

at General Hospital in Michigan, he conducted unauthorized experiments in which he nearly killed a person after he transfused blood from a corpse into the live subject. In a decade of unemployment, while offering "death counseling," he bought old toy parts to make "Mercitrons" or "Thanatrons." By 1989, he was looking for his first victim.

Since 1950, Kevorkian had urged death row prisoners to choose a form of execution that allows them to donate their organs or have medical experiments done on them during operations from which they would never wake up. He tells those who are ill or who are "going to be killed anyway" that their lives hold no value, but their deaths might. His promise of harvesting enough body parts to save six or eight people always starts with killing the patient. The more he kills, the more he can save! He proposed a medical auction where organs go to the highest bidder. The poor get what's left over.

Kevorkian says that his early experience of seeing a woman ravaged with cancer convinced him that doctor-assisted euthanasia/suicide is ethical. His mother died of cancer—as Hitler's support for euthanasia has been dated back to his nursing his own mother in a battle against breast cancer. Kevorkian's perversion of "mercy" is such that he now wants to facilitate the killing of anyone with "any disease that curtails life, *even for a day.*"

Accomplices in high places

Legislators have used Kevorkian's murders to push bills to make medically assisted suicide legal. The Michigan Civil Liberties Union is attacking even a pitiful law that temporarily makes assisted suicide a felony in Michigan, on the grounds that assisted suicide is an issue of the constitutionally guaranteed right to privacy, just as abortion is.

A major accomplice is Nazi "ethicist" Howard Brody, M.D. (see accompanying article), head of the Medical Society's medical ethics committee and its forum to "study" this issue. Brody runs Michigan State University's Medical Humanities Program and is chairman of the Medical Ethics Resource Network, where rationing health care based on age and handicap, and the denial of life-saving care are hot topics. Although the Medical Society voted down any motion to support laws to stop assisted suicide, its president, Thomas Payne, insisted to *EIR*, "We're against any euthanasia or assisted-suicide." Did Payne not know that his ethicist Brody just endorsed assisted suicide in the *New England Journal of Medicine*?

Medicide, Kevorkian's neologism that uses the first and last syllables of "medically assisted suicide," actually means; translated from Latin, the slaying or killing of the practice of healing, or of those who heal. Thus there are two questions here: Is Kevorkian insane? And will the people and medical professionals of Michigan and the nation stop his accomplices from allowing that "slaying" of the medical profession's capacity to heal?

Dr. Brody promotes murder as 'bioethics'

by François Lepine

On Nov. 23, 1992, in reaction to two new murders by "serial killer" Jack Kevorkian, the Michigan legislature passed a bill creating a commission to study whether or not to legalize physician-assisted murder. Michigan could become the first state in the nation to legalize active euthanasia—a Nazi policy that the entire world condemned at the Nuremberg Tribunal.

Dr. Howard Brody, the chairman of the Committee of Bioethics of the Michigan State Medical Society, is rumored to be under consideration to head that commission. If that appointment takes place, it would be a continuation of Brody's work on behalf of euthanasia with a similar commission throughout 1992.

Brody is a leading member of the bioethics movement who has been promoting euthanasia since the 1970s, and has made a specialty of shaping the debate on this issue in order to reach a "democratic consensus." His Michigan Ethics Resource Network plays a major role in this effort. During 1992, he participated in a series of forums on physician-assisted suicide, in which Michigan Right-to-Life, the Michigan Catholic Conference, Hemlock Michigan, the Michigan Nurses Association, the Michigan State Medical Society, and the offices of 10 members of the state House of Representatives also took part.

The real agenda

While euthanasia has been sold to the credulous as a democratic "right" to die, one need only read a book written by Brody in 1975, *Introduction to Ethical Decisions in Medicine*, to discover that the bioethics movement is no more for democracy than was Adolf Hitler.

The book is a textbook written to brainwash Michigan State University students, through a series of case studies that offer to the student controlled choices, in which respect for the sanctity of life has been excluded. Again and again, Brody attacks the very concept of the sanctity of life, writing, for instance, "Our basic objection to the sanctity of life should be predictable from the emphasis we have placed all along on rational decision-making processes. In practice, sanctity of life becomes a decision-avoiding tool; decisions are made in advance for all cases without any consideration of any

individual circumstances. It may not be completely fair to accuse sanctity-of-life adherents of wanting to get out of doing their moral homework, but that is one way of looking at the end result. The objection against this view is the same as the objection against any absolutist stand, which claims to be stating a moral principle that is valid for any person, place and time."

The concept of the sanctity of life that Brody attacks is at the foundation of Judeo-Christian civilization. It upholds such universal ideas as truth, justice, beauty. If you reject these, then anything is permitted, including your "right" to die. The sanctity of life means that man, being in the image of God, can think in a creative way, not just like a computer. Third, it signifies that man is not an animal, but that he can be motivated by nobler ideas than sex, money, or power.

Brody ridicules his opponents, whose "domino theory"—their belief in the sanctity of life—makes them, according to him, "emotionally state, first you allow abortion, then you open the door to mercy killing, then you start shooting inmates of mental hospitals, and eventually, in short order, we will have resurrected Nazi Germany."

The idea that there is no right or wrong is brought to such an extreme by Brody, that he claims he cannot understand which is nobler, giving one's life for justice, or taking LSD. For him it is a matter of different values for different people. "Several justifications for the expansion of consciousness by chemical means can be advanced. One is an alternative-religion model, in which Utopia is viewed as an esthetic experience in the present instead of an ascetic afterlife yet to come. . . . While several objections can be cited to these views [on LSD use—ed.], this seems to be another instance of disagreement based on different views of the future. One states that drug use does not lead to real mind-expansion, but only gives an escapist a superficial impression of doing so; and it is really the escapism rather than the supposed mind expansion that the user seeks. *It is hard to see how such a statement can be proved or disproved on empirical grounds; it may boil down to differences in taste and lifestyle*" (emphasis added).

Brody presents 60 hypothetical cases, to lead the reader to reject the sanctity of life, "democratically."

For instance, in Case 41, Brody says, "You are a one-man 'God Committee,' who has two kidney machines and five patients who are ready to die of renal failure if they do not get a machine. The information you have been given on them is the following: sex, marital status, age, number of children. Are you going to select your two lucky winners at random? If not, what criteria are you going to use?" This so-called problem is a fraud. By eliminating the fact that there is no such a thing as patients equally sick, he shifts the problem from medicine, to "lifeboat ethics." In a sane world, you give the machines first to those who need it the most, and in the meantime you try to get additional machines. "There must be a solution; therefore, I will find it, or at least

I will try," says the believer in the sanctity of life. But Brody would rather box you in to a problem where man cannot use his creativity to find a solution.

To make sure you are getting the point in the next case study, Brody adds the occupation of the patients (a Nobel Prize winner in medicine, a violinist, a mafioso hit man, an accountant on trial for embezzlement, a brothel manager), so that the question is now posed as: Who is more worthy of living, the mafioso hit man with two children, or the bachelor Nobel Prize winner?

Brody's model: Hitler

Brody's model for changing society that is not Jesus Christ, or Philo of Alexandria, or Dante, but Adolf Hitler. He writes: "While the bioethicist is not shy about his goals of creating a new culture, he is desirous of doing it in a more reasonable (and more effective) way than Hitler set about doing it. This immediately leads him to reject any use of coercion to get people to accept the new attitudes he is proposing, and to accept the fact that the bioethical message must be transmitted by some sort of educational process. There is good reason to believe that the speed at which this educational process can take place, more than any other factor will determine whether or not we will be successful in avoiding cultural catastrophe. Our mention of Hitler may raise another question: Granted that we reconstruct a culture based on bioethical values, whatever they turn out to be: Would this be a just society? Note that the bioethical emphasis on individual diversity already seems to have made specters of *1984* and *Brave New World* less likely."

Eliminate 'excess' population

Don't be fooled by Brody's profession of respect for "individual diversity." What he means by educating, is 1) to teach people that their democratic rights exist only as long as they don't threaten society's survival, and 2) to brainwash people that the Earth is overpopulated and that therefore natural resources and health care have to be rationed. For instance, speaking of euthanasia, he says that apart from alleviating suffering, there is another reason to be in favor of it, which is the "more modern concept about conserving scarce resources which has been given impetus by the realization that continued overpopulation may produce the extinction of our civilization."

Finally, in his new "democratic culture," he even admits that the consent of individuals is not absolutely necessary, in order for society to have them exercise their "right" to die: "Note that we have not said that informed non-consent is wrong necessarily. . . . If society as a whole should decide that the population problem reached a crisis stage, it would seem appropriate for society to force individuals to accept sterilization. Our ethical concern in such a case would be that the burden is imposed equally over the entire childbearing population."