute to the privatization of deathmaking.

*Time (4 June 90) carried a major article on the peculiar phenomenon of more and more adoptive parents, raised in an entitlement mentality, "giving back" any of their adoptive babies that do not meet their expectations. Some parents have gone so far as returning a child 5 years after adoption to the responsible child placement authorities. This phenomenon is probably also yet another expression of the perception of children as utilitarian commodities. First of all, such commodities are acquired to give one satisfaction, and secondly, they can be bought, sold or junked like any other material possession.
Not surprisingly, some disappointed adoptive parents have even filed suits for "wrongful adoption," which underlines how close this phenomenon is to child deathmaking, because the construct has its origin in those of "wrongful birth" and "wrongful life" suits. In one such suit, parents were demanding $6 million in damages.

The Organ/Tissue Transplant Culture is Now Strongly Linked to Utilitarian Deathmaking

General Background

Human organs/tissues come from 3 sources: (a) voluntary sale of one's organs by living people; (b) parts taken from people after they died from causes not related to the parts quest; (c) people being killed outright for their organs, these people being either healthy, or who were about to die and had their lives abbreviated in order to get their organs/tissues before these got impaired.

Type "b" has a long history, exemplified by eye donorship. Type "a" significantly heightens people's risk of dying, as exemplified by kidney donorship. Type "c" is a form of murder. However, even type "b" now contributes to deathmaking by contributing to a transplant culture that is increasingly linked to deathmaking. Theroretically, one could have an entirely moral organ/tissue transplant medicine, but anyone is a fool who thinks that in the contemporary value context, it is possible to maintain such a transplant culture without getting directly or indirectly tied to deathmaking.

Increasingly, it is becoming legal to take people's organs/tissues after they have died without needing to get consent from the person before death, or family thereafter. This will open the door to killing people medically for their organs, covered further below. Relatedly, some medical authorities are now pushing for provisions whereby organs of (allegedly) dead people could be used unless they had explicitly specified otherwise, rather than the other way around. We consider this a despicable proposal.

*One of the major utilitarian arguments related to deathmaking is that certain people are going to die anyway, and one might just as well get some benefit from their bodies. The argument is first applied to babies who are going to be aborted (they are going to be aborted anyway, so we might as well take their organs), then to newborns who have unhealthy conditions such as anencephaly, and increasingly to other terminally ill people whose organs or parts somebody wants. These arguments are also recruited to justify research with body parts, i.e., the use of tissues from aborted babies in research may be defended as ethical as long as one does not participate in, or approve of, the abortion—an argument heard even on Catholic university campuses.

By the way, the first several times a particular internal organ transplant takes place, virtually 100% of recipients die anyway. Typically, they are given false hope, but in reality serve as sacrificial lambs for the perfection of the procedure.

*According to a Gallup poll, 27% of Americans expressed willingness to donate their organs after death—but 71% were quite eager to give permission to donate the organs of their family members after their deaths (Update, 2/91).

*Modern-day grave robbing? In the United States, the number of operations in which bone or tissue is transplanted has climbed from about 4500 in 1981 to close to a half million a year. By early 1990, the body parts transplant business had become a billion-dollar one. Various for-profit corporations had sprung up to access, collect and distribute tissues, organs and bones, competing with each other in what one report called "hard ball" fashion. By late 1989, there were 70 bone and tissue banks, 44 Red Cross units involved in bone collection, and at least 100 other hospitals and independent groups engaged in this business. Yet there were no established national guidelines for federal safety standards regarding quality and procedures for these transplant materials. Because the demand is so high and the
supply so scarce, it is a seller's market, which means that these agencies are charging outrageous prices for these "materials," and that there is a tremendous incentive to obtain these "materials" in just about any way possible. We have gruesome images of modern-day thieves hanging around where people die to collect "material," or even "harvesting" parts from the still living, which they would then sell to middlemen who would in turn charge exorbitant prices for these, much as in the 19th century there was a lively trade in corpses dug from cemeteries and sold to physicians and medical schools for research, learning and teaching (Indianapolis Star, 14 January 1990; source item from Joe Osburn).

*Everybody should consider it most ominous that so often, people in the forefront of the tissue donations culture are also in favor of "euthanasia," and vice versa. In this connection, it is ominous that two medical professors, from the University of Minnesota and University of Pittsburgh, who have been consistent promoters of "euthanasia" received a $1.6 million grant from the US government to study organ and tissue donations (Update, 2/91).

*A West German company has been sending letters to people who filed for bankruptcy, offering to pay them as much as $45,000 for a healthy kidney which it plans to resell for $85,000 to wealthy people. Nor is this the only commercial human organ brokerage. For instance, the German operation is being undercut by cheaper Asian kidneys (Newsweek, 5 Dec 88).

*According to a 12/89 Oslo newspaper, rich people in the Western world have also been buying body parts from those of the Third World, sometimes for a mere pittance.

*One of the places in the world where there is a lively trade in organs is in India. Some renal units in Bombay have run commercial kidney transplant programs. Patients are often wealthy Arabs from the Mid-East. However, the transplant operations are commonly so poorly conducted as to have a high failure rate (The Age, 22/11/90; source item from John Annison).

*In the Islamic world, there is strong religious objection to transplants of organs of the dead—but not to those from the living. In consequence, rich Muslims have begun to buy organs from poor ones for themselves. In Egypt alone, several hundred people every year have sold their kidneys to rich Arabs, who mostly come from the oil-producing nations (IAETF Update, 9 & 10/91). There are cafes in Egypt where people go to let it be known that they are prepared to sell one of their organs, and where the haggling over price takes place. The problem of poor people in Egypt selling their kidneys had gotten so bad that efforts have been made to ban the practice, but such efforts are unlikely to be successful (AP, in SHJ, 13/1/92).

*The very natural consequence of the claim that one "owns" one's body is, of course, that one can also sell it; and thus, the body ownership argument that is one of the major rationales of the abortion movement feeds viciously into the legitimization of the body organ market.

*A repulsive thing is to benefit from the organs of people judicially executed. They are not killed for their organs, but by accepting their organs, one sanctions capital punishment. A pathologist from Michigan has tried for 30 years to legalize the "harvesting" of organs from capital offenders. Since the organs must be "fresh," he proposes that the condemned be medically anesthetized, and then at the very point of brain death, have their organs taken out (Newsweek, 9 Jan. 89). Physicians in Hong Kong all received a letter telling them that their patients could get kidney transplants in China for $12,800. One reason why China has a great surplus of kidneys to offer for transplants is that it has very few people on dialysis, and therefore also very little demand for kidney transplants itself. Secondly, almost all the fresh kidneys in China come from executed prisoners. The Chinese sell the organs of people condemned to death for hard
currency. This requires a gruesome and deliberate orchestration of movements of the condemned and the organ recipients, and of the execution itself so that it is very "neat" and results in minimal organ damage, with physicians removing the organs within seconds, and transplants often taking place within hours.

Now if all the people (including many Christians) who are opposed to abortion but say that it is moral to accept tissues from aborted babies were to be logical, they would also say that it is perfectly moral to accept organs from executed prisoners, regardless of why they were executed or who executed them. After all, "they would have been executed anyway," which is what they are saying about the aborted babies. Of course, if China discovers that it can earn hard currency from the sale of organs of the people it condemns to death, it might find a motive for condemning a great many more to death. After all, the one thing that has long been cheap in China is lives.

The names of various genetic engineering firms that are involved in the "harvesting" of organs and fetal tissue for transplant also reveal the strategies of detoxification: Select Embryos; Quality Embryo Transfer Company Limited; Sunshine Genetics; Reproduction Enterprises, Inc.; and Treasure Valley Transplants (Cordes, 1991; source item from T. Neuville).

We have heard much of cases lately where parents conceived a child only in order to have it serve as a living tissue source for a sibling (e.g., as in the Ayala case in Los Angeles), or parent.

In German medieval literature, there is the story of "Poor Henry," a noble knight with a deadly disease (this is why he is called "poor") cured only by a medicine made with the parts of a virgin maiden. A selfless maiden steps forward to sacrifice her life for Poor Henry. Just as she is about to be slaughtered by the physician, Poor Henry decides he would rather die himself than regain health at her expense. A noble lesson for potential beneficiaries of transplants from other humans in our day.

When organs or tissues are taken from people for utilitarian purposes, we really should not call this harvesting, but at best "harvesting," and better yet something like extracting, exploiting, etc. Otherwise one contributes to detoxification of the practice.

Killing Impaired Adults for Their Bodies or Parts

In a 1987 article in the American Journal of Law & Medicine, Cranford (a neurologist mentioned earlier as a prominent deathmaker) and Smith, a lawyer, proposed first of all that consciousness is the single "most critical moral (constitutional) standard for human personhood," and that secondly, human status should be linked to this construct of personhood—which, of course, had been proposed earlier, particularly by Joseph Fletcher (also mentioned earlier) and the US Supreme Court. These authors have advocated that a person once declared to be "neocortically dead" should lose all legal rights or liberties. This proposal would open the way for keeping such persons alive for purposes of research, or as tissue and organ sources. According to Cranford, this would include the permanently unconscious, those in apparently irreversible comas or so-called persistent vegetative states, as well as anencephalic infants. Also, the life functions of such persons can be carried on so as to be discontinued only in order to "maximize insurance disability payments or pensions." Nat Hentoff (Nat. Right to Life News, 12 April 1990) has called this the "Cranford efficiency model of death."

How perverse and obscene the "brain death" scam can become was dramatically brought out in a case in Melbourne. The local Anglican archbishop had a heart attack and urgently needed a heart transplant. Just at that time, a 42-year old woman had a brain hemorrhage and was rushed to a hospital in a coma. She was
resuscitated, but the doctors pronounced her "dying," and then claimed she was brain dead, and that she was just being kept alive for her organs. Her family was asked to sign a consent to donate her organs, but refused to do so. Thereupon, the woman rallied and began to regain one function after another. Eventually it was discovered that her hemorrhage had actually been much less severe than the physicians had interpreted. She then had brain surgery, and within days of being interpreted as brain dead, she was walking, talking, alert, and responsive to relatives. After all of this had happened, the hospital turned around and claimed that there had never been a "definite diagnosis of brain death." In the meantime, the Archbishop died (Weekend News, 13/10/89; source item from John Pitchford). Unfortunately, this also means that if there really were such a thing as brain death, one would now be reluctant to agree to donate somebody's organs because one could not be sure that brain death actually had taken place.

*Yet another example of the deception that surrounds the eagerness to "harvest organs" from allegedly dead people occurred in Florida where a couple was told that their 15-year old daughter was dead, and the emergency room physicians asked them for her organs. The parents did not respond right away—and two days later, the girl suddenly scribbled out a message that she wanted to talk to her mother (IAETF Networker, 10 Jan. 90).

*A physician at a hospital in Cambridge, England, famous for its pioneer work in heart transplants, took early retirement because he could no longer deal with what he saw going on. He said that heart donors were having their beating hearts excised while they were still alive, having previously been declared brain dead simply so that this could be done (Daily Telegraph, 11 April 88; source item from SpeakOut, 3/89).

*People who sign papers that their organs can be taken after death are not aware that they may be signing their death warrants, in that they may then be killed for their organs while being merely in critical condition, or at least made dead earlier while in terminal condition. Thus, when the Catholic bishops of Ontario began in 1990 to strongly encourage their flock to sign permissions to donate their organs on their deaths, they were apparently totally unaware that they were thereby promoting medical homicide.

*In the Australian state of Victoria, the legal definition of death is contained in "The Human Tissues Act of 1982." (Source from Rob Nicholls.)

*A ring of thugs in Colombia has been killing homeless men (at least 22) often by clubbing them, and then selling them to universities, apparently to be cut up for anatomy courses. Worse, 10 victims were taken into university buildings on a single night, and clubbed to death there, apparently in order to be "fresh" for use (AP, in SHJ, 3/3/92).

Killing Impaired Babies for Their Body Parts

*About the time that the Loma Linda Medical Center in California began to aggressively pursue the transplantation of organs from babies allegedly born anencephalic into other infants who needed hearts, livers, kidneys, etc., an increasingly common argument has been that such babies are not really live to begin with, which of course provides another excuse for de facto killing such babies in order to "harvest" their organs as fresh as possible.

*By now, everybody is apt to have heard of the baby born in Florida in early 1992 with anencephaly whose mother did everything she could to have the baby killed for organ donations. A judge prohibited the killing, but allowed all organs to be taken short of killing the baby. Apparently, the University of Miami abstained from doing this because of the vast amount of publicity, and the baby died without being taken apart.
We received a belated clipping announcing that in 1988, in a hospital in Birmingham, England, a woman was known to be carrying an impaired baby that the people on the scene were inclined to abort, but decided to keep alive so that they could butcher it immediately upon birth and use its organs for transplants—which is what they did (South Wales Echo, 8 Aug. 88; Source item from Kristjana Kristiansen).

Killing Healthy Adults For Their Body Parts

Adults, often still youthful, may now be killed for their body parts. These are either healthy adults, in which case we have what most people would call murder; or they are impaired adults, usually ones who are near death and whose deaths are brought about early in order to get the organs while they are still viable. Morally, this kind of deathmaking is also murder, though most people no longer see it as such.

Healthy adults now only seem to get killed for their parts in something akin to a slave trade, reported to be active across the borders of several Asian countries. Women and children allegedly get captured, the women in part to be sold into sex slavery, in part to be killed for their organs, as are the children.

Killing Healthy Children for Their Body Parts

As mentioned above, some of this is reported to be part of an international slavery trade. One other place where this is happening is South America, where police death squads and private citizens are killing unwanted abandoned children anyway in increasing numbers, some after having been used as slave labor. There is increasing evidence that in at least 5 Latin American countries, children get bought and sold for between $1,000-$10,000, depending on the child's skin color and health. Some of this commerce appears to be for the sex industry, but there is suspicion that some of it is for organ transplants (CNS, in CM 15/8/91).

In Paraguay, seven Brasilian babies were rescued by police from a gang of kidnappers who apparently had planned to sell them to the US under the pretense of being adopted, for about $12,000 each, in order to be butchered for their organs. The families who were going to buy them had posed as the adoptive families. Apparently, these were wealthy families who had a member who needed organs that a baby could supply. It also appears that there are illegal underground organ banks in the US, and possibly illicit transplant operations (Australia Herald, 8/8/88, from John Armstrong; South Wales Echo, 8/8/88, from Kristjana Kristiansen).

Exploiting Aborted Babies for the Sake of Their Body Parts

While the use of fetal tissues from babies that would have been aborted anyway is now "old hat," having been common since the early 1970s, aborting babies only in order to benefit from their bodies is more recent. Fetal tissue trade started for the sake of research, and more recently expanded to transplant purposes. While most people would still disapprove of aborting a baby only, or primarily, for the sake of its organs/tissues, a large proportion have no big scruple—if any—about the organs/tissues of babies aborted for other reasons being exploited in a utilitarian fashion, either for transplants or research. Yet some of these same people have said that the results of medical research conducted by the Nazis on Jews or foreign prisoners should not be used, or even disseminated. What hypocrisy! We would choose to die from a disease rather than be cured by the tissues of babies that were wilfully aborted.

In 1989, it was announced that the US government was funding research in which brain tissue from aborted babies of schizophrenic women would be implanted into the brains of rats to see if they would become schizophrenic.

The British government approved the use of fetal tissue from abortion for research purposes in 1989 (Science, 4 Aug. 89). We can thus anticipate a vastly
increased amount of such research in the UK.

*In 5/90, tissue from an aborted baby was transplanted for the first time in the US to an unborn child who had a genetic disorder. Ironically, the medical establishment very cleverly selected for their first such case a couple where the husband is a Baptist pastor and both parents are opposed to abortion (or at least were)—but who then testified in 4/91 before a US congressional subcommittee that the federal ban on the medical use of aborted fetuses should be terminated. Interestingly, the New York Times news service article that reported on this referred to the aborted child as a fetus, but to the fetus under treatment as an "unborn son" (NY Times News Service, in SHJ, 16/4/91). It is also interesting that by the time the pastor testified, it had not yet been clear whether this treatment showed any benefits.

*One glimmer of good news is that there has been a growing sentiment among German medical scientists to abstain from research on human embryos (Doerner, 1989), and the West German government announced plans (Science, 4 Aug. 89) to ban virtually all use of human embryos in biomedical research, as well as the creation of "spare embryos" during artificial insemination efforts.

Abortion For Other Utilitarian Reasons

People have abortions for many utilitarian reasons. Some are the very same ones for which they would otherwise practice contraception: to have a child is troublesome, costs too much, cramps one's options, inhibits one's career, is risky to health, etc. Some women abort for cosmetic reasons: it disfigures the body, and at least one even said it was the wrong season because she would not look good pregnant in a bathing suit during the summer. And then there are eugenic reasons, or fear of having to rear an impaired child. Some people abort because the child is the "wrong" sex.

*The combination of materialistic utilitarianism, and the equation of humans with objects, is exemplified by the comment of one young mother about her decision to have amniocentesis to determine the "quality" of her unborn child: "Having a baby isn't like buying a car, but in a way, he (her husband) wanted to know what he was getting..." (Elshain, 1991, in Cordes, 1991, p. 65).

*In late 1989, scientists announced that soon, genetic defects in the ovum will be identifiable even prior to its fertilization. What all this forebodes is (a) a fanatic quest for the perfect and pre-manufactured baby, (b) a vast technologizing, objectification and dehumanization of human reproduction, (c) a new eugenics era, and (d) the destruction of innumerable embryos in vitro.

*US insurance firms are heavily involved in the funding of abortions, and one can easily see why they have an extremely high incentive for doing so. An abortion may cost them as little as $300, while a live birth might cost them $5,000. Since an estimated 20% of US abortions are paid for by insurance firms, and possibly more, it is therefore also not surprising that some of the major US insurance firms (including Prudential, Metropolitan Life, Nationwide, Pacific Mutual and Lincoln National) have been heavy contributors to Planned Parenthood (Life Advocate, 9/91).

*Opposing abortion for utilitarian reasons is morally not much better than promoting or performing it for such reasons. For instance, ex-presidential candidate Robertson said that he opposed abortion because "the hands, hearts and arms of these children killed would have produced $1.4 trillion in our GNP by 2020" (Newsweek, 29/2/88). Quite aside from the fact that these figures may be grossly overstated, it is a most peculiar materialistic argument against abortion, playing into the very motives behind so much abortion in the first place.
The Connection Between Deathmaking & Commercial Sex, Especially Prostitution & Pornography

It is amazing how little recognized the connection is between deathmaking on the one hand, and commercial sex, primarily in the forms of prostitution and pornography.

By pornography, we mean the presentation in the media of sexually provocative material in order to entertain and arouse observers, and especially of sexual behaviors and acts that would ordinarily be performed in private. Our definition would overlap, but not necessarily be identical to, the accepted legal definitions, which include phrasings to the effect that this material is presented in order to "stimulate the prurient interests" of observers. By the very fact of their being exposed to such material, most people's "prurient interests" are stimulated, whether that is the intent of the depictors or not, and whether this is admitted or not. We also distinguish pornography from prostitution, promiscuity, and other sexual vices.

Pornography expresses and contributes to deathmaking in a number of ways, though some of these are subtle and indirect. Below follow some examples of the link between pornography and deathmaking.

1. We have noted that many diverse forms of deathmaking are, at root, expressions of a hedonistic, materialistic, individualistic, utilitarian value system (what we have called "modernism") which has gained preeminence in Western societies. Pornography is intimately tied to one of the core premises of this value system, namely, that unbridled sensual self-indulgence is one of the highest goods, or at the very least, that it should not be denied to anyone. Thus, one often hears arguments to the effect that all sorts of pornography should be legal because it would be wrong to "restrict people's freedom to enjoy it if they want to." This legitimization of practically any behavior, no matter how it may affect others, on the basis that it is an individual's "right" or "choice," has led to an increasing prevalence and availability of pornography. Thus, pornography feeds on, and back into, the very modernism that is itself a source of so many other forms of deathmaking, as we have explained at length elsewhere.

2. At least the visual forms of pornography induct the people who display themselves (and whom we shall call "actors") into a culture which, at the very least, demeans love, family and sex itself. How would it be possible for persons who surrender their bodies to meaningless, mechanized, objectified, and highly public sex to avoid dissociating sex from love (at least over time)? Furthermore, how could such persons continue to view the conjugal act as a loving, intimate, and even sacred one, inextricably linked to the passing on of new life? If one comes to separate from each other sex, love, and all the things that are related to these in the transmission of life (such as the family), and instead, to perceive any of these as mere instruments for one's own gratification, then it becomes much easier to turn against, and even get rid of, any of these which fail, or cease, to bring one gratification. Getting rid of includes making dead.

3. Pornography emphasizes mechanical genital sex experiences, divorced from (a) legitimate relationship, (b) loving relationship, and often (c) any relationship whatever. In other words, it is genital sexual stimulation per se that is being purveyed by pornography. This implies that the persons with whom one engages in sex are only valuable to the degree that they are useful for achieving genital sexual pleasure or release. Elsewhere, we have explained how a materialistic hedonistic utilitarianism values human beings only in materialistic hedonistic terms, such as according to how much pleasure they can give to others.

If and when a person is not willing or capable of giving sensual pleasure to others, these others may decide that the person has no more value, and can legitimately be killed. Thus, the depersonalization of sex that is evidenced in pornography both derives from, and contributes to, the general depersonalization of humans that is a part of materialistic hedonism. Whenever a person is de-personalized—i.e., reduced to an object—then it becomes much easier for others...
to do bad things to the person. Feminists are thus vindicated in their claim that pornography demeans women by portraying them as sex objects and even as sexual "means," and that it thus plays into all sorts of other discriminations against women. However, men too can become sexual objects, being reduced to mere genital sexual instruments (and only one of many conceivable ones), as evidenced by all sorts of courses that teach women to masturbate with penile-type mechanical objects. Thus, pornography is not merely a "women's issue," but a human one.

By the way, the gender blinders in regard to pornography were exemplified by a recent Canadian Supreme Court ruling that "obscenity" refers to what subordinates or degrades women (only!), and that pornography results in violence--but only (!) against women and children. What is this craziness?

At the same time, large segments of feminism have been silent vis-à-vis pornography for one very relevant reason: modernistic feminism is heavily individualistic, materialistic, here-and-now-istic and sensualistic, and an attack on pornography would undermine the very libertarianism on which feminism thrives so much. Unless one understands this, one will not understand why feminism has directed so little effort to combating pornography, as compared to other issues, and above all, abortion. The (woman) president of the sex magazine Penthouse very logically applied the feminist abortion arguments in favor of pornography (Newsweek, 16/12/91): "I think if a woman has a right to an abortion and to control her body, then she has the right to exploit her body and make money from it. We have it hard enough. Why give up one of our major assets?"

4. Any particular theme of pornography eventually becomes boring (i.e., sense-saturating), and can sustain interest only by escalating in intensity. Thus, ever more and ever higher levels of sensory indulgence must be sought in order to give the same "high." This means that eventually, explicit sex will no longer stimulate observers to the same degree that it might have done when it was a novelty. In a permissive, sensualistic society, "conventional" or "old-fashioned" pornographic themes have quickly reached their limits of novelty, and therefore, ever more drastic escalations of their intensity are sought. A major such escalation is violent sex. Indeed, in some pieces of pornography, violence is depicted in order to give observers a thrill. Some of the actors—in pornographic films, especially women—are reportedly even killed, as in so-called "snuff films," also reflective of the depersonalization mentioned earlier. This should not be at all surprising, because once one accepts the premise that it is right and good for people to pursue unlimited sensual indulgence, then there is no logical end point at which to limit the kinds of sensual pleasures that may be indulged.

5. More and more pornographic materials are becoming available which display children for sexual purposes. This abets deathmaking in four ways. (a) Many such children are kidnapped and sold into sexual slavery. (b) Children used for pornographic sex are susceptible to venereal and all sorts of other diseases, and among other things die as a result of these. (c) In some films, the child actors may actually be killed, as already mentioned. (d) Child pornography is apt to incite sexual crimes against children, including their abduction, abuse and murder. (e) There is really little reason to doubt that children used as sex objects will be more likely to become violent (and sex-abusive) adults.

6. Because human beings imitate each other, including the "fascimiles" of other human beings that they see in films, on TV, and in other media, it can only be expected that people who get enjoyment out of pornographic degradation of sex and women (men), and even out of pornographic violence, would be more likely to act out such degradation and violence in their own lives.

7. Pornography is sexually tempting, arouses lust, and overpowers the defenses of some people. They may then lose control over inhibitions and take recourse to violence, as in rape, child sexual abuse, or violence that does not involve sexual acts, but is sex-driven. For instance, much arson is sex-driven, as are many non-sexual acts of sadism. The above dynamics are at work in both sexes, but in men more so, and women and children are more likely to become victims. Even where no violence is involved, pornography can arouse people to having sex, which results in conception, and conception under such circumstances will often result in (a) abortion, or (b) unwedded pregnancy and single motherhood, which in turn
contributes to child abuse, child neglect, and the growth of children into adulthood with many problems that have their respective long-term deathmaking components. Readers should note that feminists commonly deny that men are more vulnerable to sexual arousal via visual stimulation, liberals commonly deny that pornography contributes to violent sex, and both commonly deny that single motherhood is bad, and bad for children in ways other than merely economic ones.

8. The prevalence of advertisements and promotions of pornography in the cultural environment affects even those members of the culture who do not buy pornographic magazines or view pornographic films. For instance, even children whose buying and viewing habits are closely monitored by their parents are still likely to see pornographic displays in magazine stands, or TV ads for pornographic films, or to witness other adults purchasing such magazines or attending such films. They may even be witnesses to pornography on cable TV, on TV in hotels/motels where they may stay whilst travelling, or on other unexpected occasions. As a result, children are more likely to want to observe pornography, to find it exciting, and to participate in it, and what it leads to and contributes to.

9. In the United States, pornography is an $8 billion (or more) a year business. Thus, if for no other reason than that it contributes so heavily to the American economy, pornography is linked to deathmaking, because the US economic structure is itself a profoundly death-creating one. We have explained how such an economy makes and keeps whole classes of people poor, and how the poor are highly likely to be the victims of all sorts of deathmakings.

10. Deviant or violent sex (including mutilation) has also been strongly associated with satanic cults, together with other violent crimes. The shrink world dismisses this as merely a manifestation of psychotic behavior, but if that is so, why would there be an increase of such elements at this time?

Because of the close connections between pornography and prostitution, it should already be clear from the preceding coverage how prostitution is also linked to deathmaking. But we will further elaborate on this below.

1. Many prostitutes are recruited from the pornographic acting business (and vice versa, many people are recruited into pornographic acting from prostitution).

2. Especially nowadays, with the increasing demand for child prostitutes as well as for child pornography, children may be inducted into prostitution. This may happen through outright kidnapping of children for sexual purposes, or by preying upon children who have either been abandoned, or have run away from home and ended up on the city streets with no money. An easy way for them to earn money for food, and for them to feel taken care of, is to work for a pimp. Of course, all sorts of awful things are apt to happen to the children as a result, including not just sexual abuse, but also possibly contraction of venereal disease, addiction to drugs (possibly as a way for the pimp to control the child), battery and other violence by either the "clients" or the pimps, etc. Estimates are that about 1/3 of the prostitutes in Toronto are under 16, and some of them are as young as 12. The younger ones had almost all been in foster or group homes before becoming prostitutes; 95% of these younger ones had sexually transmitted diseases, and many were on drugs (Globe & Mail, 31/1/86). Already in 1977, police in New York City estimated that 20,000 runaway teenagers under 16 were living on that city's streets, many of them available for commercial sex. In the same year, it was estimated that up to 3000 girls and boys under the age of 14 were engaged in prostitution in Los Angeles (Tannahill, 1980, p. 374).

3. Of course, it is not only child prostitutes who are subject to violence. Violence is an integral part of the world of prostitution. Many pimps use violence to control those who work for them, and as well, many prostitutes are subject to violence from their "clients."

4. Prostitution is a major transmitter of disease. For instance, much of the AIDS that is currently devastating central Africa is transmitted by prostitution. Male prostitution has been a major transmitter of AIDS in the western world, and plays a major role in the current resurgence of drug-resistant TB.
5. Historically, the life expectancy of prostitutes has always been low, due to such things as the violence of the subculture of the streets, drug use, and their increased susceptibility to venereal and other disease. For instance, both in the past as well as currently, prostitutes have been more likely than other groups to be the victims of mass/serial murderers.

6. Further, prostitution is very intimately linked with the drug culture. For instance, many pimps are drug dealers. Many prostitutes take up prostitution in order to support a drug habit, or become hooked on drugs after they have taken up prostitution. Also, the members of each subculture often are look-outs and recruiters for each other.

7. Just as pornography dissociates sex from love and marriage, so too does most prostitution. Above, we have explained how this severing of the tie between these two contributes to deathmaking.

The US Attorney General's commission on pornography released its report in 1986 which was greeted with a great deal of skepticism by the media, and especially the liberal media. An earlier federal commission on pornography under President Johnson had concluded that pornography was not harmful either to individuals or society; many of the critics of the Reagan administration's commission claimed that the earlier commission's findings were correct, and that this one—which found a number of harms resulting from pornography—was biased, non-objective, and outright wrong. In deciding where to stand on this issue, we believe it is helpful to keep in mind a number of points.

1. Material which would have been considered pornographic 20 years ago, when the first presidential commission on pornography conducted its investigation, is now considered tame or possibly not even pornographic. Most people think that pornography consists of the photos shown in such well-known "men's magazines" as Playboy and Penthouse. However, pornography today goes far beyond that, including everything from depictions, video-showing, or enactment, of homosexual activity, violent sex, child molestation, human-animal sex, forms of coprophilia, mutilation and murder.

2. It is utterly inconceivable that human learning mechanisms and other human dynamics which apply in every other situation in which humans are involved would somehow not apply with regard to pornography. The dynamics of imitation, of excitation of drives that seek relief and fulfillment, of both conscious and unconscious image messages impinging on the mind, of the previously never-thought-of becoming quite thinkable, etc., surely must be expected to have their effects with regard to pornography, just as they do with regard to any number of other issues, from the selling of automobiles to the education of children in schools. Thus, the presence, and especially the widespread and abundant prevalence, of pornography in the environment must have an effect on members of society, and especially on impressionable people, which certainly includes children.

3. The idea that the level or degree of pornography could somehow be controlled seems to us most suspicious. After all, the phenomenon of sensory saturation is real, i.e., a gratified sense eventually becomes sated, and in order to receive the same degree of stimulation or even pleasure, the degree of excitation of the sense must go higher. Therefore, it must be expected that after a while (and perhaps after only a short while), milder forms of pornography would cease to give the same degree of pleasure or arousal to observers that they once did, and therefore ever more explicit and/or violent forms of pornography will be sought.

4. As we explain elsewhere, there is a close connection between pornography and the victimization of especially women and children. For instance, in major cities, a large proportion of homeless children and teenagers are involved in some form or another in pornography (e.g., as models or actors) and prostitution. Prostitutes are often recruited into pornography.
We thus challenge our readers to re-examine any easy, reflexive, skeptical (liberal?) stances that they may have adopted, especially towards anything promoted by any conservative body or governmental administration. In regard to this issue specifically, we believe that it is more likely than not that the Reagan commission's findings are true, though their recommendations, being on a technical level, can hardly be expected to bring about much improvement. Instead, much as with the growing drug problem in our society, the roots of the problem must be sought, and solutions must be addressed to those root causes. So far, there are no signs that this is likely to be done in regard either to drugs or pornography.

The Privatization of Many Kinds of Deathmaking

Societies have always regulated morality. With the advent of modern legal thinking came the distinction between issues in which the state "had an interest," and those in which the state did not. If the state had an interest in something, it would regulate it, or at least establish legal incentives or disincentives in respect to it. Otherwise, citizens were free to do as they pleased, the matter being, or becoming, a "private issue."

Within the culture of modernism, more and more deathmakings in which the state once had an interest have been made into private issues, i.e., been privatized. The most striking example is abortion (a private issue for a woman, or between the woman and her physician, as the current slogan goes). In fact, first the abortion movement, and then other deathmaking movements, have carefully cultivated the language of privacy because it has such strong superficial appeal to the thoughtless, shallow people of modernism.

Privatization of all sorts of moral decisions had one of its major constitutional boosts in a 1965 US Supreme Court decision (which overturned the birth control law of the state of Connecticut) which stated that the guarantees in the Bill of Rights have "penumbras," and that these create "zones of privacy". The 1973 Roe vs. Wade decision that legalized abortion on demand further elaborated the privacy construct, explicitly used the term "right of privacy," and placed the issue of a woman's right to an abortion under this privacy construct. Thereby, it interpreted the right to privacy as even pre- eminent over the question whether the unborn was a human, and explicitly noted that "we need not resolve the difficult question of when human life begins."

Other court decisions which basically fed on privacy constructs include the 1975 Karen Quinlan case in New Jersey, where the New Jersey supreme court explicitly invoked the "unwritten constitutional right of privacy," stated that Karen's death was subject to Karen's will—and then further expanded the privacy construct by transferring the life-and-death decision to Karen's family because of Karen's incompetency.

Ever since, the right to privacy construct has been invoked in one deathmaking case after another. One notorious example was the Philip Becker case in California in 1979 (which also reached the US Supreme Court) that permitted absentee parents to withhold permission for potentially life-saving surgery from a teenage boy with Down's syndrome.

By 1982, the privacy construct was extended over parental decisions whether or not to seek life-saving medical care for a handicapped infant, including infants whose handicap was not even particularly dramatic.

Also, starting in the early 1980s, the privacy construct was invoked to cover the withholding of liquids and nourishment from impaired (but not necessarily comatose or moribund) patients by other parties, and without any prior or concurrent informed consent by the patient.

And not surprisingly, the privacy construct, first applied to the "right to suicide," is currently being pushed to include the right to help someone to commit suicide.

Much as has the word "choice," so has the word "private" become a code word for deathmaking, or been promoted in novel ways in other contexts in order to
facilitate the privatization of deathmaking. One of the more striking examples of this was the appearance of a credit card in 1991 with the name "Private issue." It is being advertised with campaigns that play on the privacy theme, as by people asking others what credit card they have, and then deciding to desist further inquiries when they are told that it is a "private issue" (e.g., Newsweek, 14/10/91). 

Below follow some specific elaborations.

*Privatization of infanticide & other child killings.* This has made vast "progress." As more and more parents kill more and more of their children, the state is doing less and less about it. How far the privatization of infanticide has gone was evidenced by a case in California where parents took a baby home from the hospital and never fed her so that she died from malnutrition 11 days later. On the basis of some very tortured reasoning, no charges were filed against them (NRLN, 26/2/91).

*Privatization of the killing of impaired spouses.* More and more people are killing their impaired spouses, and less and less are they being prosecuted, convicted or punished. In 1989, an elderly Philadelphia man strangled his bedridden wife with a necktie and pleaded guilty to voluntary manslaughter. The (woman) judge who sentenced him to no more than probation encouraged the perpetrator with the following words: "You took care of a very sick woman. It's important that you not torture yourself. Try to go along enjoying your life" (Time, 19/6/89). A California man who suffocated his wife by putting a plastic bag over her head was acquitted. Soon, people will be able to kill their spouses without even having to prove that the person they killed was very ailing, or wanted it this way.

*Privatization of medical "euthanasia."* More and more, the state is letting physicians decide whether a patient should live or die, or even whether a patient may or should be killed. For instance, there are many people in the medical professions who go as far as saying that the state has no business at all deciding who lives and who dies, but that "these decisions should...be settled in the medical community" (US News & World Report, 11 Dec. 89, p. 36). We have so much material on this that it has to be covered separately.

*The privatization of women killing abusive husbands or "lovers."* Largely as a result of feminist ideology, the view has arisen that a woman should be permitted to kill a husband or lover who has abused her physically—and that she is the only one to decide for what form or extent of abuse she is justified in applying the death penalty. As many men get abused by wives and women "lovers" as the other way around—in fact, more do, as research has shown. But we have not heard a single voice calling for privatization of the killing of one's abusive wife or woman "lover."

A 5/90 Supreme Court ruling in Canada opened the door wide to privatized intra-familial killing by acquitting a woman of murdering her husband. The woman had shot him in the back of the head while he was walking away from her unarmed, and the killing was justified on the basis that he had abused her in the past.

In 12/1990, the governor of Ohio released from prison 25 women who had killed or grievously assaulted their husbands or male companions. In 3/91, the governor of Maryland followed suit, releasing 8 such women. Feminists called on other governors to do the same; no one called for the release of equivalent men.

*The extension of private killings of heterosexual spouses/lovers to the killing of one's homosexual lovers.* Once (a) homosexual relations were considered at least as good as heterosexual ones, and once (b) heterosexual spouses/lovers were seen as privately killable, why would anyone be surprised that we would see the privatization of killings between homosexual "lovers," male or female?
One--merely one--example occurred in the recent Dahmer case. A youth being tortured to death by serial killer Dahmer in a homosexual encounter escaped and ran (naked) for help to police. The police handed him back to Dahmer because they assumed it was merely a homosexual "lovers' quarrel." Dahmer then killed the youth.

The Link Between the "Animal Rights" Movement & the Deathmaking of Humans

Most people--including many in the co-called "animal rights" movement (we call them the "animal people")--either do not know, or do not want to admit that this movement gives powerful impetus to deathmaking of humans. We can point to several reasons.

1. When the distinction between humans and non-humans is eroded, then it becomes easier to consider humans no better than non-humans, or perhaps even worse; to interpret healthy non-humans as more valuable than impaired humans; or to even interpret sick animals as more valuable than healthy humans. All this has been most explicitly spelled out by many animal people.

2. The animal people are usually quite prepared to kill ailing animals mercifully. Hence, many call for the same for ailing humans.

3. Apparently, many people join the animal movement precisely because they do not have much in their hearts for human beings, or do not know how to interact positively with humans, or have gotten hurt in human relations. Then animals do become more important to them than humans.

4. People who (largely unconsciously) have written certain humans more or less out of the human race begin to view and treat them more like animals--but not necessarily even as valued animals. This also accounts for a lot of the animal companion crazes, where animals are recruited as substitutes for human caring staff, relationship, friends, etc.

5. All this is not just an issue of animals vs. humans, but revolves around (a) the distinction of humans from everything else, and (b) cosmic assumptions or beliefs, hence de facto religion, and (c) hence also beliefs about the nature of humanity, and whether there is anything special or different about humans. If humans are merely animals that have evolved more for some reason, a universe without humans may be just as good—or even better—than one with. This is exemplified in the "rights of nature" movement (exemplified in the title of a 1989 book) in which rocks, trees, plants, and other elements of nature are accorded rights ordinarily only accorded to humans. The has led to some amusing ethical hairsplitting as to whether it is worse to kill an innocent blossom, or in self-defense slay a not-innocent armed attacker, with the conclusion that flowercide is the greater of the two offenses.

Such reasoning is moral babble of the worst kind, because it utterly confuses people of good will but foolish mentality. Who is to accord rights if not humans? And instead of merely insisting on good stewardship of nature, they end up considering animals and elements of nature as having higher moral value than all sorts of human beings. Eventually, this contributes to a massive deathmaking mentality toward all sorts of human classes, and particularly likely those who are seen as an economic burden that also burdens the natural environment.

6. The fact is that animal rights people—for whatever reasons—have been among the leading advocates of deathmaking of devalued humans (e.g., see Singer, mentioned earlier). One also finds this on the local level, where people active in abortion, suicide or "euthanasia" movements often also belong to some animal welfare group. Unbeknownst to many people, this linkage goes back to the days of social Darwinism.

It is not widely known that the various societies for the prevention of cruelty to children had their origins in the movement of the American Humane Association, and in prevention of cruelty to animals. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (SPCC) was founded in 1874 with the reluctant assistance of Henry Bergh, who had earlier single-handedly founded (and for quite a while constituted) the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA).
About the time he did so, an estimated 100,000 (in 1880) homeless children wandered about in New York City, and there were no laws on the books to permit the rescue of an abused child from parents or guardians. In 1874, the story of Mary Ellen came to Bergh's attention. Mary Ellen was a child who was maltreated by her alcoholic foster or adoptive parents, malnourished, and beaten up regularly. She was found, wandering naked through the slums, by a New York social worker. Interested church workers were unable to convince local authorities to take any action, mostly because the parental right to chastise one's children was considered sacred, and because of the absence of any law that would sanction the entry of any agency to protect a child. So the church workers appealed to the SPCA and to Henry Bergh, who succeeded in having Mary Ellen removed from her substitute parents under a dog warrant on the grounds of "the child being an animal," and that her case therefore could be included under the laws for the protection of animals which Bergh had succeeded in getting passed earlier. This case offended public sensibilities so much as to enable the launching of the SPCC in New York, and thereby protective services for children, and Bergh returned his attention to real animals. Unfortunately, child welfare never recovered from its animal origins. Indeed, it appears that the term "custody" or "protective custody," sometimes used in connection with protective services, may have found sustenance from the custom of the animal protection agencies of impounding animals.

Later, during the eugenic era, cattle breeders became one of the most potent advocates for eugenics. The cattle people quickly caught onto the newly discovered laws of genetics, and wanted the same principles that worked so well for them applied to humans. The American (Cattle) Breeders Association eventually became—again, unbeknownst to most people today—the American Eugenics Society, which published the Eugenics Quarterly, and which became the Society for the Study of Social Biology in 1972.

Science (23/2/90) noted that "liberation movements have a way of creating an environment that isn't exactly conducive to humor." But some people have begun (thank goodness) to poke fun at what the philosophers have called animal earnestness. Some have formed "Anaerobe Liberation Front," "Single Cell Rights Eukaryotic Action Movement (S.C.R.E.A.M.)," and "People for the Ethical Treatment of the Yeasts (P.E.T.T.Y)" (a take-off on the prominent animal group, PETA). One flyer screamed, "OUR NATION'S SHAME--EVERY TIME A LOAF OF BREAD IS BAKED, APPROXIMATELY 150,000 YEASTS ARE KILLED. Come to the award-winning 1987 film, 'The Very Small and Quiet Screams'--a cinematic electronic micrograph of yeast being baked"

We now give vignettes that illustrate at least some of the above points.

Interpreting Humans and Animals as Equal or the Same

*A survey of animal rights activists discovered that close to 100% are caucasian, 80% are female, and 78% said that they value animals just as much as they do humans, which of course does not surprise us (Science, 19/7/91). Generally, their demographic characteristics are almost identical to those of pro-abortion demonstrators (CNS, in CS, 23/4/92), and for some reason, they tend to be feminists. There is also a group called Vegetarian Feminists, and another, World Women for Animal Rights Empowerment. Imagine: not only animal rights, but animal empowerment. The TIPS editor's master, Felix von Krisher (a Siamese cat), already has too much power in the Wolfensberger household!

*We recently received a mailing from an advocacy organization on behalf of yet another disadvantaged victim group. These victims were described as "sensitive, vulnerable beings with distinct personalities." "Just like you and me." Who are they? Animals! And the organization was People For the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). The circular said "We believe that if animals share many of our feelings, then they ought to share some of our rights." (Source item supplied by Susan Thomas)
*The very cover story of the 23/5/88 Newsweek was devoted to the question how smart animals are. Not surprisingly, the Zeitgeist calls for an equation of animals and humans, and therefore an emphatically positive interpretation of the intelligence of animals. Also, not surprisingly, the article was immediately followed by a sympathetic one on animal rights.

*We reported before that some people have called for inter-species marriage rights. Indeed, we have also reported that a man, fed up with human women, married his dog Spunky, because she was not fickle like the others. Conversely, there are reports that some women are keeping large dogs in lieu (perhaps in addition to) men. Not surprisingly, then, there is a pornographic book entitled Fran's Friendly Canine.

*One of the animal people's slogans is "a rat is a pig is a dog is a boy," (coined by PETA co-director Ingrid Newkirk). PETA stands for People for Ethical Treatment of Animals, though we have been waiting for AETH (Animals for the Ethical Treatment of Humans). Newkirk also once said "Six million Jews died in concentration camps...but six billion broiler chickens will die this year in slaughterhouses." Which—if any—is worse? Heinrich Himmler once said: "We Germans, who are the only people in the world who have a decent attitude toward animals, will also assume a decent attitude toward these human animals," referring to the Unterminh class.

*Animal rights advocates equate the killing of broiler chickens in slaughterhouses to the holocaust, and the abduction and the "liberation" of turkeys from poultry farms, and rabbits from research laboratories, with Lincoln's emancipation proclamation, the civil rights movement, and the quest for feminine rights. One is amazed to note that feminists do not take vigorous issue with being put in the same category as turkey liberation (Science 26/5/89).

*A book entitled, Adam's Task: Calling Animals by Name, by a Yale professor claims that animals are capable of moral perception and creativity.

*One of the looniest exploits of the animal people took place when, together with several companions, a science teacher trying to imitate Martin Luther taped a 10-point petition to the gates of St. Peter's in Rome asking that the pope declare that all animals above the mollusk have immortal souls. The petition also called for condemnation of the hunting, fishing, trapping and killing of animals. The amazing thing is that this event did not receive more press coverage (Vermont Catholic Tribune, 7 Aug. 90; source item from Susan Mack).

*There is a Wesleyan drive-in church in Armbrust, PA. Among the people this appeals to are those who want to eat during the service, or who consider their pets to be humans, and who are not allowed to bring them to regular church services but who can bring them in their cars to the drive-in church (AP in SHJ, 25/10/86).

*In 1985, environmentalists marched in Vienna with placards that showed images of Jesus Christ surrounded by suffering guinea pigs, with the inscription, "He loved them too" (Time, 27/1/86, p. 75).

*The Public Broadcasting Service in the US reported in 10/86 of animal wedding ceremonies conducted by animal lovers.

*A rich childless widow in California left her dog $500,000. Lawyers contested the will on behalf of the woman's mynah bird that had been cut out of the will. Now this is actually a joke, but we bet you believed it—and that is a sign of the times.
Another example of the equation of animals with humans was found in the advertising material for an organization called DELTA, which stands for "Dedication and Everlasting Love To Animals." It is an animal rescue organization, which describes the animals it finds as "he's and she's," refers to them each by name as if they were people, speaks of "mothers" and "their children" and "brothers and sisters" rather than pups and litter mates, and even describes a starving dog found with her 8 puppies in a cardboard box as if she were a homeless street person living in a cardboard box on a heating vent in a street. These types of advertising materials are exceedingly similar—in fact, they are almost indistinguishable except by the pictures—to those which beg for support to rescue poor and starving children in various Third World countries.

In a 1988 fund-raising drive, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals reminded potential donors that "your stamp on this envelope will help feed an orphan!", meaning a "homeless" animal.

*Could it happen anywhere but in England that a tortoise that became aged would be admitted for care in an old-age home for humans? (Advertiser, 29/10/88; source item from Michael Rungie).

In late 86, a new kind of full-page ad appeared in major news magazines (e.g., Time) by "Friends of Animals" that warned readers to "beware" of pet napping. If one only substituted "child" for "dog" or "pet", one would think that the ad was a warning against kidnapping, thus further blurring the distinction between humans and animals.

*The orangutan who played Mr. Smith on television was paid $100,00 a year.

Fortunately, there is at least one person among our subscribers who reads Reader's Digest, or we might never have learned what it said in its 6/88 issue about the recent shifting of the pet-human balance of power. A dog has sued an airline for $62,000 for mental anguish in consequence of having gone around a luggage carousel for five hours before being found and rescued by its owners. There is an entire fashion industry that appeals to pet owners and there are dog houses that look like miniature mansions. Indeed, one can even have them designed by architects, and they may cost anywhere between $9,000 and $124,000 or even more. One can buy a silver bowl inscribed, "For the Yuppie Puppie." Many pets live very fancily off trust funds bequeathed by their departed owners. Of course, on pet restaurants and pet hotels, we have already commented previously. (Source item from Barry Wever.)

*Newsweek (11/1/88) had a whole page devoted to the latest ways by which increasing numbers of people are treating their pets as if they were human: dressing them in expensive clothing, feeding them gourmet foods, giving them psychotherapy, and beautifying them with all sorts of jewelry and accessories. There are even skull caps with a Star of David for Jewish dogs. The article wondered whether dogs will retain awareness that a $100 leash is still a leash.

*Even as august a journal as The Journal of Medical Ethics very seriously has carried an article by a lawyer at the University of California at Berkeley and a philosopher at New York State University (Kusher & Bellotti, 1985) that claims that the stated goal of medicine, to reduce suffering and preserve life, is as applicable to animals as humans, and that there ought to be "equal treatment." If we treat animals unequally, we first would have to justify how they are different enough from humans to be accorded unequal treatment. If one did not know that the authors were serious, one would laugh at their following statement: "Surely this conviction rests on something firmer than the mere fact that these living creatures happen to belong to different species." The article called the use of a baboon heart for transplant into a handicapped child a "beastly business." Further, it claimed that if a human child should be so retarded that its "cognitive capacity is
reduced to the same level as that of a baboon," they would "now share an equal claim to the needed organs." Should the baboon have a more extensive relationship network (with other baboons) than the handicapped child, then the child should be sacrificed in order to benefit the baboon.

The authors cross-referenced their ethics to Singer who, of course, bases his largely on Fletcher, and Fletcherian thinking suffuses this article. It is amazing how influential Fletcher has been with a set of arguments that are so ridiculous that some of our TI audiences have been thrown into convulsions of laughter when we reviewed them. Yet the entire article is suffused with claims to logic, prudence, etc. Humans particularly suitable as organ sources would seem to be those in irreversible comas, infants with anencephaly, and persons already brain dead. With great solemnity, seriousness and moral authority, it proclaimed that there is "no defensible reason why in the case of irreversible coma the individual could not be used for both organ donation and experimental research." (Item drawn to our attention by John O'Brien.)

*Until about 1950, veterinarians served mostly farm animals, and that is what they were trained for. Since then, the number of veterinarians has more than tripled, and at least 80% of their practice is devoted to pets. At least 60% of US households have a pet. Cats overtook dogs as the most common household pet in 1985, because they are less trouble than dogs. Other pets include about a million hamsters, 6 million rabbits, 7 million horses, 10 million birds, and several hundred million fish. Cats with crooked teeth can have them straightened with braces, cancerous dogs can get chemotherapy, and some pet "hotels" feature color television. The economy concerned with pets amounted to about $20 billion already in 1985 (Newsweek, 19 May 86).

*CAT scans for cats and other pets. Also at the same time, animals can now receive the kind of medical care poor people are being denied, and at a level of quality that is only slightly behind top quality available to humans. There even exist pet oncology departments, and pets can receive such fantastic services as CAT scans and reconstructive surgery of the leg of a beloved pet rat (Newsweek, 3 April 89). People can now also have pacemakers installed into their cats and dogs.

*We all know that in most urban localities, dogs have to be licensed. The good news is that dog therapists (i.e., people who do psychotherapy on dogs, not dogs who do therapy on humans) may soon also have to be licensed. Delta (mentioned before) has many members who do "family therapy," i.e., the whole family, together with their dog, have to go into therapy in order to cure the mutt of some objectionable behavior. This may include breaking dogs of their whining, making aggressive dogs more gentle and withdrawn dogs more social. One of their treatments is called "progressive systematic approximation therapy training" (Washington Post, in Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3 Aug. 86; source item from John Morris).

*About 20% of US tuna "production" is eaten by cats. This seems unfair and cruel to us, and calls for tuna liberation, or perhaps the killing of all the pet cats.

*If the animal rights activists ever catch on to the issue of imagery, then our normative language will have had it. Soon, we may no longer be able to use such expressions as "hare-brained," "pig-headed," "snake in the grass," "clumsy as an ox," "like a bull in a china shop," "bear market," and so on, lest we be accused of being "species-ist." Indeed, the animal people are already trying to outlaw the songs "Three Blind Mice," "Old MacDonald had a Farm," and the fairy tale of "Little Red Riding Hood." They refer to killing of an animal as "murder," and in their world, pretty girls who kiss frogs into princes would be prosecuted for depriving frogs of their valued natures. (Source material from Guy Caruso.) We would put some of the excesses of the contemporary animal rights movement into the category of "normative insanities," of which our time is replete.
Deliberately Blurring the Distinction Between Humans & Animals

If one can blend humans and animals genetically, one can more readily claim that animals should be treated the same as humans—or better.

*Human genes have been put into several animal strains. One is a pig called the "first transgenic pig" (Science, 7 Oct. 88). As Paul deParrie pointed out, in a way, that might soon make us cannibals if we eat pork. One reason the crossing was pursued was to get a pig strain that produces human hemoglobin in blood. The aspiration here is to soon be able to extract from pigs blood transfusion or immunization components for humans (AP, in SHA, 16/6/91).

*Some scientists have referred to the mice that they created with human cell lines as "humans with fur" (Syracuse Herald American, 21/4/91). Headlines have called it the "human mouse." We keep calling it the hmouse (plural hmice). We understand that there are now also hhamsters.

Animals as Helpers or Friends in Lieu of Humans

*The degree to which pets have replaced close human relationships, and particularly family ties, is underlined by findings that 25% of pet owners celebrate their pets' birthday, 50% keep a picture of their pet at home, in a wallet or at work, 79% report that the pet is their closest companion, and 87% interpret the pet as a member of the family! (SHJ, 23/2/90).

*The Delta Society (mentioned earlier) awards approximately $50,000 per year for research on the interactions between people and dogs or cats, and another $30,000 on human relationships with birds, fish and small pets.

*Animal rights activists demand that the word "pet," being "demeaning" to animals, be replaced by "animal companion" (USN&WR, 22/7/91). May lovers still be pets to each other?

*An Australian article told the story of a dog that was interpreted to be a staff member of a nursing home. The article spoke in terms of "member of staff," "job description," being on "24-hour duty," being a "resident companion," having certain "nursing home duties," and "being given and accepting orders" like other employees (North Side Messenger, 10 Nov. 88; source item from M. Rungie).

*Here is yet another example of how far the animal-as-human and service animal craze can go. A legally blind man caught driving a car in California argued in court that he was not really driving solo, but that his dog, Queenie, should count as a "second driver" (a legal construct) because she was helping him navigate. This dispute joins a series of others that have taken place in California, where one pregnant woman argued (successfully!) that her unborn child was a second person, and a mortuary van driver tried to claim a corpse (unsuccessfully) as a second driver (Atlanta Journal, 28/10/90; source item from Charles Mingle).

*But where have their hands been? At one time, Capuchin monks were renowned for their closeness to the poor and needy. The monks are largely gone—but they are being replaced by Capuchin monkeys, sometimes interpreted as "simian aides" or "helping hands." The idea sprung from the fertile mind of B.F. Skinner in the mid-1970s (source item from Randy Webster). But here is food for thought, so to speak. Monkeys use their hands in ways and places civilized people do not—or at least not in public, or at least, they wash them afterwards.
Personally, if there are to be any "artificial aids," we prefer robots. They have already been deployed to be of assistance to handicapped people in various tasks, and to deliver food trays in hospitals. At least we know where their hands have been. Also, there would be less confusion about who is human and who is not. According to one expert, a robot helper for handicapped persons might cost no more than an automobile. Some handicapped people who have used such robots say they prefer them to human helpers, because "humans don't always do what you ask them to." For instance, one handicapped person ordered a robot to light him up a cigarette, and the robot did without any back-talk. When he asked a human helper the same thing, she scolded him, "Jack, you know you shouldn't be smoking so much." (News item submitted by Barbara Fischer.)

Killing Impaired People as One Would Impaired Animals

*The attention-getting guest editorial by Katie Letcher Lyle in the 2 March 1992 issue of Newsweek spelled this out: "Why can't we treat fellow humans as humanely as we treat our pets," by which she meant killing "ancient friends," poorly behaved retarded people, institutionalized people, incompetent deinstitutionalized dumped people, people in a "drugged hell," etc. By the way, Lyle sits on the board of three advocacy bodies on behalf of handicapped people, and stated that she was the personal advocate for at least one individual (whom she wants killed). A friend (John Reisch) of a friend of ours said, "it must be the unique burden of people with disabilities that people who propose to murder them are allowed to masquerade as their advocates," and that if Hitler lived today, he might claim to be the advocate of the Jews.

Interpreting Healthy Animals as More Valuable Than Devalued Humans

*People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) has published a booklet entitled Animal Liberation by Peter Singer, the same person who has argued forcefully for abortion, infanticide and "euthanasia" (source item from Chris Welter). One of its brochures showed a number of pictures of animals "saved," namely Britches and Sarah, monkeys, Ana (a dog) and Peter (a cat).

*Representatives of the animal rights movement have proposed that brain-dead humans be substituted for animals in surgical research (Science, 29/8/86).

*In 2/92, in Philadelphia, one parade of demonstrators with signs proclaiming "Stop the killing" per chance encountered another one, before an abortion clinic, that carried signs "Abortion is murder." The first group turned out to be an animal march--and it cheered for the pro-abortion people (LA, 4/92).

*In a two-day period in New York City, a homeless man and a dog were killed on subway tracks; 90 people telephoned to express concern about the dog, none about the homeless man (IAETF Update, 5 & 6/91).

Interpreting Impaired Animals as More Valuable Than Healthy Humans

*In 1990, the parents of a six-year old girl agreed to have a kidney taken from her and transplanted into a sick young monkey in Atlanta. The child's father also said that he would be glad to donate his own heart to a sick laboratory rat in California that he heard about, but that unfortunately, his heart would be too big (Parade, 30/12/90).
Harper's magazine of 5/90 carried an ad for the National Hemlock Society, promoting "voluntary euthanasia for the terminally ill," and the very next ad to it was for a "dog retirement home" with "furniture, rugs, TV, medical care, running room, dinner nightly, and personal, loving attention" (source item from Zana Lutfiyya).

Interpreting Animals as More Valuable Than Humans—Sick, Healthy, or Whatever

*The former chief of counterintelligence of the CIA claims that a clique of radical environmentalist scientists are trying to develop a virus that will kill all humans, but leave the animal kingdom more or less undisturbed. Thereby, they hope to save the earth from the destructive behavior of humans (SHA, 14/4/91). Those who might interpret this report as coming from the paranoid mind of a spy chief can unfortunately be quickly disillusioned: a number of environmentalists have publicly said as much, and in regard to this specific plan, some said that it was not such a bad idea after all. One geologist said that if he were a biologist, he would work for the demise of mankind. Environmentalists of this type are almost invariably animal rights activists who would put a cockroach on the same level of importance as a human being. Our opinion is that the radicals only need to wait, and that mankind will do the job for them in its own way, and while there are still quite a few animals left to survive, and especially so cockroaches.

*A pet cemetery in Milwaukee advertised: "all pets burned with complete dignity." Indeed, animals were disposed of with human funeral rituals, including solemn pronouncements and flowers—while aborted human fetuses were unceremoniously tossed into the same oven.

*Research on animal welfare continues to make great progress even as human baby welfare has been deteriorating sharply.

*Over a period of years, the American Psychological Association simultaneously came to endorse abortion on demand, and produced standards for the better treatment of laboratory animals.

*A few years ago, a 4-year $230,000 pact was signed for Henry Rojas to act as the mascot of the Phoenix Suns. Rojas is a gorilla (source item furnished by Joe Osburn).

*An Iowa man who killed his parents, his sister, her three children, and then himself wrote a will only days earlier that left his considerable estate to the World Wildlife Fund (source clipping from John Morris).

*Of eagles, beagles, beadles, and babies. If you steal an eagle egg, the federal penalty is $5,000. The US Congress passed a law forbidding the use of dogs in tests of chemical, biological, or radioactive warfare. However, infanticide is now commonly practiced in the United States and in other countries, not even to mention mass abortion; and aborted babies (including live ones) have been widely used for all sorts of gruesome experiments.

*In Texas, a family dog attacked and killed the family's four-week old baby, upon which the mother observed quite correctly that "I can always have another baby but I can't replace my dog, Byron" (Time, 18/8/86).

Approving Euthanasia For Humans But Not For Animals

*There is profound irony in the fact that animal rights activists, who generally have been quite ready to approve of all sorts of human deathmaking, have been in an uproar about the euthanizing of 3 elderly and very debilitated monkeys who had for years been experimental subjects (e.g., Science, 13/7/90).
Concluding Comment on Deathmaking and Animal Rights

With the arrival of the animal rights movements, its proponents began to fail to make a distinction between treating animals without cruelty and kindly, versus according human identity to them, which is what happens when one begins to speak of them possessing rights. Much progress has been made since the mid-1800s in diminishing cruelty to animals without the invocation of the rights construct. However, it has become increasingly difficult to tell apart the older strategy of combatting cruelty toward animals, and the animal rights thrust, because many of the more traditional organizations concerned with animal welfare have begun to invoke the language of the animal rights movement, or joined in the promotion of its goals. Yet the fundamental difference between the two approaches becomes clear when we see that the people who promote animal rights may not at all be in favor of kindness, mercy, and non-violence. Many animal rights people are vehemently in support of all sorts of deathmakings of humans (abortion, infanticide, euthanasia, etc.), and in England particularly, they have begun to take recourse to violent attacks on anyone who does not support them, and particularly on members of the scientific community who use animals in research. Other targets have included butchers, stores that sell furs, and even shops that display posters advertising the arrival of a circus. These attacks have gone far beyond destruction of property, which we ourselves do not label as social violence, and have escalated to bombing attacks on people in which some of them have been hurt, could have been killed, and perhaps were meant to be (Science, 22/6/90). Among other things, animal rights people also not uncommonly propose that "rapists, abusers, murderers" (SHA, 29/17/90) and impaired infants be used for research instead of animals—something one never used to hear from animal welfare people, as distinct from the animal rights ones.

We want to reiterate that we think it is an awful thing to inflict a cruelty to animals—but not because they are human, or better than humans, but because a kindly and compassionate human being would not do such a thing, and if somehow induced to do it, would become a worser person for it, quite possibly desensitized to other kinds of violence. Furthermore, kindness to animals is good modelling before children, so as to gentle them. Yet further, such kindness is also concordant with respect for our living environment, and without such respect humans will destroy it, including themselves. However, when people become so befuddled that they can no longer tell the difference between animals and humans, as is happening now, we should not be surprised to find the degradation of humans to animals or below that we are also seeing, and which is in fact not only a hallmark of the militant animal rights movement but is also concordant with the prevailing deathmaking sentiment toward all sorts of devalued people.

*In a letter to Time (2 Jan. 84), the executive director of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals warned that China's campaign to eliminate dogs from Peking could presage the killing of handicapped or otherwise unproductive and unwanted people. It would appear that in our country, it might be the other way around. Might wholesale brutality against handicapped people not also eventually turn into brutality against pets?

*From scanning a great deal of literature, including a whole series of letters to editors in various periodicals, it appears as if the animals-as-humans people are about to gain the upper hand.

Conclusion to the Special Section on Deathmaking

The above material on deathmaking constitutes only about 25% of the deathmaking copy that we have on hand. Other such topics have to await another day—assuming there will be another day.
RESOURCES

Two companion volumes:

and
A Guideline on Protecting the Health and Lives of Patients in Hospitals, Especially if the Patient is a Member of a Societally Devalued Class

In 1987, the Training Institute published a monograph by Wolf Wolfensberger entitled The New Genocide of Handicapped and Afflicted People, based on a one-day presentation on the topic. It addressed (in about 95 pages) the increasing practice of "deathmaking" of devalued people, a topic which is frequently covered in TIPS. It also contained a 20-page single-spaced appendix entitled "Protecting the Health and Lives of Patients in Hospitals, Especially if the Patient is a Member of a Societally Devalued Group." The appendix was included because both the dynamics of deathmaking described in the monograph, and the complexities of contemporary hospital medicine, are greatly increasing the risk to life of anyone who becomes a hospital patient, and even more so of people who are members of societally devalued classes.

However, many people have been interested in using that appendix as a free-standing document. Also, since the time of the first edition of The New Genocide, we had developed quite extensive revision material for the appendix, based on additional experience and insights. Therefore, what used to be the appendix in the first edition of The New Genocide has been revised, greatly expanded, and published separately and in a format better suited to carrying along to the hospital bedside. It provides extensive instructions on how to maximize the likelihood that a person will come out of the hospital alive, and hopefully also well. The guidelines have proven enormously helpful in many instances—even with hospital patients who were not devalued, and were therefore merely at "ordinary" risk.

Besides no longer containing the detailed, full-length hospital guidelines, the 2nd edition of The New Genocide contains only a few other minor revisions. It still explains how devaluation leads to deathmaking; how deathmaking can take different levels and degrees of expression; the connection between imaging people negatively, and their subsequently being the objects of deathmaking; how and why deathmaking is "detoxified," i.e., concealed, disguised, and interpreted as good; the most common ways people get made dead in society, including in human services; who is most at risk of deathmaking; how deathmaking derives from contemporary materialistic hedonistic utilitarian values; and a proposed coherent pattern of opposition to deathmaking. Both items are now available from the Training Institute. Prices are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd edition of The New Genocide of Handicapped and Afflicted People</th>
<th>A Guideline on Protecting the Health and Lives of Patients in Hospitals, Especially if the Patient is a Member of a Societally Devalued Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single copy:</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Discount:</td>
<td>10 or more copies 20% discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-99 copies 20% discount</td>
<td>100+ copies 30% discount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postage & handling Charges as follows:

| Single copy: | $1.50 |
| Multiple copies: | 15% of order |
| to North America | 15% of order |
| to all other locales: | 20% of order |

15% of order
All prices are in US funds. Larger discounts for very large quantity orders can also be negotiated. Items are sent by surface mail. If a faster or more expensive method of shipping is requested, there will be an extra charge.

Other Deathmaking Resources

*The TI receives literally scores of periodicals concerned with deathmaking in some form or other, but the most concentrated source of information it receives is probably the International Anti-Euthanasia Task Force Update, which is available on a subscription basis from the Human Life Center, University of Steubenville, Steubenville, Ohio 43952. Each issue contains a large number of short summaries of items related to deathmaking that have been published in other sources, and particularly generic newspapers.

*Kuper, L. (1981). Genocide. New York: Penguin. We have found this book to be very informative on the history and dynamics of genocides in general. It is very complementary to our monograph on The New Genocide.

*Gorman, M.J. (1982). Abortion and the early church: Christian, Jewish and pagan attitudes in the Greco-Roman world. New York: Paulist Press. This little book (about 100 pages) is an elaboration of a paper written by the author for a graduate course at Princeton Theological Seminary. It explains both the ideals and the practices regarding abortion in Greek and Roman society, in Judaism, and then in early Christianity. It explains that where abortion was disapproved or outlawed in pagan society, this was because it was seen as an offense against either the state, sex, marriage, or the father/household. In contrast, in Judaism, abortion was disapproved because it involved bloodshed (which Judaism found abhorrent and requiring ritual cleansing), and because it was seen as a rejection of God's gift of life. In contrast to all these, Christianity abhorred abortion because it was viewed as the taking of the life of a human being who had a soul—in other words, because Christianity was concerned with the individual being whose life was being taken, not because of concern with the state, or the father's rights, or because it might bring on ritual impurity. The author claims that it is Christianity's concern for the unborn him/herself that distinguishes its stance of opposition to abortion from even the opposition stance of Judaism and of certain pagan cultures, such as the Stoics. Because of this concern with the unborn him/herself, Christianity also distinguished the unborn from its mother's body, and from any offense against her that abortion that was induced by another party might entail.

Gorman also thinks that a number of passages in the New Testament that condemn "sorcery" and poison drugs (Galatians 5:20; Revelation 9:21; 18:23; 21:8; 22:15) may refer to abortion, since poison was so often the means used.

In the last chapter, Gorman ties together the early church's condemnation of abortion with its total non-violence, and commends a coherent non-violent stance for today, just as it was called for then. However, he does not explicitly condemn or reject all forms of violence (such as non-nuclear wars, violent revolution, violence in self-defense), so it is not clear just how fully coherent he is, or recommends others to become. (Review by Susan Thomas)

Translations of TI Publications

In 1991, the Training Institute published a monograph-length overview of Social Role Valorization—the longest such overview other than the mammoth one contained in PASSING (Wolfensberger, W. (1991). A brief introduction to Social Role Valorization as a high-order concept for structuring human services. Syracuse, NY: Training Institute for Human Service Planning, Leadership and Change Agentry (Syracuse University)). Also, the monograph contained considerable material on the dynamics of social devaluation that is not in PASSING.
In late 1991, the French, German and Italian translations of the monograph were published in Geneva, Switzerland. Below follow the correct references for these three books.


These translations were published in very well-done format that makes them look like small books, in contrast to the spartan TI format. However, all three editions do have certain problems of translation. The ones in the German translation are the most obvious to us (and they are extensive), and those in the Italian one the least so. The French version seems to be the best translation. For each translation, there is an errata sheet, and readers should be sure that they receive one with each book. However, the German errata sheet corrects only a minority of the errors.

So far, we know that both the French and the English versions have been adopted at some colleges as text, and perhaps surprisingly, the French version much more so than the English.

Readers are advised that the English version is undergoing a revision that will contain many improvements, and expansions of certain sections. This new edition should be available in the spring of this year.


This translation took several years to achieve, with translators having a great deal of difficulty with the material. However, the translation problems that remain in the published version are relatively minor. One of them was hilarious. As an example of a death image juxtaposition, we cited the Toomey-Abbot Towers for elderly and handicapped residents in Syracuse because it not only contains a clang association to "tomb," but it was also built atop a cemetery. This facility name got translated into German into a phrase which, translated back to English, would be "Tower of the Damned Abbot."

*During 1990, we noticed a dramatic increase in the prevalence of women—particularly young ones—with blonde hair. Obviously, one can hardly invoke genetics for this, especially since the trend was not paralleled among men. Very strangely, this phenomenon happened at the same time that bimbo jokes about blonde women have also been on the rise. Nor is that all. Shortly thereafter, two more trends became apparent. One is a dramatic increase in white-colored cars, first being driven mostly by women, and then by men as well. Obviously, such phenomena must mean something very deeply unconscious on the national scene. We suspect that it reflects an unconscious drawing back from aggressive "multiculturalism," and perhaps heralds a further strengthening of conservatism and republicanism. After all, there are mounting signs all over the world that people have reached the limits of their capacities to assimilate diversity, variously in the form of

Signs of the Times
immigrants, multi-lingualism, multi-ethnicity, people with handicaps, people with different cultural ways, etc. (NOTE: This was written before the Rodney King verdict.) The other trend mentioned above we first observed in late 1991, namely a dramatic increase of women with red hair. Even on TV, more of the younger female personalities were sporting red hair. We observed this with great puzzlement for several months, without being able to come up with a reasonable hypothesis—until we realized that one of the women in the film "Thelma and Louise" was a redhead, and the other one was a blonde with a tinge of red. Again, we suspect that in total unconsciousness, women are expressing an approval of the values personified by these two women, a prominent one being that women can be just as nasty as men.

*In recent decades, there has been a dramatic increase in the proportion of Americans who live alone, reaching 22 million in 1990, or 12% of the population. One may say all sorts of good things about living alone, but the fact is that people who live alone have a much shorter life expectancy. Some interpreters speak of them as "dying of isolation" (SHJ, 25/1/92).

*We were very amused when a hacker in eastern Germany managed to plant a virus into the computer system of the World Bank. This time around, the virus was friendly and announced itself with the message, "Do not panic. I am harmless." The next time around, a hacker may wipe out the world's savings (Time 23/9/91). Now that will make people real mad.

Social Role Valorization

*Some SRV challenges are more challenging than others. Here is one of the more advanced ones: There are many abbreviations for Social Role Valorization, now that the term and concept have been translated into several languages, and those who aspire to senior leadership positions in the SRV movement should know about this, and even try to memorize them. Below is the most up-to-date listing that we have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tongue</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Social Role Valorization</td>
<td>SRV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Valorisation des Rôles Sociaux</td>
<td>VRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Valorizzazione del Ruolo Sociale</td>
<td>VRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Aufwertung der sozialen Rollen</td>
<td>ASR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bewertung der sozialen Rollen</td>
<td>BSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>Verdsætjing av Sosial Rolle</td>
<td>VSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic</td>
<td>Gildisaukandi Félagslegt Hlutverk</td>
<td>GPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>Faloreiddio Rôl Gymdeithasol</td>
<td>FRG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oh, for the good old days of normalization! It could be abbreviated (at least informally) with the "X" sign from statistics, which stands for mean or average.

*A 1992 study undertook a very ambitious sampling of the degree of social integration of older (63 or above) retarded persons from residential facilities of all types run, owned or licensed by "developmental disability services" all over the US. Overall findings were that such persons had "disturbingly low levels of social integration," and that the degree of integration varied significantly with the size of grouping. Half the sample either had no friends or had never visited friends, and what friends they did have were almost entirely residents of the same facility. Only 45% had ever met a neighbor, and only 14% had ever visited a neighbor's home. Only about 30% had regular social contact with anybody who either was not a staff member or another handicapped person; 50% had no contact with family members, and in half of these cases, no living family member was known to exist to the information-providers. About 40% visited a grocery store monthly, which is an index of the generally low utilization of generic resources. Of people in community residences or foster homes specifically, 40% had no close friends, and half had no contact with people other than the staff or handicapped persons.
MADCAP. The Royal Society for Mentally Handicapped Children and Adults (MENCAP) in Britain has been raising funds by means of a horse race without horses. Instead of horses, it is volunteers in fancy costumery who run the horse race course, overcoming water jumps, jumping fences, etc. Such events have been held at horse racing tracks all over Britain (Down Syndrome News, 11/91). Apparently, MENCAP is not aware that it is thereby continuing an ancient custom that associates horse events with foolery. In fact, when the TIPS editor teaches his course on the history of mental retardation, he refers to this tradition as "horse foolery."

Relevant to the SRV theme of imitation (and modelling) is an example of just how powerful an influence respected public figures can have on people. A 1992 survey reported that one-third of the population in England has dreams about the Queen—and even more remarkably, more than half of these people dream that they are having tea with her (CBS Evening News, 6 Feb. 92).

No less than the assistant dean at the Harvard University School of Public Health proposed in 1991 that committing violence be classified as a disease that is properly in the province of medicine. The reasoning was that violence results in several hundred thousand hospitalizations each year in the US, and adds many hundreds of millions of dollars to health care costs. Therefore, violence is a public health problem, and doing something to prevent it is preventive medicine (Washington Post, 29/4/91; source item from Karen Barker).

The term "gravely disabled" appears to have arisen in the late 1970s, and then to have been driven underground by the new consciousness of the importance of language. However, in the early 1990s, the term underwent a resurgence. In New York State, the government has begun to use it to refer to a person "who, as a result of mental illness, is physically endangered by the failure to meet his or her essential needs," which certainly points without any doubt to the likelihood that the person will end up in his or her grave. In fact, we would say that anybody who is dead is gravely disabled.

Human Service News

Apparently the construct of "head injury" has replaced those of "brain damage" or "brain injury." Presumably, unknown parties have decided that this should be so because injury to the head may sound less image-jeopardizing than injury to the brain. However, we keep reminding everyone that having one's ears pierced in order to be able to wear earrings constitutes a head injury.

We were also amazed to learn that there are about 800 "traumatic brain injury" rehabilitation facilities in the US, and that a large proportion—possibly even the majority—are proprietary (Probe, 12/91; source item from Ed the Hothead). There are even entire chains of such facilities, such as the New Medico Head Injury Systems, headquartered in Lynn, MA, which employs 8,000 people at 36 facilities in 15 states, and has 200 sales people drumming up business. A lot of these facilities use methods which have no research basis, and while some of them may work nonetheless, much of this falls into the category of either flailing or crazes. For instance, of the mini-technologies used by some of these facilities is called "comstim," which stands for coma stimulation, and consists of somebody reading the newspaper or other material to comatose people. Also, some of these facilities apparently virtually hold their residents prisoners, at least until their money runs out. Some of these facilities charge $30,000 a month or even more. Since people with brain injuries may show impairments of life, someone in one of these facilities who is not totally recovered can be said to "need" further services forever, at least until the money runs out.
The 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is so complex that it has spawned a whole new cottage industry of lawyers, architects, and consultants. A spokesperson for an organization representing 500,000 small businesses called it "a nightmare." He said his constituency is trying to be in compliance, but nobody was clear what that would imply. One prediction is that there will be an avalanche of lawsuits, with many lawyers and a very few plaintiffs getting rich (SHJ, 21/1/92).

Already we have run across another of the perversions wrought by the Americans with Disabilities Act: we have been told that families with a handicapped member who argue loudly cannot be evicted from their dwelling. Also, an insane person who bangs the walls at night so the neighbors cannot sleep can also not be evicted. All this will make people (a) mad as hell at handicapped people and the government, (b) try everything they can informally not to rent housing to handicapped people, and (c) try not to live anywhere near handicapped people.

In 1981, a leader of a movement of physically handicapped people in West Germany took his crutch and started beating the country's president—which hardly seems to be a commendable method for lobbying, or improving public attitudes toward handicapped people. Interestingly, this handicapped man developed into one of the most visible opponents of "euthanasia" in West Germany.

There is a group of people called Jerry's Orphans who are opposed to the way Jerry Lewis has been portraying handicapped people on his annual Muscular Dystrophy Telethon. The group includes at least one former Muscular Dystrophy Association poster child. In early 1992, they announced a national boycott of all 7-11 stores, and called on all handicapped people to join the boycott. The store chain has been subsidizing the telethon at the same time as some of their stores have been inaccessible to people in wheelchairs (source material from Chris Greene).

To our shock, but not to our surprise, we learned in 1/92 that the term "supported work" is beginning to be applied to any kind of provision that seems good, and that can even only remotely be viewed as associated with work. Thus, somebody occasionally advising a handicapped person in regard to personal appearance or clothing purchases may be interpreted to fall under the category of "supported work." Other measures so referred to may even include assistance with one's residential situation. Apparently, it is argued that if one has problems with where one lives, one may not be able to work, and this is how service or assistance related to one's residence has come to be labeled a work-related support (e.g., SACL Dialect, 12/91).

When news came to Syracuse University that Romania was starving and otherwise in desperate straits, the University quickly responded—no, not by sending a contingent of weight counselors for the starving, but by sending relief in the form of a choir. Perhaps the reasoning was that impoverished and starving people were sad, and what they therefore needed was being uplifted by song.

The Pizza Hut chain hopes to eventually employ more than 10,000 handicapped people. When it first started doing this systematically a few years ago, the chain relied on rehabilitation agency job coaches, but now has given training to its restaurant managers to do the "coaching," and has phased out the human service workers (JOMRDD, No. 1, 1992).

The "miracle" anti-depressant drug Prozac is now being followed by yet another supposedly miraculous anti-depressant, Zoloft, put out by a competitor. Prozac had become enormously profitable overnight since coming to America in late 1988, selling to the tune of $910 million (about $2.5 million a day) in 1991 alone.
One way in which the drug hoods are trying to defuse potential criticism of this new drug is by interpreting any such criticisms as coming from Scientology, the madcap religious sect that has it in for shrinkery (source clipping from Joe Osburn).

*In early 1992, Governor Cuomo of New York proposed to fingerprint all welfare recipients (SHJ, 21/1/92).

*The annual (cost-adjusted) 1989-90 expenditure per pupil in US schools varied from about $2,800 in Utah to $6,900 in New York State. Only in part were the discrepancies accounted for by state wealth.

*According to statistics about American schools, at least in Fall 1991, the good news is that more pupils in the US graduate from high school (83%), among other achievement tidbits, than ever before, but the bad news is that they do not learn anything while in school: 40% cannot solve very basic math problems, and less than 20% achieve math competency. In Louisiana, only 5% have math competency (SHJ, 30/9/91).

*We have discovered one of the reasons why our children no longer learn anything in school, and have fallen so far behind in science. We discovered (and we kid you not) that there is a science curriculum based on song, entitled "Sing-a-Song of Science and Social Studies." An example is a song sung to the words of "Pop Goes the Weasel," which runs,

"The Moon goes around the Earth,
We call it a satellite,
The Moon reflects light from the Sun.
Out comes the Moonlight!"

*The Syracuse public school system ruled that if a student scored below 50%, he or she would get a score of 50 no matter how low the performance really was. Critics said that this made as much sense as when we buy something and it turns out to be no good, or to break right away, one would still pay half the price. A repairman who comes to one's house but cannot fix the problem at issue should be paid half of what it would have cost had he fixed it. And rather than firing incompetent secretaries, one should keep the persons on and simply pay them half a salary.

*Between 1979 and 1990, the special education enrollment in New York City increased 243%, and 28.6% of the entire school budget went to special education. $12,000,000 alone had to be spent on setting aside empty seats in special education classes. An absurdity of state regulations has required this waste.

*A fascinating and illuminating question occurred to us: what happens when everybody becomes "learning disabled"—as appears to be happening? Once everyone becomes learning disabled, then teaching would no longer be "special" for such a group, and maybe we will then return to the basic three Rs once again.

*Personnel working in one of the buildings of an institution for the mentally retarded (formerly used by mentally disordered people) in the Australian state of Tasmania have reported it to be haunted. At least six employees have seen apparitions, and one was even thrown about by it. The government responded by declaring that there was no danger to the retarded residents and that the ward was operating "as normal," by transferring some of the haunted workers, and by offering them "occupational counseling" (The Age, 25/7/91; source item from Michael Steer). Actually, we suspect that most older institutions are haunted.
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