February 11, 2015

To: The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (CPSO)
80 College St., Toronto, ON M5G 2E2

Response to the New Draft Policy: Professional Obligations and Human Rights

It is well said that those who do not learn from history are destined to repeat its mistakes, and the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (CPSO) has shown great ignorance of history and thus made an exceptional mistake in drafting a new policy that will force doctors to facilitate the taking of human lives (against the great medical tradition of healers to “do no harm”) or else lose their licences to be doctors in Ontario (which would greatly impoverish medical care, if precisely those doctors who most value the human lives they treat are not allowed to be doctors).

There is a gravely serious aspect of the current discussion about this which most people likely miss, but which stands out clear as day to me as a scholar with a wide breadth of historical knowledge and as a professor of a course approximately covering the First Millennium (107 AD to 1014 AD), during which period the groundwork for all later human rights and freedoms was laid. The CPSO’s intention to take away a doctor’s rights to refuse to participate (including by referral) in procedures against their conscience, including abortions which end the human lives of the unborn human babies involved (and including the just recently legalized euthenasia/assisted suicide of old and/or sick humans), ACTUALLY UNDERCUTS THE VERY HISTORIC AND LOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF ALL OUR MODERN DEMOCRATIC FREEDOMS AND HUMAN RIGHTS. These things only began to be possible after Western Civilization learned to value ALL human life, without exceptions, and protect human life without exceptions, starting in the 4th Century AD.

What Western Civilization Was Like Before the 4th Century

Before the 4th Century it used to be the norm that human life was cheap, not valued very highly except as it could serve the greater State (whatever form the State took). Governments provided a basic societal stability but had no interest at all in helping individual humans find their individual human fulfillment (“life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” and such), governments had no interest in providing health care or education for all their subjects, and governments could even be the biggest threat not only to individual human freedom but also to individual human lives. Even in the most highly civilized society, the Roman Empire, the popular entertainment – the “TV” of the day – was public torture and murder in the Roman arenas, where human lives were taken in various ways, such as wild animals tearing them apart, and athletes like gladiators murdered each other with government approval. No surprise then that in this most advanced and civilized of ancient western cultures where even here human life was so very cheap a "pro-choice" philosophy ruled the day, where parents (particularly fathers) had the right to choose whether to raise or kill their children, whether before birth by abortifacient potions and other abortion methods or after birth by exposure or other forms of infanticide. Thus the sewers of ancient Rome were clogged with dead babies who ran afoul of their parents' choice, and some ancient cities had convenient garbage dumps.
outside of the city specifically for human children (girls were particularly targeted for infanticide). Parents could sell their children as slaves, since there were no human rights or basic freedoms. Many citizens became slaves if they could not pay their debts, and governments could enslave or kill their citizens whenever they felt it suited them. Fully 1/3 of the population of the Roman Empire were slaves. Slave or free, full citizens or lesser conquered subjects, all were NOT free to seek and find their human fulfillment and meaning in life through searching religion/spirituality or any other means. It was normal worldwide for the government – whether a tribal chieftain, a national king or international emperor or even a republic (as the Roman Republic before the Empire) – to set religious policy. The government normally decided which religion was the Official Religion, and which other religions were tolerated and which were persecuted, and to what degree. Religious freedom to seek and find meaning and fulfillment in life was unheard of. Even in the ancient experiments with republican democracy as in Greece and the Roman Republic before the Empire, only upper-class free men could have any say in government. Most men and all women were excluded from voting because there was NO PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY AMONG HUMANS but quite the opposite. Greeks considered the less civilized “barbarians” to be profoundly inferior. Roman citizens and subjects might be proud to be part of the Roman Republic or the Roman Empire, the greatest the world had ever known, but they still did not expect their government to necessarily protect either their lives or their freedom.

So what happened to change all this? What led to the human rights and freedoms we have and enjoy today? What turned us from human individuals serving a greater State which frequently threatened both our freedoms and our lives to being human PERSONS who are instead served BY the Democratic State (which is why our political leaders often now call themselves “Ministers” – because they minister to the needs of human persons, and provide safety and freedom to help their citizens seek and find their human fulfillment).

What Changed in the 4th Century That Made Modern Human Rights and Democracy Possible

What happened is that in the 4th Century Western Civilization learned that ALL human life, without exception, was inherently valuable and precious, and started to treat ALL human life as valuable and precious. Gladiatorial fights to the death and other entertainment killing in the Roman arenas, and parental “pro-choice” abortion and infanticide were soon outlawed, and further centuries of reflection on this “pro-life” conviction of the SUPREME value and EQUAL dignity of every human life without exception would naturally and logically lead eventually to the end of slavery in any form, modern democracy (for all) and human rights, including previously unheard of human rights to health care and education which enhance all our human lives. Governments from the 4th Century on would be judged and remembered by the standard of how they treated their subjects – because all human subjects were now seen to be immeasurably valuable.
A Brief Overview of the Development of Modern Human Rights and Democracy Starting From Their 4th Century First Principles

Where did this great and immensely fruitful 4th Century insight into the supreme dignity and value of all human life without exception, which is at the very foundation of our safe, free and democratic civilization, come from? It came from Western Civilization first legalizing Christianity in the 4th Century and then embracing Christianity's religious convictions that every human life (male and female - Genesis 1:27) is created in God's Image and is extremely valuable and precious to a Loving God, and thus that humans must LIVE and be FREE from government coercion so as to seek and find their human fulfillment in this great Truth about humanity's outstanding value. In fact, the very term and concept of "personhood" comes from Christian theology. Human individuals were not called "persons" until after Christian theologians developed their terminology of One God in Three Persons (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit - Parenthood, Childhood, and the Bond of Love which binds them, a Divine "Family" who IS Love in its deepest essence, reflected in loving human families made in God's Image). The Christian message effectively told the government - first in the Roman Empire, then in the later Kingdoms of Western Europe, and in the Eastern Roman or Byzantine Empire which lasted 1000 years after the Fall of Rome - that any government's job was no longer to lord it over the lives of human individuals who served the greater State, but that any government's job was now to provide safety and security for human PERSONS made in the Image of the One God in Three Persons, so that they may be free to seek and find their human fulfillment and a meaningful life as their Loving Creator desires for them. Human individuals had lives that were cheap, and the government could use human lives to serve the greater State, or take or enslave human lives, at will. But human PERSONS made in the Image of the One God in Three Persons had HUMAN RIGHTS rooted in God's Love for them, starting with the right to Life which is why murderous entertainment and parental abortion and infanticide were almost immediately outlawed (and remained outlawed until very recently); and human persons had the right to be FREE from religious coercion, free to seek and hopefully find their human fulfillment in this wonderful Truth about their supreme human value which no other religion taught. From this point on, instead of the political State being the highest authority and using individual humans however it wanted, all States would be held accountable to a Truth higher than any State which had revealed in the Bible that slaves and their masters, political rulers and their subjects, were all EQUAL, and EQUALLY PRECIOUS, before God who made them all in love – and therefore slave owners and those who govern were now accountable before God to treat their slaves and subjects accordingly (e.g. Ephesians 6:9). The Bible further testifies that neither nationality/ethnicity, social class nor status, nor gender make any difference to a human person's exceptional value before God (e.g. Galatians 3:28). Thus Christians, who invented hospitals, typically provided health care and education to all (Christian or not) wherever they spread as missionaries, as a service of love appropriate to the great value and dignity of all human beings without exception, and later Christian governments would start to take this function on themselves since governments now served the people instead of the people serving the State (and now we take these things for granted having forgotten where they came from).

Old habits die hard. The new Christian ideal Pro-Life values took many centuries to really penetrate into Western Civilization's societal mindset. Only gradually did some of these Christian values overcome the long established pre-Christian norms so as to eventually yield more of their full logical fruit, like the end of slavery as an institution and equal opportunities for equally capable women. Indeed this process still continues. Yet the foundations for these were laid in the 4th Century and the long but natural and logical process towards the human rights and equal democratic freedoms we have today began in earnest right away: human life was no longer considered cheap but valuable, and protected by new laws; extremely
common female infanticide was almost immediately banned, by 318 AD, 5 years after the 313 legalization of Christianity. [I digress here to note it is near the height of absurdity to claim that legal abortion is about "women's rights," since it has in fact effectively brought back the long-banned common female infanticide in the new form of sex-selective abortions of females just for being female, which in many locations has worryingly skewed nature's balance of nearly 50-50 female to male births; the supreme height of absurdity is to claim that legal abortion is somehow a "human right," since it kills a human life in violation of the very first human right, the right to live, on which all other human rights historically and logically depend. Human rights were unheard of before ancient abortion and infanticide were banned]; slavery and its worst abuses were also reduced and eventually slavery ended in any form in Western Civilization (human trafficking still acceptable in other cultures), notably by dedicated Christians like William Wilberforce in Britain insisting the laws reflect those Biblical Christian values that made slaves equal to their owners before God, meaning that it was ultimately entirely inappropriate for any human being to say they "owned" another; the lingering after-effects of slavery in the U.S.A. were also successfully combated by Christians like the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. insisting on Christian values being put into practice at the societal level.

The specifically Christian British Empire, the largest and most advanced Empire the world ever knew, starting with the 1215 Magna Carta which limited the monarch's power from its pre-Christian norms, very gradually and by many small stages developed modern democracy in an entirely Christian context and then spread its (Christian-based) ideals all over the globe through colonization, including the colonization of America, "land of the free." The Parliament in London gradually gave more and more say in government to gradually more and more of the people, entirely in a Christian cultural context and in practical development of the Christian belief in the immense and equal value of all human persons: that regardless of social strata a king and a peasant were EQUAL before God, and equally loved by God. The various colonizations from Christian Europe, for all their sad failures and lack of respect for some indigenous cultures, still also imported these Christian values of human rights and freedoms worldwide, these taking root to greater or lesser degree in the colonies. Thus it is that Biblical and Christian "Pro-Life" religious values are the historical foundation of all International Law, including all Human Rights. The countries which are today described by the UN as the most notorious violators of human rights are precisely the most markedly non-Christian countries, precisely because these governments do not share the Christian religious and moral conviction about the immense value and worth of all human life without exception. Not sharing this foundation, rooted in specifically Christian religious conviction, makes democratic freedoms and human rights a very foreign concept to the governments of these countries. And worst of all, history shows, are countries with a Christian background whose governments specifically rejected their Christian heritage: they eventually revert to totalitarian states just like the totalitarian states before Christianity which typically threatened the lives and freedom of their own citizens. The two worst genocides in history were perpetrated by such governments, who actively rejected and persecuted their countries' Christian heritage – Stalin's Soviet forced starvation of 7 million of my fellow Ukrainians in 1932-33 just as the occultist Hitler's Nazi Holocaust of 6 million Jews was starting (Hitler's ideal "Aryan Race" comes from occultic mythology; thousands of Catholic priests and others who stood against Hitler's rounding up of Jews as sub-human and no longer protected by the government were sent to the death camps as well). All totalitarian states have in common the rejection of the specifically Christian beliefs about the supreme value and dignity of all human lives without exception.
New or Proposed Law and Policy Changes Attack and Erode the Very Foundation of Our Modern Democracies

Because of this history of the development of our modern democracies, it is ridiculous to claim, as CPSO does, that religious and moral beliefs are merely private and have no place in public policy or in doctor's offices – specifically Christian religious beliefs, including the Pro-Life Principle, are NOT MERELY PRIVATE BELIEFS BUT ARE THE PUBLIC FOUNDATION OF ALL HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRATIC FREEDOMS. They are not incidental to them, they are logically essential to them, and where they are lost, human rights and democracy are logically (if gradually) lost, as in Germany and the Soviet Union. The Pro-Life Principle historically made democracy possible in the first place, as demonstrated above, and it is the very best long-term guarantee of democracy, simply because it is only the Pro-Life principle that says every human life without exception MATTERS such that every human life must be allowed to LIVE and must be FREE from coercion in living that life.” Those who are ignorant of history are destined to repeat its mistakes.” The legalization of abortion in many countries since the late 1960s and early 1970s ignorantly reversed the banning of abortion and infanticide by 318 AD which had made all subsequent development of human rights and democracy possible because it was the first legal recognition of the immense and equal value of all human lives without exception. Legalizing abortion after this long history of the development of our modern human rights and freedoms flowing logically from abortion being banned is LOGICALLY TANTAMOUNT TO OUR GOVERNMENTS NO LONGER RECOGNIZING IN ANYONE AN INHERENT HUMAN RIGHT TO LIVE, JUST LIKE IN ANY TOTALITARIAN STATE. If you and I could have been legally killed when we were of fetal age, this must logically mean our government no longer recognizes in either you or I any INHERENT right to live just for being human and for being alive. Others than ourselves decide if we humans live or die: Our mothers before we were born merely allowed us to live (lucky us), and after we were born our government decided to protect our lives with laws. But note many other governments did not and do not protect all human lives after birth, particularly totalitarian states. But democracy only ever developed in the "Pro-Life" context that taught that all human life without exception was precious regardless of any State’s laws; governments that violated the "Pro-Life" principle by treating their citizens badly since the 4th Century were judged against this principle of supreme human value, higher than any particular State. By abandoning the Pro-Life principle our democracies have already taken the first big step towards becoming totalitarian states such as were common before the Pro-Life principle entered Western Civilization in the 4th Century, and now it is just by simple logic starting from that abandonment decades ago that current new and proposed law and policy changes will take us even closer to exhibiting characteristics of a totalitarian state. RIGHT NOW in Ontario, doctors are SCARED that they can lose their jobs because they value human life like doctors as healers traditionally have – this is not something that is supposed to happen in a democracy! Recent developments like coercing doctors to participate in killing human lives against their will (even by "effective referral" to someone willing to kill), OR ELSE LOSE YOUR LICENCE AND JOB AS A DOCTOR, as the CPSO's draft policy will make happen in Ontario, strikes at the very heart of not only the doctor's personal democratic freedoms but strikes at the very foundation of democracy itself.

What Does the Science of Biology Say About Human Life and How Does That Properly Inform or Affect Law and Policy?
Usually “Pro-Choice” advocates will try to downplay “Pro-Life” objections by claiming that abortion is not the same as killing human lives, and therefore not morally objectionable, because they claim the human fetus is somehow not really or not fully human, or somehow not yet a human person but only a “potential” human person. But on what hard science, and on what philosophy of personhood, are these claims based? It is good to here clarify some things which uninformed and unclear thinkers have used past and present to justify not protecting human life before birth as after. Abortion was originally legalized back when scientific, medical knowledge about the full human life-cycle was much more murky than it is today. I still remember pro-abortionists calling the human fetus a “tissue blob” that was merely part of the mother’s body in such a way that implied “if we knew for certain the fetus was human, we would want to protect it, but we think it’s just a tissue blob and therefore it’s OK to remove it.” Abortion was presented as allowable in the “grey area” of being “unsure” about the true and full humanity of the fetus. It is important to notice that this argument, which helped abortion be made legal in the first place, is never used by pro-abortionists anymore, because hard biological, medical science makes it completely untenable. There are no more shades of grey about the human life-cycle but rich scientific data including full colour photographs and video from micro-cameras that can go inside the human body. Pregnant mothers who want their babies can now be shown rich details of how the growing new human life develops and interacts with his or her maternal environment at every stage of growth in the womb. According to biological science “the first stage in a unique organism’s development” is the zygote (fertilized egg). The zygote has absolutely unique human DNA distinct from the mother’s and therefore constitutes a separate living biological organism (a living human organism: not bovine, not feline nor anything but human!). This new human life (exactly the same as YOUR human life) as it grows progresses through life-cycle stages such as embryo; fetus (Latin for “little one”); neonate (“newborn”); baby; toddler; child; adolescent; adult; senior adult. From zygote to senior adult it is (and YOU are) the very same unique living human biological organism with absolutely unique human DNA: The zygote and embryo (and YOU when you were a zygote and embryo) are as much a unique human life as the toddler, just younger – and just as dependent upon their mother to live. Even children are likely to die without their parents (or any other human adults) taking care of them, and certainly all the human life-cycle stages from toddler down to the original human zygote are totally dependent upon their parents, particularly their mother, to stay alive. Wikipedia’s “Fetal Viability” article indicates human fetuses (from Latin: “little ones”) born about 3 months early or 26 weeks after their biological human life began as a zygote have a 90% chance of surviving and being healthy outside of their mother’s womb (despite this, older, full term babies before their birth can still be legally killed by abortion in Canada, the U.S. and other countries). Under 26 weeks gestational age premature births either do not survive or are likely to have health problems. But although before this age the unique new human life is dependent upon its mother to survive, it is still so distinct a human life from his or her mother that (science now knows) the baby does not even share blood with the mother; the baby can even have a blood type incompatible with the mother’s blood type! Nutrients pass between the mother’s blood to the baby’s separate (and possibly incompatible) blood through a membrane by the process of osmosis to feed the baby.

Hippocrates, who founded medicine and the doctor’s “Hippocratic Oath” to “do no harm,” apparently allowed a few of the many ancient abortion methods, and a few Christian theologians, while one cannot say they approved of abortion, were unsure just how strongly they should oppose it: But this limited openness to abortion was based on ignorance due to the limitations of the primitive science of their day which could not so clearly tell that a tiny mass of cells was actually a distinct growing human life (of course they knew nothing of DNA, and even knew nothing of cells!), and it is clear that had they known what biological science knows today about the distinct and unique human life growing throughout its life-cycle from conception to adulthood they would have more thoroughly opposed abortion, since human life
was their key value. For example, for a long time it was held that human life began not at conception but at "the quickening," which was when the mother first felt the presence of her baby in her womb. Modern science now knows there is absolutely nothing of biological significance in the development of the baby at "the quickening;" this event merely shows the baby, who has been swimming in his or her mother's womb for some time, is finally big enough for mother to distinctly feel it. When the results of an abortion (or a natural miscarriage) had a remotely human shape, even those uncertain ones wrote things like "who can doubt that the abortion is human?" (sadly, most abortions occur well after the unborn baby has arms and legs etc., but unlike in ancient times, today's professional abortionists, who actually have to put back together the pieces of a baby torn apart by a common vacuum suction abortion to make sure no pieces are left in the mother which might go septic and poison the mother, whisk away the human corpse so that the testimony of the baby's humanness is left unseen by those who choose to kill their babies).

Since some unclear thinkers use the argument that a fetal age baby can be aborted because it is not "independent" of his or her mother yet, it is important to note again that the baby for years after its birth is also just as absolutely dependent upon his or her mother (or other human adult) to live. This is why several "Pro-Choice" thinkers have advocated for allowing infanticide, sometimes calling infanticide "after-birth abortion." Some Pro-Choice philosophers even argue that parents should be able to kill their children until age 7, as "the age of reason." These philosophers are not crackpots: they are using their highly trained minds consistently with the Pro-Choice logic that a human life that is not fully developed or cannot yet live on its own does not have a right to live and thus can rightly be terminated by his or her parents. The logic of calling infanticide "after-birth abortion" and advocating for it to be legal to kill babies before or after birth is also entirely consistent with the ancient history of the "Pro-Choice" philosophy which in ancient times little distinguished between abortion and infanticide which both were expressions of the same "Pro-Choice" principle of the "right" of parents to get rid of any unwanted new human life they had conceived. Though there were many ancient forms of abortion, including chemical "potions" (oral abortifacients) and tying things tightly against the stomach until the growing baby dies and is expelled from the mother's body, simple infanticide, just killing the baby or abandoning him or her (most often her) to die after birth, was often preferred as the then-most-effective and safest (for the mother) method of exercising one's "right to choose" to be a parent or not.

Most of us would not be comfortable taking Pro-Choice philosophy to its full and consistent logical conclusions, which not only include at least a certain logical openness to infanticide and even killing older children who are also "not yet developed and independent," but which of necessity include saying that NONE OF US have an inherent right to live, since all of us could have been killed perfectly legally when we were younger, before our births. Thus I suggest that the whole Pro-Choice philosophy is untenable in a democratic context which says each human is so valuable he or she properly has a say in his or her own government. According to the Pro-Life principle, when a particular human life becomes non-viable and dies at any stage of the human life-cycle before or after birth, baby to adult, it is a human tragedy and loss, including the about 25% of pregnancies which for a variety of reasons do not progress past the first trimester. These natural, "spontaneous abortions" in no way justify aborting during the first trimester "since they might not live anyway." Fully 75% of pregnancies are viable human lives after the first trimester to full term. If you needed an operation to stay alive and there was a 75% chance that you would survive the operation, you would undergo the operation, wouldn't you? In the case of first-trimester abortion there is a 75% chance the baby will live a healthy life if he or she doesn't undergo the operation! If there was a 75% chance that there were live human beings still in the burning building, the firefighters would be obligated to attempt to rescue them, and they would not be justified in saying "we won't attempt a rescue because there is a 25% chance there is no still-viable human life in the building."
Our whole civilization since the 4th Century is based on the belief that human life is so valuable and precious wherever it might be we will go to exceedingly great lengths to save it. Until now.

The Pro-Life principle so foundational to our democracies is simply enough applied even to difficult medical decisions in a way which maintains the value and dignity of all human life. In the exceedingly rare case where a complication in the pregnancy puts the mother's health in serious danger, it will be a human tragedy if either the mother or the baby or both die. If doctors are in the very rare situation of having to make a decision to save one of the two human lives or the other but cannot save both, whichever one dies will be a tragedy, because human life is precious. Even in these cases, some Pro-Life surgeons argue there is no such thing as a "medically necessary abortion," because a medical procedure that saves the mother's life which the baby will not survive (as a side-effect) still does not need to target the baby for death as an abortion does. Much less are some other suggested "justifications" for abortion in extreme cases reasonable given the full humanity of the unborn which biological and medical science confirms. Pregnancies resulting from rape are extremely rare just because a woman can only conceive about 2 days of her monthly cycle, and it is facilitated by physiological factors involved in normal love-making but not present in violent rape. In the regrettable case of a very rare pregnancy due to rape, there is still no reasonable justification for allowing abortion, however: would you kill a toddler whose father was a rapist? Of course not! So why would you kill a fetal age baby? They are the same unique human life whatever their age. I have met people who were conceived in rape, and read the stories of several more. I defy anyone to look these people in the eye and tell them they deserved the death penalty for their father's rape. If we value human life at all, the circumstances of one's conception where one began one's human life should make no difference. Worst of all is the proposed "justification" of the abortion of fetal age babies who are judged to be handicapped in some way (according to medical procedures which do not always turn out to be accurate). Down's Syndrome apparently is easy to diagnose, and I know a child with Down's whose mother was repeatedly pestered to abort. This increasingly common occurrence of pestering to abort the handicapped sends the message loud and clear to the handicapped that our society thinks it's better to be dead than handicapped; that handicapped lives are not worth living. But Down's children can often read and do many things despite their limitations; there are even some music bands with Down's such as Finnish punk band PKN. Do you want to look them in the eye (after they sign their autograph on your concert ticket) and tell them you think fetal age babies just like them should be aborted? Targeting the handicapped for abortion comes from the same values set that was actively pursued in Nazi Germany, which rounded them up to be killed. Our whole society became as humane as it is because all human lives were recognized to have the same tremendous value, despite the limitations of disabilities.

For certain there is no scientifically accurate way to avoid saying that abortion kills a unique human life. Let us all be very clear about that. And there is no biologically compelling reason to protect human life by law after birth but not before. Scientifically speaking birth is only a change of location for the new biological human life (or "baby") with absolutely unique human DNA. A 9-months gestation unborn fetus is actually more developed and more biologically viable than a 3 months-prematurely-born baby. It is ultimately completely arbitrary to protect or not protect a human life on the basis of whether it is yet born or not. Technically the science itself is value-neutral: science merely confirms that at every stage of the human life-cycle from zygote to senior adult an individual specimen of the human species is the same distinct human life with absolutely unique DNA. That leaves it up to us to decide: is human life valuable, or is it not? If human life is valuable, then it makes most sense to protect it by law whatever its age, embryo or elderly, as has always been normal for democratic states which are founded on the belief that every human lives matters which is why it is appropriate for everyone to have a say in how they are
governed. If human life is not valuable, or not necessarily valuable, then there is no more reason to protect it by law after birth than before birth. If not all human lives are considered inherently valuable, just for being human lives, then it would naturally fall to the government that makes the laws just which human lives are protected by law and which are not, just like in any totalitarian state which decides which human lives it will protect, and which it will imprison or kill for the sake of the greater State (for example, at the 1989 Tiananmen Square Massacre, the Chinese Government decided that students protesting for democracy no longer had a right to live that the State would protect, and took their human lives for the sake of the greater State. Such can only be expected where the Pro-Life principle is not the foundation of the political system as it was in all our modern democracies but is no more since the legalization of abortion).

A physician who on January 24, 2015 contributed to the CPSO’s Discussion Forum over the new draft policy to force doctors to refer for abortions (etc.) or lose their physician’s licences, who has the medical expertise and experience that I do not, essentially confirms my analysis in these words:

"My clinical experience in Canada goes back to the days when abortion was illegal. I have never been able to identify a natural dividing line that might (even in concept) distinguish a fertilized human egg (which by standard scientific criteria is unequivocally human) from either a newborn baby or a very elderly adult, both of which also are human by the very same criteria. Of course there are obvious differences, but the process of human development and senescence seems to me to be a continuum, with no biologically significant break until death. Any dividing line that we try to make between a “person” and a “pre-person” or a “non-person” will be quite arbitrary, a line that has shifted in the past and will continue to shift with further advances in fetal care and palliative medicine.

In Canada, full-term abortion is not illegal. With no biologically significant way to distinguish between a living full-term fetus and a living newborn baby, is there any possibility that we might soon be required to include the killing of unwanted newborns as a part of our “patient care”? Killing newborns by exposure has a long history, and in certain countries (including Canada) it is still being practiced unofficially. When I first began my practice, I never would have believed that any Canadian physician might come to accept the killing of either a full-term fetus or a mentally-deficient adult as anything other than murder, but we certainly seem to be heading in that direction.

Since biological science yields no justification to protect human life after birth but not before, often the language of “personhood” is misused such that only those particular human lives that the government’s laws define as human “persons” are considered “fully human” and protected: if you are unquestionably human and alive (like Jews and fetuses) but the government does not define you as a “person,” then you can be written off as somehow “sub-human” and killed with impunity. Jewish humans in Nazi Germany were denied the legal personhood they previously had and so they were killed. Young, not-yet-born humans are now denied the legal personhood they previous had in Canada, the U.S.A., and many other countries, and so they are killed."
But the term and concept of "personhood" itself originates directly from the Christian theology of the supreme value of human persons made in the Image of the One God in Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and it refers to ALL human lives without exception who the Bible says were "knit" by their Loving Creator God in their mother's wombs. The Christian creators of the term "person" intended it to refer to ALL of God's human creations made in God's Image - and only this logically grounds human rights and democracy and only this guarantees that any form of political totalitarianism that denies human personhood to any group of biological human lives must be considered unacceptable.

So when the Government of Canada or the U.S.A. says a biological human life with unique human DNA before he/she is actually born is not a human person under the law, but somehow sub-human and no longer protected by the government as before, it means exactly the same thing as when the Government of Germany said Jewish human lives were somehow sub-human and no longer protected by the German Government as before. The Pro-life principle and human rights and freedoms are historically, logically and integrally linked: if you threaten one you threaten the other. History bears this out.

Beyond this, I note that the pro-abortionist "tissue blob" argument used when abortion was legalized, implied that "if we were absolutely sure the fetus was human life, of course we would want to protect it," making it seem like pro-abortionists at least still valued human life, in common ground with Pro-Lifers. It is very disturbing that the pro-abortionist side apparently showed their true colours, that they never really cared about the value of human life at all but only about the personal convenience of abortion, because as ever-more-rich biological science about the human life-cycle made it excessively clear that a unique separate human life distinct from the mother was being killed in abortions, they did not stop abortion to preserve the value of human life now that they could be sure the fetus was a human life. Instead they just looked for a new excuse to justify their convenient abortions. Thus they developed the "Pro-Choice" philosophy, apparently because the word "choice" made it sound like it had to do with freedom. But, as I noted at the beginning, those who are ignorant of history are destined to repeat its mistakes. In their great ignorance of history they did not realize that the "Pro-Choice" philosophy they adopted is not new at all but ancient, and is a philosophy very contrary to human freedom. The "Pro-Choice" right of parents to raise or kill their children is what Western Civilization had back in the days when human rights and freedoms were unheard of, specifically BECAUSE "Pro-Choice" philosophy DENIES any INHERENT human right to live, just for being human and being alive, and thus "Pro-Choice" philosophy is specifically CONTRARY to democracy which historically and logically DEPENDS on every human life without exception being regarded as SUPREMELY and EQUALLY valuable and precious, which is why ALL humans SHOULD be allowed to live and not be killed with government approval, and why ALL humans SHOULD have a free say in how they are governed.

So to recap: biological science provides no justification for the legal protection of human life after but not before birth because scientifically, biologically speaking a human life is every bit as alive, human, and uniquely human (with absolutely unique DNA) when it is of embryonic age, fetal age, child age or adult age. And there is no solid basis for denying the most basic human right, the right to live, by claiming that after birth babies are persons and before birth somehow babies are not persons, especially when the very word and concept of personhood itself comes from Christian theology and from its beginning the meaning of the concept of personhood included precisely those not-yet-born humans (and just-born humans) who were so often killed before the 4th Century because there were no human rights at all. Back when there were no human rights or modern democratic freedoms, back when "Pro-Choice" philosophy was the norm, it was also the norm for governments to have the power of life and death over their citizens,
and it was normal for governments to tell their citizens what to believe. “Pro-Choice” philosophy was of course perfectly consistent with brutal ancient totalitarian governments like the pagan Roman Empire because both believe human life is not inherently precious, and can be killed when convenient.

The Bottom Line: Human Life Is *Inherently* Valuable and Precious or it Isn’t. What Logically Follows from Each Position?

The bottom line is: Either human life is inherently valuable and precious wherever it exists, or it isn’t. When you say it IS, then human rights and democracy naturally and logically flow from this Pro-Life principle: every human life has a right to live and seek human fulfilment and every human life matters, which is why all humans should have a say in how they are governed, and government’s purpose is to provide safety and security for supremely valuable humans. But as soon as you say that human life wherever it exists is NOT necessarily valuable, as soon as you say that having human life itself is NOT enough to compel any government to protect that human life but there are exceptions to which human lives merit government protection — any exceptions — then there is no potential end to how the “exceptions” to protected human life may be defined by future governments, and because you have denied the logical First Principle underlying all human rights and democracy, you already have the foundation for totalitarian states where human lives serve the greater State instead of government serving human lives. Most worryingly of all, denying the INHERENT value of all human life without exception means the STATE makes the laws that define which human lives are worth protecting and which are not, since States are no longer held accountable to a higher principle of the supreme and equal value of every human life without exception which governments must serve – the principle which historically and logically grounded the development of our current democracies.

The practical result of this is that just being human and alive is no longer enough to guarantee government protection of your life. Being human and alive but Jewish or Ukrainian meant your government could kill you with impunity in the two biggest genocides of history, in 1930s Germany and the Soviet Union, because in the absence of a recognized principle of the inherent value of ALL human life, the government defines the exceptions. Being human and alive but still young and still located in your mother's womb are the new exceptions defined today here in Canada and other countries. But even one exception always brings others. In Germany being handicapped meant you didn’t have a right to live and the Nazis targeted you for the death camps along with the Jews (as more “genetic deadwood”); today in Canada being possibly handicapped (according to prenatal tests which are not always accurate) and still located in the womb means doctors actively target you for abortion and repeatedly pester mothers to abort. In both cases the same underlying value is that handicapped human lives are not worth living. In keeping with this (Nazi) value, assisted suicide and euthanasia, killing the old and/or the sick, are now legal in some countries (and Canada has foolishly just legalized it as I was writing this, PROVING MY POINT THAT ONE EXCEPTION TO PROTECTED HUMAN LIFE LEADS TO OTHERS) so that now, if you become handicapped, before you have a chance to adjust to your new reality and eventually overcome the challenges of your handicap and live a meaningful life despite it, in your initial depression you can now choose to have a doctor kill you, or, as also happens where assisted suicide/euthanasia is already legal, a doctor may choose to euthanize you without your consent, since, after all, according to the above principle shared by Nazis and doctors who pester women to abort handicapped children, "handicapped human lives are not worth living." Where this value logically goes
in the long run is that taking care of the handicapped becomes seen more as a burden on society instead of seen as an expression of the supreme value and dignity of every human being regardless of nationality, class, gender, or handicap. In this philosophical environment what started as an "option" for doctor-assisted suicide eventually will logically become an obligation to euthanize so as not to put burdens on the healthy. Of course starting with the same principle the Nazis had, that handicapped human lives are not worth living, eventually (in the long run) leads to the Nazi solution of killing the handicapped (and saving all that money it takes to accommodate them). We are already aggressively targeting the handicapped in the womb. Money is once again worth more than human life, as before the 4th Century. This is just one example of how making one exception to which human lives are protected logically leads to more. If we value our human rights and democracy at all, if we want to make sure our grandchildren are raised in a democracy, we cannot afford to continue making ANY exceptions to the INHERENT value and worth and dignity of ALL human life.

The Law and Policy Changes since the Legalization of Abortion (Which Effectively Declared Unborn Human Lives "Less than Human" and Removed the Legal Protection Unborn Human Lives Previously Had, Logically Ending Western Civilization's Belief in the Inherent Value of All Human Life since the 4th Century) Follow the Same Pattern as the Early Stages of the Gradual Loss of Democracy in Germany after it Similarly Abandoned the 4th Century "Pro-Life" Principle by Declaring Jews Were "Less than Human" and Removed the Legal Protection Jewish Human Lives Had Previously

Where this logical progression of one exception leading to others comes perilously pertinent to the current discussion about doctors' freedom to refuse to participate (even by referral) in human life-ending abortions is as follows: When a government, abandoning the Pro-Life principle which grounded Western Civilization since the 4th Century, now defines that some human lives are no longer protected by law, as in Nazi Germany, some people, who still believe in democracy and the value of every human life without exception which undergirds it, will be brave enough to stand up and oppose the government and its anti-human laws, protesting in defense of those humans whose right to live has been "legally defined away." If the government is serious about denying protection to ALL human lives for whatever reason, it is a very simple matter for such a government to legally define those protesters who defend all human lives as somehow seditious against the government and arrest or imprison them or otherwise curb the free speech of their protest with sanctions (such as losing their jobs and livelihood) intended to silence their protests. If, despite these measures, they should persist in protesting the legal de-humanization of Jews or whichever humans, declaring their belief in the extreme value of ALL human life and its right to live, which is the first of all human rights, any government which already denies the right to human life to some can always take away the right to live of protestors against anti-human laws. It is a mark of a totalitarian state to arrest, imprison, or otherwise sanction those who stand up for those human lives the state has devalued, and, at the extreme, devalue the protestors' human lives as well (after all, they already deny any INHERENT human right to live. It is most convenient for totalitarian states to deny the right to live also to those who protest such policies). Nazi Germany used all kinds of sanctions and arrests and imprisonments early on to convince those who opposed their first
gradually restricting Jewish freedoms and later entirely de-valuing Jewish human lives, to be silent. Most good people in Germany were bullied by these tactics into not expressing the esteem they had for all human life. Those brave enough to still stand up anyway eventually had their human right to live taken away by the government also, and thousands of Catholic priests and others who defended human life were sent to the death camps as well.

While of course our current situation in Canada is not yet near so extreme, there are already many disturbing parallels. People can be and have been jailed in Canada for PEACEFULLY protesting the taking of human lives by abortion, and now doctors who refuse to be party to the taking of human lives are about to be forced to or they will lose their jobs and livelihood. Just like Nazi Germany in its early stages: "shut up about the value of all human lives or lose your position." Indeed, those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat its mistakes. People who disagree with the recent legal "defining-away" of the human rights prenatal babies had since Canada was founded (and since the 4th Century), who peacefully protest this devaluing of human rights near an abortion clinic, can be jailed. I will say that again in case you missed the significance of this. YOU CAN ALREADY BE ARRESTED AND JAILED IN CANADA (and the U.S.A. etc.) FOR PEACEFULLY EXPRESSING YOUR BELIEF IN THE VALUE OF ALL HUMAN LIFE WITHOUT EXCEPTION WHICH IS THE FOUNDATIONAL VALUE OF ALL HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRATIC FREEDOMS WHICH DEVELOPED IN WESTERN CIVILIZATION SINCE THE 4TH CENTURY. Just think about that! It’s already a crime in Canada to express belief that all human life is valuable and shouldn’t be killed. That fact alone ideally should make any thinking human frightened. What happened to free speech? This is not the legitimate censoring of hate speech for any group of humans, but quite the opposite. You can be arrested and imprisoned in Canada for hating no-one and expressing belief in the exceptional value of ALL human life! Shouldn’t this only happen in a totalitarian state? But oh, I forgot – by recently legalizing abortion after over 1600 years of it being banned in Western Christian Civilization, Canada already adopted the view shared by every totalitarian state, that NOT every human life is equally valuable and precious. It always takes time for new ideas to show their full logical effects in society. I guess it has been enough decades now that we should expect signs of the erosion of democracy in Canada like this: that you can be arrested for your belief in the pro-life principle which historically and logically grounds our democracy. And we should expect such signs to continue, and they have. The brand new sign is that now the CPSO has drafted a policy which will force doctors who refuse to be party to the taking of human lives to lose their jobs and livelihood if they do not facilitate killing at least by ensuring that the young human lives whose long former protection has been taken away get delivered to other doctors who are willing and ready to kill them.

"Ensuring" their patients' "access to abortion" against their own conscience almost means driving them to the door of an open abortion clinic: the doctor, against his will, will be forced to "make sure" their patient gets to kill their baby. To use the terms of the CPSO's new draft policy itself: CPSO insists morally-objecting doctors MUST at least ENSURE patient access to abortion etc. through an EFFECTIVE REFERRAL "to a non-objecting, available, and accessible physician or other health-care provider." This is closely parallel to the Nazi government telling a German career soldier who thought his job was to protect his country that if he isn’t willing to kill Jews himself he MUST at least ENSURE the Jews get delivered to the Death Camps where a "a non-objecting, available, and accessible" soldier will do the killing he is unwilling to do, OR ELSE HE WILL LOSE HIS JOB. This is tantamount to a doctor's "forced accessory to murder" AGAINST HIS WILL which has no place in any democracy and is only to be expected from a totalitarian state.
As I said at the start: It is well said that those who do not learn the lessons of history are destined to repeat its mistakes. As an educator I have taught the Nazi Holocaust through memoirs of surviving Jews. What is striking about the loss of democracy and human rights in Germany is how gradual it was, and how most good people who opposed the gradual changes kept silent for fear of repercussions, always thinking that it couldn’t go much farther, things couldn’t get much worse (though they kept getting worse). Also striking is that there was no military coup that finally ended democracy in Germany: though not without political maneuvering (and no democracy is free of this), it was through a democratic process that Hitler was first appointed Chancellor by the elected President, later became the legitimately elected President, and was finally VOTED emergency powers to deal with the Communist threat which finally ended democracy in Germany (at the final vote, Hitler’s thugs prevented some from entering who they knew would vote against him; but by this time he was already the legitimately democratically elected President of Germany!).

In a sense the German people got what they asked for, since they democratically elected a government which manifestly did not value all human lives as equally valuable and precious, therefore they democratically voted in a government that did not respect the foundational, "pro-life" principle historically and logically underlying all human rights and democracy. No wonder they lost democracy in the long run! (Politicians take note: voters would be foolish to similarly vote in a government that manifestly does not respect the principles human rights and democracy are founded on, so construct your platform accordingly if you want informed voters who love democracy and human rights to vote for you). The fortunate thing is that in our case I doubt there is a "Phantom Menace" lurking in the shadows actively manipulating things towards the end of democracy in Canada (though who knows? Similar things have happened not only in Star Wars but in real history, such as the Roman Republic to the dictatorship of Caesar, democratic to totalitarian Germany, even through the established government without any military fight. We cannot reasonably assume this cannot happen here. We most likely cannot lose democracy tomorrow – but we CAN lose it). But in the probable absence of conspiracy, in that case it is pure ignorance of the history of the principles underlying democracy which have led to the disturbing parallels with totalitarian states we are already seeing in Canada (and other nations which legalized abortion after over 1600 years banned). This ignorance that is seriously eroding the foundations of our democracy and human rights must be replaced with knowledge (reading this article/my letter to the CPSO is a good start; my facts are easily enough verified), for the long-term safety of our democracy. Even in the probable lack of a single manipulative conspirator, history warns us that if we let our foundations be eroded long enough, there are always political opportunists around to take advantage of the situation and at the right moment take control. We must not let our foundations erode any further than they already have. Educating the ignorance which got us where we are is key. I have been either a student or an instructor/professor my whole adult life: education is my life, and I hereby dedicate that life to education that helps ensure the long-term maintenance of democracy here in Canada and around the world.

For further education here I note that is well said that “the price of freedom is eternal vigilance.” We have failed to be vigilant and our democracies have already gone much further than most people realize in following the example of the Nazi government in its de-valuing and desecration of human life. The Nazi Death Camps did not simply kill all the Jewish human lives they murdered – at the Nuremberg Trials it came out that they experimented with using the bodies of the Jews they killed to make products to be sold or given to the people (without telling them the source, of course!). The Nazis made products like “leather” bags, lampshades and “canvas” for painting all made out of Jewish human skin, as well as other products. Having already followed the Nazis’ example in abandoning the Pro-Life principle
undergirding all human rights and democracy by “excepting” some human lives from legal protection, by legally defining away the previous right to live of unborn human lives; having already followed the Nazis’ example in killing such de-valued human lives which are considered “unwanted;” having already followed the Nazis’ example in sanctioning those who stand up for the devalued human lives by arresting peaceful Pro-Life protestors and now threatening Pro-Life doctors’ jobs; and having already followed the Nazis’ example by making our doctors into killers instead of healers who swear an oath to “do no harm;” our society has now also followed the Nazis’ example in experimenting with the bodies of the devalued humans killed to make products to be sold or given to the Canadian (and American, etc.) people. These products are mostly health and beauty products, and the American company Senomyx makes flavour enhancers for foods using aborted human cell lines in their product development procedures. Starbucks uses products so developed. Aborted human cell lines are also now in many of the common vaccines the American and Canadian governments buy for their citizens — without anyone having ever democratically asked the PEOPLE if they wanted the government to approve such “consumer cannibalism” of making vaccines and other products from human babies killed by abortion.

“Consumer Cannibalism” – Like the Nazis made “Leather” Bags and Other Products from Killed Jewish Human Bodies, Aborted Human “Fetal Cell Lines” Are Living Human Cells Grown from the Killed Baby’s Still-living Cells (With the Killed Baby’s Unique DNA) and Used to Host a “Live Vaccine” Instead of Growing into a Bigger Baby (The Baby’s Human DNA Clings to the Live Viral Vaccine Despite All Attempts to Remove it after Growing the Vaccine, and a Growing Number of Studies Link Aborted- Human-Cell-Line Vaccines with Increased Cases of Autism – an Unnecessary Health Risk since Effective Vaccines Can and Used to Be Made Morally from Animal Cells Which Do Not Pose this Health Risk)

The term “cell line” means the living baby cells, growing by multiplication to make the baby bigger and bigger, while they are still living are taken out of the just-aborted baby (rushed from the abortion clinic to the science lab that paid for it) and kept alive and kept growing by multiplication in a lab, and the ever-greater number of cells, instead of being part of a bigger baby, are infected with a virus which feeds and multiplies on the multiplying human baby cells until there are enough to make thousands of doses of a “live vaccine”. Science cannot create life, it can only manipulate life which already exists. So whose human life is used to make the vaccine? The aborted baby’s, given an unnatural extension as a living, growing cell line used to make live vaccines instead of being tissue of a bigger living, growing baby. This is akin to the people (especially in China and other places) who are murdered so their still-living organs can be sold on the black market to those who need organ transplants. Thus it remains very morally objectionable that a baby as an independent human organism is not allowed to live and its living cells are harvested and made to serve other people, just like black market organs. Moreover, occasionally the vaccines need to be replenished. So I understand the manufacturer keeps the original aborted baby cells frozen, and occasionally has to go back to them to grow more. This is akin to Dr. Frankenstein going back to the human meat-locker in his lab to again violate the dead. The original dead baby’s cells will be reused again and again. And, since some in ignorance will downplay the significance of human cell lines, sometimes calling them merely “aborted fetal byproducts,” remember, any of the cells in the aborted fetal cell line are truly the dead baby’s cells by any principle of biology - living human cells with the dead baby’s absolutely unique human DNA, multiplied/grown from the original living cells of the no longer living baby by the same process which made the living baby grow bigger. But instead of growing into a two then four then six-year-old child, the child’s living,
multiplying cells over the years are used and grown (and frozen, and grown again) to make more doses of a live viral vaccine – a repeated violation of a murdered human body. All of this is done for the supposed health benefits of a vaccine – but it is completely unnecessary to use HUMAN cell lines to make an effective vaccine, and the human cell lines actually have a distinct disadvantage. An increasing number of studies have linked the introduction of new human fetal cell line vaccines into the general population with increases in cases of autism, because, in the words of one expert: “unlike animal cell lines’ DNA, human DNA has the potential to insert itself into the developing brain cells of babies and toddlers through a process known as homologous recombination. DNA does not cross species so this is not an issue with animal based vaccines.” Even though the new Pro-Life Sound Choice Pharmaceutical Institute (SCPI) is prepared to make ethical versions of vaccines which are no longer available, and even though there is much demand for such “moral vaccines” among those not ignorant of the reality of “immoral” human fetal line vaccines, SCPI have apparently been blocked from doing so by American agreements with Merck and other companies which make most of the vaccines used in North America and which have chosen to no longer offer moral alternatives (Merck’s Physician Order Number is 800-422-9675, and they will readily admit they use aborted human fetal lines in many of the vaccines they produce).

These highly morally objectionable vaccines are made then bought and advertised by government health agencies, given for free to our children in schools in Canada and the U.S.A., but without informing the public that dead human DNA from babies killed by abortion is in them. This is not a conspiratorial secret, but confirmation that Health Canada/Immunization Canada uses aborted human cell line vaccines is only available in obscure places on their websites. Not only does our government not inform us of something so stomach-turning, and so related to the erosion of modern democracy which came about only in the Pro-Life context of Christian Europe (especially Christian Britain whose Commonwealth of Nations we Canadians belong to), but there appears to be a deliberate policy of deflection of accountability for this. For example, my dear Bride went to Immunization Ottawa in May 2014 and the personnel there pretended not to know anything about aborted human fetal cell lines in vaccines to brush her off, but since my Bride pressed it in lengthy conversation, showing the proof from pamphlets with vaccine manufacturer’s contact information, the employee eventually revealed she knew far more about it than she claimed at first, but attempted to justify the use of human cell vaccines saying “we have to make our decisions for the best for the public.” This appears to mean that people in governmental authority over us and paid ultimately by our taxes are deliberately deceitful with us, perhaps even trained to be deceitful with us, to deflect and dissuade any thoughtful concerns we citizens have about how we are being governed, and to assuage and dissuade any actual government accountability to inform and disclose their anti-human (and thus ultimately anti-democratic) policies to the public or to individual citizens - even on controversial matters like human cell-line vaccines related to the extremely controversial abortion procedure which procures the human cells by killing babies who HAD been protected in the womb since 318 AD. DOES THIS MEAN these people in authority over us treat us like we’re already in a Communist country, where the citizens are just sheep expected to go along with whatever the government decides to do “for the best of the public”, and the government has no obligation to inform us of what decisions they are making “on our behalf”, and they want no challenge to their accountability even on issues relating to highly controversial ethical decisions of human life and death? Even when they are making decisions that cheapen the human lives of all of us? Given how highly controversial abortion is in the first place, for the good reasons I have identified in this letter/article, I suggest IT IS DEMOCRATICALLY IRRESPONSIBLE TO NOT INFORM THE PUBLIC that killed human DNA is in the vaccines, and to not at least give the public a CHOICE of moral, ethical vaccines as those which used to be made but are in many cases no longer available except from other countries like Japan (but the Canadian government refuses to buy ethical vaccines from Japan if asked). But, I must rhetorically ask, why should we expect democratic responsibility from
governments which already turned their back on the Pro-Life principle which historically and logically grounds human rights and democracy? Our government since legalizing abortion already no longer logically admits any INHERENT human right to live, so why should we expect dead, killed human remains to be treated any more respectfully than they were in Nazi Germany which also made products out of those humans it killed? “The price of freedom is eternal vigilance.” We have not been vigilant and WE have allowed things to go this far down the path to totalitarianism. Now we must become educated and stand up for the Pro-Life principles our democracies were nursed in, if we want to be sure our nations will remain democracies long-term.

I am very sad to have to “burst the bubble” of those many innocent minds who (like the average German in World War II) will prefer not to believe some of what is already happening in Canada, the U.S.A. and some other countries, that demonstrates just how much human life has already been desecrated since abortion was legalized after 1600 years banned, from which it logically follows that NONE OF US, who all started our human lives before we were born, have any INHERENT right to live. Abortion clinics tell girls to come back at certain times for a scheduled abortion, because they know they can sell the dead babies of certain gestational age to certain companies for use in making or developing certain products. Human life is literally no longer sacred and precious, but human death is now a big money business – money apparently now being (once again) of more worth than human life. This “consumer cannibalism” is one area where we have outstripped the Nazis in our society’s devaluing of human life, since they only had time to begin the process of desecrating the dead and experimenting with the remains of those human lives they took after legally defining away their human right to live.

The Origin of Religious Freedom in the 4th Century

Returning to the historical roots of democracy, it is important to also note that religious freedom to freely seek and find answers to the most basic questions of life’s existence and purpose, which is therefore the root of all other freedoms, itself is actually originally a CHRISTIAN idea. Against the previous worldwide norm of the government normally telling its citizens and subjects what to believe – still common in markedly non-Christian countries – Christianity insisted on freedom from coercion in matters of belief not only for itself but also for others, since acceptance of Christianity ideally must be a free act of love for God who first loved us (and rooted in the Christian belief that God gave FREE WILL to man as the necessary condition for true LOVE, even though there are natural negative consequences for selfishly using free will to choose against love). Although a few Christian rulers in history non-ideally imposed their “official” religion of Christianity forcefully according to the pre-Christian norm of rule, this was never accepted as proper by Christian authorities. The main violator here was Charlemagne, who had told the pope it was the pope’s job to pray for Christendom, but Charlemagne’s to rule it – though at least even Charlemagne realized his forced Christianization of conquered barbarian tribes was not ideal, and his “Carolingian Renaissance” of learning provided for schools so the next generation of barbarians could be civilized and educated and raised in an adequate Christian context inclining them to accept Christianity freely.

Christianity had only become legal (though promoted) under Emperor Constantine in 313 AD, and paganism remained the official religion of the Roman Senate. Some historians say Constantine, who was not baptized Christian until his deathbed, rather than bringing it merely acknowledged the victory of Christianity which had already converted about half the Roman Empire by his time even though it
had been persecuted for centuries, the recent Empire-wide persecution started by Emperor Diocletian in 303 AD and ending 313 having been the most severe yet (many of the Christian bishops at the First Ecumenical Council in 325 AD, survivors of Diocletian's great persecution, still wore many disfigurements from torture). Christianity had won so many converts despite it being dangerous to be a Christian under pagan Roman persecution because Christians LIVED those values which eventually resulted in modern human rights and democratic freedoms. They valued ALL human lives EQUALLY without exception, even if people (who were used to human life being cheap) didn’t agree with them, made fun of them, or persecuted them. When there was plague, Christians spontaneously cared for the suffering, whether pagan or Christian. "Charity" was unheard of before Christianity: the word comes from Latin “caritas,” translating the New Testament Greek “agape” interpreted as the Divine and unconditional Love of God. Christian charities were open to all, pagan and Christian alike. When Emperor Julian the Apostate temporarily renewed the persecution of Christianity, he planned to copy Christian charities, which had been unheard of in paganism, so that pagans would no longer go to the Christians who had invented charity in response to their Pro-Life belief in the great value and dignity of every human life. Because Christians lived like this, practically showing charitable love that had never been seen before, and then died in the bloody persecutions with courage, forgiving their killers as Jesus had forgiven his, there was a saying, "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church," because for every Christian killed for spectacle in the Roman arenas, three more left the stands because they knew nothing they believed could make them live like this and die like this. Our recently secularized culture has come to TAKE FOR GRANTED so many basic assumptions and principles and institutions that only entered our civilization because Christianity brought it to us, including human value, human rights, equality of all humans, an ideal right to health care and education as proper to human dignity, and including even the religious freedom to freely reject Christianity (instead of the government deciding what citizens may or may not believe, as was normal before Christianity, and still normal in totalitarian states).

Christianity Insisted the New Human Rights Be Accorded to Pagans As Well, Ending Government’s Previous Power of Life and Death Over Citizens

Much of the Roman Empire was still pagan when Roman Emperor Theodosius, a year after his 380 AD Christian baptism, started to restrict public pagan practices, making Christianity for the first time effectively the sole official religion of the Roman Empire. But when in 390 AD Theodosius had his army bloodily massacre thousands of revolting pagans, Bishop Saint Ambrose of Milan (where Theodosius kept residence) excommunicated the Emperor for it. Ambrose was extremely brave and bold, and very fortunate the Emperor was a good enough Christian to accept the rebuke, for NOTHING LIKE THIS HAD EVER HAPPENED BEFORE. It was essentially the world-wide norm before Christianity that the government decided what the religion was (of the tribe, nation, kingdom, republic or empire) and whether or not there would be any toleration of dissent from the official norm. The Roman Empire was still a totalitarian state under the Emperor. The only reason Christianity was not being persecuted at this time, as it had been, severely, at the beginning of the century, was because the Roman Emperors had no longer been choosing to persecute it but promote it instead. But when the Christian Emperor who made Christianity the only official religion of the Empire massacred a large group of revolting pagans the nearest Christian Bishop, Ambrose, stood up for the pagans, stood up for their human rights and for their human lives, dearly loved by God. This excommunication was no short "slap on the hand" for the powerful Roman Emperor: For eight months Bishop Saint Ambrose refused to allow Emperor Theodosius into a Christian Church to worship or receive Holy Communion (hence “ex-communicated”). Bishop Saint Ambrose did not lift the excommunication.
until Emperor Theodosius consented to Ambrose's wish that Theodosius make a law which regulated and limited the Roman Emperor's pre-Christian complete power of life and death over his subjects (a power even the pagan Roman Republic had over those it had governed). Under the new law, in cases of death sentences there would be a thirty-day "lag period" before the execution would be enforced, which effectively prevented any quick or rash killing of the citizens by the government (which had been a factor in the massacre of the pagans). Following up on the ban on abortion and infanticide by 318 AD and the banning of murderous entertainment in the Roman arenas shortly after Christianity was legalized, this was another major victory of CHRISTIANITY'S NEW "PRO-LIFE" PRINCIPLE GRADUALLY CHANGING THE WAY HUMAN LIVES WERE GOVERNED: in defense of the rights of pagans who did not even believe in Christianity, Christianity insisted that ALL human lives in the Roman Empire be no longer subject to death at the whim of the powerful Roman Emperor. FROM THIS POINT ONWARD IN WESTERN CIVILIZATION, GOVERNMENTS, not even the Roman Emperor, absolute ruler of the mighty Roman Empire's government, NO LONGER COULD KILL THEIR HUMAN SUBJECTS WITH IMPUNITY, but governments were from then onwards accountable to the Christian "Pro-Life" value that every human life without exception is supremely and equally precious to a God higher than any State who loves ALL humanity without exception. Christianity taught Western Civilization the brand new truth that all our modern democracies were built on, that human life was NOT cheap, that human lives were NOT made to serve a greater State however the State saw fit, but that ALL human lives without exception are supremely and equally valuable and precious, (as the Bible taught) whether slave or free, upper or lower class, male or female (which is why previously common female infanticide was outlawed in 318 AD), and yes, even regardless of creed, regardless of religious belief. Even if you were not Christian, even if you rejected Christianity, still Christianity taught for the first time that your life was immensely valuable and precious; still Christianity taught for the first time that you and all should be FREE FROM ALL COERCION in matters of belief, in the hopes that you could then freely seek, find, and come to accept Christian truth, but serious about your FREEDOM even to reject it since genuine Christianity REQUIRES FREE ACCEPTANCE and cannot be forced. Even if you were not Christian and rejected the opportunities you had to become Christian, still Christianity taught for the first time that you had a HUMAN RIGHT TO your LIFE which was a gift from God the Holy Trinity who IS LOVE, and Christianity taught for the first time that it was NOT APPROPRIATE FOR ANY GOVERNMENT TO HAVE UNRESTRICTED POWER OF LIFE AND DEATH OVER YOU ANY LONGER, now that God had revealed himself as the lover of humankind through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ for humanity's many sins against the LOVE that God IS. Thus Christians believed the pagans who revolted and provoked the wrath of the Roman Emperor and were massacred by his orders had a HUMAN RIGHT TO LIVE and that neither the Roman Emperor (nor any government) should violate that human right to life. This was completely unheard of before Christianity. Governments normally held the power of life and death over their citizens, and there was usually no higher authority they were accountable to that would defend the lives of their subjects. Christianity taught the ideal of the human right to live for all. The practical realities of a government sometimes needing to protect its citizens from serious and/or violent repeating criminal offenders by execution still continued, as did "just war" to protect one's nation from violent aggressors, but even here the Christian ideal Right to Life expressed itself in that through to modern times Christian priests and other ministers compassionately tried to prepare the souls of those the State was about to execute for their crimes for eternal life with God through urging their sincere repentance for these crimes and accepting God's love and forgiveness. The Crusades, for all their regrettable failures and excesses, began precisely as a "Just War," to protect the Christian Byzantine Empire, the gateway to the rest of Europe, from aggressive Muslim military conquest; those Crusaders who were genuinely devout Christians lamented the necessity
of killing for this noble purpose and after battle put their swords in the ground like crosses and prayed for the souls of those they had had to kill in defense of Christendom. The Crusades despite their many regrettable elements nevertheless made modern human rights and democracy possible because they kept Europe Christian, so that democracy could develop logically from their Christian First Principles, instead of Europe falling back then to an aggressive Islamic empire whose modern-day countries are among the most notorious for human rights abuses, slavery and lack of religious freedom (Christians as I write are being killed in these countries. I am extremely open to working with moderate Muslims to make the world a better place on the basis of the great amount of common faith we share as Abrahamic faiths, including the Koran's banning infanticide; but unfortunately, worldwide Islam, which literally means "submission" or "slavery," is not associated with human rights nor with religious and democratic freedoms. I hope for the world's sake that Christians and moderate Muslims working together might one day help change that, since Islam even recognizes Jesus as a prophet. Christians can help Muslims better understand this prophet of theirs who we recognize as more than a prophet, whose enlightened teaching undergirds human rights and democracy for the world's benefit). Now, though indeed there were all too many Christian rulers who following the pre-Christian norm of rule did what they wanted regardless of what the Christian Church advised, still from the 4th Century Christianization of Western Civilization onwards, whenever later rulers of the Christian Roman or Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire or the later Kingdoms of Europe (and even modern states up to this day) violated the Pro-Life principle and took the lives of their own citizens and subjects, they were judged and remembered harshly for it, judged by a higher standard than the State's own laws.

Once again, before Christianity governments were normally in charge of what their citizens may or may not believe, because there was no concept of religious freedom to freely seek and find answers to the most basic questions of life's meaning and purpose. Christianity changed all that, since Christianity by its own principles must be accepted FREELY and not coerced. The entirely CHRISTIAN ideal of religious freedom means even the freedom to reject Christianity. Thus it is that the historically Christian countries of today are those most known for religious freedom and human rights, which both flow historically, naturally and logically from the Christian convictions about the greatest value and dignity of the human person lovingly made in the Image of the God who IS Love, who created humanity desiring us to be adopted into God's own Trinitarian Family of Love. Real freedom to seek and find the wonderful truth about humanity's exceptional value taught by Christianity does mean real freedom to fail to find it, and real freedom to reject Christianity. This is why so few Christian rulers even tried to forcefully impose Christianity, and those that did were usually not supported by Church authorities, and why even Charlemagne, the biggest violator here, did his best to well educate his conquered barbarian subjects to best help ensure the next generation would freely accept it. Even the Spanish Inquisition was formed by the Government of Spain to root out Muslims and Jews who were pretending to be Christians and thus were considered a threat to national security (Spain having once been under Muslim control). If you readily admitted you were a Muslim or Jew, you had nothing to fear from the Inquisition (whose methods, by the way, were much more controlled and humane than those of the contemporary civil authorities, since pre-Christian times. Torture was one of the many pre-Christian norms which continued by habit into the Christian era before Christian values of human dignity eventually overcame them. Also, the myth of the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition historians have shown to be exaggerations from anti-Spanish Empire propaganda from the British Empire). There were some sad periods of prejudiced persecution of non-Christian minorities in some European countries, but as a rule non-Christians were free to be non-Christians because of Christianity's concept of religious freedom, and this is even why "secularism" is a phenomenon particularly of historically Christian countries—because everyone was truly FREE to attend Church or not, FREE to forget about the Christian origins of human rights and FREE to
start taking them for granted!

But, returning to the 4th Century, when human rights and freedoms were non-existent, generally once people, BECAUSE of the new CHRISTIAN idea of religious freedom from coercion in matters of belief, came to look at all their religious options, and realized that Christianity truly stood far above all other options because it taught genuinely “Good News” (which is what the word Gospel literally means) for all humanity, they were usually inclined to use their new religious freedom to freely accept Christianity which taught such wonderful new truths about their human lives: that every human life without exception is extremely valuable and precious to a God who IS Love (1 John 4:8), and who lovingly created each human PERSON (another Christian-invented word!), made in Image of the One God in 3 Persons, for the express purpose of adopting him or her (via baptism) into God’s own Trinitarian Family life of Love (Father, Son and Holy Spirit – parenthood, childhood, and the bond of love which binds them, meaning the very essence of Family Love is in God who sent His Son Jesus Christ as “the New Adam” to repair the relationship-breaking damage done by Adam’s primordial sin and by all human sins against Love ever since). Once most people in Western Civilization came to use Christianity’s own notion of religious freedom to FREELY accept these Christian truths, it utterly transformed Western Civilization in a steady but logical progression which grew eventually into our modern human rights and democratic freedoms from this entirely Christian and Pro-Life starting point. Up to and including most of the 19th Century, Christianity as the “official” religion of most Western countries was not actually imposed but it was assumed, as a given, that Christianity (whatever the imperfections of Christians) was the best, most advanced and enlightened religious worldview on which to found a human civilization. And how could anyone reasonably argue with that? What other religion before or since Christianity could compete with how the specifically Christian understanding of supreme and equal human value actually in history developed logically into modern human rights and freedoms? Any attempt to persecute or outlaw Christianity, as in 1920s Mexico and the Soviet Union, always brought with it severe restrictions on human freedom and violations of human rights.

It is true that at no time in Western Christian Civilization (the appellation “Christian” only recently abandoned) were all citizens baptized Christians, and still less were all citizens or governors mature or even practicing Christians, and history provides plenty of examples of failures to live up to the Christian ideals of great love for all humans without exception. Still, Western Christian Civilization’s highest ideals were always Pro-Life and Christian, and those citizens who came closest to living them were canonized as Saints, like “Blessed” Mother Teresa in modern times, role models for the rest of us because of their heroic love of God and for God’s beloved human creation (however much even the Saints were imperfect, always humbly cognizant of this fact, and however much they remained a product of their times, with whatever state of penetration Christian ideals had yet made into their culture). But whatever the failures to love in Christian history, the ideal was always there calling citizens to be much better, and starting from the 4th century Christianization of Western Civilization on, all governments and rulers would be remembered and judged for how well or poorly they treated the human lives they governed!

All ideas take a long time to show their fruit in society. Christians have never been perfect (and some far from perfect), but through history they have struggled to find better ways to live the Biblical, Christian ideals of great love for every supremely and equally valuable human life without exception, both personally and as a society, and this struggle, this process, this only gradually greater penetration of the Christian and Pro-Life ideals into Western Civilization, naturally and logically led us to the human rights and democratic freedoms we have today.
There were hiccups along the way. So many pre-Christian norms continued after the 4th Century, some even to this day. The previous norm of government setting religious policy was continued but with Christianity being chosen as the official religion of the State, with both benefits for and detriments to the best practice of Christianity. Christian rulers never could resist the pre-Christian norm of government setting religious policy, and more than a few Christian Roman Emperors and Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Emperors were judged heretics by the Church which suffered greatly under their reigns as they tried to militarily enforce their heretical understanding of Christianity on others, in violation the Christian concepts of human rights and religious freedom (it always being a great relief when the new Emperor supported Christian orthodoxy). 7th Century Pope Saint Martin I and Saint Maximus the Confessor were arrested and tortured by the Byzantine Emperor and later died from the abuse). The first "Holy Roman Emperor," Charlemagne, though ceremonially crowned by the pope in 800 AD, had told the pope that his job was to pray for Christendom and Charlemagne's job was to rule it. The whole history of the Christian Church is one of seeking independence from being the puppet of the State -- political rulers choosing morally unworthy bishops and popes for their political loyalty, and such. The worst "wayward popes" of history came from this "lay investiture" crisis. French King Phillip the Fair sent thugs to beat up Pope Boniface VIII whose notorious papal bull in context was not power-grabbing like it sounded but a plea for Church independence in the face of King Phillip who was "fair" in complexion but not in character. The "separation of Church and State" in America was intended to prevent the government from telling the Church what to do (and not intended to divorce the State from the foundational Christian values which over centuries had matured into human rights and democratic freedoms). The ideal, slow and gradual transition from pre-Christian style monarchy to democracy (under a "constitutional monarchy" that remains to this day) had happened in the British Isles, the earlier stages in Catholic England but the later stages in Protestant Great Britain. Thus the Catholic Church, which had since the 4th Century become accustomed to being "the official religion" chosen by the government according to the pre-Christian norm of government setting religious policy, unfortunately experienced the transition from monarchy to rule of the people through the bloody French Revolution and its "Reign of Terror," which was a "rule of the people" more violent and terrifying than the rule of any traditional monarch for a great many centuries (and one particularly anti-Christian). No wonder then that the Catholic Church temporarily opposed this new-fangled notion of democracy! But once the modern democracies had made their political transitions from traditional (pre-Christian) monarchies to democratic republics or "constitutional monarchies," with greater or lesser degrees of violence in the transition, the Catholic Church not only accepted the new situation but eventually, at the Second Vatican Council, in 1965 produced the Declaration on Religious Liberty, which is a mature, developed expression of the Christian principles of religious freedom from the beginning which actually first introduced the concept of religious freedom into the world where it had previously been normal for the government to control the religion and therefore the very thoughts and hopes of their citizens. I believe this Declaration on Religious Liberty, as a mature expression of the Christian value of freedom of religion and freedom of conscience for all, Christian or not, contains much wisdom and many very helpful guidelines to help reestablish the foundations of democracy which have been eaten away.

Because the concept of religious freedom itself COMES FROM Christianity and is part of Christianity's understanding of the extreme value and great dignity of every human life without exception, the very historic concept of religious freedom naturally includes the limiting factor that genuine religious freedom does not include the freedom to engage in religious practices which kill or harm human lives or violate human dignity. "Religious Freedom" can never be an excuse for harming human lives or violating human dignity, because it is only because of human dignity that Christianity taught Western Civilization the foundations of religious freedom in the first place. I have to make this point very clear because this is
yet another area where today we have forgotten the Christian origins of our civilization and thus we so much take for granted the specifically Christian values our whole civilization is based on. And some people who have lost this root get confused about religious freedom, as if it means we have to tolerate intolerable practices that violate human dignity. This kind of confusion is behind recent attempts in the U.S.A. to have public Satanic Black Masses in the name of “religious freedom.” But Satanism of course is not a genuine religious path but deliberately mocks the Christianity our society’s highest values are based on, even drugging unwilling participants for sexual exploitation on the altar to honour Satan and even stealing the Eucharistic Host Bread from a Catholic Mass in order to desecrate it in a satanic “Black Mass.” Cults like this which violate human dignity are not what religious freedom has ever been about, because religious freedom is a Christian idea. A great many of the religions of the ancient world involved human sacrifices of babies and/or of adults to their gods, and/or various forms of human blood-letting and other practices not respectful of human dignity such as sexual exploitation of women as part of worship (there are still “Temple prostitutes” in some cultures in the world today). The native religions of Latin America practiced widespread and frequent human sacrifice to their gods. For all the talk of how “insensitive” the Spanish Conquistadors were to the local culture in their colonization, and however that insensitivity is truly regrettable as far as it goes, how many Latin Americans really want their “old-time religion” where even the losing team of sporting events would be sacrificed to the gods! Even culturally insensitive Christians brought the Christian values of the ultimate worth and great dignity of human life wherever they went!

The Declaration on Religious Liberty

In Vatican Council II the Catholic Church changed its posture in relation to the greater, now secular society with The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, emphasizing how the Christian Church within the world works towards the betterment of humanity together with all people of good will rather than the Church being in opposition to the greater society (the stance during the difficult adjustment from medieval to modern realities). One of the suggestions made in the Council’s 1965 Declaration on Religious Liberty is that recognizing Christianity as the or as one “official” religion of a State is still appropriate, coupled with genuine religious freedom to freely explore religious options in the search for one’s highest meaning and purpose in life (within the limitations of good public order for the common good and respect for everyone’s human rights). These are all Christian values after all, and in recognition of the great debt our modern democratic societies owe to Christianity which gave them their highest values of human rights and freedoms, it would thus be appropriate to once again recognize Christianity as a country’s “official” religion, or at least as one of them. Some people might balk at this, in over-reaction to Christianity’s past privileged “official religion” status which unfortunately always still had the character of pre-Christian “official State religions” which might at least sometimes be imposed forcefully by the State (and which looked down on other paths than the State’s official religion). Many people have this incorrect notion that Western Civilization used to be Christian, “we already tried that, and now we need to move on.” Because I am a scholar with a good sense of the sweep of history, seeing the trends as they developed, noting, as I said before, how so many pre-Christian norms still remained in force for many centuries and even to the present day, I can say that a State organized according to Christian values including ideal Christian religious freedom has never been tried. Even a century ago, English writer G. K. Chesterton noted that it wasn’t the case that Christianity had been tried and been found wanting; rather it had been found difficult, and left untried! Christians, regular citizens and those involved in government, throughout “Western Christian Civilization” have been struggling with how best to put the rich and beautiful teaching about humanity’s immense value and dignity into practice in their own lives and in their societies, but they have been doing it often laboring under the burden of pre-existing, pre-
Christian habitual norms and styles of government and social classes and so on, and thus truly Christian ways of organizing human society according to the supreme and equal worth of every human life has often been a long time coming. Ending slavery entirely was totally in line with ancient Biblical, Christian teaching of the equality of masters with their slaves before God (e.g. Ephesians 6:9), but Western Civilization didn’t fully put its Christian ideals into practice on that point until more recently (Christians still being the prime movers in society’s change, such as William Wilberforce and Reverend Martin Luther King Jr.); women’s ultimate equality with men is declared in the first Chapter of the Bible, male and female BOTH “made in the Image of God” (Genesis 1:27), the New Testament confirming ethnicity, class and gender make no difference to God (e.g. Galatians 3:28), yet women were the last group to finally get the vote in most democracies (keep in mind that men, just for being men, did not have the vote all that much earlier; more and more humans were gradually granted the dignity of voting according to other criteria like social class). Women’s rights showed up right from the first State adoption of Christianity in 313 AD, with the abolition of common infanticide which most often claimed girls in 318 AD, but women’s full say in government as we have in modern democracies took much more time and many political revolutions all aimed at changing things, however gradually, from the pre-Christian norm of a totalitarian State without any human rights to a form of government each time however slightly more appropriate to the vast value and dignity of human beings which only Christianity had taught, and taught right from its start. Likewise with religious freedom, Christianity made immediate improvement but fuller development of Christian beliefs about religious freedom would take much longer, and would have to overcome pre-Christian habits. From the very first decade Christianity became the “only official religion” of the Roman Empire, Saint Ambrose in 390 AD (at great personal risk by excommunicating the Emperor) stood up for the rights of the pagans whose freedom to publicly worship had been taken away, and insisted the Emperor limit his previously unrestricted power over the lives of his citizens including revolting pagans. Yet it would take until 1965 for the Vatican to produce the Declaration on Religious Liberty as a mature expression of the ancient Christian principle of freedom from coercion in matters of belief. Especially with this now mature Christian understanding of religious freedom, having Christianity as the (or “an”) “official” religion in no way interferes with religious freedom. In fact, it is ONLY countries where Christianity was the official religion for many centuries that developed naturally into democracies with religious freedom (and didn’t have democracy and freedom imported from the Christian West). Christianity and religious freedom in a democracy go naturally together BECAUSE only Christianity teaches the absolute value of every human life which must be free from coercion in matters of faith, and insists that Christianity can only be genuine if accepted freely.

For decades now Christianity has been marginalized from its formerly central place as guardian of the values of our free civilization and finally we are starting to see the resurgence of the persecution of Christians for these same Pro-Life values that early Christians were thrown to the lions for, in things like this current attempt to force Christian, Pro-Life doctors to facilitate killing human lives by abortion or euthanasia OR ELSE LOSE THEIR JOBS. If these anti-life (and therefore ultimately anti-human, anti-democratic) forces succeed in this persecution of Christians for the same Pro-Life values that historically and logically undergird all human rights and democracy, it will be a big step back towards the old pre-Christian norm of totalitarian government.

Thus I believe that current evidence suggests it is now important that Christianity be reinstated as at least “one of” the “official” religions of a country, for the very practical reason of enshrining the ultimately Christian values that historically and logically ground all human rights and democracy, as the very best defense against the future totalitarianism which I have demonstrated that our democracies are
slowly but inexorably sliding towards since they denied the Christian value of the supreme and equal value of every human life by legalizing abortion which had been banned since the 4th Century. What the current trends prove beyond all reasonable shadow of doubt is that so-called "Post-Christian," secularized countries which try to keep the ideal of human rights and democracy without their historical and logical Christian roots do it terribly and cannot even keep the very first of all human rights, the right to live. In legalizing abortion our democracies have betrayed the very foundation of democracy and have logically taken away from all of us any inherent right to live. It is not reasonable to hold that these countries can hold onto democracy and avoid totalitarianism for the long term. I have demonstrated how much our democracies have already followed the precedent of the slow and gradual loss of democracy that happened in Germany. We also have the first generations of young people who did not grow up learning the 10 Commandments as a moral basis how to avoid the anti-love called sin, and we have the first generations of young people going to school with guns and massacring their peers and teachers. There are many such signs of our modern culture's moral confusion and degradation, including some very dangerous ones like these recent steps towards totalitarianism by forcing doctors who actually value all human life to be involved in killing human life or lose their jobs. At the time the Vatican Declaration on Religious Freedom was written in 1965, our western cultures were still so steeped in their Christian heritage that perhaps it did not look absolutely necessary to follow the Declaration's suggestion of having Christianity as an official religion but with official respect for others' religious freedom. The current conditions which compromise democracy right from its very logical foundations convince me that having Christianity as the (or at least "an") official religion is probably necessary to guarantee democracy in the long term, since democracy logically DEPENDS on Christian values, long-term.

Health Care and Education for Everyone Defined as Human Rights

Not only were human rights and religious freedom generally unknown in the world before Christianity, health care and education for everyone as a government ideal was also completely unknown before, and also grew logically from the Christian Pro-Life conviction, as part of helping ALL humans, with their exceptional human dignity, to find their human fulfillment. Not only did Christians spontaneously take care of the sick, Christian or pagan, during plagues (risking their own health in manifest love which won many converts), but ancient Christians INVENTED hospitals, and founded the great ancient schools of Antioch and Alexandria, institutes of higher learning. Not only did Christian missionaries typically spread health care and education wherever they went as a logical expression of the Christian concern for the whole human person, the modern University System actually grew out of the medieval Cathedral Schools which started with advanced scholarly study of the Bible and branched out into all the other fields of knowledge we know today including the natural sciences, which is why periodic table elements are named after monks and the like and dozens of craters on the moon are named after Jesuit priests. This whole article has been about addressing the great ignorance of history which has led to so many of the current or proposed policies which are undermining the very foundation of our democracies, because "those who fail to learn the lessons of history are destined to repeat its mistakes." Thus, to educate those who still suffer from the Enlightenment era myth that Christian faith and reason are somehow opposed, I present a brief overview of the natural sciences which so many for some reason look to as an "alternate" authority to the Christian Revelation of the Bible when in fact the natural sciences, as much as human rights and democracy, depend upon principles first revealed to humanity in the Bible.

The Greek philosophers of the Socratic School (such as Socrates, Plato and Aristotle) who are recognized
as the first scientists, who laid the philosophical foundation for doing science at all, got their starting point from their exposure to the much older Jewish Bible, the Christian Old Testament, which had much earlier testified to the Greeks' foundational insight that the universe is an ordered cosmos (which can be studied to find patterns of order, the sign of an ordering intelligence) and is NOT a random chaos. Everyone knows the Greeks loved wisdom: the Hebrew culture was much older, Hebrew King Solomon’s wisdom was legendary, and so the Greeks made sure they knew the Hebrew Bible. Socrates studied with the Jew Ahitophel and there is an ancient rumour Socrates converted to Judaism before he died. Whether that rumour is true or not, for certain Plato was criticized by his enemies for being “Moses speaking Attic” (a Greek dialect), because he was so well-versed in the Hebrew Bible, the Christian Old Testament, and his star pupil Aristotle articulated the First Principles of Being/Existence, on which all logic and science depends. The pure sciences and the modern scientific method were gradually built upon this solid and Biblical foundation mostly by Christians in Christian Europe (and of course, those things, such as works of Aristotle which Western Europe had forgotten but were reintroduced to through the Crusades in the East, were things which Eastern, Byzantine Christians had preserved and developed, and given to their later Muslim conquerors who also operated from the older Judeo-Christian worldview).

Basically all the greatest thinkers and scientists from Aristotle to Einstein (from ancient to modern times) believed in at least the basic Judeo-Christian concept of God and the Universe He ordered which makes it possible to study the universe with the scientific method at all. The world’s greatest thinkers and scientists always saw the great distinction between the superstitious type of religion and the genuine type of religion which science depends upon. Thus the first, Greek scientists rejected the traditional Greek Pantheon of gods as "silly superstition," yet they worshipped the Absolute Being upon whom all other existence is dependent, who ordered the universe and who is also the source of humanity's innate sense of justice and morality. Thus Einstein noted that "there is no conflict between science and genuine religion," because in fact "science without [genuine] religion is lame" - science cannot even get on its feet without assuming an intelligent orderer God who designed the supremely intricate and elegant order science discovers. Einstein also noted that "religion without science is blind," that is, the superstitious type of religion. Einstein knew the difference between the two, but far less acute and accomplished intellects of the Enlightenment era tried to lump genuine religion together with the superstitious type of religion which the Enlightenment era legitimately discredited. But the pure sciences, and the modern scientific method, developed nowhere else in the world but in Christian Europe, starting from this Biblical and Christian foundation. The fact remains that when a Christian is doing science in a lab he or she is operating from the same worldview or set of assumptions about how the universe operates as when he or she is worshipping in Church, which cannot be said of many other religions.

Despite the deficiencies in ancient Greek science which simply came from their starting the field, the Greeks were brilliant and noted the connection between the Orderer God and Justice/morality which properly orders human relationships. The comparative moral bankruptcy of the greatest so-called "enlightened" atheist thinkers is evident in the fruits of their thinking which divorced any concept of God from human morality and "the greater good." By far the most bloody of all centuries was the 20th Century, largely due to the policies of the Communist and Nazi regimes implementing what they believed was “the greater good” for humanity, largely inspired by atheist philosophers like Marx (who said religion was “the opiate of the masses” and dispensed with all religion in his ideal, Communist, state) and Nietzsche (who proclaimed “God is dead” and who inspired Hitler with his idea of the “superman” and his blatant anti-semitism). No governments have ever been anywhere near so bloody, nor on such a scale, as these governments which actively implemented atheist philosophies (the two largest genocides in history were Hitler’s Nazi extermination of 6 Million Jews, and Stalin’s
Communist starvation of 7 Million of my fellow Ukrainians).

So religious believers need never feel intimidated by loud-mouthed and arrogant atheists who belittle the intellects of people with religious faith: All the atheists have is bluster and hot air, and they generally do not even understand the philosophy (ontology or metaphysics) which the scientific method depends on, one which is consistent with the Bible and not with atheism. Atheist scientists are just ‘technicians’ using a method built by Christians upon a philosophical foundation grounded in Biblical principles which they do not even understand (these days you can get a Ph.D. in Science without even taking a Philosophy course), although they live their lives by its powerful principles every day (Aristotle noted that even those who disagreed with his First Principles of Being were forced by the structure of reality to live their lives as if he was right). The religious believer, especially the Christian, can be confident that in his philosophical position for the existence of an Intelligent Creator God who ordered the Universe, he is standing not only with the majority of human beings, but with the great majority of the world’s greatest and most accomplished thinkers and scientists throughout history to modern times.

Thus Christians can confidently claim both the natural sciences AND human rights and democracy, things which our culture of today still values highly, are historically and logically rooted in Biblical and Christian principles. If you value these things you are half-Christian already, and just need to be reintroduced to the underlying principles grounding these wonderful things, before we lose our democracies because we abandoned the Christian Pro-Life principle they are founded on.

So, governments never used to provide health care and education for ALL their citizens and subjects, but Christian missionaries typically started hospitals and schools to provide health care and education wherever they went in order to best serve the needs of valuable human lives and raise their standard of living as proper to the great dignity humans have as beloved children of God. More than merely basic education, Christians since founding their ancient schools of Antioch and Alexandria have always been at the forefront of Higher Education as well, and our Modern University System literally grew out of the medieval Cathedral Schools. Our whole Western (Christian) Civilization has become so used to this high standard of concern for human lives and all the human rights, democratic freedoms, and health care and education (even at the highest level) that these have now even been defined as “human rights” which governments should as far as possible make available for everyone (without exception) because of their great human dignity. ALL OF THIS CAME TO US LOGICALLY AND NATURALLY THROUGH THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT STARTING FROM THE PRO-LIFE PRINCIPLE REPLACING THE PREVIOUS PRO-CHOICE PHILOSOPHY IN THE 4TH CENTURY.

Conclusion

Thus, returning to the burning issue of right now which motivated me to write this historical reflection on the sources of the human rights and democracy we still say we value so highly, it is no exaggeration to say that the CPSO’s attempt to strip doctors of their democratic freedom to not take a human life or else they will lose their jobs is an all-out attack on the very FOUNDATION of all of our human rights and democratic freedoms. The recent return of the ancient "pro-choice" philosophy of the brutal ancient world and the recent return of legal abortion after over 1600 years (during which human rights and democratic freedoms developed logically from the Pro-Life principle only in Western CHRISTIAN Civilization) already logically means that our Government does not acknowledge in ANY OF US an INHERENT Right to Live such as that which all human rights and freedoms were originally founded on.
If human lives which are young enough to not yet be born can be legally killed, that logically means NONE OF US have an INHERENT right to live, since ALL OF US were once that young. This logically means that just being human and just being alive is not enough to guarantee us government protection of our lives: there are EXCEPTIONS to which human lives are protected by the government. And history shows us that once there is ONE exception, once it is no longer true that ALL human lives WITHOUT EXCEPTION are considered valuable and precious, the list of exceptions to which human lives are protected by the government always gets longer and longer. And history shows us that those who defend the human lives no longer protected are soon persecuted too: losing their jobs, being arrested, and even being sent to the death camps as well.

In Germany, they democratically elected a government that rejected the country's Christian heritage (Hitler and his top Nazis were occultists; the "Aryan Race" is part of an occultic mythology), a government that manifestly did not value all human lives as precious but made exceptions, against the foundations of democracy developed logically starting from the Pro-Life principle in the 4th Century. This newly-elected Nazi government was voted emergency powers to deal with the Communist threat, which formally ended the democracy whose foundation had already been lost. The newly-elected Nazi government legally defined Jews as somehow "sub-human" and no longer protected Jewish human lives but actively threatened these unwanted human lives. And German career soldiers who joined the army to protect their country suddenly found their new Nazi government telling them that they had to round up and kill those human lives no longer protected by the government (directly, or indirectly by taking them to the camps) OR ELSE THEY WOULD LOSE THEIR JOBS (or worse).

In a disturbing parallel, in Canada already the government has legally defined an exception to government protection of human life, legally defining young human lives just like each of us before we were born as essentially "sub-human," no longer protecting young human lives in law as the government used to, and these lives are under threat. Like the soldiers who thought their job was to protect their countrymen were told they had to participate directly or indirectly in the killing of these now legally unprotected human lives or else lose their jobs, Ontario doctors who thought their job was to heal and save human lives are being told by the CPSO that they must participate directly or indirectly in killing these now legally unprotected human lives OR ELSE LOSE THEIR JOBS. The CPSO's proposal takes us disturbingly close to the characteristics of a totalitarian/police state, and it is very disturbing that the CPSO ignored the huge amount of feedback they received in the Summer 2014 discussion forum and quick poll in support of doctor's democratic rights to freedom of conscience in the practice of their healing profession (77% of 32,688 Votes by the August 5 2014 Deadline), including discussion feedback from several who once lived under Soviet Communism or other totalitarian states where there was no freedom and recognized the CPSO's proposed policies would take them back there.

The CPSO's proposal is seriously flawed on other grounds as well: more than enough scientific studies link most of the "procedures" that some doctors morally object to, such as abortion and oral contraceptives, with significantly increased health risks like cancer as well (some government postings even inform of these concerns), and competent doctors with no religious or moral conviction may well properly and within their professional medical competence want to refuse these "procedures" on purely medical and scientific grounds. Why is CPSO treating these procedures as if any patient had a "right" to take these medical risks? Moreover these "procedures" may not properly speaking be "medical" procedures at all: one would stand completely in the great tradition of the medical profession to argue that since the purpose of the entire discipline of medicine is to heal, save and protect human lives, and since this procedure of abortion ends a human life every time it is performed, abortion is not properly called a medical procedure.
per se, and should not be performed, in order to save the integrity of the medical profession which since ancient times was founded on the principle and the doctor's oath "do no harm."

But I think the CPSO's most vitally significant flaw is in claiming a doctor's private "Pro-Life" moral stance should not interfere with a doctor providing a "service" like abortion. As demonstrated above, a "Pro-Life" position is NOT merely a private religious or moral belief. It is the PUBLIC FOUNDATION of every human right and freedom in our Western society, and every society where the Pro-Life principle is NOT held by its government gradually becomes more and more inhospitable to human life and freedom.

I am not at all suggesting that everyone must be Christian; as I have demonstrated in some detail, it is Christianity itself which first insisted on religious freedom for ALL so all are genuinely free and thus able to freely seek and (hopefully) find its truth, and Christianity accepts the great God-given gift of Free Will even to reject Christianity. But everyone who loves our human rights and democratic freedoms must at least recognize and respect their Christian origin, or these our highest values can be lost. They have been lost before, as in Germany, and they can be lost again. We have already taken several steps parallel to Germany down the road to losing them, and the CPSO is poised to take another step towards ending democracy by forcing doctors to take human lives or lose their licences to be doctors (and thus lose their livelihood).

Thus I am amazed at the massive ignorance of those who ask if Christianity is still relevant today; those who, faced with the historical facts, might admit Christianity's role in the foundation of human rights and democratic freedoms but claim Christianity has outlived its usefulness, as if our cherished rights and freedoms can be maintained without the religious convictions which spawned them. But history shows Christianity is just as vital to the preservation and maintenance today of human rights and democratic freedoms as it was vital to the original establishment of human rights and democratic freedoms. Both the ancient and the modern history of governments where the specifically Christian understanding of the extreme value and equal dignity of all human lives without exception are not held show that where this "pro-life" conviction is not held, human life again becomes cheap; the "exceptions" to which human lives are valuable and which human lives the government will protect keep increasing; and human rights and freedoms are progressively trampled. Thus Christians serve a vital role in society - that of preserving our human rights and freedoms by reminding society where they came from in the first place: the "Pro-Life" conviction that every human life is supremely valuable and precious, because human life is made in the Image of the God who is Love. It is indeed well said that if one does not learn the lessons of history, one is destined to repeat its mistakes. Thus for our own good, for our own long term human safety, security, and freedom, we as a society need to make sure we relearn the lesson of the immense value and dignity of every human life without exception, from his or her beginning conception as a unique human biological organism ("zygote" or fertilized egg) to his or her natural death: this is the value all of our human rights and democratic freedoms are ultimately based on. If the CPSO foolishly does not withdraw its clear attack on the very foundations of democracy, it will face a public outcry from those who love democracy (including those immigrants who came from totalitarian states who have already in last summer's feedback warned the CPSO that they know where they are heading). These good doctors whose democratic freedoms are being threatened are concerned for their patients' physical, emotional and psychological health and well-being, long-term and short-term. The (moral) doctors' points of view are not only based on the specific moral and religious convictions that historically and logically ground our democracy, but they are also based on North American and International Studies that show a substantial increased risk of cancer or other physical and emotional
problems and side effects of the "treatments" these doctors are professionally inclined not to use. Doctors have a right and responsibility to tell patients that something is not good for them based on evidence; their job obligates them not to give their patients things not good for their health and well-being. Clearly they should not be pushed out of the medical profession for their professional medical opinion which happens to also coincide with their "private" religious and moral beliefs which happen to be the same values which historically and logically grounded all of our human rights and freedoms.

The bottom line is: Canadians have a right not to kill human lives if they don't want to, a right firmly based in the long tradition of Western Christian Civilization since the 4th Century which saw human rights and democracy gradually develop from the primary "Pro-Life" principle that all human lives are supremely valuable and precious. And this right not to kill must take priority against any new-fangled notion that Canadians have a right to kill human lives, as long as the government does not define them as human lives (contrary to clear scientific fact, and following the Nazi precedent).

I have taught the history of the Nazi Holocaust in schools. Democracy in Germany was lost slowly, by many small changes and degrees, but with inexorable logic starting from the government's abandonment of the "Pro-Life" Principle which had grounded all of Western Civilization since the 4th Century when abortion and infanticide were banned because from then on all human life without exception would be treated as precious. Germany first abandoned the Pro-Life principle when it took the human right to live, the first of all human rights, away from Jews. Failing to learn the lessons of history, our current democracies abandoned it again when they legalized abortion after over 1600 years being illegal because all human life was precious. It cannot be considered coincidental that Nazi doctors in the Death Camps, experimenting on Jewish pregnant women inmates (who usually WANTED their babies), developed the first "safe" (for the mother) abortion techniques — since they did not care how many Jewish women died as they were testing ideas on how to kill their babies without killing the mother. What is truly amazing is that after winning the war against totalitarian Germany, the democracies of the free world would later follow Nazi Germany's abandonment of the "Pro-Life" principle that had guaranteed Western Civilization would develop human rights, start making exceptions to which human lives are protected, and even follow the Nazis' pioneering work in abortion techniques.

We have already seen several of the early changes of the erosion of democracy starting logically from our government abandoning the Pro-Life principle and taking away the human right to life from the very young, not yet born, even though fully human and fully alive and fully unique, as biological science confirms. As of a few days ago at time of writing, the old and the sick in Canada can now be legally killed as well. One exception to life being protected always leads to others. The countries which have already taken this step prove that once doctors become killers instead of healers, they tend to get used to making the big life and death decisions, and end up using their own judgment, with or without the consent of their patients who must be now called their victims (regardless of the checks which are supposed to prevent people from being killed without their consent). When hospital administrators see the money saved on health care by simply killing patients, this motivates more killing. All because ALL human life was devalued first by legalizing abortion after over 1600 years banned, now money is worth more than human life (and abortion clinics sell their human victims for health and beauty products and other product development such as the food industry work done by American company Senomyx).

It has been said that all that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing. In this vein it is noted that if enough people stood up to Hitler early enough, despite his terrifying thugs which cowed them, they could have stopped things from getting as completely out of hand as they did. But they didn't.
Just like so many of us now, in Germany the people were flustered, confused, scared, at all these little changes (at first), but they put up with them, each time thinking "this is as bad as it will get" or "surely it won't get any worse than this." The many good people who objected to the erosion of the Pro-Life values which undergird democracy kept silent out of fear of consequences which they hoped wouldn't get any worse. Indeed those who fail to learn the lessons of history are destined to repeat its mistakes. I guarantee you the current erosion of democracy will not stop here. It may take time to get as far as Nazi Germany, but it will definitely get there if people don't start standing up for human rights, starting with the very first human right on which all others depend, the human right to live, currently denied to the youngest humans, NOW. As in Germany, it will just keep getting worse and worse until enough good people stand up against the erosion of these human rights which are the foundations of democracy (because it's only if every human life matters that it is important for every human life to have a say in how it is governed). It's time for all who genuinely want to keep our democracies, whether Christian or not, to learn where it comes from and shore up that badly eroded foundation or else we will lose it.

The atheism touted by a tiny but loud and blustering few most certainly cannot guarantee human rights and democracy in the long term, in fact, quite the opposite, atheism influenced the greatest genocides in history, and logically so. Because no matter how much secular humanism or other atheist perspectives try to borrow nice values from Christianity, in atheist context these human values are not solidly rooted in anything, because ultimately it really doesn't matter how one random sack of biochemicals treats another, and there is no principle of atheism by which any atheist can say Stalin and Hitler, so heavily influenced as they were by the atheist philosophers Marx and Nietzsche respectively, were absolutely wrong in how they attempted to make the world a better place.

Thus, once again, a "Pro-Life" position is NOT merely a private religious or moral belief that is "true for you but you shouldn't push your moral values on others." It is the public foundation of every human right and freedom in our Western society, and societies where it is not held by the government tend to gradually become more and more inhospitable to human life and freedom. Wherever a Christian "Pro-Life" understanding of the supreme and equal value of every human person is notably lacking, it is all too easy for the list of exceptions to which human lives are protected to get longer and longer, as in all totalitarian states. Religious liberty is itself a Christian ideal, rooted in the necessity that all people without exception be truly free to seek and find their human fulfillment, which no governments were motivated to help their citizens find before Christianity.

Thus Christians, (including our Christian doctors whose democratic freedoms are now so threatened in Ontario), must be confident of the plain facts that their Christian beliefs historically and logically ground ALL human rights and democratic freedoms, and nothing else can sustain them in the long term near as well. We can see the results of the failure of secularism to keep Western Civilization's highest values without their Christian roots all around us, in our compromised democracies where RIGHT NOW you can be arrested and jailed for peacefully protesting the killing of human lives whose right to live was "legally defined away," just like in Nazi Germany, and where RIGHT NOW good people (starting with our doctors) who believe in the sacred value of all human life without exception are afraid they might lose their jobs and livelihood if they speak up against the killing of human lives and if they refuse to assist in this killing. This is intolerable for anyone who loves democracy, Christian or not.

From now on Christians must get used to thinking of themselves as the defenders of democracy, and confidently proclaim the Christian principles on which all of our historic democracies were built. Our societies have failed to learn the lessons of history, and so are destined to repeat its mistakes, taking us back further and further towards totalitarianism unless we remind them of the core principles...
which enabled us as a civilization to mature beyond totalitarianism in the first place. If our
government agencies, including government-regulated bodies like the College of Physicians and
Surgeons of Ontario, whose current threat to democracy, religious freedom, and human life all at
once has motivated me to write this letter/article in defense of democracy, are at all serious about
human rights and freedoms, they will have to listen to us, or else history I guarantee will curse them
as the fools who failed to learn from history and repeated its greatest mistakes.

Appendix: The Ancient Letter to Diognetus, on the Vital Role of Christians in
Keeping Society Together, is Still Relevant Today, When We are in Danger of
Losing the Human Rights and Freedoms Which Back Then Did Not Exist But
Christians Were Then Introducing Into Western Civilization

As you read this excerpt from the Letter to Diognetus, written in the late 1st or early 2nd Century, keep in
mind that at the time there were no human rights: Governments (whether republics or dictatorships) as a
norm had the power to enslave or kill their citizens (and lesser human subjects not even accorded
citizenship) with impunity, and governments normally were in charge of what their citizens and subjects
may or may not believe. Religious freedom to seek and hopefully find human fulfillment and meaning in
life was unheard of, and governments had no particular interest in providing health care or education for
all their citizens and subjects nor in otherwise enhancing human lives nor in creating conditions conducive
to helping individual humans find human fulfillment or happiness. One third of the Roman Empire, the
most advanced Empire the world had ever known, were slaves. Parents had the right to sell their children
as slaves or to kill their unwanted children before or after birth, especially girls (there might even be a
convenient garbage dump outside the city for unwanted children). Even the ancient experiments with
democracy did not believe in the equality of humans and excluded most from voting.

Note in The Letter to Diognetus how into this context Christians have come and are starting to teach
Western Civilization the values we now take for granted (but are now in danger of losing because we have
forgotten their source). For example, Christians “do not abandon the babies that are born,” as was then
so common, because all human life without exception is precious. Christians declare the new ideal of
religious freedom, “It is not like God to use compulsion” – God grants us free will and religious freedom
to come to him and will not use His Power to force us to choose the good and right and loving path,
because true Love must be freely given, and Christianity must be freely accepted. “It was no earthly
discovery that was committed to them, nor is it mortal wisdom that they feel bound to guard so jealously,
nor have they been entrusted with the dispensation of merely human mysteries...” The new Christian
“Pro-Life” principles of the supreme and equal value and dignity of every human life without exception,
completely unheard of at this time, rooted and grounded in the Christian beliefs that God the Creator of
the Universe IS Love and created every human life in love, intending to adopt each of us into God’s
Trinitarian Family of Love (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), are no mere mortal wisdom but truly principles
of divine origin, which is why these principles have been so immensely fruitful as they were gradually
implemented practically over the centuries of Western Christian Civilization, so as to eventually yield
modern human rights and democracy as logical developments of these Christian principles.

And note how at this time, for holding these wonderful, enlightened principles that would eventually
utterly transform Western Civilization for the better, Christians were PERSECUTED, “thrown to wild
beasts to make them deny their Lord [Jesus].” Western Civilization did not recognize the magnificent
beauty and power of Christian ideals for the best ordering of human societies, and instead tried to stamp out Christianity as a threat to the established (totalitarian) authorities. IT IS ONLY because Christians, empowered by the supernatural divine LOVE that God IS, held firm to their beliefs in these principles, including the Pro-Life principle, NO MATTER HOW SEVERELY THEY WERE PERSECUTED, that they shocked the world with how “the more of them who are punished, the more they grow in number,” and thus Western Civilization eventually gave in to Christianity, and finally adopted it and its life-giving principles, especially the Pro-Life Principle rooted in God’s Love for every human life, that grounded all subsequent development of human rights and freedoms in Western Civilization (which took them to the rest of the world).

This ancient Letter to Diognetus is just as relevant today because now we are seeing the gathering of anti-life, and thus ultimately anti-human and anti-democracy, principles and forces in our “post-Christian” culture, which are seriously threatening to take us back to the totalitarian style of government that was normal when this Letter was written. Now as then, Christians are the “soul” of the “body” of the world that holds it together, the only thing that can keep it from falling apart. For decades now Christianity has been marginalized from its formerly central place as guardian of the values of our free civilization and finally we are starting to see the resurgence of the persecution of Christians for these same Pro-Life values that early Christians were thrown to the lions for, in things like this current attempt to force Christian, Pro-Life doctors to facilitate killing human lives by abortion or euthanasia OR ELSE LOSE THEIR JOBS. If these anti-life forces succeed in this persecution of Christians for the same Pro-Life values that historically and logically undergird all human rights and democracy, it will be a big step back towards the old pre-Christian norm of totalitarian government, and our democracy will be progressively compromised the more Christians are threatened, persecuted, or silenced in proclaiming the Christian, Pro-Life values of the supreme and equal dignity of every human life without exception, which are at the very foundation of the very idea of democracy.

Excerpt from The Letter to Diognetus [gloss in square brackets]:

Christians are not different from the rest of men in nationality, speech, or customs; they do not live in states of their own, nor do they use a special language, nor adopt a peculiar way of life. Their teaching is not the kind of thing that could be discovered by the wisdom or reflection of mere active-minded men; indeed, they are not outstanding in human learning as others are. Whether fortune has given them a home in a Greek or foreign city, they follow local custom in the matter of dress, food, and way of life; yet the character of the culture they reveal is marvellous and, it must be admitted, unusual. They live, each in his native land—but as though they were not really at home there. They share in all duties like citizens and suffer all hardships like strangers. Every foreign land is for them a fatherland and every fatherland a foreign land. They marry like the rest of men and beget children, but they do not abandon the babies that are born. They share a common board, but not a common bed. In the flesh as they are, they do not live according to the flesh. They dwell on earth, but they are citizens of heaven. They obey the laws that men make, but their lives are better than the laws [and I add, the principles they lived their lives by became the source of all human rights and freedoms which were unknown in the world at the time this was written]. They love all men, but are persecuted by all. They are unknown, and yet they are condemned. They are put to death, yet are more alive than ever. They are paupers, but they make many rich. They lack all things, and yet in all things they abound. They are dishonored,
yet glory in their dishonor. They are maligned, and yet are vindicated. They are reviled, and yet they bless. They suffer insult, yet they pay respect. They do good, yet are punished with the wicked. When they are punished, they rejoice, as though they were getting more of life. They are attacked . . . and are persecuted . . . yet those who hate them can give no reason for their hatred.

In a word, what the soul is to the body Christians are to the world. The soul is distributed in every member of the body, and Christians are scattered in every city in the world. The soul dwells in the body, and yet it is not of the body. So, Christians live in the world, but they are not of the world. The soul which is guarded in the visible body is not itself visible. And so, Christians who are in the world are known, but their worship remains unseen. The flesh hates the soul and acts like an unjust aggressor, because it is forbidden to indulge in pleasures. The world hates Christians—not that they have done it wrong, but because they oppose its pleasures. The soul loves the body and its members in spite of the hatred. So Christians love those who hate them. The soul is locked up in the body, yet it holds the body together. And so Christians are held in the world as in a prison, yet it is they who hold the world together [Can you imagine what the world would be like without Christianity? Those countries which we now call the biggest violators of human rights and freedoms, in which Christians are still violently persecuted as I write, would still be the norm, as before Christianity!]. The immortal soul dwells in a mortal tabernacle. So Christians sojourn among perishable things, but their souls are set on immortality in heaven. When the soul is ill-treated in the matter of food and drink, it is improved. So, when Christians are persecuted, their numbers daily increase. Such is the assignment to which God has called them, and they have no right to shirk it.

For, as I said, it was no earthly discovery that was committed to them, nor is it mortal wisdom that they feel bound to guard so jealously, nor have they been entrusted with the dispensation of merely human mysteries. The truth is that the Almighty Creator of the Universe, the invisible God Himself, scattered from heaven among them the seed of truth and of holy thought which is higher than men's minds, and He made it take firm root in their hearts. . . To them He sent Him [Jesus Christ]. Do you really think—as might be humanly possible—that He [God the Father] sent Him [God the Son, Jesus Christ] to impose His power with fear and terror? Certainly not. He came in gentleness and humility. He sent Him as a King would send a son and king; He sent Him as God for the sake of men. In sending Him, He acted as a Savior, appealing to persuasion and not to power—for it is not like God to use compulsion [here we see again how right from the beginning Christianity taught religious freedom]. He acted as one inviting, not as one pursuing; as a lover, not as a judge. Later on, indeed, He will send Him as a Judge; and then who will be able to withstand His coming? [at the end humankind will be judged for how they lived, with or without love for each other and God, and there will be natural consequences for selfishly choosing against love, including living without love down here and losing the eternal rewards of love in the afterlife – the spiritual condition of utter loneliness known as Hell. But while on earth God only invites and woos us like a lover to choose love over selfishness, and does not compel us with His Power because true love must be FREELY given]. . . Do you not see them [Christians] thrown to wild beasts to make them deny their Lord—and yet they are not conquered? Do you not see that the more of them who are punished, the
more they grow in number? Such things do not look like the works of men; they are
the power of God; they are signs of His coming.¹

And what was the benefit of God’s Son Jesus Christ coming to earth? It took this group of Christians
who followed Him, for all their human weaknesses and sins and imperfections, and gave them the most
enlightened principles ever known for ordering human civilization to be the most humane, and the most
conducive to human happiness down here while preparing for an afterlife of Pure Love! Our whole
Western Civilization since the 4th Century is grounded on these Christian principles, especially the “Pro-
Life” Principles that every human life without exception is supremely and equally valuable and precious,
and thus must be allowed to LIVE and not be subject to being killed by the government (as used to be
normal) and must be allowed to LIVE FREE from all government coercion in matters of belief so as to be
able to freely seek and hopefully find this wonderful truth about human existence. Let us as a society
that still benefits from these enlightened Christian principles no longer forget these principles on which
our whole free and humane civilization is built, and no longer devalue and disparage them as we have
been, denying ALL OF US any INHERENT right to live by legalizing abortion outlawed in the 4th
Century, and now, with the CPSO’s new draft policy, even turning doctors from healers into killers and
undemocratically forcing them against their will to facilitate killing human lives or else lose their jobs.
If we keep on in the direction we are heading we will surely lose all that we still hold dear.

As a final thought: I suggest that the CPSO does not want to have the embarrassment of being the group
that took our society another big step closer to totalitarianism.
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