

In his much quoted and current lecture at the First European ProLife Forum in Berlin Schirrmacher, professor of ethics, warns of the growing discrepancy between the theoretical law on paper and the judicial and medical reality in several European countries. In a detailed analysis of the European Bioethics-Convention he proves unsparingly how here the human rights fall behind the research of scientists.

Foto wie auf dem Buch God wants you to learn ...

Thomas Schirrmacher (born 1960) is rector of Martin Bucer Theological Seminary and holds a chair of ethics both in Germany and at seminaries in the USA. He has authored and edited 40 books and is listed in Who's Who in the World, Who is Who in Germany and in Who's Who in Distance Education. He holds the following degrees: M.Th. (STH Basel, Switzerland), Drs.theol. (Theologische Hogeschool, Kampen, Netherlands), Dr.theol. (Missiology, Johannes Calvin Stichting, Kampen, Netherlands), Ph.D. (Cultural Anthropology, Pacific Western University, Los Angeles), Th.D. (Ethics, Whitefield Theological Seminary, Lakeland), D.D. (honorary doctorate, Cranmer Theological House, Shreveport).

**HUMAN RIGHTS THREATENED IN EUROPE:
EUTHANASIA - ABORTION -
BIOETHICS-CONVENTION**

THOMAS SCHIRRMACHER

With additional essays by Dr. Susanne Lux and Dr. Christine
Schirmacher

CONTENTS

Human Rights Threatened in Europe: Euthanasia - Abortion - Bioethics-Convention	7
1 Three Remarkable Trends	7
1.1 Right to Life Problems Merge	8
1.2 Illegal but Justified?	8
1.3 Human Rights, the Magic Word	10
2 Central Examples	10
2.1 The Bioethics Convention	10
2.2 Euthanasia - Homicide on Demand or at the Doctor's Discretion?	17
2.3 Prenatal Homicide	24
3 What next? - Suggestions for the Right-to-Life Movement	30
<hr/> The Old Testament vs. Abortion	33
<hr/> What Can we Learn from the ProLife Work in the U.S. <i>By Dr. Susanne Lux</i>	41
<hr/> Human Rights and Christian Faith	49

Appendix: Human Rights in Islam <i>By Dr. Christine Schirrmacher</i>	59
--	-----------

Footnotes	65
-----------	----

Books by Thomas Schirrmacher	83
-------------------------------------	-----------

HUMAN RIGHTS THREATENED IN EUROPE: EUTHANASIA - ABORTION - BIOETHICS-CONVENTION

Lecture at the First European ProLife Forum 1998 in Berlin

By Dr. Thomas Schirrmacher
Translated by Cambron Teupe

1 THREE REMARKABLE TRENDS

The convergence of the European Right-to-Life Movement has become increasingly essential. Since substantial powers of jurisdiction on these matters have been transferred to the European level, European institutions require an appropriate counterpart. Having originated with civic action, the Right-to-Life Movement still acts primarily on the local level, and should continue to do so. Where else can a woman find counsel and assistance for an unwanted pregnancy or for the emotional consequences of an abortion, just to mention one example? At the same time, the movement must offer European legislators a united front. This forum is the right step in that direction.

The Right-to-Life Movement has always considered itself a human rights movement, for it represents above all the rights of those who cannot represent themselves, originally unborn children, but social and medical developments have advanced, creating new victims: the elderly, the infirm and the disabled, as well as embryos and patients. In

this context, I would like to call attention to three trends significant for all Right-to-Life organizations in Europe.

1.1 Right to Life Problems Merge

The issues facing the Right-to-Life Movement have begun to merge. Genetic technology allows genetic analysis, which is used in prenatal diagnosis to determine which children may be aborted and which may be born. Euthanasia (the practice of killing for reasons of mercy) occurs not only at the end of life, but also at its beginning, when newborns are left to die. The so-called Bioethics Convention implements not only research on embryos, but also genetic research on adults unable to decide for themselves, who can be used only because they don't understand what is happening to them. At the moment, the respect for human life is particularly threatened at the beginning of human life - by abortion before birth - and at its end by euthanasia. The fluid transition between abortion and euthanasia is quite visible when judges show increasing sympathy for parents who kill their living disabled children: the news magazine *Focus* recently titled an article, "Euthanasia: in the Name of Sympathy: A woman who has killed her disabled child finds mild judges, but little sympathy from the disabled,"¹ for the woman was given a six-month sentence on probation - no penalty at all.

In 1982, a British study discovered that euthanasia on newborns was already common practice, although no one admitted it publicly.² British doctors also consider the extent of the right to abortion to include the time after birth,³ according to a medical journal of 1987: "The British Medical Association had now reformed its 17 year old euthanasia policies,⁴ although it declared active mercy killing illegal, it considered the decision justified not to prolong life in certain cases, such as a malformed child."⁵

1.2 Illegal but Justified?

Only a small percentage of a country's population orients itself towards values different from those of national or international law. Some may apply Christian ethics to their everyday lives or do without cars or electricity out of concerns for the sake of conservation, but the majority of the population orients itself simply towards the laws of the state⁶, particularly penal law and judicial decisions. In Europe, the

state's influence has particularly increased with the Church's loss of influence on the younger generation. Few parents try to give their children moral values above and beyond the consensus of their society, either because they themselves have none or because they feel incapable. Why do most Europeans have no problem with pornography, even in its most disgusting forms, but find child pornography detestable and wish to have it punished? Simply because this is the legal situation in most European countries!

In this situation, we experience an increasing schizophrenia, in which actions which infringe against the right to life are considered wrong and illegal, but are still permitted, encouraged and financially supported. Dutch law still regards mercy killing homicide and wrong, but neither registers nor penalizes it; the patient or the doctor are considered to have a right to take things into their own hands!

German law is no different in its attitude towards prenatal homicide, which is legally killing and wrong, but is practically never penalized; society leaves the right to decide up to the mother. The judge Bernward Büchner, chairman of the Juristen-Vereinigung Lebensrecht (Lawyers' Society on the Right to Life) assumes that this inconsistency will have serious consequences for our system of rule by law and for our legal consciousness.⁷

The question is, what hollows out the integrity of law more: the open announcement that children and the infirm no longer have a life worth living, or laws which declare the deliberate ending of innocent life to be homicide, but refuse to penalize it, defend the right to such homicide, and even encourage the State to support such slayings financially. The latter is much more dangerous, for it encourages the attitude that even the most serious human crime, the murder of an innocent person, can be ignored. At the end of the day, any form of deliberate homicide might be condemned but not penalized. Judicial decisions in Europe tend to find increasing sympathy for all sorts of killing - including obvious murder, and to reduce the severity of the penalty until it is completely innocuous. To declare a form of killing illegal, but to permit it, regulate it and encourage it reduces the borders between right and crime to an unrecognizable state.⁸

The population, which orients itself towards penal law and judicial decisions, thus learns not only that abortion and euthanasia are permissible, but also that even the most important legal issues depend on inclination, that there is no real distinction between legality and

illegality, between right and wrong or good and evil. This development is emphasized by the fact that all our present right to life problems began when courts ceased penalizing cases of abortion and euthanasia etc. clearly condemned by law,⁹ thus indicating that even indisputable laws can be ignored.

1.3 Human Rights, the Magic Word

In order to understand why illegal acts increasingly remain unpenalized and are even declared civil rights, we must examine the debate over human rights. The lawyer and human rights expert, John Warwick Montgomery, has noted that nowadays, everything can be packaged and sold as a human rights issue, so that the very idea of human rights loses its potency.¹⁰ 'Pro-Familia', for example, derives the right to abortion from the right to family planning,¹¹ a clear example of the way the magic word 'human rights' can be used to justify the killing of innocent human beings. Josef Punt writes, "From aid for victims of catastrophes to euthanasia and abortion as the right of disposal over one's body, any supposedly humane act or any individual need can be clothed in the demands of human rights."¹²

If cannibalism or human sacrifice had a lobby nowadays, they would probably attempt to exploit the human rights idea.¹³ The most central human right to life and liberty, Article 3 of the General Declaration on Human Rights of the UNO, 1948, is being sacrificed to other rights, or supposed rights, which would be better defined as wishes. Consider for example the right to decide on which side of the street one wishes to drive. Should this 'right' be declared more important than the right to preserve life?

We desperately need to remember the difference between unalterable human rights and wise but variable regulations, and to concentrate on fundamental human rights.¹⁴ It is simply not logical to fight for human rights and to combat torture, debt slavery, child abuse and the rule of law, but to dilute the most fundamental of rights, the right to life to the point that abortion, euthanasia, interference in human genetics and embryonic research become permissible.

Against this background I would like to examine the Bioethics Convention, euthanasia and prenatal killing.

2 CENTRAL EXAMPLES

2.1 The Bioethics Convention

In 1990, the Council of Europe requested the Directing Committee for Bioethics (Comité Directeur pour la Bioéthique, CDBI) to draw up a proposal for a Convention on Bioethics.¹⁵ The proposal, which was treated as secret, was long kept under wraps until it came to the public's attention in 1994, when it immediately released a storm of indignation. The "International Initiative of Citizens against Bioethics" achieved initial success for the Right-to-Life Movement, which prevented the presentation of the Convention with five auxiliary protocols for signing without any public or parliamentary discussion. The proposal published by the Council of Europe in 1994 following the protests was rejected by the Parliamentary Assembly, but the Council apparently had sufficient forces to pass it in spite of massive opposition from its own ranks. Numerous delegates of European and national parliaments protested that they would not have had access to the documents without the aid of citizen's initiatives, and that a deliberated misinformation policy had been carried out against delegates.¹⁶ Furthermore, this policy of desinformation shrouds the unbelievable amalgamation of the committees, organizations and advisors, and the research organizations and beneficiaries of greater liberties in research on the European platform.¹⁷

In May and June 1995, the Congress of the Federal Republic of Germany demanded extensive changes which summarized the essential criticism of the Bioethics proposal. The European Parliament and the Parliamentary Assembly accepted these objections for the most part, since only immaterial alterations were made in the original formulation, the objections still apply to the version signed by most governments:

1. Research on persons unable to give consent is still permissible, as long as it serves others.
 2. Research on embryos is permissible.
 3. Since the intervention in human genetic make-up is insufficiently restricted, eugenics and genetic manipulation of human beings are still possible.
-

4. The transmission of research results is insufficiently regulated (data security).

On June 6, 1996, a further proposal, "The Human Rights Agreement on Biomedicine", was submitted under German protest without significant alterations.¹⁸ On November 19, 1996, it was accepted by the Ministerial Committee of the European Council at the embassy level with the abstention of Germany, Belgium and Poland. On April 4, 1997, 21 of the 40 member states of the Council of Europe signed the proposal. At the moment, 23 countries have signed, but only Slovakia has ratified it.¹⁹ (Five states must ratify before the Convention becomes effective.²⁰) Whether Germany will sign or not is still unclear,²¹ but ratification appears to be out of the question, since all German states must first assent independently, not in the Upper House of Parliament,²² and the Hessian Parliament has already unanimously rejected the Bioethics Convention.²³

At any rate, a massive misinformation policy has been employed, in which the translation for the German Federal Ministry of Justice²⁴ sounds better than the binding French and English versions,²⁵ for example. Where the original refers vaguely and legally intangibly to the "representatives" of persons "unable to consent for themselves", the German version refers to their "legal representatives".²⁶ In fact, there is still no official German translation of the Explanatory Report of the European Council on the Bioethics Convention.²⁷

In the "Unterrichtung der Bundesregierung über den Verhandlungsstand des Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Biomedizin"²⁸ ("Federal Government Report on the Negotiations concerning the Human Rights Agreement on Biomedicine"), the German government assumes that the newer version has achieved a significant improvement over the 1994 version, but whitewashes the individual points to a great extent,²⁹ and reads it as if it were indeed clearer and better than the former version. Germany agreed to Article 18,³⁰ because it supposedly precludes embryonic research for commercial use, although the article only prohibits the production of embryos for such purposes. The German government still criticizes Article 36,³¹ under which any state may register its own reservations to any article without exception, and Article 32, Paragraph 4, which includes an unrestricted amendment: "This regulation offers problems which would cause any doubt as to the seriousness and soundness of the rights and principles guaranteed in the agreement."

The most fundamental problem³² of the Bioethics Convention is its basic concern, the desire to syncretize the human right to life with the demands of scientific research and technical progress. It may sound as if two equally valid legal values were in conflict, but actually the most fundamental human rights (to life and dignity) contradict certain indefinite wishes and aspirations, that is the desire to further scientific progress and, at the same time, to serve mankind. Besides, Man and his personal rights are confronted by an abstract, research - or, in the context of the German Constitution, (Basic Rights in Articles 1-3 of the Basic Law), the Right of Science, Research and Instruction (Article 5, Paragraph 3. GC), which has no power to annul any other basic rights. In this context, it should be very clear that human dignity has the priority in any legal discussion of rights and values. I know of no official document which declares scientific research a value in itself more important than human life. Our society tends to put its faith in science, but to pour this faith into a legal mould and to cement it judicially must challenge anyone differently minded. Jobst Paul writes: "The bioethical hypothesis that in principle there cannot be a value, especially human dignity, which exceeds the freedom of research leads to the demand that human dignity and the freedom of research be considered as equal rights and have to be brought to an "agreement". The present priority of human dignity is attributed to an irrational 'Judeo-Christian' religiousness. A change of awareness (Bewußtseinswandel) is to be achieved by "educating" the public awareness in this respect which then would tolerate the individual cases of violation of human dignity on the part of research."³³

According to Paul, the bending of human rights under international research is intended to "ideologically harmonize the European bioethics based on American examples."³⁴ This is not to indulge in cheap Anti-Americanism, but it cannot be overlooked that the almost limitless freedom and support of research in the U.S. pressures all other countries. "The U.S.-doctrine of Bioethics manipulates the term human dignity ... According to it, 'man' is no longer meant to primarily relate to the individual, but to 'man' as the representative of the species. According to the paper, research for probable use is to be considered a human right for the human species, e.g. for future generations, and the human right of the individual has to submit to it. When and for which purpose is decided by current research, of course."³⁵

This trend will keep increasing. Heinz Trompisch writes from an Austrian perspective: "The Bioethics Convention is nothing but a

tessera of worldwide trends. I just want to mention the declaration of the UNESCO: After the European Bioethics Convention there is another danger threatening the mentally handicapped person, his human dignity and his human rights: An "International Bioethics Committee" is preparing a 'Declaration (which is cynically called) on the human genome and on human rights' in the framework of UNESCO, a sub-organization of the United Nations. Here also, the preparations were made in secret."³⁶

In spite of the persuasive title, "Human Rights Agreement on Biomedicine", the document offers no comprehensive protective regulations for the huge complex of biomedicine, and uses the term 'Human Rights' as a sort of magic formula for soothing the suspicious. The statement never defines who has which rights! Extensive areas such as euthanasia, prenatal life, artificial insemination, the brain-death issue, organ transplantation, the sale of organs, data protection, etc., etc., are completely ignored! Thus, the Central Committee of the German Catholics (Zentralkomitee der deutschen Katholiken) does not find any protective regulations for the most basic human right, the right to life in the beginning and end (abortion and euthanasia) in the Convention.³⁷

In the few areas covered, protective regulation is vague and insufficient - for example, an otherwise prohibited act can be permitted in an "exceptional case", if there is only a "minimal risk".³⁸ Science can always find a way around the regulations, it must only find sufficient excuses. "... the paper does not find a consistent terminology"³⁹ especially when it comes to the threat of punishment: "Unfortunately those articles of the Convention that regulate the sanctions in case of a violation of the regulations of the Convention (chapter VIII) are very unspecific and worded imprecisely."⁴⁰

Jobst Paul finds harsh words for that, and rightly so: "In the end, over 200 years of human rights history are definitely ended with a single stroke of a pen. This history knows the impetus of the individual human rights alone as a stronghold especially against collective power in all of its documents. Nazism and the holocaust do not seem to have happened, no conclusions, no consequences in solemn human rights documents."⁴¹

Martina Steindor, the "Green" congresswoman, points to parallels with the ethical restrictions in Article 53b of the European Patent Agreement, which requires all patent grants to adhere to good man-

ners. This expression is so nebulous; and its legal value is so low, that all objections have been rejected,⁴² even those dealing with gene technology. Peter Liese, a member of the European Parliament (CDU), points to the contrary development which will soon set in: "We still have the right to enforce stricter standards, but in reality the Convention is considered a good basis for the judgment of ethical issues in biomedicine."⁴³

Not even the protection offered by the Convention can be guaranteed. Each state may retain its own protective regulations, for example, Germany's Law on the Protection of Embryos from 1.1.1990,⁴⁴ but looser regulations may also be preserved, such as the British Law "Human Fertilization and Embryology Act", 1990. Each country may also make reservations in its ratification, and, except for the European Court of Justice, no one can bring legal action on the basis of the law. The Court of Justice can only interfere on the government level and that is only an advisory function. There is no provision for an action by an organization or an individual.⁴⁵ The official reasoning, that the Court would be overwhelmed by the load, is unconvincing.⁴⁶ Will the future validity of human rights depend on the capacity of courts or on the finances of European bureaucracy? In the *Frankfurter Allgemeinen Zeitung*, Rudolf Willeke writes, "A human right or a civil right, for which neither the citizen nor his legal or contracted representative has appeal to any court of law, is not worth the paper it is printed on."⁴⁷

The insufficient protection provided by the Bioethics Convention is worthless for yet another reason. The Convention leaves the definition of essential terminology, such as 'human being', 'person' or 'every' up to national law, apparently to make agreement possible, according to the Explanatory Report.⁴⁸ Need we be surprised that the beginning of human life is left completely undecided? When central terminology is left undefined, the possibility of countless readings results. The reference to 'professional duties' and 'principles of professional ethics' is another rubber clause. What good is the Agreement, under these conditions? No one can take the thought of any uniform European or international minimum protection seriously.

Besides these fundamental weaknesses in the Convention, there are a number of individual problems:

1. Embryonic research is not prohibited, only the production of embryos for commercial purposes (Art. 18), which corresponds to the

legal situation in most European countries, such as England since the 'Human Fertilization and Embryology Act' of 1990, which permits the production and conservation of embryos for research purposes, or Italy, Spain and Belgium,⁴⁹ as well as the USA. This contradicts the German law on the protection of embryos, which has, however, been strongly attacked by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft⁵⁰ (German Research Society) and many scientists.⁵¹ And it is publicly ridiculed by researchers in other countries.⁵² The strictness of the regulation rebuts any argument that Germany should sign the Convention in order to prove that it is not opposed to protective standards.⁵³ In fact the Bioethics Convention in the end will be used as argument to lower the German standards.⁵⁴

2. The Convention provides no guarantees for data protection for the results of genetic tests (Art. 12). This failure results mainly from the objections of the Swiss, under pressure from Swiss insurance companies, to a ban on the use of such results.⁵⁵ The German Federal Government writes, "We could not agree whether only insurance companies or also employers should have access to the data."⁵⁶

3. Interference in human genomes are not prohibited (Art. 13), as long as there is no intent to alter the genetic makeup of the offspring. This rubber clause allows too much dangerous freedom to unscrupulous researchers.

4. Persons unable to decide for themselves (under German law, embryos, children, the mentally retarded, wards, people in coma - but every state defines this term differently) may be used for research purposes under certain vague stipulations (Art 17 with Art. 6-7), and even in "exceptional cases" (whatever that means) that do not benefit them. Tissue which can be regenerated, such as medulla (from the spinal cord) can be taken from them (Art. 20). By failing to define the patient's representatives - even a 'legally' appointed committee may make the decision for him - the statement breaks the ancient principle only ignored by dictatorships such as National Socialism, that test persons must agree freely, consciously and without any pressure to participate in such testing. This was even the opinion of a legal report of the scientific ministry of the German federal parliament (Wissenschaftlicher Dienst des Deutschen Bundestags) unlike the Federal Ministry of Justice!⁵⁷ And even the Parliamentary Assembly of the European Council wanted to totally prohibit research done on persons unable to decide for themselves, but the Committee of Ministers (Ministerkomitee) nevertheless held on to it.⁵⁸

5. The weakest members of our society are thus verbally sacrificed to the needs of scientific progress - actions will doubtlessly soon follow the words. According the 'Nürnberg Code' for doctors, which was created after the Third Reich, the patient must agree to any experiments carried out on him. This civil right must be retained in spite of the demands of the 'Zentrale Ethikkommission bei der Bundesärztekammer' (Central Ethics Commission of the Federal Medical Chamber), which are expressed in a similarly vague fashion.⁵⁹

6. The Supplementary Protocol on Cloning,⁶⁰ which was signed by 17 of the 40 member states, prohibits cloning ("No intervention shall be carried out with the intention of creating a human being genetically identical to any other living or dead human being."⁶¹), but this ban concerns only the birth of cloned humans. It forbids neither the cloning of embryos not to be carried to full term nor the cloning of separated parts of the human body for 'spare parts depots'. Besides, the protocol defines only intentions, for it requires no penalties.⁶² This is exactly what for example Ian Wilmut, Dolly's father, is planning.⁶³

In 1962, at the Ciba Symposium in London, the American geneticist and Nobel Prize winner, Joshua Lederberg called for the complete genetic alteration of the human constitution.⁶⁴ There, Hermann J. Muller also demanded a genetic control of births especially by selecting the semen, but also by cloning - without being challenged for his position. The Bioethics Convention's opposition to this demand is extremely restrained.

One principle common to the Bioethics Convention and the increased legalization of abortion and euthanasia seems to me to have been insufficiently considered. Whereas in cases of abortion or euthanasia, society gives the doctor the power over life and death, because of his scientific training and experience, the Bioethics Convention declares the highest authority to be the scientist and the researcher, who will interfere with human dignity and even take prenatal lives for the sake of progress.

2.2 Euthanasia - Homicide on Demand or at the Doctor's Discretion?⁶⁵

Let us examine the issue of euthanasia. Once killing on demand has softened the ban on active homicide, victims are soon likely to be killed without their consent - particularly in the case of the elderly, the

infirm, the disabled and the mentally disturbed - a consequence already to be observed in the Netherlands, according to John Keown.⁶⁶ The increase of violence against patients and the killing of patients by medical personnel in German hospitals⁶⁷ are serious precursors of such developments. We are well on the way to reinstating the euthanasia policies of the Third Reich,⁶⁸ which carried out scientist's (!) dreams. The supporter of active euthanasia Norbert Hoerster makes the fear of the National Socialist euthanasia responsible for Germany's lag in admitting euthanasia: "I think that it is time that the question of euthanasia is no longer tabooed in our society under the pretext of Nazi euthanasia..."⁶⁹ Dietrich von Engelhard writes, "Towards the end of the 19th century, Social Darwinism played a primary role, leading to such programmatic works as Adolf Jost's 'Das Recht auf Tod' (Göttingen, 1895⁷⁰), Elisabeth Rupp's 'Das Recht auf Tod' (1913), or Karl Binding's and Alfred Hoche's 'Die Freigabe der Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens'⁷¹ (Leipzig 1920)".

The views expounded by Social Darwinism⁷² were proscribed for half a century, but are now being rediscovered. National Socialism's euthanasia program was legally based on the extension of doctors' discretion. Nowadays, doctors permit themselves to be made the motors of illegal killing, due to the extension of their accountability at the beginning of life (abortion) and at its end (euthanasia).⁷³ The philosopher Robert Spaemann warns, "Besides, ending life on demand is only a gateway drug for the 'de-tabooisation' of destruction of 'life not worth living' - with or without consent."⁷⁴ He refers to the "example of the Netherlands, in which one third of legalized killing - we are talking about thousands of people - do not die at their own request but at the discretion of doctors and family members to decide whether life is no longer livable."⁷⁵

Few European legislatures have legalized the trend towards allowing euthanasia, even though courts seldom enforce the law, and even though the "Grundsätze zur ärztlichen Sterbebegleitung" of the Zentralen Ethikkommission bei der Bundesärztekammer⁷⁶ are so vague that they have been strongly criticized by members of all political parties and lobbies.⁷⁷ On the other hand, the State Court in Frankfurt recently (July 5, 1998) permitted euthanasia in a complex case, using the construction of the 'presumed will' of the patient, who lay in a coma, and who had once vaguely indicated that she did not wish to endure any slow death.⁷⁸ Here the court has overstepped the boundary to active euthanasia, as well as to mercy killing without the patient's

consent -as is the case in the Netherlands, as we will see. The Right-to-Life Movement itself debates whether this is a case of active⁷⁹ or passive⁸⁰ euthanasia. When the modern English, Spanish, French or Italian speaker uses the term 'euthanasia' (coined by Francis Bacon in 1605 from Greek 'eu' = good + 'thanatos' = death⁸¹), we must not only distinguish between active, passive and indirect euthanasia but also take abetment to suicide into consideration.

"Active euthanasia is killing on demand; the deliberate inducing of death by means of a substance foreign to the body."⁸²

"Passive euthanasia is the rejection or the interruption of life-prolonging treatments."⁸³

"Indirect euthanasia" is the "acceptance of the possibility that an earlier death may result when conditions of severe pain and suffering are treated with pain relievers."⁸⁴

Indirect euthanasia is simply a continuation of the risk common to every medical treatment. Even though the decision can be extremely difficult, it does not involve the deliberate ending of another person's life.⁸⁵

Hans Thomas would prefer to abolish the terms 'euthanasia' and 'assisted death' and the descriptions associated with them, and to substitute 'killing' for active euthanasia and 'permission to die' for passive euthanasia.⁸⁶ Although his suggestion would clarify the actual issue, it is unlikely that it will be accepted.

Passive euthanasia, which merely ceases to interfere in a death process already in progress, usually has little to do with homicide - although the individual decision will always be difficult; there can be no black or white judgment on the issue,⁸⁷ as is the case in most ethical questions. The expressions 'active' and 'passive' must not be understood to mean that the difference lies in the doctor's participation.⁸⁸ Murder and manslaughter can occur by omission as is the case when an infant is starved.⁸⁹ Passive euthanasia suspends the artificial preservation of life processes once recovery and the reversal of the death process have been dismissed as impossible. Not the doctor's intervention but the disease causes the patient's death.⁹⁰ Active euthanasia on the other hand, induces the death process before the natural death process has begun. This is a deliberate killing.

To assist another to die is just as wrong as active euthanasia or suicide, but in contrast to active euthanasia, it is not indictable under German law. Robert Spaemann points out that this legal gap makes

Germany unnecessarily attractive to advocates of the individual's right to decide over the end of his life.⁹¹

When active euthanasia is performed at the patient's demand (which is supposedly always but in reality seldom the case), it is actually abetment to suicide. The problem is that the death wish is: 1. often due to a psychological disturbance; 2. usually temporary and 3. more frequently due to poor social conditions than to pain.

Thomas Fuchs writes concerning the first two points, "A person's death wish is generally, in 95% of the cases, the expression and the symptom of a psychological illness or an acute conflict situation. Between 80 and 90% of those who have attempted to take their own lives are later glad to be alive. Only about 10% repeat the attempt."⁹²

Concerning the question whether the wish for suicide should not be binding for the doctor, Gerhard Robbers points out that suspicion of our own will is also legally anchored in other places so that door-to-door sales and consumer credits, for example, are not automatically binding and can easily be revoked later.⁹³ Suicide is not simply the free disposal over one's own life that is none of anyone's business, but it has consequences for society. It conveys the impression that life is of low value, it serves as an example, increases pressure on others, e.g. older people, the sick or handicapped, to act the same way and shapes our dealing with life in general.⁹⁴

For the third point Fuchs then refers to the only available Dutch studies on the issue: "According to Dutch studies, the major motive behind the death wish is not the often cited unendurable pain, but the feeling of the loss of one's dignity, the fear of dependence, helplessness and deformity. These reflect much more the quality of belongings as the human attitude of the dying person to his environment."⁹⁵ Of all countries in the world, as of 1994, only the Netherlands allows active euthanasia under specific circumstances.⁹⁶ But the US and Australia are also forerunners, as Peter Singer⁹⁷ and Derek Humphrey,⁹⁸ vehement public advocates of euthanasia and abetment to suicide, have declared. In Australia's Northern Territory⁹⁹ and in the US state Oregon, federal courts have annulled the legalization of euthanasia, but in referenda in several American states, the legalization of euthanasia has been only defeated by a small margin,¹⁰⁰ in Washington, for example, by 45-55% and even religious and ecclesiastical groups are divided on the issue.¹⁰¹ Laurence O'Connell writes, "There can be no doubt that active mercy killing on demand

will be a legal and moral possibility in the United States by the end of the century."¹⁰²

The situation varies considerably in different European states. Due to the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, the debate over euthanasia is almost unknown, but is becoming conspicuous in the nineties.¹⁰³ A similar state of affairs is to be observed in France without Roman Catholic influence.¹⁰⁴ In Sweden, the debate is older, but euthanasia is surprisingly not so widely accepted as would be expected in view of the country's reputation as forerunner in the dismantling of other ethical issues.¹⁰⁵

Since the seventies, a euthanasia movement has established itself in the Netherlands, while during the seventies and the eighties, the courts' clemency since the Leeuwarden euthanasia case of 1973 has ipso facto revoked the laws,¹⁰⁶ a development typical for the development of human rights problems. As a result, in the eighties the courts have almost always acquitted defendants accused of mercy killing. In 1984, the Dutch Medical Chamber presented codes for active euthanasia, although it was still illegal at the time. The courts comply with these codes, which speak of the patient's free will, his prolonged death wish and unendurable, hopeless suffering, but require only the confirmation by a second doctor as the only protection against abuse. On June 1, 1994, a law was passed which declares euthanasia punishable in principle, but practically prevents an investigation by the state attorney as long as the doctor has observed the Dutch Medical Chamber' standards. Since these standards do not require that the patient be suffering a terminal illness, all sorts of social and emotional disturbances can be brought into the context of euthanasia, opening the door for all sorts of abuse.

The Rummelink Report, published in 1991, played a key role in the legislation.¹⁰⁷ 405 doctors were interviewed and 7,000 deaths examined anonymously. In 1995, after the passing of the new law, the study was repeated. The first study officially recorded 2,300 cases of active mercy killing per year, 1.8 percent of all deaths,¹⁰⁸ as well as 400 cases of abetment to suicide.¹⁰⁹ The most serious result was that in 1,000 of the 2,300 cases, the patient was killed without his consent. The actual number is probably even higher. In 14 cases, the patient had not been consulted even though he was conscious.¹¹⁰ The primary reason given by doctors for the mercy killing was not pain resistant to therapy (30%), but the hopelessness of the treatment (60%), poor quality of life and the inability of the patient's family to handle the situation (30%

- more than one answer was possible.). Doctors and family members had the power over life and death and no intent to murder could be detected - assuming that we are willing to speak of murder. Impatient heirs need only persuade the doctor to perform euthanasia, which no state attorney and no court of law will investigate any further.

Independently of each other, John Keown,¹¹¹ Henk ten Have¹¹² and Jos Welle have shown in detail that the Rummelink Report minimizes the number of euthanasia cases, particularly those performed without the patient's consent. As the report defines euthanasia as a case of killing on demand within the context of medical treatment, it fails to clarify the evaluation of mercy killings performed without the patient's consent.¹¹³ Besides there is a special category for cases in which medications which shorten or end life were administered in order to kill, although this is the 'classical' method. Even using the report's own numbers, we find not 2,300 cases of euthanasia but at least 10,558,¹¹⁴ probably 26,350, including those cases in which medication was given at least partly in order to shorten life. In that case the number of euthanasia cases is five or ten times higher than reported.

In 1995 the number of cases of active mercy killing rose from 1.8% of all deaths to 2.3%. If we add those cases in which pain killers etc were deliberately administered in a higher dose, we arrive at 4.5%. Then we can add 10.1% of deaths in which life-prolonging treatment was interrupted, usually without the patient's consent (60%), and over 7% with similar methods. Altogether, 20% of all deaths, according to information given by doctors, because the doctor has decided that the patient should no longer live.¹¹⁵

"Problematic is also the circumstances of mercy killing on demand: in almost half of the cases, less than a week passed between the patient's expression of the death wish and the killing, in 13% not even a day, not enough time to adequately test the persistence of the death wish as required by the standards of the Medical Chamber ... Besides three quarters of the doctors failed to consult another colleague, which the official standards require, and 72% filled out false death certificates, in order to avoid an investigation ... As a result of the second study, 60% of the cases were not registered in spite of the new regulations ... In 1990 only 2 cases of euthanasia without the patient's consent were registered, in 1995 only three ..."¹¹⁶

Herbert Csef describes cases cited in the "New England Journal of Medicine", in which people 41 years old or less, who had been in

psychiatric treatment for only three or four months died by euthanasia,¹¹⁷ in order to avoid either further supposedly hopeless treatment or suicide (using murder to prevent suicide, in other words).

The Dutch have thus not won but sacrificed the great liberty to end their lives at will in cases of extreme suffering; the lives of any seriously ill person may be at risk. The medical standards are a farce, since doctors in almost all the cases have apparently overstepped their own rules, failing either to ask the patient,¹¹⁸ to observe his death wish long enough, or to requesting no second opinion or diagnosis by a colleague. In the majority of cases, the doctor has ended life without consulting anyone and without having known the patient for long enough!¹¹⁹ Even moralists unsure of their position on euthanasia, such as Dietrich von Engelhardt, can only say, "To carry out active euthanasia against the will of the patient or at least without any explanation or agreement is immorality and legally murder."¹²⁰

Government studies also show that death certificates are no longer worth the paper they are printed on, for deaths carried out without the patient's consent were registered as natural deaths, except in a single case.¹²¹ As reasons, 47% of doctors mentioned the annoyance of a judicial investigation, 43% claimed that death would have occurred anyway and 28% wanted to spare the family harassment.¹²²

"Dutch doctors' high-placed lawyers have scorned to deny that the consent of the patient to euthanasia was only included in the standards for tactical reasons: in this way, they hoped to achieve a general acceptance of euthanasia to start with."¹²³ As a matter of fact, the procedure for euthanasia is a part of their training.¹²⁴ The whole function of the medical code is apparently to soothe the public and to prettify the whole thing with sham legality.¹²⁵ No wonder that Dutch doctors demand a general amnesty for mercy killing of all kinds,¹²⁶ and that the new standards of 1995 have widened their extent to include patients without terminal illnesses, abetment to the suicide of mentally disturbed, the killing of severely deformed newborns and patients with dementia.¹²⁷ Even the legal process which permits doctors to pass their own laws and courts to acknowledge them is a preposterous situation for a constitutional state. The Dutch government want to keep the theoretical punishment of euthanasia, since at least half of the cases are still not reported, although the report is meanwhile directed to the doctor conducting the post-mortem and not to the prosecution.¹²⁸

And actually in 1995, a Dutch court acquitted a doctor who, at the parents' request, had administered curare to a severely brain-damaged child.¹²⁹ Nowadays, Hitler would have it so much easier in Netherlands than in World War II when they brought so much sacrifice in order to resist him! Bert Gordijn's criticism of the Dutch situation is mainly directed towards the fact that the discussion of whether euthanasia is to be morally supported "was quietly ended, or rather a positive answer was implied."¹³⁰

In other countries, abuse will probably be worse than in the Netherlands, where the family doctors have more influence than in Germany, for example, and have had longer contact with their patients. Besides, 40% of patients, twice as many as in Germany, die in their own homes rather than in hospitals or nursing homes.¹³¹ In Germany the danger of anonymous euthanasia is thus much greater. In the US and in poorer countries there is also the danger that economic factors could determine the question, when the family is no longer willing to pay for treatment.

Christians, above all, are faced with the challenge of facing the euthanasia issue and informing the public about it. Unfortunately, the two excellent studies of the Linacre Centre for Health Care Ethics,¹³² the bioethical center of the Archbishops of England and Wales,¹³³ have found no imitators in other European countries.¹³⁴

What can we learn from the Dutch example? First, that the right to life is indivisible. When society begins to give individuals the power to decide over the right to life, it can not prevent the principle from being applied to ever more circumstances. In warning against the liberalization of abortion laws, Pro-Life advocates in most countries have long predicted that disregarding the sacredness of life before birth would be inevitably followed by further measures and laws that treat human life as if it were worthless.

The human right to life is indivisible. The train has been running in the wrong direction for too long, and the public's conscience is becoming increasingly dulled in regard to offenses against human life. Either we let the train continue and need not be surprised if we are the next victims whose lives are left to others' discretion, or we stop it and get into one going into the opposite direction. The Dutch train is farther along than in the rest of Europe, but be not deceived! We are going in the same direction, if somewhat slower.

The Dutch example also teaches us that the advocates of euthanasia use the same tactics as the Pro-Choice movement. At first, they were concerned with only absolute exceptions, a few grave cases of terminally ill patients with unbearable pain, who had expressed a definite wish to die. The supposedly short life expectancy was then extended, new reasons such as loneliness and worries about financial dependency were added, and instead of the express death wish assumed consent, then, if the individual was unable to be consulted, even the lack of the death wish. At the end of the process, euthanasia can even be performed on individuals capable of consent.

"Many of Holland's citizens now carry a "Declaration of the Wish to Live" in self defense,"¹³⁵ but the medical profession doesn't take them very seriously, they have no legal significance. And that, although the whole mercy killing debate began in the Netherlands with the propaganda, that the written wish of a patient to die in case of serious illness is morally permissible and obligatory.

2.3 Prenatal homicide

A report published by World-Watch in Washington reveals that every year there are nearly as many abortions as deaths in World War II. During the entire war, some 55 to 60 million people died altogether, but nowadays, 50 million children are murdered in their mother's womb, as well as some 200,000 women who die as a result. The numbers are not exaggerated, they probably still do not completely cover the number of unreported abortions.¹³⁶ In Japan and France, half of all children are killed before birth, in Germany and the Netherlands, one fourth.

You are all quite familiar with the problem, since prenatal murder is the Right-to Life's original concern, which has been extended above all by medical progress. I would like to address two special aspects.

Prenatal Killing as a Method of Family Planning

Even as a verbal excuse, the needs of single mothers have given way to other excuses. One lexicon dryly but accurately divulges the brutal but true reason for the high number of abortions: "Induced or artificial abortion is one of the major methods for birth control"¹³⁷ American surveys show that 93% of all abortions are conducted for the reason of birth control and not because of difficult predicaments.¹³⁸

This becomes obvious, when we observe that the influential organization "International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF: in the US 'Planned Parenthood', in Germany, the founding member of the movement,¹³⁹ 'Pro Familia') maintains at the same time the most abortion advice centers in the world and makes massive efforts to promote the right to abortion. As we have already seen, Pro Familia derives the right to abortion from the right to family planning.¹⁴⁰

Out of 1,000 American men who escorted their partner to the abortion clinic (and this probably a special selection), 60% claimed to have used poor birth control methods or none at all, 90% would do anything possible in future to prevent an abortion, but 30% were not at the abortion clinic for the first time, and 26% considered abortion the killing of a human being.¹⁴¹ There are therefore many, who use no birth control even after experiencing a abortion.

Every abortion statistic clearly shows that abortion has become a common birth control method which makes sexual desire more important than the right of a human being to live,¹⁴² According the statistics of the Medical Tribune,¹⁴³ in Germany in 1988,¹⁴⁴ 8,300 abortions were registered, naturally not the number of all performed. Nearly half of the mothers were married (48%), but 87% of the operations were performed on the pretext of 'other grave distress', and that in one of the world's wealthiest countries!¹⁴⁵ Even if we assumed that unwanted pregnancies were unavoidable in extra-marital relations, there is still no reasonable explanation for the fact that half of the children were aborted by married couples who as educated Europeans of the Twentieth Century ought to know how children are made. But abortion has become an acceptable birth control method.

The magnitude of the abortion tragedy can only be explained by the magnitude of modern liberal sexuality. Abortion is supported not only by Pro-Choice lobbies but also by the sex industry. One of the most significant commentaries on German penal law says, "An individual and social attitude that no longer considers children a blessing but considers abortion a means to female self-fulfillment has blunted many people's repugnance towards the act."¹⁴⁶

Prenatal Diagnostics have Transformed our View of Disease

In the mean time, medical progress is increasingly being used as a step towards killing a child in the womb. Prenatal diagnosis is seldom

employed in the treatment of health problems before or directly after birth, but to make possible the most awful selection, if the infant is or even might be disabled according to a genetic analysis. Ulrich Eibach writes, "In no other field of medicine is the gap between diagnostic and therapeutic possibilities so wide as in the field of prenatal diagnosis. The result is, that diagnosis is deliberately performed even when there is no therapy available for the 'object' of the diagnosis. This is new in medicine, for diagnostic methods are generally only legitimate when they serve the well-being of their 'object' - The factual consequence of the prenatal diagnosis of disease is almost always abortion, not the treatment of the bearer of a disease, but his destruction."¹⁴⁷

This has far-reaching consequences for medical practice. "Predictive medicine transforms our view of disease. A person is considered ill, not when the disorder has manifested itself as a disturbance in the real functions of the body or the psychological-mental affects, but when he has inherited a genetic tendency towards such disturbances, tendencies which may never express themselves."¹⁴⁸

At this point, we cannot ignore the parallels to the Third Reich and its selective policies¹⁴⁹, as Ulrich Eibach points out, "Completely unconvincing is the assertion that our modern attitudes towards prenatal diagnosis, selection, euthanasia etc. have nothing in common with those which laid the intellectual groundwork for the medical crimes in Nazi Germany. The Nazi state put into practice the theories that Social Darwinism and other philosophies of the early twentieth century had justified as rational, even scientific (=evolutionary)."¹⁵⁰

If we are again prepared to allow the state to dispose over the right of whole sections of the population to life, the state has lost its most important right to exist, the responsibility to protect the life of its citizens. While governments were signing an agreement in Rio de Janeiro to protect endangered species of plants and animals, the German Parliament passes a law permitting the destruction of the 'species' human being in the womb.

Excursus: The Dubious Founders of 'pro familia'

As we have seen, 'pro familia'¹⁵¹, the largest family planning organization (6,195 members¹⁵²), derives the right to abortion from the right to family planning.¹⁵³ Repeated documentation demonstrates that the organization persuades, even pressures women to abort,¹⁵⁴

vehemently opposes financial aid for mothers in need and measures to ease the adoption of children which would otherwise be aborted.¹⁵⁵ Abortion at any price? 'Pro familia' publishes pornographic material, even for children, and encourages children to have sex which adults also enjoy. Rüdiger Lautmann, professor for sociology (sexology) openly solicits pedophiles in his article, "The Desire for the Child"¹⁵⁶, and propagates his opinions in 'pro-familia's magazine.¹⁵⁷ But 'pro familia' appears to be a sacred cow. And this organization advises more families and pregnant women in need than all other organizations together?

The links between National Socialist, racist eugenics and abortion reform and the family planning movement can be found in the years prior to 1950,¹⁵⁸ with the founder of the 'International Planned Parenthood Federation', Margaret Sanger, and, more clearly, with the founder of 'pro familia', Hans Ludwig Friedrich Harmsen. These organizations' silence about their origins is striking, considering the fact that they all too cheerfully accuse their opponents of fascism.

Margaret (Higgins) Sanger (1883-1966) was the "pioneer of the American and international movement for birth control. In 1917/1929, she edited the magazine, "Birth control review", founded the first clinic for birth control in the US and in 1921, the American League for Birth Control ... In 1927, she organized the first world conference on population in Geneva and became the first president of the International Alliance for Family Planning in 1953."¹⁵⁹ Although she had originally had close ties to National Socialist family planning, she later repudiated them, but still supported abortion as well as birth control. She emphasized not only the supposed rights of women but also the reduction of the surplus population.¹⁶⁰ Even abortion advocates speak of the "racist-eugenic heritage of the IPPF initiator, Margaret Sanger".¹⁶¹ Sanger demanded the limitation of the number of children ...¹⁶²

In the beginning, Sanger was a Socialist who wanted to get rid of Capitalism. Birth control was considered a means of class struggle.¹⁶³ Later on she followed the Malthusian thinking¹⁶⁴, but her Socialist tendencies were still shining through when she claimed that Capitalists, priests and politicians only suppressed birth control because the higher numbers of children would impoverish the lower social classes.¹⁶⁵ The number of people unfit for life¹⁶⁶ was to be reduced by means of birth control. By that Sanger usually referred to handicapped and mentally ill people, although she sometimes understood the term

ethnically¹⁶⁷ and in practice, she work together a lot with many racist thinking eugenicists.¹⁶⁸

Hans Ludwig Friedrich Harmsen (1899-1988)¹⁶⁹, co-founder and president of 'pro-familia' from 1952 to 1967, was one of the leading eugenicists and adversaries of 'inferior' human beings, and at the same time the medical administrator of the Lutheran Inland Mission (nowadays Diakonisches Werk).¹⁷⁰

As early as in 1926, he supported to free a people of harmed genotype ('schädliche Erbmasse') in his second doctoral thesis.¹⁷¹ Later on, Harmsen held leading offices in social welfare services of the church and in hospitals. In 1931, he spoke out for the "need ... of a eugenic new-orientation of our welfare services."¹⁷² Whether he, together with other founders of 'pro familia', was already for the eugenic indication, that means abortion in case of handicaps,¹⁷³ since the national power (Volkskraft) was not to be wasted on raising the inferior (Minderwertige),¹⁷⁴ is disputed.¹⁷⁵ He more and more explicitly demanded the selection of people with hereditary diseases and thus voted for the National Socialist "Law for the contraception of genetically damaged offspring" of 1933, - as a representative of the church social welfare services! This law permitted compulsory sterilization (Zwangssterilisation), compulsory abortion and soon the killing of handicapped and mentally ill people.¹⁷⁶ As manager (Geschäftsführer) of the 'Gesamtverband der deutschen Krankenanstalten' (General Association of the German Hospitals and Clinics), Harmsen was the leading Protestant advocate of this law in a number of publications, for example a church commentary on the law on hereditary health (Erbgesundheitsgesetz).¹⁷⁷ At the same time he was the person chiefly responsible for the practical application of this law and other National Socialist measures in Protestant hospitals and clinics.¹⁷⁸ This has neither harmed his career after 1945, nor did it lead to a statement on the part of the church.¹⁷⁹

After the war, Harmsen never denied his support for the eradication of the genetically damaged.¹⁸⁰ Heidrun Kaupen-Haas has demonstrated¹⁸¹ that, in the Fifties, Harmsen never condemned the 'Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses' as National Socialist, but continued to defend the same positions he had held prior to 1945. In spite of this, he was made a professor and the director of the Hygienic Institute in Hamburg, where he assembled other renowned race-eugenicists of the pre-1945 period into scientific associations and worked as a appraiser for the German Government.¹⁸²

'Pro familia' claims to have been unaware of Harmsen's engagement in the Third Reich¹⁸³ until 1984, when it urged him to give up his honorary presidency.¹⁸⁴ This seems very improbable, as the facts had long been well known, the accusation that 'pro familia' had grown out of racist roots just like the IPPF were old, and 'pro familia's' own commemorative publication on Harmsen's eightieth birthday¹⁸⁵ had also hinted at the fact. Whereby the Laudatio¹⁸⁶ and other articles about Harmsen¹⁸⁷ catalogue his writings and his offices in the Third Reich, but offer neither explanations nor criticism.

3 WHAT NEXT? - SUGGESTIONS FOR THE RIGHT-TO-LIFE MOVEMENT

The developments described above present the greatest challenge to the Pro-Life Movement in Europe! Most of those threatened either cannot speak for themselves and/or have no organized lobby. The Pro-Life Movement, as a human rights organization must give them a lobby!

This speech has been scheduled between the three major themes of this forum: abortion, euthanasia and the Bioethics Convention, and the practical issues of - 'Pro-Life Cooperation' in Europe, which are to be discussed today and tomorrow. I would like to take this opportunity to make a few suggestions.

Even though the conditions are somewhat different in the USA, I believe that we can learn from our American counterparts much that we, as the Aktion christliche Gesellschaft e. V. (Campaign Christian Society) have examined in order to win new ideas for Europe. As we have no time at the moment to go into the historical details, I would like to refer you to the report of my representative, Dr. Susanne Lux, which is available here.¹⁸⁸

1. We need a much stronger system of communications and collaboration between all Right to Life groups and activities: lawyers' associations, counseling centers, homes for single mothers, media campaigns, both on the national level and on the international level. Much has been achieved, but not enough. The purpose of this conference, to bring European Pro-Life groups together, must not be only a nine-day wonder. Too many groups are unaware of the publications, activities and possibilities of others. The attempt to find out what is

being done in another city or country leads to a long, weary search, because there is no central directory available.¹⁸⁹

2. The combined efforts of the Right-to-Life Movements must be coordinated into a political lobby. Our local work must provide a base, but we need full-time representatives on higher levels to continually remind governments, whether by appointment or as participants in conferences, etc., that central human rights issues must still be clarified, for they still disturb part of the population.

3. We must learn to employ 'Salami-Tactics'. This means publicizing minor changes in the law or making concrete stipulations which are still being supported by the public. The demand, "Prohibit abortion," will find little echo, but we can still provoke emotional support for the demand "Prohibit the abortion of children capable of living outside the womb."¹⁹⁰ We must learn that those who oppose late-term abortion are not necessarily opposed to early-term abortion; they are merely trying to keep the Right-to Life issue alive in the public's mind. The German campaign, "www.timlebt.de" is an excellent example. If such tactics are to succeed, all Pro-Life groups must be willing to engage their efforts on such projects.

4. The success of the American groups depends to a large extent on the support of the churches, not so much the national organizations, but the local congregations, which often provide the necessary groundwork. We must use the potential of the local churches who are interested in our cause but lack information. Within the great denominations, whether state church or free church, the local congregations are quite varied in their attitude towards abortion. We need a network of congregations willing to provide us with more than logistical or other support. Christians will simply have to overcome some of their fears of contact, if we are to aid the unborn. These fears frequently prevent churches from using their potential.

5. We need information for the public and solid medical, legal and ethical literature, such as the German "Zeitschrift für Lebensrecht" of the Juristenvereinigung Leben (Journal for the Right to Life by the Lawyers' Association Life) or ALFA's 'Lebensforum'. They must be produced on the same level as established journals, so that they can be made available in public libraries. We need - and I say this as a publisher - annuals and collections such as *Readers Digest* which reprint good articles from our professional journals, Europe-wide if

possible, to act as a lobby and to inform on Pro-Life issues in a professional manner.

Prologue for my Colleagues

Please allow me to say a few personal words on the subject. I would like to call German theologians to the fray. I am often disappointed in the failure of Christian theologians and church leaders to take their role of watchmen seriously; often they stab Pro-Lifers in the back. On the Protestant side, few Ethics professors engage themselves in the Right-to Life movement, or even support its ideas. Even on the Catholic side, there is a deep gap between the engagement of the Church and many of its Ethics professors. The speaker for the professors of morality in Germany, Hans Kramer, advocates to some degree the use of the abortion pill RU 486.¹⁹¹

A glance into the Table of Contents of theological ethical works shows that the majority generally ignore the issue or avoid clear positions on it¹⁹² - I am ashamed to compare the number of medical and legal professors who support the movement with solid articles on the debate.

The declaration made by the two major churches, "Wieviel Wissen tut uns gut? Chancen und Risiken der voraussagenden Medizin" (How much knowledge does us good? Chances and Risks of Predictive Medicine)¹⁹³, written primarily by ethics professors¹⁹⁴, makes no clear statements against abortion except where it is "illegal".¹⁹⁵ Prenatal diagnosis could prepare the way for eugenics¹⁹⁶, but where is the church, anyway? Such tendencies are already brutal reality. The most they have to say about the defense of the unborn is, that it is a value worthy of being protected¹⁹⁷, or "When we speak of prenatal human life, we must mention its moral status and its right to protection."¹⁹⁸ As if the German Supreme Court or the Pro-Choice advocates said the opposite.

A Commission of the World Council of Churches published a declaration on gene technics in 1973.¹⁹⁹ At prominent places they call for such 'important' things like a better education for scientists²⁰⁰, as if one would need the churches for remarks like this. But they say near to nothing about the real ethical problems. Discussing prenatal diagnosis nothing is said against abortion²⁰¹, even so it is stated that abortion is 'a difficult decision'. The 'clearest' sentence about abortion

sounds like this: "We can say that a decision for fetal diagnosis and abortion is a weighty decision, for the fetus, although still dependent, has a potential existence as an independent human being."²⁰²

The Central Ethics Commission of the Federal Medical Chamber, for example, voted 22 to 23 in 1989 to permit the elimination of unwanted additional children produced by artificial insemination. A woman wants to become a mother and purchases the privilege with murder. The only opposing vote came not from the theologians (Professors Böckle, Bonn, RC and Rösler, Tübingen, Lutheran), but from the Hamburg Andrologist Professor Schirren!²⁰³ Michael Gante considers the 1960 liberal contribution of the Protestant Theology professor Karl Janssen in the journal "Evangelische Ethik" (Protestant Ethics) a trail-blazer for the elimination of the old abortion law.²⁰⁴

How different are the words in Dietrich Bonhoeffer's *Ethik*: "To kill the fruit in the womb is to injure the right to life given the child by God. To even ask whether this is already a human being or not, only confuses the simple fact that this human being has been intentionally robbed of his life. That is nothing other than murder."²⁰⁵ "That the motives leading to such an act may arise out of deepest human or economic need and despair, that the guilt often lies at society's door, and that, whereas wealth may be able to conceal foolishness, the poor are most likely to be discovered, all of these factors should determine the counselor's personal behavior towards the individual, but none alter the fact that this is murder."²⁰⁶

Karl Barth expressed himself in similarly barbed terms, for he speaks of the "secret mass murder which has recently taken flight and become habit, and that in the so-called civilized world."²⁰⁷ In 1951, he asked, "...where is the testimony of the Protestant Church in response to this rising tide of disaster?"²⁰⁸ Fifty years later, we can only repeat his cry.

¹Barbara Esser and Petra Hollweg. Euthanasie: Im Namen des Mitleids: Eine Frau, die ihre behindertes Kind tötete, fand milde Richter, aber kein Verständnis bei Behinderten. (Focus 18/1998): pp. 34-36.

²Luke Gormally (Ed.). *Euthanasia, Clinical Practice and the Law*: (The Linacre Centre for Health Care Ethics: London: 1994), pp. 15-22, 95, 104-107.

³The most extensive presentation of the German situation is: Mirjam Zimmermann. *Geburtshilfe als Sterbehilfe: Zur Behandlungsentscheidung bei schwerstgeschädigten Neugeborenen und Frühgeborenen*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt, 1997 (it is concerned with medical, psychological and ethical aspects as well as

Schirmmacher, Human Rights Threatened in Europe

aspects of law - the author is not against euthanasia in principle). Comp. also the personal report of a couple that purposely decided to deliver a severely handicapped child: Inka und Torsten Marold. Immanuel: Die Geschichte der Geburt eines anenzephalen Kindes. Edition pro mundis 1. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1996.

⁴Ärztezeitung from July 1st/2nd, 1988.

⁵Christine Schirmmacher. *Zeitspiegel*, (Querschnitte 1 July-Sept.1988): 4. The English government first prohibited abortion in 1803 (excepting danger to the mother's life). See: Barbar Brookes. *Abortion in England 1900-1967*. (Croon Helm: London 1988).

⁶See William A. Stanmeyer. *The Seduction of Society: Pornography and Its Impact an American Life*. Servant Books: Ann Arbor (MI), 1984, p. 93.

⁷Bernward Büchner. "Ist das 'Beratungskonzept' besser als andere Fristenregelungen." (Schriftenreihen der Juristen-Vereinigung Lebensrecht e. V. zu Köln No. 15. JVL. Cologne 1998), pp. 9-15.

⁸So uttered the chairman of the Juristen-Vereinigung Lebensrecht on the Federal Supreme Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht) in a press release on May 8, 1998.

⁹There are innumerable examples. Acquittals for euthanasia began in the Netherlands in the seventies. Long before the laws had been changed, German courts seldom penalized abortion.

¹⁰John Warwick Montgomery. *Human Rights and Human Dignity*. (Canadian Institute for Law, Theology and Public: Edmonton, Canada, 1995), (repr. from Probe Books, USA 1986), p. 15.

¹¹See: Martin Kriele. *Die nichttherapeutische Abtreibung vor dem Grundgesetz*. (Schriften zum öffentlichem Recht 625. Duncker und Humbolt: Berlin, 1992), p. 68.

¹²Josef Punt. *Die Idee der Menschenrechte: Ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung und ihre Rezeption durch die moderne katholische Sozialverkündigung*. (Abhandlungen zur Sozialethik 29. Schöningh: Paderborn, 1987), pp. 223-224.

¹³Cf. Thomas Schirmmacher. *Völker - Drogen - Kannibalismus: Ethnologische und länderkundliche Beiträge 1984-1994*. (Disputationes linguarum et cultuum orbis - Sectio V: Volkskunde und Germanistik, Vol. 4. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1997), pp. 62-64.

¹⁴Cf. Thomas Schirmmacher. *Christlicher Glaube und Menschenrechte*, (in Russian). POISK: *Ezemedel'naja Vsesojunznaja Gazeta* (Journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences. No. 48 (446) November 22-28, 1997), p. 13. Repr. as *Christlicher Glaube und Menschenrechte*, (in Russian) *Utschitjelskaja Gazeta* (Russian Teacher's Journal No. 2 (9667) Jan. 3, 1998, p. 21 and No. 3 (9968) Feb. 3, 1998), p. 22.

¹⁵For the best chronology of the convention, see Paul. *Die Bioethik- und Grundwert-Debatte in Deutschland (1993-1998): Eine Dokumentation*. Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung: Duisburg, 1998 Jobst and Hubert Hüppe. *Gefahr für die Menschenwürde? Die sogenannte 'Bioethik-Konvention' des Europarates*. pp. 3-16 in *Gefahr für die Menschenwürde? (Idea-Dokumentation*

10/97. Idea: Wetzlar, 1997). These articles also provide the locations of many protocols of various plenary sessions, announcements and resolutions, which cannot be listed in detail here. See also the various contributions for and against it in: Roland Rösler (Ed.). *Biologie im Horizont der Philosophie: Der Entwurf einer europäischen 'Bioethik'-Konvention. Moralthologie - Anthropologie - Ethik Band 2.* Peter Lang: Frankfurt, 1997 and also: Johannes Reiter. "Bioethik und Bioethikkonvention". In: *Politik und Zeitgeschichte* (supplement of: *Das Parlament*) B 6/99 (5.2.1999): pp. 3-11.

¹⁶Hubert Hüppe. "Gefahr für die Menschenwürde? Die sogenannte 'Bioethik-Konvention' des Europarates". *op. cit.*, pp. 10-12, with numerous examples (e.g. from Peter Liese) and Roland Rösler (Ed.). *Biologie im Horizont der Philosophie: Der Entwurf einer europäischen 'Bioethik'-Konvention.* loc. cit. pp. 18-21+28-29 (Roland Rösler); see also the contributions of delegates of the various parties: Robert Antretter. "Das Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Bioethik des Europarates." *Schriftenreihe der Juristen-Vereinigung Lebensrecht e.V. zu Köln Nr. 15. JVL: Cologne, 1998.* pp. 17-24 (SPD: Vice President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the European Commission); Peter Liese. "Das Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Bioethik des Europarates," *Schriftenreihe der Juristen-Vereinigung Lebensrecht e.V. zu Köln Nr. 15 JVL: Cologne, 1998,* pp. 25-38 (MdEP CDU; doctor); Martina Steindor. "Das Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Bioethik des Europarates," *Schriftenreihe der Juristen-Vereinigung Lebensrecht e.V. zu Köln Nr. 15. JVL: Cologne, 1998,* pp. 39-49 (MDB Bündnis 90/Die Grünen, doctor).

¹⁷For details see: Jobst Paul. *Im Netz der Bioethik.* Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung: Duisburg, 1994. pp.11+12+52.

¹⁸For Germany's reaction during the votes on the individual articles, see: "Unterrichtung der Bundesregierung über den Verhandlungsstand des Menschenrechtsübereinkommens zur Biomedizin." (Bundestagsdrucksache 13/5435, August 21, 1996). Here cited from <http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/zme/Europarat.htm>. (This is the Webpage of the 'Zentrum für medizinische Ethik' of the University of Bochum.)

¹⁹According to <http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/zme/Europarat.htm>, using the statements of the Auswärtigen Amt (Foreign Office); Christian Poplutz. "Die Bioethik-Convention wahrt nicht die Würde des Menschen." *The Deutsche Tagespost* (Würzburg), May 15, 1998, referring to the Bundestagsdrucksache 13/9577, Nr. 1, mentions only 22 states.

²⁰Article 33 of the Bioethics Convention and Paragraph 171-177 of the Explanatory Report of the European Council on the Bioethics Convention. One of the five must either be Canada, Australia, the Vatican, Japan, the USA or from the European Union.

²¹See the discussion in Christian Poplutz. *Offene Fragen zur Bioethik-Konvention, op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

²²According to the Upper House (Bundesrat). See Bundesrats-Drucksache 617/96.

²³Christian Poplutz. *Offene Fragen zur Bioethik-Konvention, op. cit.* p. 7. The reference cited there is not correct.

²⁴See the text in *Zeitschrift für Lebensrecht* 7 (1998) 1: pp. 16-20 (or under <http://www.k.shuttle.de/jvl/schriften/zfl1998/01>) and in <http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/zme/Europarat.htm>. These include both the translation of the Ministry of Justice, April 4, 1997, and the earlier version of Nov. 11, 1996. The latter has also appeared in *Gefahr für die Menschenwürde? Idea-Dokumentation 10/97* pp. 24-33.

Schirmacher, Human Rights Threatened in Europe

The text of the Explanatory Report can also be found in <http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/zme/Europarat.htm> (the official translation) and in *Gefahr für die Menschenwürde? Idea-Dokumentation* 10/97 pp. 34-49 (in a very good unofficial translation).

²⁵See the English original in *Gefahr für die Menschenwürde? Idea-Dokumentation* 10/97, pp. 17-23 and <http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/zme/Europarat.htm>.

²⁶Article 6, Paragraphs 2+3: "his or her representative", or "son représentant"; see Christian Poplutz. "Offene Fragen zur Bioethik-Konvention", *op. cit.*, p. 8.

²⁷An unofficial translation can be found together with the English original under the Webpage <http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/zme/Europarat.htm>.

²⁸Bundestagsdrucksache 13/5435, August 21, 1996. Cited from <http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/zme/Europarat.htm>.

²⁹*Ibid.*, under 2.

³⁰*Ibid.*, under 8. (on Article 18).

³¹*Ibid.*, under 4. (on Articles 32 and 36).

³² The internet is a treasure trove concerning this topic. The best criticism of the Bioethics Convention known to me is: "Kritik der 'Münchener Initiative gegen die Menschenrechtskonvention zur Biomedizin' an der Informationsschrift des Bundesministeriums der Justiz vom Jan. 1998 ..." <http://www.fortunecity.com/greenfield/sushine/314/infos/kritik.html>; see also: Jobst Paul. "Der Begriff und die Ideologie der 'Bioethik'". Lecture at the symposium 'Bioethics versus Human Rights' of the Green Parliament's Club in the German Bundestag on March 18, 1997, [http://info.uibk.ac.at/c/c6/bidok/texte/begriff"bioethik.html](http://info.uibk.ac.at/c/c6/bidok/texte/begriff) (visited on May 16, 1999); "Stellungnahme des Zentralkomitees der deutschen Katholiken zum Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Biomedizin des Europarats" (11.9.1997) hier nach [http://selbsthilfe.seiten.de/sonstiges/zdk"bio.htm](http://selbsthilfe.seiten.de/sonstiges/zdk) (May 16, 1999). Concerning the situation in Austria see Heinz Trompisch. "Österreich und die Bioethikkonvention". Lecture at the symposium 'Bioethics versus Human Rights' of the Green Parliament's Club in the German Bundestag on March 18, 1997, [http://info.uibk.ac.at/c/c6/bidok/texte/oesterr"bioethikkonvention.html](http://info.uibk.ac.at/c/c6/bidok/texte/oesterr) (visited on May 16, 1999).

³³Jobst Paul. "Der Begriff und die Ideologie der 'Bioethik'". *loc cit.* p. 5.

³⁴Jobst Paul. *Im Netz der Bioethik*. Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung: Duisburg, 1994. p. 52.

³⁵Jobst Paul. "Der Begriff und die Ideologie der 'Bioethik'". *loc cit.* pp. 5-6.

³⁶Heinz Trompisch. "Österreich und die Bioethikkonvention". *loc cit.* p. 5.

³⁷"Stellungnahme des Zentralkomitees der deutschen Katholiken zum Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Biomedizin des Europarats" (September 11, 1997) quoted from: [http://selbsthilfe.seiten.de/sonstiges/zdk"bio.htm](http://selbsthilfe.seiten.de/sonstiges/zdk) (May 16, 1999).

³⁸Article 17, Paragraph 7 of the Bioethics Convention.

³⁹Michael Emmrich. "Forschung an nichteinwilligungsfähigen Menschen". In: Politik und Zeitgeschichte (supplement of: Das Parlament) B 6/99 (Feb. 5, 1999): 12-21, here p. 17.

⁴⁰Johannes Reiter. "Bioethik und Bioethikkonvention". In: Politik und Zeitgeschichte (supplement of: Das Parlament) B 6/99 (Feb. 5, 1999): 3-11, here p. 9.

⁴¹Jobst Paul. "Der Begriff und die Ideologie der 'Bioethik'". *loc cit.* p. 6.

⁴²Martina Steindor. "Das Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Bioethik des Europarates", *op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁴³Peter Liese. "Das Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Bioethik des Europarates," *op. cit.*, p. 33. Strange that Liese is unsure whether the Convention should be signed, in spite of his own criticism.

⁴⁴Bundesgesetzblatt 1990 I: 2746f.

⁴⁵See Paragraph 166 of the Explanatory Report of the European Council on the Bioethics Convention.

⁴⁶According to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the arguments brought by other states in regard to the "Unterrichtung der Bundesregierung über den Verhandlungsstand des Menschenrechtsübereinkommens zur Biomedizin" ("Federal Government Report on the Negotiations concerning the Human Rights Agreement on Biomedicine") *op. cit.*, to 12, (Article 29).

⁴⁷Rudolf Willeke. "Die Bioethik-Konvention - Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Biomedizin." *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Feb. 10, 1998. See reprint in: *Medizin und Ideologie* 26 (1998) 3: pp. 33-37.

⁴⁸Paragraph 18 of the Explanatory Report of the European Council on the Bioethics Convention.

⁴⁹*Wieviel Wissen tut uns gut? Chancen und Risiken der voraussagenden Medizin. Gemeinsames Wort der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz und des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland zur Woche für das Leben 1997.* (Gemeinsame Texte 11. Kirchennamnt der EKD: Hannover & Deutschen Bischofskonferenz: Bonn, 1997), p. 23.

⁵⁰Christian Poplutz. "Offene Fragen zur Bioethik-Konvention," *op. cit.*, p. 9 on the German Research Society. *Forschungsfreiheit: Ein Plädoyer für bessere Rahmenbedingungen der Forschung in Deutschland.* DFG: Weinheim, 1996.

⁵¹See Robert Geursen. "Heilen mit Genen". *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare* 39, July 7, 1998, pp. 10-14, see p.13.

⁵²See Martins Steindor. "Das Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Bioethik des Europarates," *op. cit.* pp. 45-46.

⁵³*Ibid.*, and Hubert Hüppe. "Gefahr für die Menschenwürde?" *op. cit.*, p. 15.

⁵⁴See as an example with regard to that Robert Geursen. "Heilen mit Genen". *Gesellschaftspolitische Kommentare* 39, July 7, 1998, p.13.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, and Rudolf Willeke. "Die Bioethik-Konvention - Menschenrechtsübereinkommen zur Biomedizin," *op. cit.* The information comes from the documents of the DCBI.

⁵⁶"Unterrichtung der Bundesregierung über den Verhandlungsstand des Menschenrechtsübereinkommens zur Biomedizin," *op.cit.*, under 5 (on Article 13).

⁵⁷Wissenschaftliche Dienste des Deutschen Bundestages. Zur Vereinbarung des Menschenrechtsübereinkommens zur Biomedizin des Europarates vom 6. Juni 1996 (früher: Bioethik-Konvention) mit den Grundrechten, 7. November 1996, Bonn, Reg.-Nr. WF III-155/96; see also the legal objections in: Wolfram Höfling. "Menschenrechte und Biomedizin". Universitas (Stuttgart) 51 (1996) 603: 854-861; in Michael Emmrich. "Forschung an nichteinwilligungsfähigen Menschen". In: Politik und Zeitgeschichte (supplement of: Das Parlament) B 6/99 (5.2.1999): 12-21 and in Udo Schlaudraff. "Zwischen Konsens und Widerstand". pp. 9-28 in: Walther Gose, Herbert Hoffmann, Hans-Gerd Wirtz (Ed.). Aktive Sterbehilfe? Zum Selbstbestimmungsrecht des Patienten. Paulinus: Trier, 1997. pp. 15-20.

⁵⁸According to *ibid.* p. 17; see also Johannes Reiter. "Bioethik und Bioethikkonvention". *loc cit.* pp. 8-9.

⁵⁹*Deutsches Ärzteblatt*, Nr 15, April 11, 1997, pp. C-749-C-750. Repr. in "Gefahr für die Menschenwürde?" *Idea-Dokumentation* 10/97, pp. 50-51.

⁶⁰"Zusatzprotokoll zum Übereinkommen zum Schutz der Menschenrechte und der Menschenwürde im Hinblick auf die Anwendung von Biologie und Medizin über das Verbot des Klonens von menschlichen Lebewesen vom 12. Januar 1998", *Zeitschrift für Lebensrecht* 7 (1998). Also available in <http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/zme/Europarat.htm>.

⁶¹*Ibid.*

⁶²See: Ludwig Siep. "Klonen: Die künstliche Schaffung des Menschen?". In: Politik und Zeitgeschichte (supplement of: Das Parlament) B 6/99 (5.2.1999): pp. 22-29.

⁶³Stefan Brandmaier. "'Klumpen ohne Nerven'". *Lebensforum* Nr. 50 (2/1999): pp. 16-17.

⁶⁴Joshua Lederberg. "The Biological Future of Man," *Man and His Future*, Ed. Gordon Wolstehom. Churchill: London 1964, p. 265.

⁶⁵I primarily use the excellent works of Robert Spaemann and Thomas Fuchs. *Töten oder Sterben lassen? Worum es in der Euthanasiedebatte geht*. Herder: Freiburg 1997, pp, 219-240; and Luke Gormally, Ed. *Euthanasia, Clinical Practice and the Law*. The Linacre Centre for Health Care Ethics: London, 1994.

⁶⁶John Keown. "Further Reflections on Euthanasia in The Netherlands in the Light of the Rummelink Report and The Van Der Maas Survey in Luke Gormally, Ed. *Euthanasia, Clinical Practice and the*

Law. The Linacre Centre for Health Care Ethics: London, 1994, pp. 219-240. See also John Keown. "Euthanasia in the Netherlands: Sliding Down the Slippery Slope?" in *Euthanasia Examined: Ethical, Clinical and Legal Perspectives*. Ed. John Keown. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, Great Britain, 1995.

⁶⁷See Dirk Richter, Dorothea Sauter. *Patienttötungen und Gewaltakte durch Pflegekräfte*. Deutscher Bundesverband für Pflegeberufe: Eschborn, 1997.

⁶⁸See Hansjörg Bräumer. "'Unwertes' Leben in Gefahr: Euthanasie und Extinktion," *Informationsbrief der Bekenntnisbewegung* (Lüdenscheid) Nr. 145 (April 1991): 9-17 and *Themenheft Gestern 'lebensunwert' - heute 'unzumutbar': Wiederholt sich die Geschichte doch?* W. Zuckschwerdt Verlag: München 1998 (with documentation). On euthanasia in the Third Reich and its precursors since the turn of the century, see Kurt Nowak. 'Euthanasie' und Sterilisierung im 'Dritten Reich': Die Konfrontation der evangelischen und katholischen Kirche mit dem 'Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses' und der 'Euthanasie'-Aktion. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes* Ergänzungsreihe 12. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1978.

⁶⁹Norbert Hoerster. "Rechtsethische Überlegungen zur Sterbehilfe". pp. 51-70 in: Walther Gose, Herbert Hoffmann, Hans-Gerd Wirtz (Ed.). *Aktive Sterbehilfe? Zum Selbstbestimmungsrecht des Patienten*. Paulinus: Trier, 1997. pp. 69.

⁷⁰"The Right to Death."

⁷¹"The Legalisation of the Destruction of Life not Worth Living."

⁷² Social Darwinism, which has developed in the last century, has had an enormous impact on family and social politics and politics in general, see: Kurt Nowak. 'Euthanasie' und Sterilisierung im 'Dritten Reich': Die Konfrontation der evangelischen und katholischen Kirche mit dem 'Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses' und der 'Euthanasie'-Aktion. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes* ER 12. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1978. pp. 11-26; Peter E. Becker. *Zur Geschichte der Rassenhygiene: Wege ins Dritte Reich*. Thieme: Stuttgart, 1988; Peter E. Becker. *Wege ins Dritte Reich, Teil 2: Sozialdarwinismus, Rassismus, Antisemitismus*. Thieme: Stuttgart, 1990; Willi Dreßen. "Rassenhygiene". pp. 167-168 in: Wolfgang Benz (Ed.). *Legenden, Lügen, Vorurteile: Ein Wörterbuch zur Zeitgeschichte*. dtv: München, 1993⁴; Christian Vogel. "Die Macht der Tatsachen: Der Einfluß der Biologie auf die Moral". *Medizin und Ideologie* 17 (1995): 34-38 (aus *Universitas* 1/1993); Wilhelm Lüttger. *Die Religion des Idealismus und ihr Ende*. 4. Teil: *Das Ende des Idealismus im Zeitalter Bismarcks*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. 2. Reihe 21. C. Bertelsmann: Gütersloh, 1930. pp. 299-311 und Bernhard Hassenstein. "Biologische Theorien und deren Einflüsse auf geistige Strömungen des 20. Jahrhunderts". *Materialdienst der Evangelischen Zentralstelle für Weltanschauungsfragen* 59 (1996) 7: 193-199; vgl. zu kulturgeschichtlichen, evolutionistischen Entwürfen als Vorgeschichte der Eugenik auch Derek Freeman. *Liebe ohne Aggression: Margaret Meads Legende von der Friedfertigkeit der Naturvölker*. Kindler: München, 1983. pp. 21-81 und die historischen Teile von Markus Vogt. *Sozialdarwinismus: Wissenschaftstheorie, politische und theologisch-ethische Aspekte der Evolutionstheorie*. Herder: Freiburg, 1997.

Schirmmacher, Human Rights Threatened in Europe

⁷³Rolf Winau. "Euthanasie im NS Staat." *Lebensforum* Nr. 46:2/1998: 8-13.

⁷⁴Robert Spaemann: "Es gibt kein gutes Töten". pp. 12-30 in: Robert Spaemann, Thomas Fuchs. *Töten oder sterben lassen? Worum es in der Euthanasiedebatte geht*. Herder: Freiburg, 1997. p. 21.

⁷⁵*Ibid.* p. 21-22.

⁷⁶"Principles of Medically Assisted Death" of the Central Ethics Commission of the Federal Medical Chamber.

⁷⁷Martina Fietz. "Ärzttekammer verabschiedet Grundsätze zur Sterbehilfe: Verbände und Parteien protestieren". *Die Welt* of Sep. 12, 1998 p. 2.

⁷⁸Johann-Christoph Student. "Tötungsverbot ausgehöhlt". *Lebensforum* No 47 3/1998: pp. 6-7.

⁷⁹*Ibid.*

⁸⁰E.g. Hans Thomas. "Das Frankfurter Oberlandesgericht unterspült keinen Damm". *Zeitschrift für Lebensrecht* 7 (1988) 2: pp. 22-26.

⁸¹Francis Bacon and Thomas Morus were the first modern advocates of active euthanasia, which had been unthinkable since the middle ages. Cf. Dietrich von Engelhardt. "Euthanasie in historischer Perspektive". *op. cit.* pp. 16-19. Bacon and Morus looked back to antique models like Sparta, Platon's 'Politeia' and the Stoa (*ib.* p. 17). Cf. to the history of euthanasia *ibid.* completely, esp. the literature pp. 24-25.

⁸²Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe: Das Beispiel der Niederlande und die Ethik des Sterbens". pp. 31-107 in: Robert Spaemann, Thomas Fuchs. "Töten oder sterben lassen? Worum es in der Euthanasiedebatte geht". Herder: Freiburg, 1997. p. 34. It should indeed be noted, that the desire of the patient is not crucial and - as the example of the Netherlands will show (see further on in the text) - is rarely evident.

⁸³*Ibid.* p. 35.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*

⁸⁵Friedrich Haarhaus. "Aktivierende Altenhilfe". Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1991. p. 132 deems the borderline between active and passive euthanasia fluent, because even the Pope Pius XII admitted the use of anaesthetics that imply a short cut to life. Such gifts of anaesthetics deal neither with active nor with passive euthanasia, if the intent of the medication is by no means the manslaughter. Otherwise the majority of operations, narcotizing etc. must not be applicated, because many of these cases embody a potential risk for life.

⁸⁶E.g. Hans Thomas. "Das Frankfurter Oberlandesgericht unterspült keinen Damm". *Zeitschrift für Lebensrecht* 7 (1988) pp. 22-26, p. 23.

⁸⁷Dietrich von Engelhardt. "Euthanasie in historischer Perspektive". *op. cit.* p. 23 and Harald Wagner. "Euthanasie". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993): pp. 87-89, p. 88 also accentuate, that the evidently existing vagueness of distinction between active and passive euthanasia is not refuted; cf

Markus von Lutterotti. "Grenzen ärztlicher Behandlungspflicht und passive Sterbehilfe". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993): pp. 3-14.

⁸⁸See esp. Ulrich Eibach. *Sterbehilfe - Tötung aus Mitleid: Euthanasie und 'lebensunwertes' Leben*. R. Brockhaus: Wuppertal, 1998. pp. 89-91; Anselm Winfried Müller. *Tötung auf Verlangen - Wohltat oder Untat?* Kohlhammer Philosophie. Ethik Aktuell 3. W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1997. pp. 95-128 and N. M. de S. Cameron. "Euthanasia". pp. 357-359 in: David J. Atkinson, David H. Field (ed.). *New Dictionary of Christian Ethics and Pastoral Theology*. IVP: Downers Grove (IL), 1995.

⁸⁹So defines Brian Clowes in "Die Tatsachen des Lebens." *Human Life International: Front Royal* (VI), 1997. p. 64 the terms, which in my opinion is totally misleading. Besides that the catholic author is also in contradiction to the 'facultas docendi' of the Pope and the worldwide church, see Johannes Paul II. *Enzyklika Evangelium vitae*. of march 25 1995. "Verlautbarungen des Apostolischen Stuhls 120". Sekretariat der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz: Bonn, 1995 3. pp. 78-81, No 64-65 and "Katechismus der katholischen Kirche". Oldenbourg: München, 1993. pp. 579-580, No 2276-2279.

⁹⁰Esp. Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe". *op. cit.* pp. 67-68.

⁹¹Cf. Robert Spaemann. "Es gibt kein gutes Töten". *op. cit.* pp. 27-28. Even the advocat of active euthanasia, Norbert Hoerster. "Rechtsethische Überlegungen zur Sterbehilfe". pp. 51-70 in: Walther Gose, Herbert Hoffmann, Hans-Gerd Wirtz (Ed.). *Aktive Sterbehilfe? Zum Selbstbestimmungsrecht des Patienten*. Paulinus: Trier, 1997, here p. 61 is for an introduction and tightening of the prohibition of suicide, because he only accepts euthanasia in "a severe, irreversible case of suffering".

⁹²Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe". *op. cit.* p. 85.

⁹³Gerhard Robbers. "Euthanasie und die Folgen für unsere Rechtsgemeinschaft". *loc cit.*, pp. 81.

⁹⁴Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe". *loc cit.*, pp. 76-78.

⁹⁵*Ibid.* p. 57.

⁹⁶Cf. the excellently discriminating outlines in Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe: Das Beispiel der Niederlande und die Ethik des Sterbens". *op. cit.* pp. 36-54; Henk A. M. ten Have, Jos V. M. Welle. "Euthanasie - eine gängige medizinische Praxis: Zur Situation in den Niederlanden". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993): pp. 63-72; John Keown. "Further Reflections on Euthanasia in The Netherlands in the Light of The Rummelink Report and The Van Der Maas Survey". *op. cit.*; John Keown. "Euthanasia in the Netherlands: Sliding Down the Slippery Slope?". *op. cit.*; Bert Gordijn. "Die niederländische Euthanasie-Debatte". pp. 29-50 in: Walther Gose, Herbert Hoffmann, Hans-Gerd Wirtz (Ed.). *Aktive Sterbehilfe? Zum Selbstbestimmungsrecht des Patienten*. Paulinus: Trier, 1997; Brian Clowes. "Die Tatsachen des Lebens". *Human Life International: Front Royal* (VI), 1997 (HLI Wien: hli-aut@magnet.at, Fax 0043/01/ 7966529). pp. 76-80 and Herbert Csef. "Aktive Euthanasie heute: Beim psychiatrisch unterstützten Selbstmord ist der Damm längst gebrochen". *Lebensforum* No 46 (2/1998) pp. 32-37 = Herbert Csef. "Aktive Euthanasie heute". pp. 126-138 in: Ingolf Schmid-Tannwald (Editor). "Gestern 'lebensunwert' - heute 'unzumutbar': Wiederholt sich die Geschichte doch?" W. Zuckschwerdt Verlag: München, 1998 (this version includes literature), see also the outline of a professor of

Schirmacher, Human Rights Threatened in Europe

law who supports the jurisdiction of the Netherlands: Peter J. P. Tak. "Euthanasia in the Netherlands". *Leipziger Juristische Vorträge* 29. Leipziger Universitätsverlag: Leipzig, 1997. Numerous important contributions can be found in the volume of the Netherlands Movement for the Right of Life: Schreeuw im Leven, Hilversum (sol.cfl@rainbow.lifenet.nl, Fax 0031/35/6244352). L. P. Dorenbos (Ed.). Euthanasia in the Netherlands and Abroad: Proceedings Three International Conferences. Schreeuw im Leven, Hilversum, 1998 - enthält die Bücher L. P. Dorenbos (Ed.). Dutch Euthanasia - Worldwide Threat. Schreeuw om Leven: Hilversum, 1996; L. P. Dorenbos (Ed.). The Threat of Euthanasia. Schreeuw om Leven: Hilversum, 1997; L. P. Dorenbos (Ed.). The Continuing Threat of Hilversum. Schreeuw om Leven: Hilversum, 1998.

⁹⁷Cf. Ruth Doelle-Oelmüller. "Euthanasie - philosophisch betrachtet: Ein Diskussionsbeitrag zu Argumenten von Spaemann und Singer". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993) pp. 41-54.

⁹⁸Derek Humphrey. "Final Exit: The Practicalities of Self-Deliverance and Assisted Suicide for the Dying". The Hemlock Society: Eugene (OR), 1991; cf. Hans Schwarz. "Fürsorge für das menschliche Leben". *Evangelium und Wissenschaft* No 33 (Apr 1988) pp. 20-34.

⁹⁹Cf. Loane Skene. "Euthanasie: Die Rechtslage in Australien". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993) pp. 239-251.

¹⁰⁰Cf. Laurence J. O'Connell. "Die Diskussion um aktive Euthanasie in den USA". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993) pp. 79-82, p. 80 and Dietrich von Engelhardt. "Euthanasie in historischer Perspektive". *op. cit.* p. 15.

¹⁰¹So also Laurence J. O'Connell. "Die Diskussion um aktive Euthanasie in den USA". *op. cit.* p. 80.

¹⁰²Ibid. p. 79.

¹⁰³Cited from Paolo Cattorini, Massimo Reichlin. "Euthanasie in Italien". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993) pp. 55-62.

¹⁰⁴Cf. Patrick Verspiere. "Die Euthanasiedebatte in Frankreich". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993) pp. 331-338.

¹⁰⁵Cf. Erwin Bischofberger. "Die Euthanasiedebatte in Schweden". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993) pp. 73-77.

¹⁰⁶See Henk A. M. ten Have, Jos V. M. Welle. "Euthanasie - eine gängige medizinische Praxis: Zur Situation in den Niederlanden". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993) pp. 63-72, p. 63.

¹⁰⁷P. J. van der Maas, J. J. M. van Delden, L. Pijnenborg. Euthanasia and other Medical Decisions Concerning the End of Life: An Investigation ... Health Polity (Amsterdam) 22 (1992) 1+2 (special Issue): 1-262 with following investigations: pp. 27-109 fieldwork of doctors, pp. 113-146 fieldwork of doctors starting from attestations of death, pp. 150-174 and statistical analysis over six months made by doctors in praxi.

¹⁰⁸P. J. van der Maas, J. J. M. van Delden, L. Pijnenborg. "Euthanasia and other Medical Decisions Concerning the End of Life". *op. cit.* p. 178.

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.* 179; cf. Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe". *op. cit.* pp. 39-40.

¹¹⁰Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe". *op. cit.* p. 40.

¹¹¹John Keown. "Further Reflections on Euthanasia in The Netherlands in the Light of The Rummelink Report and The Van Der Maas Survey". pp. 219-240 in: Luke Gormally (Ed.). "Euthanasia, Clinical Practice and the Law". *The Linacre Centre for Health Care Ethics*: London, 1994 (further contributions of the author are cited *ib.* p. 219, annotation 1).

¹¹²Henk A. M. ten Have, Jos V. M. Welle. "Euthanasie - eine gängige medizinische Praxis: Zur Situation in den Niederlanden". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993) pp. 63-72, pp. 64-67.

¹¹³Cf. in contrast the better definition: Luke Gormally (Ed.) Euthanasia, Clinical Practice and the Law. *op. cit.* p. 11) "there is euthanasia when the death of a human being is brought about on purpose as part of the medical care being given him".

¹¹⁴See esp. the table *ibid.* p. 224.

¹¹⁵Summarized by Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe". *op. cit.* pp. 41-43; cf. John Keown. "Further Reflections on Euthanasia in The Netherlands ...". *op. cit.* pp. 222-232.

¹¹⁶Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe". *op. cit.* pp. 44; cf. John Keown. "Further Reflections on Euthanasia in The Netherlands ...". *op. cit.* pp. 232-234.

¹¹⁸P. J. van der Maas, J. J. M. van Delden, L. Pijnenborg. Euthanasia and other Medical Decisions Concerning the End of Life. *op. cit.* pp. 57-69+181-182.

¹¹⁹This evidently is proven in John Keown. "Further Reflections on Euthanasia in The Netherlands ...". *op. cit.* pp. 228-233+235-236.

¹²⁰Dietrich von Engelhardt. "Euthanasie in historischer Perspektive". *op. cit.* pp. 23.

¹²¹P. J. van der Maas, J. J. M. van Delden, L. Pijnenborg. Euthanasia and other Medical Decisions Concerning the End of Life. *op. cit.* p. 65.

¹²²*Ibid.*

¹²³Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe". *op. cit.* p. 50.

¹²⁴So also *ib.* pp. 49-50 and John Keown. "Further Reflections on Euthanasia in The Netherlands ...". *op. cit.* pp. 235-236.

¹²⁵Cited from Brian Clowes. "Die Tatsachen des Lebens". *op. cit.* p. 76.

¹²⁶Cited from Thomas Fuchs. "Euthanasie und Suizidhilfe". *op. cit.* p. 49.

¹²⁷*Ibid.* pp. 49-50.

¹²⁸Bert Gordijn. "Die niederländische Euthanasie-Debatte". *Loc cit.* p. 47.

¹²⁹*Ibid.* p. 50.

¹³⁰Bert Gordijn. "Die niederländische Euthanasie-Debatte". Loc. cit. p. 49.

¹³¹*Ibid.* p. 47.

¹³²Luke Gormally (Ed.). "Euthanasia, Clinical Practice and the Law". *The Linacre Centre for Health Care Ethics*: London, 1994, the study of a 16-headed commission of 1982 in pp. 7-107 (esp. pp. 51-58 a classical outline of the christian standpoint), the study of 1992 for the British House of Lords 'Submission to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Medical Ethics' pp. 109-165.

¹³³Outlines of the Christian standpoint: Jochem Douma. "Euthanasie". *Kamper Bijdragen* 12. Uitgeverij 'De Vuurbank': Groningen, 1973; John M. Frame. "Medical Ethics: Principles, Persons and Problems". *Presbyterian & Reformed*: Phillipsburg (NJ). 1988. pp. 67-70; John Warwick Montgomery. "Human Dignity in Birth and Death: A Question of Values". pp. 153-165 in: (John Warwick Montgomery). *Christians in the Public Square. Law, Gospel and Public Policy*. Canadian Institute for Law, Theology and Public Policy: Edmonton (CAN), 1996; Norman Geisler, Frank Turek. *Legislating Morality. Is it Wise? Is it Legal? Is it Possible?* Bethany House Publ.: Minneapolis (MN), 1998. pp. 179-206; Franz Furger. *Ethik der Lebensbereiche*. Herder: Freiburg, 1992³. S. 124-128; "Euthanasia" pp. 138-139 in: R. K. Harrison (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Biblical and Christian Ethics*. Thomas Nelson: Nashville (TN), 1987. Cf. the church patriarch's refusal of euthanasia: Bernhard Schöpf. "Das Tötungsrecht bei den frühchristlichen Schriftstellern bis zur Zeit Konstantins". *Studien zur Geschichte der katholischen Moraltheologie* 5. F. Pustet: Regensburg, 1958. pp. 64-71; cf. as an overview: Philipp Schmitz. "Euthanasie - verschiedene Wege ethischer Orientierung in einem christlichen Umfeld". *Zeitschrift für medizinische Ethik* 39 (1993) pp. 27-40. Aus der Sicht von Behinderten und Schwerkranken behandelt Joni Eareckson Tada. *Sterben dürfen? Unser Recht zu leben und zu sterben*. Ausaat Verlag: Neukirchen, 1995 die Frage der Sterbehilfe.

¹³⁴See also the contributions against active euthanasia going beyond the Christian view: Anselm Winfried Müller. *Tötung auf Verlangen - Wohltat oder Untat?* Kohlhammer Philosophie. Ethik Aktuell 3. W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1997 and Walther Gose, Herbert Hoffmann, Hans-Gerd Wirtz (Ed.). *Aktive Sterbehilfe? Zum Selbstbestimmungsrecht des Patienten*. Paulinus: Trier, 1997, bes. Gerhard Robbers. "Euthanasie und die Folgen für unsere Rechtsgemeinschaft". pp. 71-88; Udo Schlaudraff. "Zwischen Konsens und Widerstand". pp. 9-28. (Norbert Hoersters contribution: "Rechtsethische Überlegungen zur Sterbehilfe". pp. 51-70 speaks out for active euthanasia.)

¹³⁵Brian Clowes. "Die Tatsachen des Lebens". *op. cit.* p. 77.

¹³⁶Cited from "Zeitspiegel" in *Querschnitte* 3 (1990) 4 (Okt-Dez): 3.

¹³⁷Ellinor E. N. Draper. "Birth Control". pp. 1065-1073 in: *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*. 30 Vols. Vol. 2. Encyclopedia Britannica: Chicago, 1982 15/9, here p. 1069. Henri van Straelen. "Abtreibung: Die große Entscheidung". Josef Habel: Regensburg, 1974. At p. 32 he wrote already in 1972 after an outline of the situation in Japan: "Die Tatsache, daß die Abtreibung an die Stelle der Empfängnisverhütung getreten ist, kennzeichnet auch die Lage in den anderen Ländern". ("The fact that abortion replaced birth control is also true for the situation of the other countries.").

¹³⁸Norman Geisler, Frank Turek. *Legislating Morality. Is it Wise? Is it Legal? Is it Possible?* Bethany House Publ.: Minneapolis (MN), 1998. p. 157; Robert Bork. *Slouching Towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline*. Regan Books: New York, 1996. pp. 180-181 und William J. Bennett. *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators*. Schuster & Schuster: New York, 1994. p. 69.

¹³⁹Mechthild Bock. "Internationale Verbindungen". pp. 182-197 in: "Frauen gegen den Paragraph 218 ... (Ed.). "Vorsicht 'Lebensschützer'! Die Macht der organisierten Abtreibungsgegner". Konkret Literatur Verlag: Hamburg, 1991. p. 185.

¹⁴⁰Cf. Martin Kriele. "Die nicht-therapeutische Abtreibung vor dem Grundgesetz". *Schriften zum öffentlichen Recht* 625. Duncker und Humblot: Berlin, 1992. p. 68.

¹⁴¹All to find in the paragraph "Die Verarbeitung einer Abtreibung durch die Väter" in: Jochen Beuckers, Pantaleon Fassbender (Ed.). "Psychische Folgeschäden nach Schwangerschaftsabbruch". *Aktion Lebensrecht für alle: Augsburg/Bonn*, 1991. pp. 76-77. Correctly there is noted that the last figures should be significantly higher in Germany.

¹⁴²Cf. Thomas Schirmacher. "Evolution and Sexual Revolution". *Christianity and Society* 7 (1997) 1 pp. 9-12.

¹⁴³Medical Tribune No 38/1989.

¹⁴⁴We have chosen the old figures because the announced numbers since the recent alteration of the paragraph 218 are so remnant and unreliable that they are of no use.

¹⁴⁵Carsten Hobohm writes in: *Zeitspiegel in Querschnitte* 4 (1991) 2 (April-June: 2 "In 1990 78.808 abortions have been announced to the Statistisches Bundesamt for the territory of the old West German Federation. This amounts to roughly one third of the true figure as it can be reckoned e.g. by the billing to the social assurance. Anyhow the figures of the Statistical Bundesamt are able to reflect a rough picture of the common situation. 89.1 % of the announced abortions can be counted to the so called social indication. 65 cases were due to criminological indication, i. e. the child was begotten by rape. About one half (47.7 %) of the women that have aborted are married, 43.1 % unmarried, the rest widowed or divorced. The majority of them (53.0 %) don't have children yet. Only 2.2 % of aborting women were younger than 18 years."

¹⁴⁶Jähnke. "Sechzehnter Abschnitt: Straftaten gegen das Leben". pp. 1-124 (comment to paragraphs 218-220) in: Hans-Heinrich Jeschek, Wolfgang Ruß, Günther Willms (Ed.). *Strafgesetzbuch: Leipziger Kommentar: Großkommentar*. Vol. 5: Paragraphs 185 to 262. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, 1989 10, here p. 9 (enhancement added by the author).

¹⁴⁷Ulrich Eibach. "Vorgeburtliche Diagnostik und Leidbewältigung: Wieviel genetische Diagnostik können wir verantworten?" *Evangelium und Wissenschaft* No 33 (Apr 1988) pp. 4-19, here p. 9.

¹⁴⁸Ib. p. 12.

¹⁴⁹Cf. C. Everett Koop. "Unterwegs nach Auschwitz" (1977). pp. 31-51 in: Ronald Reagan. *Recht zum Leben: Abtreibung und Gewissen*. Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1994, esp. p. 45.

Schirmmacher, Human Rights Threatened in Europe

¹⁵⁰Ulrich Eibach. "Vorgeburtliche Diagnostik und Leidbewältigung: Wieviel genetische Diagnostik können wir verantworten?", *op. cit.* p. 5.

¹⁵¹A well documentation aiming against 'Pro Familia' can be found in Thomas Friedl. "pro familia - ? Eine Dokumentation". *Junge Union Deutschlands, Landesverband Rheinland-Pfalz*. Mainz, (about 1990/91); cf. the critics of 'Pro Familia' from the juristic view: Martin Kriele. "Die nicht-therapeutische Abtreibung vor dem Grundgesetz", *op. cit.* pp. 66-74.

¹⁵²Martin Kriele. "Die nicht-therapeutische Abtreibung vor dem Grundgesetz". *Schriften zum öffentlichen Recht* 625. Duncker und Humblot: Berlin, 1992. p. 67.

¹⁵³Cf. *Ibid.* p. 68.

¹⁵⁴E.g. *Ibid.* p. 71.

¹⁵⁵E.g. *Ibid.* pp. 69-70.

¹⁵⁶Rüdiger Lautmann. "Die Lust am Kind: Portrait des Pädophilen". Ingrid Klein: Hamburg, 1994.

¹⁵⁷Rüdiger Lautmann. "Unterscheiden sich Pädophilie und sexuelle Kindesmißhandlung". *Pro Familia Magazin* 3/1995 pp. 9-11.

¹⁵⁸Atina Grossmann. "Reforming Sex: The German Movement for Birth Control and Abortion Reform 1920-1950". Oxford University Press: New York, 1995; concerning the efforts of leading eugenicists for abortion since 1920 until the lift on abortion see: Mary Meehan. "How Eugenics Birthed Population Control". *Human Life Review* 24 (1998) 4: 76-89.

¹⁵⁹"Sanger, Margaret". pp. 678-679 in: *Meyers Enzyklopädisches Lexikon* (in 25 Volumes). Vol. 20. Bibliographisches Institut: Mannheim etc., 1977 9, here p. 678. The best scientific biography is David M. Kennedy. "*Birth Control in America: The Career of Margaret Sanger*". Yale University Press: New Haven/London, 1970.

¹⁶⁰Cf. the excellent study of George Grant. "Grand Illusions: The Legacy of Planned Parenthood." Wolgemuth & Hyatt. Brentwood (TN), 1988, as well as Randall A. Terry. "Accessory to Murder. The Enemies, Allies, and Accomplices to the Death of Our Culture". Wolgemuth & Hyatt: Brentweoof (TN), 1990. pp. 23-31 and Gene Edward Veith. "Modern Facism: Liquidating the Judeo-Christian Worldview". Concordia: St. Louis (MO), 1993 pp. 108-109 (ib. p. 173, Annot. 38 further literature is given that deals with Sanger's nazi alliances).

¹⁶¹Mechthild Bock. "Internationale Verbindungen". *op. cit.* Bock criticizes, that Pro Familia so far "keeps silent to these reproaches and discusses it at best internally" (*Ibid.*).

¹⁶²David M. Kennedy. "Birth Control in America: The Career of Margaret Sanger". *Yale University Press*: New Haven/London, 1970. p. 117 (cited from a speech of Sanger she held 11 Feb.1923).

¹⁶³*Ibid.* p. 109-112.

¹⁶⁴*Ibid.* p. 112.

¹⁶⁵Ibid. p. 113.

¹⁶⁶Ibid. p. 113+115+118.

¹⁶⁷Ibid. p. 118.

¹⁶⁸Ibid. p. 113-117.

¹⁶⁹Cf. with Harmsen critically Heidrun Kaupen-Haas. "Eine deutsche Biographie - der Bevölkerungspolitiker Hans Harmsen". pp. 41-44+201-202 in: Angelika Ebbinghaus et al. (Ed.) "Heilen und Vernichten im Mustergau Hamburg: Bevölkerungs- und Gesundheitspolitik im Dritten Reich". Konkret Literatur Verlag, 1984; Sabine Schleiermacher. "Hans Harmsens hierarchisches Gesellschaftsmodell: Auszüge einer sozialdarwinistischen Familienpolitik". *pro familia magazin* 1/1990 pp. 28-29 and Thomas Friedl. "pro familia? Eine Dokumentation". *Junge Union Deutschlands, Landesverband Rheinland-Pfalz*. Mainz, n.d. (about 1990/91). pp. 8-14 (with figures).

¹⁷⁰Ibid. p. 8.

¹⁷¹Hans Harmsen. *Bevölkerungsprobleme Frankreichs unter Berücksichtigung des Geburtenrückgangs als entscheidender Wirtschaftsfaktor*. Diss.: Univ. Marburg, 1926; Hans Harmsen. *Bevölkerungsprobleme Frankreichs unter Berücksichtigung des Geburtenrückgangs*. Kurt Vowickel Verlag: Berlin, 1927; concerning this and the first doctoral thesis of 1924 see: Heidrun Kaupen-Haas. "Eine deutsche Biographie - der Bevölkerungspolitiker Hans Harmsen". Loc. cit. p. 41.

¹⁷²Hans Harmsen. *Praktische Bevölkerungspolitik: Ein Abriß ihrer Grundlagen, Ziele und Aufgaben*. Fachschriften zur Politik und staatsbürgerlichen Erziehung. Junker und Dünnhaupt: Berlin, 1931. p. 79.

¹⁷³Thomas Friedl. *pro familia?* Loc. cit. p. 9.

¹⁷⁴Concerning abortion of people of other race and handicapped in the Third Reich see: Michaela Garn. "Zwangsabtreibung und Abtreibungsverbot". pp. 37-40+201 in: Angelika Ebbinghaus u. a. (Ed.) *Heilen und Vernichten im Mustergau Hamburg: Bevölkerungs- und Gesundheitspolitik im Dritten Reich*. Konkret Literatur Verlag: Hamburg, 1984.

¹⁷⁵In Hans Harmsen. *Praktische Bevölkerungspolitik*. loc. cit. pp. 33-36+87-88 he speaks out against it: "Die Achtung vor dem Schöpfungsgebot aber verbietet uns die Vernichtung eines möglicherweise erbbelasteten Kindes ebenso wie die Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens." ("But the respect of the creation imperative prohibits the destruction of a child that is possibly genetically harmed as well as the destruction of life not worth of living."), p. 87.

¹⁷⁶In 1931, he already quotes the bill on the mix of races of the NSDAP of March 12, 1930 ("Gesetz zum Schutz des Volkes"; "Law for the protection of the people") without any comment. In: Hans Harmsen. *Praktische Bevölkerungspolitik*. loc. cit. pp. 38-39. More writings of Harmsen before 1932 can be found in *ibid.* p. 94. In *ibid.* p. 32, Harmsen demands a law that forces every couple to have three children. If "insignificant inferiority (Minderwertigkeit) of the offspring" are to be expected, they are not allowed to have more children than that - other than all the "valuable" couples that do.

Schirmacher, Human Rights Threatened in Europe

¹⁷⁷Hans Ludwig Friedrich Harmsen. Wichtige Entscheidungen zur Durchführung des Gesetzes zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses. Schriftenreihe des Evangelischen Gesundheitsdienstes 6 (ed. by Hans Harmsen). Verlag Dienst am Leben: Berlin-Grünwald, 1936; Hans Harmsen (Ed.). Das Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses. Schriftenreihe des Evangelischen Gesundheitsdienstes. Dienst am Leben - Beiheft 3. Verlag Dienst am Leben: Berlin-Grünwald, 1935; see: Hans Harmsen. "Die Bedeutung der erblichen Krüppelleiden in der Volksgesundheitspflege." *Gesundheitsfürsorge* 8 (1936): 203-208, also as offprint (Sonderdruck): Schriftenreihe des Evangelischen Gesundheitsdienstes 4. Verlag Dienst am Leben: Berlin-Grünwald, 1936. p. 208. Harmsen even recommends to include the sterilization of cripples in certain cases which the law does not cover.

¹⁷⁸Comp. Hans Harmsen (Ed.). Das Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses. Loc. cit. p. 64-68 ("Mitteilungen der Auskunftsstelle des Central-Ausschusses für Innere Mission"), Statement of July 13, 1934 of the "Ständige[n] Ausschuß für Fragen der Rassenhygiene und Rassenpflege". It states on p. 64: "... haben sich alle Stellen der I. M. nachdrücklichst für die Durchführung des Gesetzes zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses vom 14. Juli 1933 einzusetzen und alle erlassenen Anordnungen und Vorschriften genauestens zu befolgen." ("All offices of the I.M. have to support the passing of the law for the precautions against offspring with hereditary diseases of July 14, 1933 and they are to strictly follow all passed regulations.").

¹⁷⁹The most detailed description in: Heidrun Kaupen-Haas. "Eine deutsche Biographie - der Bevölkerungspolitiker Hans Harmsen". Loc. cit. p. 41-42.

¹⁸⁰So unisono representents of 'pro familia', e.g. Sabine Schleiermacher. "Hans Harmsens hierarchisches Gesellschaftsmodell". *op. cit.* p. 28, and objectors, e.g. Thomas Friedl. "pro familia?" *op. cit.* p. 10.

¹⁸¹Heidrun Kaupen-Haas. "Eine deutsche Biographie - der Bevölkerungspolitiker Hans Harmsen". *op. cit.* p. 44.

¹⁸²*Ibid.*

¹⁸³Presumably by the article of Heidrun Kaupen-Haas. "Eine deutsche Biographie - der Bevölkerungspolitiker Hans Harmsen". *op. cit.*; vgl. Sabine Schleiermacher. "Hans Harmsens hierarchisches Gesellschaftsmodell". *op. cit.* p. 28.

¹⁸⁴Cf. *Ibid.* and Thomas Friedl. "pro familia?" *op. cit.* p. 12.

¹⁸⁵Hermann Schubnell (Ed.). "Alte und neue Themen der Bevölkerungswissenschaft: Festschrift für Hans Harmsen." *Schriftenreihe des Bundesinstituts für Bevölkerungsforschung* 10. Boldt-Verlag: Boppard / Rhine, 1981 (Harmsen indeed had become 80 years in 1979).

¹⁸⁶Sabine Rupp, Karl Schwarz. "Laudatio". pp. 9-10 in: *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁷Ferdinand Oeter. "Der ethische Imperativ im Lebenswerk Hans Harmsens". pp. 11-16 in: Hermann Schubnell (Ed.). "Alte und neue Themen der Bevölkerungswissenschaft". *op. cit.* and Martin Kornrumpf. "Erste bevölkerungswissenschaftliche Untersuchungen nach der bedingungslosen Kapitulation des

Deutschen Reiches 1945". pp. 141-149 in: *Ibid.*, here pp. 141-142.

¹⁸⁸Susanne Lux. "Was können wir von der ProLife-Arbeit in den USA lernen?". *Querschnitte 11* (1998) 1: pp. 1-4, the English version is to be found in another chapter of this book.

¹⁸⁹A list of addresses of German groups for the Right-to-Life included local groups was published 1998 by the Meeting of Christian Groups for the Right-to-Life and the Cooperation Right-to-Life as a pamphlet "Rat für Schwangere und Familien sowie Frauen nach der Abtreibung" (e.g. of kaleb@kaleb.cid-net.de or info@ead.de, fax 0049711/2364600).

¹⁹⁰Comp. the campaign www.tim-lebt.de and Gisela Klinkhammer. "Ein für Ärzte bedrückendes Dilemma". *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 96 (1999) 20/21. pp. C-939-C-941.

¹⁹¹Cited from Wolfgang Furch. "Was eint die neue RU-486-Koalition?". *Zeitschrift für Lebensrecht* 7 (1998) 2 p. 21.

¹⁹²As an exception in the German speaking countries are to mention the evangelical ethics, e.g. the ethics of my professor Georg Huntemann. "Biblisches Ethos im Zeitalter der Moralrevolution". *Hänssler*: Neuhausen, 1996 and logically my own ethics (Thomas Schirrmacher. "Ethik". 2 Vols. *Hänssler*: Neuhausen, 1994. 1800 p. (a revised edition is planned for 1998). I am grateful for further hints.

¹⁹³See in "Wieviel Wissen tut uns gut? Chancen und Risiken der voraussagenden Medizin" *Gemeinsames Wort der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz und des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland zur Woche für das Leben 1997*. Gemeinsame Texte 11. Kirchenamt der EKD: Hannover & Deutsche Bischofskonferenz: Bonn, 1997.

¹⁹⁴See *Ibid.* p. 30 the list of colleagues.

¹⁹⁵*Ibid.* p. 10.

¹⁹⁶*Ibid.* p. 13.

¹⁹⁷*Ibid.* p. 15.

¹⁹⁸*Ibid.* p. 15.

¹⁹⁹"Genetics and the Quality of Life". *Study Encounter Nr. 53*. 10 (1974)1. pp.1-26.

²⁰⁰*Ibid.* p. 18.

²⁰¹*Ibid.* pp. 8, 9,18 and 22.

²⁰²*Ibid.* p. 8.

²⁰³Article "Zeitspiegel" in *Querschnitte 2* (1989) 3 (July-Sept): 3.

²⁰⁴See Michael Gante. "Paragraph 218 in der Diskussion: Meinungs- und Willensbildung 1945 - 1976". Droste: Düsseldorf, 1991. p. 76 for Karl Janssen. "Die Unterbrechung der aufgezwungenen Schwangerschaft als rechtliches und theologisches Problem". *Zeitschrift für Evangelische Ethik 4* (1960): pp. 65-72.

Schirmmacher, Human Rights Threatened in Europe

²⁰⁵Dietrich Bonhoeffer. "Ethik". (Chr. Kaiser: München, 1949). p. 118. Cf. for the refusal of abortion by Bonhoeffer and Karl Barth in Henri van Straelen. "Abtreibung: Die große Entscheidung". Josef Habel: (Regensburg, 1974). pp. 70-71.

²⁰⁶Dietrich Bonhoeffer. "Ethik" *op. cit.* pp. 118-119. Bonhoeffer refused abortion even if the mother's life is endangered. See *Ibid.* p. 119, Note 6.

²⁰⁷Karl Barth. *Kirchliche Dogmatik*. Studienausgabe Bd. 20: Die Lehre von der Schöpfung III, 4 §§ 55-56: Das Gebot des Schöpfers 2. Teil. (Theologischer Verlag: Zürich, 1993 (1951): p. 475. About abortion in general see pp. 473-482.

²⁰⁸*Ibid.* p. 477.

THE OLD TESTAMENT VS. ABORTION

By Dr. Thomas Schirrmacher

Translated by Cambron Teupe

Abortion is Murder

Dietrich Bonhoeffer once expressed the traditional view of abortion with the following well-chosen words, "Marriage is inseparable with the recognition of the unborn child's rights, rights not in the parents' disposition. When these rights are not recognized, marriage ceases to be marriage, and becomes a mere relationship ... To kill the fruit in its mother's womb offends against the child's God-given right to live. The question whether the 'fruit of the womb' is already human or not only confuses the issue. The fact is, that God intended to create a human being, and that this human being has been robbed of its life. What is that if not murder?"²⁰⁹

No situation, however difficult, changes this fact. Bonhoeffer continues, "That the motives for such a deed can vary, that the responsibility may lie more with society than with the individual, when the deed results from the depths of human abandonment and despair, that money can cover up quite a lot of foolishness, while the poorest of the poor, who have not chosen to go ahead with the deed without great deliberation; are more easily caught, this definitely concerns the personal relationship of the counselor to the individual, but it changes nothing in the fact that murder has been committed."²¹⁰

Cardinal Josef Ratzinger has pointed out that only a 'theonomic view' of law (i.e. that law is founded in the law of God), can guarantee the inviolability of the human being under all conditions. The will of society is insufficient.²¹¹ The Christian opposition to abortion, and the identification of the killing of an unborn child with the murder of a born human is based:

1. on the general prohibition of murder in the Ten Commandments,
2. on the biblical description of the 'fruit of the body' as a blessing,
3. on the biblical view of the unborn child as a human being capable of a relationship with God,
4. on Exodus 21:22-25.

God has never given any institution the right to kill unborn children, who are innocent in the eyes of every legal law court.

The Prohibition of Murder in the Ten Commandments

The Ten Commandments state, "You shall not kill (Or murder)." (Exodus 20:13; Deut. 5:16; Matt. 5:21), which includes all illegal killing. Exceptions are permissible only where God himself has expressly permitted or commanded it, as is the case with a judicial death penalty (Gen. 9:5-6; Exodus 21:21; Rom. 13:3-4; Acts 25:11), self-defense (Ex.22:1-2) or defense of the country (Neh. 4:8+14; Rom. 13:4).²¹² God has never given any institution the right to kill unborn children, who are innocent in the eyes of every legal law court.

The Old Testament law does not even permit parents to judge their children. Young people who threatened their parents, and who were impervious to 'discipline, were to be taken to court. The punishment was carried out by the State (Deut. 21:18-21). Parental authority was limited to 'discipline' (Prov. 19:18). Only the State has the power to exercise severe punishment.

The Romans allowed the father unlimited power over his children, before and after birth, so that he could even execute them.²¹³ Oehler writing on the Old Testament, says, "Even the human right of the parent over his children is - in contrast to the laws of other ancient peoples - limited; the father has namely no rights over the life or death of his children, as in Roman law ...; the parents are to bring their rebellious son to court."²¹⁴ Many other nations permitted families to execute their own members.²¹⁵

He who gives parents the right to abortion denies everything the Bible teaches about the duties and the meaning of parenthood.

Children are a Blessing

The psalmist Solomon considered a child a reward from God before its birth (Ps. 127:3-5): "Lo, children are an heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward." In Ps. 128, 3+6, children and grandchildren are part of God's special blessing. Jacob thus speaks of the blessings of the breasts, and of the womb," (Gen. 49:25). God's blessing on the fruit of the womb is a special gift (Deut. 7:13-14), one of the consequences of obedience to his law (Deut. 28:4). To give parents the right to abort their unborn children is to deny all that the Bible teaches about the duties and the meaning of parenthood.

Only God can give us children, as the Old Testament clearly demonstrates in its treatment of barrenness. The matriarchs of Israel; Sarah, Rebecca and Rachel, were all barren at first, and only conceived when God interfered. When Rachel demands the miracle from her husband, "Give me children, or else I die.", Jacob replies, "Am I in God's stead, who hath withheld from thee the fruit of the womb?" (Gen. 30:1-2). Hannah, the mother of Samuel, experiences the same thing (1 Sam. 1-2), and praises the Lord with great joy after her son's birth (1 Sam. 2:1-10). In Ps. 113:9, God is praised, "He maketh the barren woman to keep house, and to be a joyful mother of children. Praise ye the LORD." Children are an honor and the joy of their parents, (Ps. 144:12).

In the Bible, the unborn child is a human being with a relationship to God.

The Unborn Child has a Relationship to God

The Bible is not merely concerned with the narrow biological question of when human life begins;²¹⁶ the unborn child is a human being with a relationship to God, both for good and for evil.²¹⁷ The separation from God caused by the Fall affects the child in its mother's womb, for "in sin my mother conceived me" (Ps. 51:5;²¹⁸ see also Ps. 58:3 and Isa. 48:8). Jacob cheated his brother in the womb (Hos. 12:3).

At the same time, the unborn child is already God's personal creation (Ps. 139:13,16; Job 31:15; Isa. 44:2+24). Prophets and men of God were called and sanctified before birth (Jer. 1:5; Judges 14:5+7; Isa. 49:1; Luke 1:15+41; 1:44-44; Gal. 1:15). John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Spirit and leapt for joy in his mother's womb, when

Jesus entered the room in Mary's womb (Luke 1:41-44). Jesus was already truly God and truly Man, the Messiah of the Jews and the Savior of the world from the moment of His conception, for He was begotten by the Holy Spirit.

Because body and soul are inseparable in the Bible, there is no point in time at which the soul enters the body, which was the view of Greeks, Romans, Hellenistic Jews and some of the Church Fathers. The pagan idea of the entrance of the soul into the body, long

The Unborn Child has a Relationship to God

1) Belief in God

Psalm 71:6 By thee have I been holden up from the womb: thou art he that took me out of my mother's bowels: my praise shall be continually of thee.

Psalm 22:10 I was cast upon thee from the womb: thou art my God from my mother's belly.

2) Calling and Sanctification

Jeremiah 1:5 Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.

Romans 9:11; Gen. 25:22-26 (For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;) 12 It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. 13 As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. (Neither child had done anything wicked, but Jacob was already called by God before his birth)

Luke 1:15 (An angel tells Zacharias about his unborn son, John the Baptist) For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb.

Luke 1:41-44 (The yet unborn John the Baptist greets Jesus, who is still in Mary's womb) And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth

was filled with the Holy Ghost: And she spake out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy.

Judges 13:5-7 (an angel about Samson) For, lo, thou shalt conceive, and bear a son; and no razor shall come on his head: for the child shall be a Nazarite unto God from the womb: and he shall begin to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Philistines. Then the woman came and told her husband, saying, A man of God came unto me, and his countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God, very terrible: but I asked him not whence he was, neither told he me his name: But he said unto me, Behold, thou shalt conceive, and bear a son; and now drink no wine nor strong drink, neither eat any unclean thing: for the child shall be a Nazarite to God from the womb to the day of his death.

Isaiah 49:1 Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken, ye people, from far; The LORD hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name.

Galatians 1:15 But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace,

3) Created

Job 10:8 Thine hands have made me and fashioned me together round about; yet thou dost destroy me. 9 Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast made me as the clay; and wilt thou bring me into dust again? 10 Hast thou not poured me out as milk, and curdled me like cheese? 11 Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh, and hast fenced me with bones and sinews. 12 Thou hast granted me life and favour, and thy visitation hath preserved my spirit.

Psalms 139:13 For thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb. 14 I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well. 15 My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. 16 Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in

thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.

Job 31:15 Did not he that made me in the womb make him? and did not one fashion us in the womb?

Isaiah 44:2 Thus saith the LORD that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, which will help thee; Fear not, O Jacob, my servant; and thou, Jesurun, whom I have chosen.

Isaiah 44:24 Thus saith the LORD, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb.

4) Sin, Original Sin

Hosea 12:3 (about Jacob) He took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with God:

Psalms 51:5 Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.²¹⁹

Psalms 58:3 The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.

Isaiah 48:8 Yea, thou heardest not; yea, thou knewest not; yea, from that time that thine ear was not opened: for I knew that thou wouldest deal very treacherously, and wast called a transgressor from the womb. [Remark: The unborn child has committed no sinful deeds, for Romans 9:11 says clearly that neither Jacob nor Esau had done either good or evil before their birth (see above).]

rejected in favor of the Christian view, has recently been revived by proponents of the abortion limit, which considers the embryo not yet fully human.

Exodus 21:22-25

Only one legal text in the Old Testament, Exodus 21:22-25, deals with the judicial aspects of abortion.²²⁰ The regulation does not deal with a deliberate abortion, but with the unintentional killing of an unborn child through careless violence against the mother. Should this text, however, equate the killing of the unborn child with the murder of an adult, the ruling can be transferred to abortion.

Unfortunately, interpreters disagree on the meaning of the text; some believe it equates the killing of the unborn child with that of an

adult, but others believe that it requires the maximum penalty only for the death of the mother, while the death of the unborn child is to be penalized only by a fine. In either case, let us note, the person who caused the death of the child is liable to legal penalties!

"If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that (First case) her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follow: he shall be surely punished, according as the woman's husband will lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine. (Second case) And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, Burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe." (Exodus 21:22-25)

The point of disagreement between the two views concerns the distinction between a miscarriage (the children are discharged) and a premature delivery (the children come out).

a). Some theologians interpret the text to mean that the children 'are discharged', which is then to be recompensed by a fine. The 'damage' concerns only the mother. If she suffers any harm, then the penalty is to be set according to 'lex talionis',²²¹ which could go as far as 'life for life', which is the death penalty. The guilty party is penalized by a fine for the death of the child, with the maximum penalty for the death of the mother.

b) Other interpreters translate the term to mean that the children 'come out', and are thus viable. If they survive, the guilty party must pay a fine. Any physical damage to the mother or child, including their death, makes the guilty party liable to the 'lex talionis', including the death penalty, if child or mother dies. The law equates the child with an adult.

Christians long considered the second solution a definite argument against abortion, but because of the text's central significance, historical criticism has developed the first solution, which turns the meaning of the text on its head. In my opinion, since there are sufficient reasons for the second interpretation, we can continue to insist without any reservations that the traditional view is God's law.²²² There is no linguistic justification for a translation of verse 22 which limits the damage to a miscarriage,²²³ even if many translations accept the first solution by rendering it as 'the fruit of the womb is discharged.' The text does not say, "fruit of the womb,"; the term is clearly 'children', and the translation, 'are discharged', completely limits the meaning of the text, which the translation 'come out' does not.

Should this text, however, equate the killing of the unborn child with the murder of an adult, the ruling can be transferred to abortion.

The Synod of the Presbyterian Church of America argue for the application of this text to abortion as following:²²⁴

1. The term 'child' (Heb. 'yeled') is never used for the unborn child, but for the child which has already been born. The first case clearly concerns a child which has been born.
2. The expression 'come out' (Heb. 'yatza') defines the normal birth of a child, not its death (Gen. 25:26; 38:28-30; Job 3:11; 10:18; Jer. 1:5; 20:18) and never a miscarriage. The only exception, Numbers 12:12, describes a stillbirth.
3. The word 'damage' (Heb. 'ason') applies to both mother and child.

Walter C. Kaiser points out, that Hebrew has a word for a miscarriage or abortion. 'meschalet', which is not used in this text.

²⁰⁹Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Ethik. Chr. Kaiser: München, 1949. S. 118. See also Henri van Straelen. Abtreibung. Abtreibung: Die große Entscheidung. Josef Habel: Regensburg, 1974. op.cit. p. 70-71 on Bonhoeffer und Karl Barth's position on abortion.

²¹⁰Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Ethik. a. a. O. S. 118-119. Bonhoeffer objects to abortion, even when the life of the mother is in danger. Ibid., p. 119, note. 6.

²¹¹Lucio Brunelli. "Ratzingers Plan für die Enzyklika". 30 Tage und die Welt 2 (1992) 5 (Mai): 28-31, here p. 31

²¹²See also. Ray R. Sutton. Who Owns the Family: God or the State? Biblical Blueprints Series 3. Dominion Press: Ft. Worth (TX); Thomas Nelson: Nashville (NY), 1987. S. 40-50; Rousas J. Rushdoony. The Institutes of Biblical Law. ob.cit., p. 185-191

²¹³Achim Keller. Die Abortiva der Römischen Kaiserzeit. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Pharmazie 46. Deutscher Apotheker Verlag: Stuttgart, 1988. p. 23

²¹⁴Gustav Friedrich Oehler. Theologie des Alten Testaments. J. F. Steinkopf: Stuttgart, 1891³. p. 372 (sic)

²¹⁵Examples and documentation in Carle G. Zimmerman. Family and Civilization. Harper & Brothers: New York/London, 1947. p 359-383

²¹⁶See also the excellent discussion in John Ankerberg, John Weldon. When Does Life Begin? Wolgemuth & Hyatt: Brentwood (TN), 1989, as well as the standard work by Mrs. J. C. Willke. Handbook on Abortion. Hayes: Cincinnati (OH), 1979³

²¹⁷Werner Neuer. "Wann beginnt das menschliche Leben?". Factum 9/1982: 27-29

²¹⁸On application of Psalm 51 as an Argument against abortion in "Report of the Committee to Study the Matter of Abortion". S. 83-122 in: John M. Frame. Medical Ethics: Principles, Persons and Problems. Presbyterian & Reformed: Phillipsburg (NJ). 1988. p. 94-95+106-107

²¹⁹Cf. About this text esp. Kenneth L. Gentry. *The Christian Case Against Abortion* (Buch). a. a. O. S. 24-43

²²⁰Gordon Wenham. "Law and the Legal System in the Old Testament". p. 3-23 in: Bruce Kaye, Gordon Wenham (Ed.). *Law, Morality and the Bible*. Inter-Varsity Press: Leicester (GB), 1978, p. 33-34 (and the bibliography).

²²¹'Lex talionis' was normally not carried out literally, but settled by fines.

²²²Exegesis and applications of the second interpretation to ethics:: Carl F. Keil. *Genesis und Exodus*. Brunnen Verlag: Gießen, 1983⁴ (Repr. 1878³). p. 525-526; Umberto Cassuto. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Magnes: Jerusalem, 1974. p. 275; Norman Geisler. *Christian Ethics: Options and Issues*. Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (MI), 1989. S. 145; Gleason L. Archer. *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*. Zondervan: Grand Rapids (MI), 1982. p. 247-249: 2Mose 21,22-25; Walter Kaiser. *Towards Old Testament Ethics*. Zondervan: Grand Rapids (MI), 1978. p. 168-172+102-104; Gary North. *Tools of Dominion*. op.cit. (Index); James B. Jordan. *The Law of the Covenant: An Exposition of Exodus 21-23*. Institute for Christian Economics: Tyler (TX), 1984. p. 113-115; Kenneth L. Gentry. *The Christian Case Against Abortion* (Buch). op.cit., 62-68; Jack W. Cottrell. "Abortion and the Mosaic Law". *Christianity Today* 17 (1972-73): pp. 602-605

²²³Ibid. S. 604

²²⁴Opinion of the Presbyterian Church of America, cited in: Joe Morecraft. *'With Liberty and Justice for All': Christian Politics Made Simple*. Onward Press: Sevierville (TN), 1991. p. 182-184. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church came to the same exegesis and conclusion 1971: "Report of the Committee to Study the Matter of Abortion". op. cit., p. 95-102+107-108 (The best exegesis and discussion of Ex. 22:21-25 I know of) See also. *Report on Abortion To The New York & Philadelphia Synod* November 1977. Reformed Episcopal Church: Philadelphia (PA), 1977.

WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM THE PROLIFE WORK IN THE U.S.: THE NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE (NRLC)

By Dr. Susanne Lux,

Doctrate in economics of agriculture,
owner of 'marketing and ethics consulting' (MEC), Bonn,
vice-president of ProMundis eV, a prolife organisation

The ProLife scene in the U.S. is confronted with the same arguments as the German one. Liberal (Protestant) churches support pro-abortionists in the U.S. as well. In the conservative evangelical or Catholic churches and congregations that are pro life in principle little or nothing is being preached about this topic. The example of the U.S. shows, however, that it is possible to reverse developments. There, the number of abortions has gone down in the last years, not least thanks to the work of different well established institutions with a large permanent staff like the "National Right to Life Committee" (NRLC) or "Rachel".

The picture that many Germans have of the U.S.-American ProLife work is wrong. The assassins that shoot doctors and women dead in abortion clinics are mentally disturbed people who are not related to the ProLife-movement. The press likes to report such incidents so that they are on our minds, because in the U.S., too, sensations sell better in the papers than legislative changes. In reality, ProLife work in the U.S. is rather based on ...

... Lobbying for Life

The "National Right to Life Committee" is a special-interest group for life that sensitizes the public by professional lobby work and

systematic information on the questions of the right to life. ProLife work done by the NRLC means a constant presence in the press (e.g. with comments on legislative changes), collections of signatures, postcard campaigns to the members of Congress, presentations in local churches, nation-wide radio shows, weekly information on TV, newsletters to pastors, e.g. with prayer requests, teenager-projects ...

The NRLC ranks tenth among the most influential lobbies in the U.S. In comparison: Planned Parenthood, the American counterpart to ProFamilia, is way down in 65th place on a hit list of lobbyists compiled by an independent institution.

History of Abortion as a Constitutional Right of American Women

At the end of the sixties, pro-abortionists in the U.S. started a campaign for the legalizing of abortion. They invented wildly exaggerated numbers about allegedly killed women during illegal abortions and about the "severe cases" (health-risk for the mother, incest etc.) They mobilized the liberal press, law faculties and ministers (mostly liberal Protestants). The pro-abortionists were surprised at the results of their campaign themselves, because the decision of the Supreme Court regarding the case Roe v. Wade in 1973 guaranteed abortion as a constitutional right of women in the U.S.

As an answer to the ruling in the case Roe v. Wade a handful of ProLifers founded the National Right to Life Committee in 1973 - at the kitchen table! Today, NRLC is an organization that - directly or indirectly - reaches over eight million people through over 2,500 local groups. It is solidly grounded in the grass roots and works closely together with other ProLife-organizations. 55 employees work in its headquarters in Washington, D.C. and in four regional offices. The budget amounts to \$ 16 millions that mainly come from small donations. Over 400,000 people donate on a more or less regular basis.

Success Factors of American ProLife Work

NRLC is a non-partisan organization. It seeks and supports ProLife-oriented candidates of both big American parties. NRLC regularly informs the public about the position of several candidates and of the

parties on this topic and it puts together and distributes election campaign brochures over ProLife-oriented churches.

The most important partner of the ProLife-movement are the churches and congregations of all denominations. In the beginning, it was mostly the Catholics who supported NRLC. In the eighties, more and more evangelicals got involved. NRLC runs an extra branch in order to support those groups. Their leader is the president of the National Pro-Life Religious Councils, an institution that can be compared to the "Treff Christlicher Lebensrechtsgruppen" (TCLG). Unlike in Germany, the American ProLife work is also supported by the conservative churches, e.g. by distributing election campaign brochures. In order to win as many groups as possible, NRLC concentrates on the topic "right to life". Their emphasis is on influencing the public's formation of opinion and political decisions.

"What is permitted by the law is also "right" in the eyes of many people," says Dr. Wanda Franz, NRLC. Since the legislation forms people's consciousness NRLC among other things focuses on the putting through of many big and small legislative changes, e.g. the cut of tax money for abortions among socially disadvantaged women. After decades of lobbying it was achieved that the U.S. does not pay abortions in the framework of welfare programs.

Further topics that are on the agenda in various states include: the parental consent to teenage abortions, Partial birth abortion (see below) and the threat of involuntary euthanasia. NRLC does not have mother/child houses or crisis pregnancy centers, but some of the associated local groups do.

The headquarters in Washington, D.C. stays in close contact to more than 2,500 local groups at the grass roots. In order to maintain an information flow to the 3.5 million Americans, who were identified as anti-abortionists, channels outside the established media have to be built. The local supporters are asked to write letters to newspapers or members of Congress, call in radio or TV shows, support politicians who have a ProLife attitude or donate money, etc.

NRLC stands out due to its professionalism. NRLC is an important, objective source of information for the press. NRLC publishes scientific studies about medical and psychological consequences of abortion. It uses the modern media such as radio, TV and the internet. It does market research and has a professional donor development program and it has founded a youth organization.

NRLC has recognized the importance of working together with the victims of abortion which they do in their branch, the American Victims of Abortion, instead of making those women and men feel guilty.

Digression: NRLC against Partial Birth Abortion (PBA)

The Effect of a Campaign against Inhumanly Killing

In the U.S., babies are aborted especially cruel in the last months of the pregnancy. Since babies are only considered born when their head has come out of their mother's womb the birth is induced in a way that the head comes last. But before the head actually comes out of the womb, the unanaesthetized baby is pierced in its brain through the back of their head with a cannula. Then the brain is sucked out so that the baby is born dead.

Without bloody pictures, NRLC has achieved that the public opinion about late stage abortion has changed. This has an influence on the whole debate about abortion. It is not so much conducted under the aspect of the "right to choose", but under the aspect of what it really is: the killing of babies. In 1996, the public support of unrestricted abortion sank 10 percent from 33 percent to only 23 percent, especially among groups that were traditionally considered pro-choice.

A great tribute to that was the drastic loss of the anti-abortionists' credibility. NRLC and independent journalists were able to prove repeatedly that PBA-supporters grossly lied to the press and also the Congress at the attempt to play down PBA. "Expertise, balanced judgement and honesty are indispensable for a ProLife lobbyist," adds Dr. Wanda Franz, NRLC.

In Germany, more and more viable babies are aborted, too. Experts say that in abortions after the 20th week about every third baby is born alive. In order to prevent their surviving German doctors also "play safe" today: Before the birth is induced with prostaglandins they kill the baby in the mother's womb with deadly potassium-chloride, which is injected into the heart.

Since the latest change of §218 [the German law for abortion] in the June of 1995, there has been a significant increase of late stage abortions. While there had "only" been 26 in 1994, the number of abortions after the 23rd week p.c. grew steadily. In 1996, 159 viable

babies were registered, in 1997 even 190. According to Frank Montgomery, the president of the "Marburger Bund", 800 babies are even aborted after the 20th week each year. (campaign: www.Tim-lebt.de; Stiftung Ja zum Leben ["Yes to life"])

There Is no Comparable Institution in Germany

Germany lacks an organization like the "National Right to Life Committee". NRLC was founded at the kitchen table and began with a handful of volunteers in the U.S. Later it grew exponentially. First, only Catholics got involved, later Christians of all conservative Protestant churches joined them.

We can also do something and there are initiatives to reverse developments. This shows the example of the U.S. that envy us in some aspects, since their starting point was and is partly even worse than ours. While for example advertisement for abortion clinics is forbidden in Germany, those clinics advertise in the Yellow Pages in several states. Sensitizing the public is also possible today in this country, because here, too, are radio and TV-stations that are willing to show broadcasts about the consequences of abortion.

The example of the U.S. also shows, however, that professional ProLife work has to have a structure in order to be successful. Americans who have already helped to found ProLife work in many countries of the world consider the establishment of an organization like NRLC possible in Germany. "National Right to Life Committee" is willing to support Germany with some people from their team.

Successful Lobbying for Life also Possible in Germany?

The basic requirements for a German "lobbying for life" are different both, in state and church. Unlike in the U.S., Germans only in part elect the candidates. Their main vote goes to a party that in turn sends in their representatives. Thus, Christians have to get involved in the parties in order to influence the election of the candidates. But the unwillingness to do that and the fear of "dirtying their hands in politics" keeps many from getting active.

One of the main pillars of the ProLife-movement in the U.S. is the Catholic Church that - in Germany - is drawn into the problem of killing babies itself because of the system of counseling certificate.

[Women who want to have an abortion are required to have a session of counseling. This is proved by a counseling certificate issued by the counselor.] That is why the ProLife groups, in which mainly Catholics (and of course also Protestants from the State Churches) are involved, are disappointed with the official Catholic Church.

Since the eighties, Christians from various confessional backgrounds have been working closely together within NRLC on the basis of their common faith. While NRLC used to be shaped by the Catholics in the beginning, now there are also evangelical and charismatic Christians active under a non-denominational roof. There is no such unity in Germany, yet. The reservations between evangelicals and Catholics are clearly greater. Many Catholics are prejudiced against evangelical Christians. Perhaps they are a sect? On the other hand, the evangelicals are also reluctant to work with groups that are dominated by Catholics, because there is the deeply rooted prejudice among evangelical churches that Catholics are not "real Christians".

Furthermore, there is little involvement in the evangelical world with the ProLife movement. What is the reason for little interest in ProLife work also - or especially? - in the evangelical churches? Situational ethics is not only common in the Protestant State Churches, an ethical attitude that holds the position that there are no more laws which are valid for everyone and that everyone has to make their own decisions based on their own conscience.

There Is Hope for Germany...

For the most part, in places where Christians have founded ProLife organizations in Germany they already work on a cross-denominational basis. Examples for that are projects such as the "Haus Heisterbach" in Königswinter, alpha-groups or "Rachel". But unlike in the U.S. most groups lack the support of their own churches and congregations. But the picture is changing in Germany as well. Christians move between the denominations and towards one another. Is the common topic ProLife work able to unite us - even if we have different opinions on the Lord's Supper or spiritual gifts?

Schirmacher, Human Rights Threatened in Europe

"Rescue those being led away to death; hold back those staggering towards slaughter. If you say, 'But we knew nothing about this,' does not he who weighs the hearts perceive it? Does not he who guards your life know it? Will he not repay each person according to what he has done?" (Prov. 24, 11-12)

The author wants to thank the NRLC, especially Dr. Wanda Franz, and the CDL for their support.

For further information write to: National Right to Life Committee, Inc. (NRLC) Dr. Wanda Franz, 419 7th Street, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20004, USA, Phone: (001-)202-626-8800

HUMAN RIGHTS AND CHRISTIAN FAITH

By Dr. Thomas Schirmacher

Translated by Cambron Teupe

Published in Russian in the journal of the Academy of Science of Russia: POISK: Ezemedel'naja Vsesojuznaja Gazeta [Journal of the Russian Academy of Science]. Nr. 48 (446) 22.-28. November 1997. p. 13; reprinted in the newspaper of the Russian Teacher's Association: Utschitjelskaja Gazeta (Russische Lehrerzeitung). No. 2 (9667) 3.1.1998. S. 21 + No. 3 (9668) 20.1.1998. p. 21 + No. 4 (9669) 3.2.1998. p. 22. Written for the Konferenz Evangelikaler Publizisten (Conference of Evangelical Journalists and Mediapeople) of the German Evangelical Alliance.

Man as Creation and Image of God

On December 10, 1948, the Soviet Union signed the General Declaration of Human Rights passed by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The declaration states that all human beings possess the same dignity (Article 1) and forbids all discrimination due to race, color, sex, language, religion or political conviction (Article 2). Because all men have the right to life and liberty (Article 3), both slavery (Article 4) and torture (Article 5) are prohibited. All are equal before the law and may be condemned only according to established law, only after being heard in a court of law (Articles 7-11). All are free to emigrate and to choose their place of residence (Article 13), and to request asylum in other countries (Article 14). Every human being is free to choose his spouse, and the family, as the "natural and basic unit in society", must be protected by the State and by society (Articles 16+26). The Declaration also demands the right of private property (Article 17), the right to liberty of conscience and religion, which

includes the individual's right to change his faith (Article 18), the right of opinion and information (Article 19), the right to congregate and to form associations (Article 20), the right to vote (Article 21). Everyone has the right to security in social matters (Articles 22+25+28), to labor with just remuneration (Article 23) and to education (Article 26).

Closely related to the idea of human rights is the claim that all people have the same right to be treated as persons - whatever race, religion, sex, political persuasion or social or economic status they may be. What is the basis of human equality, if not the fact that all were equally created by God? Thus, a Christian argument for human rights must begin with the biblical account of Creation, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them" (Gen. 1:26-27). The fact that Man was created in the image of God plays a major roll in the relationships of human beings to each other. Genesis 9:16, for example, requires murder to be punished, for it injures the image of God. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." (Genesis 9:6)

Creation exists for the glory of God and has its meaning from God. This fact holds all the more for the 'Crown of Creation', Mankind was created according to the divine order of Creation to fulfill the purpose given him by God. God made him ruler over the earth, but also gave him the responsibility for the preservation of the earthly creation. The psalmist writes, "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet: All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field;" (Psalm 8:6-7).

For this reason, human rights include only those privileges which God has given Man, no other rights which mankind may choose or claim for himself.

Christians may not, therefore, automatically identify the human rights catalogs formulated by western countries with those in the Bible. Scripture prescribes the right to an orderly court procedure according to clearly stated laws, to the hearing of witnesses, to judges who have not been bribed and to legal defense, as we will see. Such legal proceedings cannot, however, be automatically identified with Western jurisdiction. Supposing they could be—with which system?

The German system, the British, the French, the American? We all know that these systems are quite different! There is plenty of room for a variety of legal systems which differ due to the cultural and historical traditions of their people, yet still guarantee human rights.

The Christian Roots of Human Rights

No one disputes the fact that human rights, given to protect the individual, are derived from Christian thought. The General Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations, of December 10, 1948, clearly demonstrates its Christian roots. The bans on slavery and torture, the principle of equality before the law, the right to rest and recreation—as seen in the Sabbath or Sunday rest—come from Christian traditions and not by chance are the governments which confirm these rights and anchor them in their constitutions mostly in Christian countries. Even Karl Marx acknowledged this, for he rejected human rights as a product of Christianity (for example, Marx and Engels Works, Vol. 1).

No state and no legal system can survive without a minimum of common, and necessarily 'metaphysically' based values. A legal system assumes a value system, for law is derived from moral standards which exist prior to and outside itself.

The guarantee of human dignity assumes that Man is more than that which he perceives about himself. He cannot be comprehended by the means and methods of natural science. He is metaphysically open. The modern State, with its legal system, depends on requirements that it cannot itself guarantee.

Enlightenment or Forgiveness and Repentance?

According to the philosophies of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century, which attempted to found human rights without God and against the Church, all Good, including human rights, could be derived from Nature and from Reason. Rousseau's identification of 'Reason' and 'Nature' is peculiar to Enlightenment thought. The attempt to base human rights on Nature has failed, however, for no one can agree on the meaning of 'Nature' or on how its laws can be discovered. Wolfgang Schild, professor for penal law, writes, "The Enlightenment cannot and must not be the last word, our last word. Its rationality and functionality must be taken to its limits, for social life

with a dignity worthy of Man is otherwise impossible. Even and particularly penal law cannot limit itself to rational means in order to achieve peace and order at any price: it requires the recognition of the human dignity - even of the felon - as its fundament and its limit."

The thought that human beings could be improved by education, and that human ills could be solved by intellectual enlightenment, is a basic problem of Greek philosophy, of Humanism and of the Enlightenment. The Humanist ideal of education owes its existence to the idea that morals could be raised through education, for it assumes that the individual does wrong only because he is ignorant or because he thinks wrongly, not because his will is evil and because he is incapable of doing good on his own strength. These philosophies try to reduce the ethical and responsible aspect of thought, words and deeds to the question of knowledge, which hold a man responsible, only when he knows what he is doing.

Yet we are surprised to learn that doctors smoke as much as laymen do, that people maintain unhealthy life-styles, and that women continually become pregnant in spite of a flood of information about birth control. We all know from our own lives, that knowing the right answer, even being convinced of it, in no way guarantees that we live accordingly. A politician who vehemently defends monogamy as the foundation of society in Parliament does not necessarily insist on marital fidelity in his private life, and is not immune to adultery or divorce.

The Bible teaches that human sin affects not only our thoughts, but also our whole being, and that above all, our wills, which are opposed to God, lead us to act and think falsely, so that more thought and consideration are in itself insufficient. We must clear up our old, sin-encumbered past. Christians believe that God Himself died in Man's place, when Christ died on the Cross for our lack of love and our egotism. When we acknowledge that we cannot save ourselves by our own strength and our own reason, but rely on Christ's fulfillment of our penalty, we can overcome our evil will by faith in Jesus, and renew our will and our mind according to God's will (Romans 1:20-25; 12:1-3). True renewal occurs when the power of God works in our inner selves; not through educational campaigns, but by God's love and forgiveness.

Human Rights Precede the State

Human dignity and human rights are part of man's being as God's creation. Thus, the State does not create human rights, it merely formulates and protects them. Since the right to life belongs to the very essence of the human being, man does not receive them from the government, and no government has the right to decide that its citizens have no more right to live, but can be executed at the ruler's whim. Nor does the State confer the right to have a family, for the State does not own the family, it merely acknowledges the duty implied in the order of Creation to protect marriage and the family.

There are, therefore, rights which existed prior to the State, and there are rights above the State, rights derived from nature, both from human nature and from the various types of human society. The government must respect these rights and accept the limitations implied by these natural, divinely given rights of the individual, the family, the employee (or the employer!) and other human social groups.

Since human rights are rooted in a moral code prescribed to the State, this code equally forbids a false appeal to human rights, because it also defends the human dignity of others. No one has the right to express his own personality through murder or arson, for example.

Human rights assume a State with limited powers and a law valid for all mankind, a law which limits the powers of government. Were this not so, man would indeed receive his rights from the State. The individual would then have only the rights and the claims to protection which his government assured. This is the socialist view, which leaves no place for criticism or correction of a State which has declared itself to be God.

The Meaning of Romans 13

The most important scripture about the role of the State is the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, which was written by the apostle Paul, who brought Christianity to Europe and Asia in the first century AD: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For

rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour." (Romans 13:1-7)

This text makes it clear that no one who opposes the State on principle can appeal to God's authorization. On the contrary: he is opposing God's law, and is rightly liable to legal proceedings (Rom. 13:2). Since the State has the duty to stem and to punish evil, Christians must do good, if they wish to avoid conflict. If a Christian does wrong, he is justly punished by the State. For the government, as God's minister, has the duty of vengeance (13:4). As a result, the Christian pays his taxes and gives government officials proper respect (13:6-7).

But the question is, who defines what is good or evil? Did Paul leave this up to the State? Can the State declare anything good and demand it from its citizens? No. When Paul spoke of goodness, he defined it according to God's will, and defined evil as that which was condemned by God's law. "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people." (Proverbs 14:34).

The Bible thus gives us clear limitations and directions for taxes, military service and the police. John the Baptist, for example, told the tax inspectors and the police (One body served both as police and as military): "Exact no more than that which is appointed you" and "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages." (Luke 3:12-14).

From Paul's statements, we can derive two essential thoughts:

1. The government can judge only what people do, not what they think. It is responsible for good or evil 'works', with doing. It is not the duty of the State to control all sin, only those sins whose activity can be observed and which damage public order, which the State has the responsibility to maintain and to protect.

2. *The State may not distinguish between Christians and other people*, i.e. between believers in different faiths, as long as they pursue their beliefs in a peaceful manner. Since God forbids partiality in legal matters, Christians must be punished just as severely as unbelievers when they break the law. The State cannot distinguish between Christians and members of other religious groups, for it may judge only on the basis of deeds.

Human rights are protective; they serve not so much to define the privileges of the individual, as to limit the powers of the State and of other institutions which deal with the lives of individuals. For this reason, Paul limits the State's duties to specific aspects of life, rather than giving it the right to regulate and penalize all of man's thought and life.

The State is not to be identified with society, as the socialist governments have done ever since the French Revolution. In such states, all aspects of society including the family and the Church are subject to the government. Society is more than the State. The State does not have authority over all parts of society.

On the Separation of Church and State

Just as the State may not dominate a church or a religion, it may not itself be subject to any church or religion. The separation of Church and State does not contradict the Christian faith, but arises naturally out of it, for the Bible makes it the duty of the State to enable people to live in peace, whatever they believe. It is the responsibility of the Church and of religion to point to eternity, to provide moral stability and to encourage man's relationship to God.

The historian Eugen Ewig therefore speaks of the Old Testament Doctrine of Two Powers. Eduard Eichmann, also an historian, writing about the Old Testament division of powers between priest and king, "Along with the sacred Scripture, Old Testament views have become common property of the Christian West."

Jesus confirmed this separation in the words, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." (Mark 12:17). Because this rule comes from God, Who is above the emperor, the religious institutions of God on earth, the organized People of God, are not above the emperor. The first priority is obedience to God, Who determines and limits what belongs to Caesar. Caesar has no authority

to determine or limit what belongs to God. This does not, however, mean that the ruler is dependent on the Church, for God has given him the responsibility for all the people in his realm, not only for the members of one religious group.

The separation of Church and State does not mean that their duties never overlap, or that neither institution needs the other. On the contrary, the Church may advise the government and teach it God's law, as Jehoida taught Jehoash. "And Jehoash did that which was right in the sight of the LORD all his days wherein Jehoiada the priest instructed him." (2 Kings 12:2). It is sad that the modern Church has given up this critical office and prefers to howl with the pack.

The separation of Church and State does not become a war against Christianity until the State forgets its obligation to God's law and begins to persecute the faith.

God Knows no Partiality

Centuries ago in the Bible, God made fair judicial proceedings a human right. A just judge is necessary to determine justice, and God is the proto-type of the just judge (Deut. 10:17-18; Psalm 7:9+12; 9:5; 50:6. See also Psalm 75:3+8), "for the LORD is a God of judgment" (Isaiah 30:18). He is the defender of justice. Those who judge fairly act in God's Name. The Old Testament tells of the just king Jehoshaphat, "And said to the judges, Take heed what ye do: for ye judge not for man, but for the LORD, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of the LORD be upon you; take heed and do it: for there is no iniquity with the LORD our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts." (2 Chronicles 19:6-7).

A judge must be aware of the fact that God is observing him and stands by the innocent: "To turn aside the right of a man before the face of the most High, to subvert a man in his cause, the Lord approveth not." (Lamentations 3:35-36).

For this reason the Bible has many directions concerning just, humane judicial proceedings. Prosecution, for example, requires at least two witnesses (Numbers 35:30; Deuteronomy 17:6; 19:15; Mat. 18:16; John 8:17; Heb. 10:28; 1 Tim 5:18), so that the accusation is brought by two or three witnesses (Deut 10:17-18). Violent witnesses are not to be heard (Psalm 35:11).

The judge's ruling must be completely impartial (Deut. 1:16; 2 Chr. 19:7; Prov. 18:5; 24:23; Job 13:10; Col. 3:25; Eph 6:9), for God is Himself impartial. (Deut 10:17-18). Only wicked judges are partial (Isa. 10:1-2; 3:9).

The ruling is to be made without prejudice (1 Tim. 5:21), after the judge has carefully examined all the evidence (Deut 17:4). "Execute true judgment," God says in Zecharia 7:9; so that the ruling need not be repealed.

"If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked." (Deuteronomy 25:1). Bribery must not influence the judge's opinion. "A wicked man taketh a gift out of the bosom to pervert the ways of judgment." (Proverbs 17:23). God is the great example. "For the LORD your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward:" (Deuteronomy 10:17). "Wherefore now let the fear of the LORD be upon you; take heed and do it: for there is no iniquity with the LORD our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts." (2 Chronicles 19:7)

Scripture generally approves of gifts, when given to delight or to help others. Sometimes, the Bible realizes, gifts may even be necessary, if people are to achieve valid goals. The wise teacher tells us, "A man's gift maketh room for him, and bringeth him before great men." (Proverbs 18:16) and "A gift in secret pacifieth anger: and a reward in the bosom strong wrath." (Proverbs 21:14). Should an innocent person be confronted with corrupt officials, he has no hope of achieving perfectly legal goals. If he has no opportunity of overcoming this corruption in any other way, he can get his rights with gifts. Only when he buys injustice, is he himself guilty of corruption. He who is forced to bribe others will certainly strive to eliminate corruption, particularly in the Church, or in other religious institutions.

For this reason, there must be no double standard, such as one set of laws for the wealthy and another for the peasants. The Old Testament required the same penal system for both nationals and for foreign residents: (Exodus 12:49). "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment: thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty: but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbour." (Leviticus 19:15). Because God defends "the cause of the poor," (Prov. 29:7) and "the cause of the poor and needy." (Prov.

31:8), Proverbs 31:8-9 enjoins us, "Open thy mouth for the dumb in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction. Open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy."

The Bible thus measures the justice of a country by its protection of the weak. Not only the condition of the wealthy or the ruling class, but also the condition of the simple citizens is to be considered. Not only the condition of the State Church is significant, but also the condition of the smaller Christian groups. Not only the condition of the judges with money and power to defend their rights, is important, but also the condition of the poor, the widows and the orphans in court.

God is the Creator and the Lord of all mankind. He wishes us to treat with each other as His image and His creatures—human beings dealing with human beings, not animals with animals.

APPENDIX: HUMAN RIGHTS IN ISLAM

By Dr. Christine Schirrmacher

Doctorate in Islamic studies (State University of Bonn),
director of Institute on Islam and Christianity, Bonn,
visiting professor of Islamic studies, Whitefield Theological Seminary
(Lakeland, USA)

Translated by Cambron Teupe

When Christians are persecuted for their faith in Moslem countries, or when Moslems converts to Christianity are threatened with the death penalty, the Western press accuses the Islamic state of human rights violations. At the same time, most Islamic states have ratified declarations such as the United Nations 1948 General Declaration of Human Rights²²⁵. How can they justify this contradiction?

In the last decades, various Islamic organisations have themselves formulated declarations of human rights. They have one basic difference to those of Western statements, however. Because that they give priority to the Koran and to the Sharî'a (Islamic law), human rights can only be guaranteed in these countries under the conditions imposed by these two authorities and their regulations. Article 24 of the 1990 Cairo Declaration of Human Rights, for example, states that "All rights and freedoms mentioned in this statement are subject to the Islamic Sharî'a," and Article 25 adds, "The Islamic Sharî'a is the only source for the interpretation or explanation of each individual article of this statement." This emphasizes the "historic role of the Islamic Umma,²²⁶ which was created by God as the best nation, which has brought humanity a universal and well-balanced civilisation, in which harmony

between life here on earth and the hereafter exists, and in which knowledge accompanies faith"²²⁷.

What does the priority of the Koran and the Sharî'a mean for human rights' discussions? These two authorities insure that in Islamic states, human rights only exist within the limitation set by the religious values of Islamic revelation and are guaranteed only within the framework determined by the Koran and Islamic law. The secularized Westerner, molded by the Enlightenment and accustomed to separation of Church and State, has difficulties understanding that a country could determine its standards for political, social life, for private and public affairs, by the standards of religion.

Human Rights or Duties?

For this reason, Islamic apologists (defenders of the faith) are generally convinced that, while God has rights in regard to man, man has only duties towards God. Man must, for example, submit to God's will and fulfil the Five Pillars of Islam whereas God has no duties towards man.

Civil Rights for Moslems and Non-Moslems

Islamic culture has never known any sort of separation of religion and state, or of politics and religion, while, in the Old Testament, a certain division of authority between the king and the high priest did exist. In Islam, Muhammad had unified both aspects in his own person, being simultaneously religious and political leader of the first Islamic community. His immediate successors, the Caliphs, also carried out both offices.

In the Islamic states, Islam is the state religion, to which all citizens are assumed to belong, and which is considered to be the "principle on which the State is built. The State is bearer of a religious idea and is, therefore, itself a religious institution ... It is responsible for the worship of God, for religious training and for the spreading of the faith"²²⁸. For this reason, the law must distinguish between the civil rights of Moslems, who can fully enjoy legal protection because they prove their loyalty to the state by their adherence to its religion, and the rights of non-Moslems, who, as traitors, forfeit their right to state protection because of their 'unbelief'. In these countries, Moslems

always have more rights than non-Moslems. A non-Moslem can usually not inherit from a Moslem, for example.

Change of Religion is High Treason

To be a Moslem means to be a citizen imbued with all legal rights, whereas to become an unbeliever is to commit high treason, for Islam is an "essential element of the basic order of the State"²²⁹.

When a Moslem repudiates his faith, he rebels against that order and endangers the security and the "stability of the society to which he belongs"²³⁰. Martin Forstner concludes,

"Only he who believes in God and the divinely revealed Koran, and who obeys the Sharî'a, is able to become a competent citizen, whereas the ungodly are enemies of society. The repeated duty to confess the faith - by fulfilling the five daily prayers, by fasting during Ramadan ... is the medium by which the citizen's morale is conveyed, so that the Islamic State links full civil rights to the confession of the true faith"²³¹.

When Islamic law is interpreted in its strictest sense, this 'watchman' function of the State over its citizens' religion makes it impossible for human rights to be given priority over Islamic law when a Moslem gives up his faith, in spite of human rights declarations. When a Moslem commits high treason-according to the Moslem' point of view-religious law must be obeyed, and that requires the punishment of the renegade. On the other hand, a non-Moslem can only enjoy those rights given him by the Koran and the Sharî'a.

Freedom of Religion for Non-Moslems

Although the constitutions of many Islamic countries provide for freedom in exercising religious beliefs, non-Moslems almost always have great difficulties in practicing their faith. Moslems who have become Christians may even lose their lives. Still, Islamic countries claim to be tolerant and to guarantee freedom of religion.

In spite of the fact that freedom of religion is part of the law in most Islamic countries, their constitutions declare Islam to be the state religion. A few other faiths, such as Judaism and Christianity, are allowed a certain right to exist, so that their members are not required to convert to Islam, even if they live in an predominantly Islamic area, but they are never equal to Moslems before the law. They remain

'second-class citizens' with limited legal rights and are subject to the Islamic State, which defines the limits of their religious freedoms very strictly (including the building or repairing of churches, for example).

In most cases the Jewish or Christian faith must be exercised quietly, for "a Moslem citizen can not be expected to endure and continually resist the missionary activity of other religions"²³². Non-Moslem faiths, which are only tolerated and supervised, may exist only under the conditions imposed by the law, otherwise not at all.

Non-Moslems are forbidden to insult or disparage Islam, the Koran or the prophet Muhammad, which automatically occurs in Christian evangelisation, according to Moslem opinion. Moroccan law, for example, requires a prison sentence of six months to three years, as well as a fine of 200 to 500 dirham, for proselytizing a Moslem to another religion²³³. Repudiation of Islam is still considered to be a crime worthy of death, whereas the Moslem has the right to proselytize others.

Conclusion: Islamic human rights declarations of all kinds continually insist on the authority of the Islamic faith, and can therefore only guarantee civil rights which respect Islam and its principles. This automatically restricts the rights of non-Moslems, so that under Islamic law, only the Moslem can enjoy all rights, for only he is considered to be a loyal citizen.

Non-Moslems have limited rights, but are allowed to exist. The Moslem who repudiates his faith loses all his rights, for he is considered a traitor to his country and to the State and may be subject to the death sentence either under the legal system or by his neighbors. This is emphasised in the "Draft for an Islamic Declaration of Human Rights", which was composed by the Islamic Conference in Jidda in 1979²³⁴.

This statement forbids the Moslem to ever change his faith. Not to condemn the renegade to death would be an offence against the Shari'a, and can thus not be guaranteed, not even within the framework of a human rights declaration.

When Moslems convert to Christianity - Apostasy and the Death Penalty in Islam

Does a Moslem have the right to desert Islam and turn to Christianity? Is faith a private matter or do the state and its organs have the responsibility to monitor and control it? Christianity and Islam view this question quite differently.

In our 'enlightened' Western world with its separation of Church and State, the personal belief of the individual is one of the most private areas of life - so much so that many are unwilling to even share the details of their faith. Many contemporaries consider their personal faith, which they have formulated according to their own convictions independent of the Church, for the 'true faith', a religion more valid than that of those who "are always running to church."

The Islamic view is quite different: faith and religion are basically public affairs subject to the control of the state, although the measure of the control varies from country to country. Wherever Islam is the state religion and the very pillar of state order, the good citizen is expected to adhere to Islam; apostasy is treason.

²²⁵Saudi Arabia is an exception, as it did not ratify the Declaration.

²²⁶"Umma" (Arabic) is the community, the congregation. It indicates the universal fellowship of all Moslems.

²²⁷The Cairo Declaration of Human Rights was published, for example in: *Gewissen und Freiheit*. Nr. 36 (1991). pp. 93-98. See also: Osman El Hajie. "Die islamischen Länder und die internationalen Menschenrechtsdokumente". *Gewissen und Freiheit*, 36 (1991) pp. 74-79, and the critical analysis by Martin Forstner. "Das Menschenrecht der Religionsfreiheit und des Religionwechsels als Problem der islamischen Staaten". *Kanon, Kirche und Staat im christlichen Osten. Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für das Recht der Ostkirchen*. Wien 1991. pp. 105-186. See also the publication of the "General Islamic Human Rights Declaration" of the Islamic Council for Europe in Paris September 19, 1981 in *Cibedo (Documentation) Nr. 15/16*. Frankfurt 1982.

²²⁸O. Spiess and E. Pritsch. "Klassisches Islamisches Recht. 1. Wesen des Islamischen Rechts." *Handbuch der Orientalistik. Section 1. Vol. 3. Orientalisches Recht*. E. J. Brill: Leiden 1964. p. 220

²²⁹Forstner. *Menschenrecht*. p. 116

²³⁰O. Spies and E. Pritsch. *Recht*. pp. 220-343 (here p. 220).

²³¹Forstner. *Menschenrecht*. pp. 116 & 138

²³²Forstner. *Menschenrecht*. p. 114

Schirmacher, Human Rights Threatened in Europe

²³³Forstner. Menschenrecht. p. 114

²³⁴Forstner. Menschenrecht. p. 109

Books by Thomas Schirmmacher

As author:

Das Mißverständnis des Emil Brunner: Emil Brunners Bibliologie als Ursache für das Scheitern seiner Ekklesiologie. Theologische Untersuchungen zu Weltmission und Gemeindebau. ed. by Hans-Georg Wüch and Thomas Schirmmacher. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Weltmission und Gemeindebau: Lörrach, 1982. 54 pp.

A study of Emil Brunner's ecclesiology and of the bibliology and hermeneutics of dialectical theology.

Mohammed: Prophet aus der Wüste. Schwengeler: Berneck (CH), 1984¹, 1986², 1990³. 120 pp. (with Christine Schirmmacher)

A short biography of the founder of Islam and an introduction into Islam.

Theodor Christlieb und seine Missionstheologie. Verlag der Evangelischen Gesellschaft für Deutschland: Wuppertal, 1985. 308 pp.

A study of the biography, theology and missiology of the leading German Pietist, professor of practical theology and international missions leader in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Marxismus: Opium für das Volk? Schwengeler: Berneck (CH), 1990. 150 pp.

Marxism is proven to be a religion and an opiate for the masses. Emphasizes the differences between Marxist and Biblical work ethics and between atheistic and Biblical Capitalism.

Zur marxistischen Sagen- und Märchenforschung und andere volkskundliche Beiträge. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1991. 227 pp.

10 essays and articles on the science of folklore and cultural anthropology in Germany. Includes a critique of the Marxist interpretation of tales and sagas, and studies on the history of marriage and family in Europe from the 6th century onward.

"Der göttliche Volkstumsbegriff" und der "Glaube an Deutschlands Größe und heilige Sendung": Hans Naumann als Volkskundler und Germanist unter dem Nationalsozialismus. 2 volumes. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1992. 606 pp.

Discusses the history of German cultural anthropology and folklore under Hitler, especially the leading figure Naumann, professor of German language, whose scientific theory is showed to be very religious in tone.

War Paulus wirklich auf Malta? Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1992 (together with Heinz Warnecke). 254 pp.

The book shows that Paul was not shipwrecked on Malta but on another island, Kephallenia, and that the report in Acts is very accurate. The Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is defended with theological and linguistic arguments against higher criticism.

Psychotherapie - der fatale Irrtum. Schwengeler: Berneck (CH), 1993 (together with Rudolf Antholzer). 150 pp.

A critique of secular psychotherapy, showing that psychotherapy is a religion. and that most psychotherapists call every school of psychotherapy except their own nonsense and unscientific.

Paulus im Kampf gegen den Schleier: Eine alternative Sicht von 1. Korinther 11,2-16. Biblia et symbiotica 4. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1993. 168 pp.

Exegetical examination of 1. Corinthians 11,2-16, following a alternative view of John Lightfoot, member of the Westminster assembly in the 16th century.

"Schirrmacher argues that from the biblical teaching that man is the head of woman (1 Cor 11:3) the Corinthians had drawn the false conclusions that in prayer a woman must be veiled (11:4-6) and a man is forbidden to be veiled (11:7), and that the wife exists for the husband but not the husband for the wife (11:8-9). Paul, however, rejected these conclusions and showed in 11:10-16 why the veiling of women did not belong to God's commandments binding upon all the Christian communities. After stating the thesis and presenting his alternative translation and exposition of 1 Cor 11:2-16, he considers the difficulties in the text, presents his alternative exposition in detail (in the form of thirteen theses), discusses quotations and irony in 1 Corinthians, and deals with other NT texts about women's clothing and prayer and about the subordination of wives. H.-G. Wünnch has provided a three-page foreword." (New Testament Abstracts vol. 39 (1995) 1, p. 154).

Der Römerbrief. Neuhausen: Hänssler, 1994. 2 volumes. 331 + 323 pp.

Commentary on Romans in form of major topics of Systematic Theology starting from the text of Romans, but then going on to the whole Bible.

Der Text des Römerbriefes: Für das Selbststudium gegliedert. Biblia et symbiotica 7. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1994. 68 pp.

The text of Romans newly translated and structured for self study.

Ethik. Neuhausen: Hänssler, 1994. 2 volumes. 883 & 889 pp.

A major Evangelical ethics in German.

Galilei-Legenden und andere Beiträge zu Schöpfungsforschung, Evolutionskritik und Chronologie der Kulturgeschichte 1979-1994. *Biblia et symbiotica* 12. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1996. 331 pp.

Title: Legends of Galileo and other Contributions to Creation Science, Criticism of Evolution and Chronology of the History of Culture 1979-1994. A collection of creationist articles written within 15 years of the author's battle against evolution. The chapter on Galilei has been published in English in the Festschrift for Rousas John Rushdoony (1996).

Völker - Drogen - Kannibalismus: Ethnologische und länderkundliche Beiträge 1984 - 1994. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1997. 218 pp.

A collection of articles on cultural anthropology, especially on Indians in South America, cannibalism and the religious use of drugs.

Die Vielfalt biblischer Sprache: Über 100 alt- und neutestamentliche Stilarten, Ausdrucksweisen, Redeweisen und Gliederungsformen. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1997. 130 pp.

A hermeneutical study, listing more than 100 specific language techniques in the Bible with several proof texts for each of them.

Gottesdienst ist mehr: Plädyoer für einen liturgischen Gottesdienst. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1998. 130 pp.

An investigation into biblical proof texts for liturgical elements in Christian Sunday service.

Gesetz und Geist: Eine alternative Sicht des Galaterbriefes. Reformatorische Paperbacks. Reformatorischer Verlag: Hamburg, 1999. 160 pp.

Law and Spirit: An Alternative View of Galatians. RVB International: Hamburg, 2001. 160 pp.

This commentary emphasising the ethical aspects of Galatians wants to prove that Galatians is not only fighting legalists but also a second party of Paul's opponents, who were totally opposed to the Old Testament and the Law, and lived immorally in the name of Christian freedom, a view especially endorsed by Wilhelm Lütgert's commentary of 1919. Paul is fighting against the abrogation of the Old Testament Law as well as against using this Law as way of salvation instead of God's grace.

God Wants You to Learn, Labour and Love. Reformation Books: Hamburg, 1999. 120 pp.

Four essays for Third World Christian Leaders on Learning with Jesus, Work Ethic, Love and Law and Social Engagement.

37 Gründe, warum Christen sich für eine Erneuerung unserer Gesellschaft auf christlicher Grundlage einsetzen sollten. Die Wende, 1999. 40 pp.

37 reasons for Christian involvement in society and politics.

Christenverfolgung geht uns alle an: Auf dem Weg zu einer Theologie des Martyriums. Idea-Dokumentation 15/99. Idea: Wetzlar, 1999. 64 S.

70 thesis on persecution and martyrdom, written for the International Day of Prayer for the Persecuted Church on behalf of the German and European Evangelical Alliance

World Mission - Heart of Christianity. RVB International: Hamburg, 1999. 120 S.yyy

Articles on the biblical basis of World Missions.

Eugen Drewermann und der Buddhismus. Verlag für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft: Nürnberg, 1999. 132 S.

Deals with the German Catholic Author Drewermann and his propagating Buddhist thinking. Includes chapter on a Christian Ethics of Environment.

Galilei-Legendsyyy. RVB International: Hamburg, 2001. 150 pp.yyy

Shorter version of the German book 'Galilei-Legenden' mentioned above.

Human Rights Threatened in Europe: Euthanasia - Abortion - Bioethicconvention. RVB International: Hamburg, 2001. 130 pp.yyy

Updated Lectures at the 1st European Right to Life Forum Berlin, 1998, and articles on abortion.

Ausverkaufte Würde? Der Pornographie-Boom und seine psychischen Folgen. Hänssler: Holzgerlingen, 2000. (mit Christa Meves). 130 pp.

The psychological results of pornography.

Eine Sekte wird evangelisch - Die Reformation der Weltweiten Kirche Gottes. Idea-Dokumentation 11/2000. Idea: Wetzlar, 2000. 56 pp.

Detailed report on the reformation of the Worldwide Church of God (Armstrong) from a sect to an evangelical church.

As editor (always with own contributions):

Patrick Johnstone. Handbuch für Weltmission: Gebet für die Welt. Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1987², newest edition 1993⁶ (together with Christine Schirmacher). 811 pp.

Adapted German version of 'Operation World', a handbook and lexicon on the situation of Christianity and missions in every country of the world.

Gospel Recordings Language List: Liste der Sprachaufnahmen in 4.273 Sprachen. Missiologica Evangelica 4. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1992. 120 pp.

Lists 4273 languages in the world, in which evangelistic cassettes are available.

"Die Zeit für die Bekehrung der Welt ist reif": Rufus Anderson und die Selbständigkeit der Kirche als Ziel der Mission. Edition afem: mission scripts 3. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1993. 134 pp.

Articles by Schirmmacher and by theologians from the 19th century about Rufus Anderson, leading American missionary statesman, Reformed professor of missions and postmillennial theologian - together with the first translation of texts of Anderson into German.

William Carey. Eine Untersuchung über die Verpflichtung der Christen [1792]. Edition afem: mission classics 1. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1993 (together with Klaus Fiedler). 100 pp.

First German translation of the book by the Calvinist Baptist William Carey of 1792, with which the age of modern Protestant world missions started.

Bibeltreue in der Offensive: Die drei Chicagoerklärungen zur biblischen Unfehlbarkeit, Hermeneutik und Anwendung. Biblia et symbiotica 2. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1993. 90 pp.

German translation of the three Chicago-Declarations on biblical inerrancy, hermeneutics and application.

Im Kampf um die Bibel - 100 Jahre Bibelbund. Biblia et symbiotica 6. Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1994 (together with Stephan Holthaus). 168 pp.

'Festschrift' for 100 years of "Bibelbund". Articles on biblical inerrancy and on the history of the major German organization fighting higher criticism, the "Bibelbund" (Bible League), and its theological journal "Bibel und Gemeinde", edited by Schirmmacher since 1988.

Eduard Böhl. Dogmatik. Hänssler Theologie. Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1995

A Reformed Systematic Theology from the last century edited by Thomas Schirmmacher; with an lengthy introduction on Böhl's life and work.

Der evangelische Glaube kompakt: Ein Arbeitsbuch (1998). Hänssler: Neuhausen, 1998. 180 pp.

German translation of the Westminster Confession of Faith, adapted and with commentary and changes in Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Baptist versions.

Werden alle gerettet? Referate der Jahrestagung 1998 des AfeM (mit Klaus W. Müller). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1998. 160 pp.

The proceedings of a missiological consultation on the relationship between Christianity's mission and other religions.

The Right to Life for Every Person / Lebensrecht für jeden Menschen. Abortion - Euthanasia - Gen Technology: Proceedings of the 1st European Right to Life Forum Berlin, 1998. Abtreibung - Euthanasie - Gentechnik: Beiträge des 1. Europäischen Forums Lebensrecht Berlin, 1999 (with Walter Schrader, Hartmut Steeb). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 1999. 310 pp.

Kein anderer Name: Die Einzigartigkeit Jesu Christi und das Gespräch mit nichtchristlichen Religionen. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Peter Beyerhaus. Verlag für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft: Nürnberg, 1999. 470 pp.

Festschrift of Prof. Peter Beyerhaus, the leading evangelical missiologist and evangelical elder statesmen. Covers all aspects of the relationship of Christian faith to other religions.

Missionswissenschaft im Zeichen der Erneuerung: Ehrengabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Peter Beyerhaus. Sonderausgabe = Evangelikale Missiologie 15 (1999) Heft 2 (together with Klaus W. Müller und Christof Sauer) (1999) afem

Shorter version of the former Festschrift for mass distribution

Ausbildung als missionarischer Auftrag: Referate der Jahrestagung 1999 des AfeM (mit Klaus W. Müller). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2000. 210 pp.

Lectures on the relation of missions and theological education by leading representatives of schools, alternative programmes, missions and third world churches.

A Life of Transformation: Festschrift for Colonel V. Doner. RVB International: Hamburg, 2001. 350 S.yyy

Mission in der Spannung zwischen Hoffnung, Resignation und Endzeitenenthusiasmus: Referate der Jahrestagung 2000 des AfeM (together with Klaus W. Müller). Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft: Bonn, 2001. 240 pp.

Lectures on the importance of eschatology for missions in history and present reality.
