

Euthanasia

Chapter 22

Tonight we will be looking at hopefully two topics related to each other, Euthanasia and Suicide... actually, these are also related to what we looked at before our break... abortion. So let me refresh our minds just a minute to get into this.

By the way, this is a timely topic to think about again in that last Sunday was the anniversary of Roe Vs Wade being made the law of the land (1973). The statistics are varied but at least 60 to 70 million babies have been “legally” aborted between 1973 and 2021.

If we were to boil down the very essence of the argument, what would it be?

This last week Al Mohler summed it up well... *When you're looking at the issue of life, either you see it as the termination of innocent unborn human life or you see it as basically nothing at all. You see the baby or you don't see the baby. It's as simple as that.*

It is as simple as that... but it has become much more complicated. Pro abortion views the rights of a woman to be the issue... that can only be the issue of the baby in the womb is not considered to be a baby.

As bad as abortion is... it's implications go even to a worse place... listen to Norman Geisler in his “Christian Ethics”... *If abortion is morally right, then so is infanticide and euthanasia for the same reasons. In short, “today no unwanted baby, tomorrow no unwanted infant or grandparent.*

Our book does not take on Infanticide... but we need to mention it here... why?... because making infanticide is knocking on the make legal door. Already the state of New York is knocking loudly having made it legal to abort a baby all the way up to full term.

Infanticide—the killing of an infant human being AFTER birth. “Active Infanticide” involves a procedure that actually takes the life of the infant. “Passive Infanticide” simply allows the infant to die by withholding needed treatments.

In 1982, the Supreme Court in Indiana ruled that parents could permit their Down Syndrome baby to starve to death.

The common procedure in Active Infanticide is known better as “Partial Birth Abortion.

*****“**Partial Birth Abortion**”—the baby is allowed to come out of the womb feet first until a hole can be successfully drilled in the baby's head and the brains sucked out.

Arguments for Active Infanticide:

1. It is only right for parents to have the initial right to make a choice about “imperiled children” In other words, if the parents do not want the child to be born, then the child should not be born.

2. Imperiled Children are Nonpersons—they may believe the imperiled child is a human being, but NOT a person in the full sense of the word...they are nonpersons. They do not exhibit self-consciousness or other human functions.

3. The quality of the life of the child—it is permissible to terminate a child if the child does not exhibit a *certain quality of life*. It would be more merciful to kill a child in this situation than to let it live.

4. The Quality of Life for the Caregivers—If the child is going to infringe on the quality of life for the parents, community, government or medical field.

Arguments Against

1. Parental Rights DO Not Mean Absolute Rights—remember “Graded Absolutism” from when we began the class?

Graded Absolutism states a decision can be overridden if it is in conflict with a “higher fundamental right”.

2. Imperiled Children are Still Persons—there is a distinction between *being* a human being and *functioning* as a human being.

What about me and my bad knee?

3. Killing a sufferer is NOT an act of mercy—Quality of life is subjective. Many times when people are suffering they are not in a mental condition to make sound decisions.

Subjective—people living in third world countries would have different concepts of the quality of life than those in Beverly Hills.

4. It is not merciful to kill another to relive MY burdens.

I. Euthanasia (literally, “good death,” popularly called “mercy killing”) – all three terms are misleading

A. It is wrong for us actively to take our own life or the life of someone else

Exodus 20:13 "**You shall not murder.**"

2 Samuel 1:1

After the death of Saul, when David had returned from striking down the Amalekites, David remained two days in Ziklag. 2 And on the third day, behold, a man came from Saul's camp, with his clothes torn and dirt on his head. And when he came to David, he fell to the ground and paid homage. 3 David said to him, "Where do you come from?" And he said to him, "I have escaped from the camp of Israel." 4 And David said to him, "How did it go? Tell me." And he answered, "The people fled from the battle, and also many of the people have fallen and are dead, and Saul and his son Jonathan are also dead." 5 Then

David said to the young man who told him, "How do you know that Saul and his son Jonathan are dead?"

6 And the young man who told him said, "By chance I happened to be on Mount Gilboa, and there was Saul leaning on his spear, and behold, the chariots and the horsemen were close upon him. 7 And when he looked behind him, he saw me, and called to me. And I answered, 'Here I am.' 8 And he said to me, 'Who are you?' I answered him, 'I am an Amalekite.' 9 And he said to me 'Stand beside me and kill me, for anguish has seized me, and yet my life still lingers.' 10 So I stood beside him and killed him, because I was sure that he could not live after he had fallen. And I took the crown that was on his head and the armlet that was on his arm, and I have brought them here to my lord."

11 Then David took hold of his clothes and tore them, and so did all the men who were with him. 12 And they mourned and wept and fasted until evening for Saul and for Jonathan his son and for the people of the LORD and for the house of Israel, because they had fallen by the sword. 13 And David said to the young man who told him, "Where do you come from?" And he answered, "I am the son of a sojourner, an Amalekite."

14 David said to him, "How is it you were not afraid to put out your hand to destroy the LORD's anointed?" 15 Then David called one of the young men and said, "Go, execute him." And he struck him down so that he died. 16 And David said to him, "Your blood be on your head, for your own mouth has testified against you, saying, 'I have killed the LORD's anointed.'"

1. This story from the Amalekite messenger is not mentioned in 1 Sam. 31:3-6, and it may or may not be accurate (but at least he knew that Saul had fallen on his own sword, and he had the crown!)
 - a. Even if it is not true, David accepts it as true and passes judgment based on it
2. This situation is similar in several ways to cases where people say euthanasia is justified
 - a. The patient was terminally ill, with no reasonable human hope of recovery
 - b. The patient was in extreme pain, and faced the prospect of more suffering
 - c. The patient requested that someone actively put him to death (help him die)
 - d. This was also a command of the governing authority (Saul was the king!)
3. Yet King David, a man after God's own heart (1 Sam. 13:14), holds the Amalekite messenger morally accountable for killing Saul (and imposes capital punishment on him for this deed)
4. This gives significant narrative confirmation of the rightness of applying "You shall not murder" to the question of euthanasia

5. Objection: This is a unique case, because Saul was king (“the Lord’s anointed,” 2 Sam. 1:14)
 - a. The image of God is not less in other people who are not kings! Their lives are no less valuable to God, nor can we say common people’s lives deserve less protection than the life of the king.
 - b. Therefore, if it is wrong to kill a terminally ill king who requests it, it is wrong to kill anyone else who requests it.
 6. Objection: the sin of the Amalekite was not murder but rebellion against the king
 - a. David specified that he had killed someone, not that he had rebelled
 - b. David did not punish people for joining with him against King Saul
 7. Conclusion both Exod. 20:13 and 2 Sam. 1 indicate that it is wrong to actively kill a terminally ill person
- B. “Physician-assisted suicide” continues to be a threat in the U.S.
1. Michigan had great difficulty stopping Dr. Jack Kevorkian (4 trials, 1994-97, not convicted until ’99)
 2. In the Netherlands, the “right to die” has quickly slipped to the “obligation to die”

a number of elderly people are put to death against their will
 3. This is a slippery slope that we should oppose
- C. We must maintain a clear distinction between killing and letting die
1. *Killing*: actively doing something to a patient that hastens or causes death
 2. *Letting die*: passively allowing someone to die, without interfering with that process
- D. We should try to help and not allow someone to die when:
1. There is a reasonable human hope of recovery
 2. We are able to help
3. Examples: heart attack, person drowning or in auto accident, person planning to jump off building

Matthew 22:39 You shall love your neighbor as yourself.

Matthew 7:12 "So whatever you wish that others would do to you, do also to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets.

- E. It is right to allow someone to die when:
1. This is the patient's wish, and
 2. There is no reasonable human hope of recovery (a situation of "futility"),
 3. There also may be times when we are unable to help (example: person in burning car)
 - a. This may include times when we cannot afford extraordinary expense of some medical treatments
 4. When someone wants to die, and the end of life is near, it is OK for the person himself to pray that God would take his life: see Luke 23:46 (Jesus); Acts 7:59 (Stephen) the person

Hebrews 2:14 Since therefore the children share in flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook of the same things, that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil, 15 and deliver all those who through fear of death were subject to lifelong slavery.

5. Allowing someone to die may include
 - a. Not starting a life support system (examples:)
 - b. Stopping a life support system
 - c. There is much difference of opinion over a third category:
Stopping or not starting a feeding tube ("nutrition and hydration")
- F. We should do what we can to alleviate the patient's pain (see Matt. 7:12; 22:39 above)
1. The first consideration is the patient's wishes (there may be a trade-off between alleviating pain and remaining conscious, rational, alert) – patient should decide this if possible
 2. What about the "double effect" - where alleviating pain also tends to hasten death?

In the case of my dad, when he was in hospice, I was his caregiver, I was given some major pain killers (morpheme) and was instructed to give him whatever amount appeared to make him feel better. These extreme dosages of pain killers/relievers surely sped up his dying.

depends on what the primary purpose is for giving the medication

- G. It will save our families a lot of stress and trouble if we give clear directions about our wishes ahead of time

(Matt. 22:39) 39 The second is like it, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.'

1. We should all complete a “Medical Power of Attorney” designation
2. We should also verbally communicate these wishes clearly to family and/or friends
3. Love for neighbor also should lead us to be organ donors (Matt. 22:39)

H. My own personal decisions

1. If I am no longer conscious, no longer able even to pray, and if there is no reasonable human hope of recovery would I want a large amount of effort and expense put forth to keep me out of heaven?
2. Paul wants either life or death, but not to be somehow suspended between the two! Philippians 1:20

as it is my eager expectation and hope that I will not be at all ashamed, but that with full courage now as always Christ will be honored in my body, whether by life or by death. 21 For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. 22 If I am to live in the flesh, that means fruitful labor for me. Yet which I shall choose I cannot tell. 23 I am hard pressed between the two. My desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better. 24 But to remain in the flesh is more necessary on your account.

3. Sometimes in Scripture God’s people set their affairs in order and calmly die

Genesis 49:33 When Jacob finished commanding his sons, he drew up his feet into the bed and breathed his last and was gathered to his people.

4. We do not need to have a fear of death

1 Corinthians 15:55 "O death, where is your victory? O death, where is your sting?" 56 The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law. 57 But thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Paul Jonna—Special Counsel for the Thomas Moore Society

Although the idea that infanticide could happen and is happening in America is new to many people, it’s not new to me. As Special Counsel to the Thomas More Society, I represented David Daleiden and the Center for Medical Progress in litigation against Planned Parenthood and the National Abortion Federation (NAF). Planned Parenthood and NAF sued David after he published a large-scale undercover investigation revealing that Planned Parenthood had been selling aborted baby body parts for profit and was regularly performing illegal partial-birth abortions to get more “intact specimens.”

During the federal litigation, my partner Chuck LiMandri and I deposed the key abortionists involved and cross-examined them at trial. We’ve come face-to-face with the people who admit that babies are born alive in America and harvested for their tissue and organs.

The promotion of legalized infanticide is not unheard of in America. Ethicist Peter Singer, for instance, promotes the idea that for twenty-eight days after birth, it's morally acceptable in certain circumstances to kill the child. In 2019, Virginia's Democrat governor, Ralph Northam, made headlines when he suggested that doctors could have a "conversation" with parents of a newborn to decide whether that child should live.

Now the state of California is on the verge of passing Assembly Bill 2223, which will expressly make such conversations legal. Sponsors and supporters claim that the bill is intended only to ensure that women who've had miscarriages and abortions are not criminally prosecuted. But that is already the law. So what is really going on here? I've looked into the proposed legislation and have concluded that there is cause for alarm.

It's important to consider the legislative context. Why was this bill proposed, and who proposed it? In September 2021, Governor Gavin Newsom helped form the California Future of Abortion Council, whose stated mission was to make California an abortion "sanctuary state" if *Roe v. Wade* were overturned (which now appears certain). The Council released a document listing "legislative, executive, and administrative actions for state policymakers to implement in order to meet the needs of people seeking abortions." In line with these goals, on April 20, 2022, the California Assembly Health Committee passed AB-2223.

According to its proponents, including its sponsor, Buffy Wicks, AB-2223 is merely intended to ensure that women will not be "criminally prosecuted for having miscarriages or stillbirths or for self-managing an abortion." Wicks advocates expanding abortion in California and making it available to women from out of state: "We may have 1.4 million women from out of state showing up on our doorstep seeking care. And if we do, how are we going to handle that? . . . I'm very excited that we're even engaging in this conversation."

But Wicks is just the public face of AB-2223, which is really the product of a host of large and powerful organizations pushing for universal abortion on demand: ACLU California Action, Black Women for Wellness, California Latinas for Reproductive Justice, If/When/How: Lawyering for Reproductive Justice, NARAL Pro-Choice California, and Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California.

A close look at this bill reveals that it has nothing to do with protecting innocent mothers from being prosecuted for a miscarriage or a botched abortion. Rather, the bill aims to weaponize the Golden State with radically expanded abortion access in response to recent pro-life legislative

victories in other states and the Supreme Court’s anticipated dismantling of *Roe v. Wade* in the pending *Dobbs* case.

AB-2223 is part of a national movement to de-criminalize perinatal or infant death. Maryland recently proposed a similar bill. Make no mistake about it: AB-2223 intentionally opens the door to infanticide. Its key provision, §123457, immunizes both the mother and anyone who “aids or assists a pregnant person in excising their rights under this article” if there is a “perinatal death due to a pregnancy-related cause.”

What is “perinatal death,” and what is a “pregnancy-related cause”? AB-2223 is conspicuously silent on these questions. But California law makes clear elsewhere that the perinatal period includes the time after birth.

AB-2223 is open to a host of interpretations that would allow “perinatal death” due to a “pregnancy-related cause.” For example, as noted by Dr. Vansen Huang, an OB-GYN with thirty-one years’ experience who publicly and powerfully opposed AB-2223, “the most obvious pregnancy related issue is that there’s a baby. . . the pregnancy related cause was that there’s a baby.” Dr. Huang further notes that the bill’s vague language could also provide immunity to a father who intentionally causes a perinatal death.

If the bill were not intended to legalize infanticide, the legislators could have made that clear, but they chose not to.

In addition to legalizing infanticide, there are at least six other dangerous aspects of the bill:

The bill provides immunity to the mother and anyone who assists her in the death of her child at any stage of pregnancy, apparently for any reason.

It legalizes self-induced abortions without restriction, even after twenty weeks gestation.

Coroners will no longer have the duty to inquire into and determine the circumstances, manner, and cause of self-induced or criminal abortion.

Fetal deaths in general will no longer be handled like other deaths without medical attendance—thus providing a legal shroud covering up infanticide.

Anyone who denies or interferes with the “rights” created by AB-2223 may be sued for damages. Even threatening someone with criminal prosecution for causing the death of a child in the womb or “perinatally” can be construed as a hate crime.

The bill replaces the term “woman” with “individual” or “pregnant person” to conform to the new woke gender-neutral ideology.

Are the concerns of the pro-life community unfounded? Absolutely not. Infanticide is currently happening in America. Most recently, in March 2022, the fully intact bodies of five babies were discovered at an abortion facility in Washington, D.C. Based on expert review of photographs of the bodies, it appears these babies were killed by infanticide or illegal late-term abortion. Nor can we forget Dr. Kermit Gosnell, the butcher who was convicted of first-degree murder of three born-alive infants at his abortion mill in Philadelphia.

As noted above, David Daleiden and CMP’s investigation documented that Planned Parenthood facilities across the U.S., including California, regularly engage in illegal partial-birth abortions to sell intact fetal tissue. For example, during CMP’s interview of Dr. DeShawn Taylor, a former Planned Parenthood medical director in Arizona, Taylor candidly discussed the performance of late-term abortions at twenty-four weeks to procure marketable fetal tissue. As Taylor explained: “We have the people who do our paperwork for the fetal death certificates, they email us calling them ‘babies.’ Baby this, baby that, baby so-and-so, and I’m like, that’s creepy!” She continued: “In Arizona, if the fetus comes out with any signs of life, we’re supposed to transport it to the hospital.” But in making that assessment, she admitted that “the key is, you need to pay attention to who’s in the room, right?”

CMP’s investigation also revealed that Planned Parenthood doctors try to get around the federal law banning partial-birth abortions by simply checking the right boxes on clinical documentation. As Planned Parenthood abortionist Dr. Suzie Prabhakaran explains, “you know, to comply with the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban, you basically have to say: ‘I intend to utilize dismemberment techniques for this procedure. So, every time you do a procedure, that’s how you document.’” CMP investigators also found evidence that Planned Parenthood in Orange County would illegally tailor the abortion procedure in order to procure intact, marketable fetuses.

After the draft opinion reversing Roe was leaked to the public, President Biden told reporters, “Roe says what all basic, mainstream religions have historically concluded, that . . . the existence of a human life and being is a question. . . . Is it at the moment of conception? Is it six months? Is it six weeks? Is it ‘quickenings’ like Aquinas argued?” In fact, it’s not an open question. Science is unmistakably clear that life begins at conception—and abortion in the womb is just as evil as the infanticide that AB-2223 seeks to legalize. But pro-abortion activists no longer justify their

position by trying to argue that an unborn baby is not a human being; they think they have the right to kill that child anyway—which is why infanticide is their logical next step.

Once Roe is overruled, the battle will shift to the states—and many of them will try to pass bills like AB-2223. These efforts must be vigorously opposed. AB-2233 undeniably opens the door to violation of the U.S. and California Constitutions as well as the Federal Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which extends legal protection to an infant born alive after a botched abortion. Nonetheless, it's proceeding to the Appropriations Committee and then the Assembly floor for a vote.

Very soon, this bill could become law in California. It employs the veil of ambiguity to sanction the killing of born-alive infants. Its proponents claim we're crazy for saying they need only amend the bill to state expressly that infanticide is still, and always will be, illegal. If that does not happen, the true legislative intent will be exposed, and AB-2223 will be challenged—and soundly defeated—in court.

Suicide

Chapter 23

A. It is wrong to murder any human being, including yourself.

Exodus 20:13 “You shall not murder.”

B. The Bible never views suicide positively. It is several times seen as a last act of despair when a person

has turned against God and his purposes

1. Saul: 1 Samuel 31:3 The battle pressed hard against Saul, and the archers found him, and he was badly wounded by the archers. 4 Then Saul said to his armor-bearer, “Draw your sword, and thrust me through with it, lest these uncircumcised come and thrust me through, and mistreat me.” But his armor-bearer would not, for he feared greatly. Therefore Saul took his own sword and fell upon it.

2. Ahithophel: 2 Samuel 17:23 When Ahithophel saw that his counsel was not followed, he saddled his donkey and went off home to his own city. He set his house in order and hanged himself, and he died and was buried in the tomb of his father.

3. Judas: Matthew 27:5 And throwing down the pieces of silver into the temple, he departed, and he went and hanged himself.

4. However, Samson’s death should not be understood as suicide but as a last act of selfsacrifice for the sake of his people (a sort of foreshadowing of Christ)

Judges 16:28 Then Samson called to the LORD and said, “O Lord GOD, please remember me and please strengthen me only this once, O God, that I may be avenged on the Philistines for my two eyes.” 29 And Samson grasped the two middle pillars on which the house rested, and he leaned his weight against them, his right hand on the one and his left hand on the other. 30 And Samson said, “Let me die with the Philistines.” Then he bowed with all his strength, and the house fell upon the lords and upon all the people who were in it. So the dead whom he killed at his death were more than those whom he had killed during his life.

- similar to soldiers in combat who give their lives heroically to save the lives of others

Greater love has no one than this, that someone lay down his life for his friends

(John 15:13)

C. The goal of Satan is to destroy human beings made in the image of God, however he can. He will try

to persuade people to commit suicide if he can.

John 8:44 You are of your father the devil, and your will is to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, and has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks out of his own character, for he is a liar and the father of lies.

(examples of people who "hear voices" telling them to kill themselves)

D. Suicide also injures others deeply (family and friends)

1. Great sorrow, pain, suffering – with no hope for changing the outcome, or for getting answers in this lifetime

2. Thus contrary to love of others, even rightful love of self:

Matthew 22:39 You shall love your neighbor as yourself