

5th WORLD-PRAYER-CONGRESS for LIFE in ROME

October 5 – 10, 2010

“And the Light Shines in the Darkness”

Talk No. 21

held on October 7, 2010 by

John Smeaton

“The Right to Life as Human Right: Truth and Illusion in the EU”

organized by HLI Austria: www.hli.at Talks available at: www.pro-life-congress.com

In Caritas in Veritate, Pope Benedict XVI warns:

“Nowadays we are witnessing a grave inconsistency. On the one hand, appeals are made to alleged rights, arbitrary and non-essential in nature, accompanied by the demand that they be recognised and promoted by public structures, while, on the other hand, elementary and basic rights remain unacknowledged and are violated in much of the world. ...[I]f the only basis of human rights is to be found in the deliberations of an assembly of citizens, those rights can be changed at any time, and so the duty to respect and pursue them fades from the common consciousness. Governments and international bodies can then lose sight of the objectivity and ‘inviolability’ of rights.”¹

The concept of human rights emerges from divine revelation and the recognition that human beings are created in the image and likeness of God ². The validity of these rights lies in the principles of natural law written on the hearts of all men.³ However, cut-off from their source in revelation and natural law, human rights become anti-human. Rights which are incompatible with natural law are not only invalid, but their promotion demands the subjugation of some human beings in order to advance the interests of others. Almost on a weekly basis we see such alleged rights invoked to justify public policies which threaten the most vulnerable in society or used to silence those who speak out in defence of Christian values and natural law. Nowhere is this more clearly seen than with the attempts to separate the right to life from the principles of natural law.

Although recognition of human rights pre-dates World War II, today’s human rights establishment grew out of the International Military Tribunals at Nuremberg and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). Among those tried at Nuremberg were the architects of the T4 euthanasia programme and the abortionists of occupied Poland. On 27 July, 1946 the Tribunal heard how the Nazis had used:

¹ CV 43

² Genesis 1:26-27

³ Rom 2:14-15.

“various biological devices,...to achieve genocide. They deliberately decreased the birth rate in the occupied countries by sterilization, castration and abortion, by separating husband from wife and men from women and obstructing marriage.”⁴

In September 1948 the General Assembly of World Medical Association adopted the Declaration of Geneva⁵ which called on doctors to: “maintain the utmost respect for human life from the time of conception,” and affirm that “even under threat, I will not use my medical knowledge contrary to the laws of humanity...” The following year the Association adopted the International Code of Medical Ethics⁶ which also required doctors to preserve human life from the time of conception.

In 1955 the Declaration on the Rights of the Child (DRC) committed States to provide children with “special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth.”⁷ Principle 4 of that Declaration states:

“The child shall enjoy the benefits of social security. He shall be entitled to grow and develop in health; to this end, special care and protection shall be provided both to him and to his mother, including adequate pre-natal and post-natal care.”

The DRC recognised the child in the womb as a rights-holder. This recognition is carried over into the 1990 Convention on the Rights of the Child⁸ (CRC). Article 24(1) of the CRC obliges States to “recognize the right of the child to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health and to facilities for the treatment of illness and rehabilitation of health” and to “strive to ensure that no child is deprived of his or her right of access to such health care services”. Article 24(2)(d) then calls on States to pursue full implementation of this right and, in particular, to “ensure appropriate pre-natal and post-natal health care for mothers.” The child’s right to health is clearly meant to include care prior to birth.

Similarly, in 1966, Article 6(5) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights⁹ prohibited the execution of pregnant women. The purpose of this was to ensure that innocent children would not be punished with the guilty.¹⁰

⁴ International Military Tribunal (27 July 46), Volume XIX, pp 498-9 (<http://www.mazal.org/archive/imt/19/IMT19-T487.htm>).

⁵ “I will maintain the utmost respect for human life from the time of conception, even under threat, I will not use my medical knowledge contrary to the laws of humanity...” Declaration of Geneva (1948), adopted by the General Assembly of World Medical Association, Geneva, Switzerland, September 1948.

⁶ “A doctor must always bear in mind the obligation of preserving human life from conception.” International Code of Medical Ethics of the World Medical Association (1949), adopted by the Third General Assembly of the World Medical Association, October 1949.

⁷ Declaration of the Rights of the Child, G.A. res. 1386 (XIV), 14 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No. 16) at 19, U.N. Doc. A/4354 (1959).

⁸ Convention on the Rights of the Child, G.A. res. 44/25, annex, 44 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No. 49) at 167, U.N. Doc. A/44/49 (1989), entered into force Sept. 2 1990

⁹ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by GA res 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 entry into force 23 March 1976.

¹⁰ “The principle reason for providing in paragraph 4 [now Article 6(5)] of the original text that the death sentence should not be carried out on pregnant women was to save the life of an innocent unborn child.” Marc J

When the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950) was being drafted, abortion was recognised as a crime against humanity and human life was intended to be protected from the moment of conception. As the Australian scholar Rita Joseph demonstrates in her examination¹¹ of the historical background of the Convention, there was a broad consensus for the inclusion in human rights protection of the child before birth. At that time, this was universally recognised and was not controversial. The context in which the Convention was framed makes no other interpretation possible. It is true that the text of the Convention does not mention the unborn explicitly, but it also fails to mention the disabled, the elderly or the mentally ill and many other sections of the human family targeted by the Nazis. No one, as far as I'm aware, has ever argued that these groups are not protected by the terms of the Convention.

Despite all of this, however, the European Court of Human Rights has consistently sought to avoid ruling on whether the right to life before birth is protected under Article 2. Since the first case involving abortion was heard, its approach has been to view the question as an issue falling within the "margin of appreciation" granted to individual States.

Yet this position has become increasingly difficult for the Court to maintain. In the case of *Vo v France* (2004), a case which was not directly related to legalised abortion, the Court was forced to recognise the obvious, that the child before birth "belongs to the human race."¹² Nevertheless, it insisted that the question of when life begun was a matter for individual States¹³. Inevitably its lack of commitment to natural law interpretation of Article 2 has resulted in the Court moving toward recognition of a right to abortion, or at least access to abortion where abortion is lawful. ." In other words "Yes" the unborn child is a member of the human race, but "No" it is not a person and therefore entitled to protection under Article 2.

In 2007, in *Tysi ac v Poland*, the Court found that Poland's restrictions on abortion breached the right to privacy of a woman who had been denied an abortion because an eye condition from which she suffered was judged to be an insufficiently grave threat to her health to permit an abortion under Polish law. Time does not permit an examination of the conflicting medical evidence or the questionable interpretation put on it by the Court. But the ruling in this case elevated the secondary and conditional right to privacy in Article 8 above the fundamental right to life protected by Article 2. The Court then found, within Article 8, the right to access abortion. The significance of this ruling was summed-up by the Spanish judge, Javier Borrego Borrego, in his dissenting opinion when he said:

"Today the Court has decided that a human being was born as a result of a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights. According to this reasoning, there is a Polish child, currently six years old, whose right to be born contradicts the Convention.

Bossuyrt in the Guide to the "Travaux Preparatoires of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, (Martinus Nijhoff, 1987) 118, A/3764.

¹¹ Human Rights and the Unborn Child, Joseph R, Martinus Nijhoff, Leiden - Boston, 2009 ISBN 978 90 04 17560 0 Chpt 10 European Convention (1950) and the unborn child.

¹² Case of *Vo v France* [84] (Application no. 53924/00) 8 July 2004, [84]

¹³ *ibid* [83]

“I would never have thought that the Convention would go so far, and I find it frightening.”¹⁴

Last year the European Court heard *A, B & C v Ireland*. In that case three women under the guidance of the Irish Family Planning Association complained to the Court that Irish Constitutional protection for children before birth violates their right to have an abortion. While the European Convention requires that all cases should first be heard in the national courts, this case, almost unnoticed even in Ireland, sidestepped the normal procedures and was directed to the Court’s Grand Chamber, a forum from which there is no appeal. The judgement is expected sometime in 2010.

The outcome of this case could have devastating consequences and not just for Ireland. There are already powerful interests within the United Nations which try to use human rights agreements to promote abortion on demand. If the European Court of Human Rights rules against Ireland, then no country in the world would be safe from the international abortion lobby. So this case is also a threat to the right of sovereign, democratic nations to govern themselves.

Yet we are not powerless to prevent this. As I have said, true human rights find their origin in God. They cannot be granted by courts or governments, but they must be recognised and acknowledged by them. Despite attempts to distort them, international agreements like the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights recognise the right to life of all members of the human family “without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.”¹⁵ This also includes the distinction of personhood and non-personhood held by some, including thus far, European courts, to apply to the unborn child. Article 6 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948) clearly states, as does the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in its Article 16, that “everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law”.

We must call upon governments and human rights institutions to return to the original meaning of these documents which were drafted in response to the atrocities revealed by the Nuremburg Tribunals. To do this, we must become more familiar with the international agreements which were intended to protect all human beings at every stage of life.

We must resist injustice and continue to speak out for those who cannot defend themselves. Italy has shown great determination in standing against an unjust and ideologically driven attempt to remove the image of God from its schools. We must pray, that the people of Ireland show the same determination in resisting the unjust attack on the child in the womb, created in the image and likeness of God.

¹⁴ Case of *Tysiáć v Poland* (Application no. 5410/03) 20 March 2007

¹⁵ ICCPR Art 2 (1).

Tragically, abortion is legal in the vast majority of the Council of Europe member states. The BBC website has published an abortion map of the 27 countries of the European Union. Malta is the only country listed as prohibiting abortion in all circumstances.

The citizens of Ireland have also distinguished themselves in upholding the right to life of all unborn children. In a 1983 referendum, Irish citizens voted for a constitutional amendment to protect unborn children. In that amendment, the Irish State was pledged to protect unborn children in its laws.

Tragically, that protection was undermined - not by the Irish people - but by a perverse decision of the Supreme Court in the X case in 1992. The Supreme Court, contrary to all reasonable expectations, allowed abortions in the case of threatened suicide.

Then last year, on 15th December 2009, the Irish Supreme Court once again ruled in a decision, contrary to all reasonable expectations, that embryos outside the body are not protected under Ireland's constitution.

As Pat Buckley, of European Life Network Ireland, who is present at this week's conference, commented at the time: "The judges' interpretation of article 40.3.3 excluding human embryos from protection is wrong. This decision treats human embryos as if they are mere property, when in fact they are equal members of the human family. International human rights law does not exclude human embryos from the equal right to life upheld in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights instruments. There is no genetic difference between an embryo inside or outside the body. The right to life, which is inalienable, does not change according to location."

I want to turn now to human rights relating to the family, to marriage, and to parents as the primary educators of their children.

I would like to quote from an important talk, given in Qatar, by the distinguished US attorney and bioethicist, William L. Saunders Jnr, entitled "Human Rights, the Family and the Education of Children".

Mr Saunders writes: "Article 16 [of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights] declares: 'The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.' Thus, article 16 recognizes the common sense fact, sometimes overlooked by governments and international organizations, that the family exists prior to the state, is the foundation of the state, and that the state is obligated to protect it."

Mr Saunders continues: "Article 16 goes further. It recognizes the right of a man and woman to marry and found a family. In other words, it recognizes that the family is founded ... upon marriage. We can all be thankful the Declaration recognized these fundamental truths."

Listen carefully to William Saunders's explanation of how the Universal Declaration of Human Rights upholds parents as the primary educators of their children. He says: "Echoing the approach of article 16 [of the Declaration], article 26(3) recognizes that parents are the primary educators of their children. 'Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education

that shall be given to their children' [the article states]. As article 16 recognized the priority to the state of the family founded upon marriage, article 26 recognizes the priority of the wishes of parents regarding the education of their own children over any designs of the state. Remember, per article 16, the State is obligated to protect the family. If the State presumes to usurp the rights of parents to choose the education of their own children, it damages the family, violates its own obligations, and undermines the foundation of a just society and State."

William Saunders underlines the historical significance of the Universal Declaration's insistence on parents as the primary educators of their children by citing Mary Ann Glendon, Professor of Law at Harvard Law School, former US ambassador to the Holy See, and President of the Pontifical Academy for Social Sciences. In her authoritative book on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights *A World Made New* Mary Ann Glendon writes:

"In the article on education [26]...[the drafting committee for the Declaration] made an important change, influenced directly by recollections of the National Socialist regime's efforts to turn Germany's renowned educational system into a mechanism for indoctrinating the young with the government's program.... [A]fter Beaufort of the Netherlands recalled the ways in which German schools had been used to undermine the role of parents, a third paragraph was added: 'Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.'"

"In other words" William Saunders comments "one of the most important lessons drawn by the framers of the Declaration from the experience of the Second World War was that parental choice in education is a fundamental plank of international peace and security".

For many years in Britain, our government has been pursuing a policy of providing access to abortion and birth control drugs and devices for children under the age of sixteen without parental knowledge or consent. Similar policies are being pursued by the Spanish government.

Tragically, over 60 years on from the Universal Declaration and the Second World War, it seems that the lessons have not been learned, not in Britain by the British government, not in Spain, by the Spanish government, and the same pressures are developing in Ireland and, without doubt, in other countries in Europe.

Europe is under intense attack and the pro-life and pro-family movement and Catholic Church leaders must be in the front line of resistance. This is World War Three and it's primarily a war on the unborn and on parents as the primary educators of their children.

There is in fact a worldwide attack on unborn children, on marriage and the family, and on parents as the primary educators of their children. It's being led by the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the world's largest abortion-promoting agency, which has its headquarters in London. This attack is also promoted by the pro-abortion lobby in the European institutions, including the European Commission which is the world's largest multilateral donor to International Planned Parenthood Federation. This attack on the unborn and on families is also supported by leading international pro-abortion figures such as Tony Blair, the former British Prime Minister, who is clearly exploiting his entry into the Catholic Church in order to undermine Catholic teaching on the sanctity of human life, on marriage and on human sexuality, together with his wife Cherie Blair, who is also a Catholic; and by

US President Barack Obama's administration. In Britain, this attack on unborn children, marriage and the family is also being supported by the Catholic bishops' conference of England and Wales.

To begin with President Obama: In a speech on October 12th last year, Wellington Webb, appointed by Barack Obama as special adviser to the US mission to the United Nations, confirmed that the Obama administration will be promoting legalised abortion throughout the world, targeting adolescents in a worldwide abortion drive. The ambassador was speaking at the UN's 15th anniversary commemoration of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD). His speech expressly committed the US government to promoting "access to reproductive health commodities and services for adolescents" and he stated "President Obama, Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice have all underscored the strong support of the United States for human rights, women's rights and reproductive rights as well as universal access to reproductive health and family planning".

[Hillary Clinton](#), Obama's appointee as US Secretary of State, has made it clear that when her government speaks of reproductive health, it's a term which includes access to abortion.

We must understand that it's the intention of the Obama administration not to allow health professionals' conscientious objection to abortion to get in the way. "Universal access" to "reproductive health", to which the Obama government declares itself to be committed, cannot be "universal" if troublesome pro-life health professionals object in conscience to participating in abortion cases or referring them to colleagues.

In the meantime, the anti-life lobby has intensified its campaign in the European institutions.

A report on conscientious objection in medicine is being debated this week in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe consists of elected representatives from the legislatures of the 47 member-states of the Council of Europe. (Please note that the council is entirely separate from the European Union.) The report's focus is conscientious objection to abortion, contraception, IVF and euthanasia. If the report is passed, Council of Europe member-states will be under pressure effectively to abolish in law and practice conscientious objection within medicine.

Sadly, the situation is made even worse by church leaders who appear to have imbibed the spirit of the age. I want to say a few words about the Catholic Church and about our battle for the sanctity of human life, for the family, and for parents as the primary educators of their children, and I will start with the Catholic Church in England and Wales, which is my part of the world.

While the teaching of the Catholic Church is that there is a congruence between faith and reason on matters such as homosexual adoption, Catholic church leaders in England and Wales were prepared to refer homosexual couples to other adoption agencies - thus putting children at serious risk. In addition, tragically, in Britain, induced abortion and birth control drugs and devices are provided to children at school, including Catholic schools, under the age of 16 without parental knowledge or consent. This is happening with the co-operation of the Catholic authorities.

Britain is witnessing the fulfilment of the prophetic message of *Humanae Vitae*, Pope Paul VI's historic encyclical which celebrated its 40th anniversary two years ago. Speaking about

the inseparable connection between the unitive and procreative aspects of sexual intercourse he wrote: "Finally, careful consideration should be given to the danger of this power passing into the hands of those public authorities who care little for the precepts of the moral law. Who will blame a government which in its attempt to resolve the problems affecting an entire country resorts to the same measures as are regarded as lawful by married people in the solution of a particular family difficulty? Who will prevent public authorities from favoring those contraceptive methods which they consider more effective? Should they regard this as necessary, they may even impose their use on everyone."

Moreover, as Pope John Paul II points out in *Evangelium Vitae*, there is a close interconnection between contraception and abortion. According to the manufacturers, one of the contraceptive pill's modes of action is to cause an early abortion.

A teacher at a Catholic comprehensive school for boys and girls in Kent, England, spoke out recently about the sex education given to her class of 13- to 14-year-old children. The teacher, a Miss McLernon, said: "I think people should be aware of what is going on in schools. I witnessed the nurse using a plastic model to show these children how to put on what she said was a chocolate flavoured condom." She went on to explain to her pupils that flavoured condoms had been made because prostitutes didn't like the taste of rubber.

Miss McLernon added: "Every child in the class was given a card explaining where you could get free contraceptives and the abortion-inducing morning-after pill. The card also gave details of a website for young people explaining how a surgical abortion could be arranged. This is a Catholic school where you would expect children to be protected from this sort of thing."

Sadly, more and more Catholic parents are telling us at the Society for the Protection of Unborn Children about terrible experiences in Catholic schools, both at secondary and primary school level. Protests on the part of Catholic parents and teachers seeking to protect young people do not appear to be heard.

Furthermore, the British government and the European Union have enacted a body of law on the equal employment rights of male and female homosexuals, and bisexuals and transsexuals, which is to be enforced with the threat of severe legal sanctions. The Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales has produced *Diversity and Equality Guidelines*, a policy statement which (whilst it includes elements of Catholic doctrine) welcomes, seeks to implement and states that it will monitor this Government policy within the Church, including in Catholic schools.

The bishops' document speaks about welcoming [quote] "the social and cultural changes which are required of us..." It says "...it would be wrong to give some forms [of the six forms of discrimination listed by the Government] greater or lesser importance than others." The document says that Catholics "must understand and comply with discrimination legislation"

The bishops' document calls on "those with authority at all levels of the church to be more aware of whether different groups are represented in the many facets of life of the Church e.g. schools..." and the bishops say: "...Organisations, institutions and dioceses should consider appointing or entrusting someone with responsibility for diversity and equality" Finally, the bishops warn: "We ... intend to review progress ... in two years".

Pope John Paul II taught that it was an illusion to think that we could build a true culture of human life if we did not offer adolescents and young adults an authentic education in sexuality, and in love, and the whole of life according to their true meaning and in their close interconnection. However, with the bishops of England and Wales now welcoming and guaranteeing the presence of homosexual, bisexual and transsexual teachers in Catholic schools in England and Wales, is it not completely unrealistic to expect that Catholic sexual morality will be taught in these schools?

A pro-abortion document prepared at the request of the European Union Commission on the right to conscientious objection, links rights relating to sexual orientation to other supposed rights, including the "right" to abortion and the "right" to euthanasia and assisted suicide. The document is entitled *The Right to Conscientious Objection and the Conclusion by EU Member States of Concordats with the Holy See*. The document quotes, in part, the Diversity and Equality Guidelines of the Catholic bishops of England and Wales in a generally approving way. The bishops' guidelines and the European Union experts' document clearly agree that, subject to limited and narrow exceptions, Catholic organizations must ensure that no job applicant or employee receives less favourable treatment than another on the grounds of ... sexual orientation.

The Catholic Herald, a British Catholic newspaper, has pointed out^[11] that *The Right to Conscientious Objection and the Conclusion by EU Member States of Concordats with the Holy See* may be used as a legal reference point in the European Court of Human Rights. The same is therefore true, I would submit, of the Diversity and Equality Guidelines from the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales.

Disunity continues to grow in the Church throughout Europe because its leaders persist in failing to teach the doctrine and prophetic message of *Humanae Vitae*, Pope Paul VI's encyclical on the transmission of human life. Public authorities - from China to Britain - are indeed imposing on entire countries "the same measures as are regarded as lawful by married people in the solution of a particular family difficulty". Moreover, the use of contraceptive drugs and devices by so many Catholics, which may, according to the manufacturers, cause an early abortion, is draining the pro-life movement of the support of the community most likely to support the battle against abortion. Couples who may be turning a blind eye to the practice of abortifacient birth control in the intimacy of their married lives may well find it difficult to support our unequivocal campaigns against abortion, IVF, human embryo research and euthanasia.

The artificial separation of the unitive and procreative elements of sexual intercourse is not only the basis of contraception, it's also the basis of early abortion and in vitro fertilisation. It underpins today's culture of death.

It's vital that the pro-life movement in Europe studies the history and consequences of the overwhelming rejection of *Humanae Vitae* by Catholics in the West, following its publication in 1968.

In 1971 Vatican officials aimed at damage limitation to the "unity" of the Church by an unofficial policy which became known as *The Truce of '68*. This policy resulted in the Washington Case. Let me tell you about the Washington Case. This is what happened. In 1968 the Archbishop of Washington, Cardinal Patrick O'Boyle forbade his priests to preach dissent from the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*. Nineteen of his priests appealed against his

injunction to the Congregation for the Clergy in the Vatican. In 1970 this Vatican Congregation, under the guidance of the American Cardinal Wright, issued a directive which read as follows:

- Humanae Vitae must be received as the teaching of the Church.
- The doctrine of the Church is that conscience must always be followed.

There was no third conclusion, urging that conscience be formed in the light of the teaching of the Church. Cardinal O'Boyle was informed that if his priests were prepared to subscribe to this directive, he must reinstate them. The result was that priests worldwide were now able to encourage their flock to 'follow their conscience', while admitting the teaching of the Church as 'an ideal'. What had happened in effect was a nullification by a Vatican official of the authority of the Bishop as a teacher of the Apostolic tradition. The resultant chaos and silence of the Church through the promotion of a false doctrine of conscience has never been effectively redressed, despite frequent reiterations of the Church's doctrine, notably by Pope John Paul II and the then Cardinal Ratzinger, now Pope Benedict XVI.

Subsequently in March 1989 the state of the American Church was deemed to be so serious that a number of Bishops were called to Rome. Cardinal O'Connor of New York made an outstanding intervention. He pointed out that the word 'conscience' in the United States had changed its meaning between 1945 and 1989. Thus in the fifties when Bishop Fulton Sheen had used the word in his addresses, everybody understood that he was referring to the Ten Commandments. By 1989 no such understanding existed. 'Conscience' was now taken to mean literally what you will. Cardinal O'Connor then asked a pointed question: "But, Holy Father, if a Bishop teaches the doctrine of the Church, will he be upheld by Rome?"

Thus since the start of the Truce of '68 Humanae Vitae has remained a doctrinal truth dissociated from its implementation by a policy of the generalised acceptance of contraception. Policy has been in opposition to truth. Truth has been undermined by policy based on a seemingly expedient misinterpretation of conscience. The example of this disassociation of policy from truth on the transmission of human life has, quite logically, been succeeded by a similar tactical retreat on the defence of life itself.

Two years ago the issues underlying the Washington case question re-emerged starkly in Recife, Brazil. The Archbishop of Recife Archbishop José Cardoso Sobrinho was harshly called to account by the Brazilian press, Government and the abortion lobby for upholding the right to life of two unborn babies. A Vatican official Archbishop Fisichella, President of the Pontifical Academy for Life, writing in all of the language editions of the Osservatore Romano reinforced the attack upon the courageous and faithful Archbishop Cardoso Sobrinho. The result was a new uncertainty, this time not about contraception but about abortion, and by implication, euthanasia, if, as Archbishop Fisichella claimed, 'compassion' is to be the guide to the conscience of the doctor, rather than the truth about the Creator and His Creation. There was a sustained pro-life reaction to this scandalous situation very largely from the Anglo-Saxon and Hispanic world. Subsequently a document from the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith correcting Archbishop Fisichella's article was published in Osservatore Romano. Its publication had been commanded by the Holy Father. The Clarification from The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith ended with a

quotation from Number 89 of *Evangelium Vitae* “As for the responsibility of medical workers, the words of Pope John Paul II must be recalled: «Their professionwhich requires every doctor to commit himself to absolute respect for human life and its sacredness». At this point the Clarification stops abruptly in the middle of Number 89 of the Encyclical. This section of the Encyclical continues **“Absolute respect for every innocent human life also requires the exercise of conscientious objection in relation to procured abortion and euthanasia. "Causing death" can never be considered a form of medical treatment, even when the intention is solely to comply with the patient's request. Rather, it runs completely counter to the health-care profession, which is meant to be an impassioned and unflinching affirmation of life.”**

Had the quotation from N89 of *Evangelium Vitae* not been discontinued it would have explicitly corrected the core error in Fisichella’s article. Regrettably this specific dubium on the autonomy of the medical conscience has not been corrected.

We are now undergoing a total onslaught of this evil culture under the leadership of President Barack Obama whose administration is orchestrating a worldwide attack on unborn children, on marriage, on parents as the Primary educators of their children, on the terminally ill and on conscience.

I believe that the values of Nobel Prize Winner Mother Teresa who said in her acceptance speech: "[T]he greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion" will prevail over the values of Nobel Prize Winner, Barack Obama who has called for abortion on demand to be legalized throughout the world. Through our work in the years ahead, the dignity and inviolability of every human life will once again be reflected in people's consciences and national law, just as it's deeply entrenched in universally-binding human rights agreements. On the other hand, the values of the pro-abortion, pro-human embryo research lobby, reflected in the callous rhetoric of choice which tramples on human lives, born and unborn, will be consigned in the not so very distant future to a tragic chapter of human history.

Our crisis began with the rejection of *Humanae Vitae*. It will end with its acceptance and implementation. The acceptance and implementation of the prophetic teaching of *Humanae Vitae* will only be possible if there is a radical change in the nomination policy of Bishops throughout Europe. The Truce of 68 is over. The nominations of bishops who do not have a sustained and genuine track record of fidelity to the teachings of the Magisterium on the transmission of human life (*Humanae Vitae*) must stop. Such nominations must stop because the cost in babies' lives is simply too great. *Humanae Vitae* which has been re-stated in Pope Benedict's *Caritas in Veritate* must become central to our pro-life and pro-family movement. We and our bishops will go on to lead the world provided we are united on the totality of the truth on human life and its transmission.