

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

Position Paper

ABORTION

Human Life International opposes direct abortion in all its manifestations. This is in accordance with the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, which says: "Since the first century the Church has affirmed the moral evil of every procured abortion. This teaching has not changed and remains unchangeable. Direct abortion, that is to say, abortion willed either as an end or a means, is gravely contrary to the moral law" (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, #2271).

The Church further teaches that procuring an abortion incurs the penalty of excommunication (Canon 1398). This can apply not only to the woman who undergoes the abortion but also to the people who support her in this crime financially, physically or morally (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, #2272).

Human Life International, following science and the Faith, supports the truth that human life begins at the moment of conception—when a sperm fertilizes an egg, creating an embryo, a tiny human being with an eternal soul.

An abortion is the intentional or unintentional expulsion of the pre-born child at any time after fertilization and before the natural birth process is completed. There are various types of abortion. They include:

- Suction Curettage—Performed in the first trimester (first three months of pregnancy) but sometimes up to four months. Cervix is dilated, then a suction tube with a sharp tip is inserted into the cervix and the uterus. The suction machine tears the baby apart and sucks him through the tube into a bag.
- Dilation and Curettage (D&C)—Performed in first trimester. A sharp looped knife is inserted into the uterus to scrape its walls and cut the baby apart and remove his body parts.
- Dilation and Evacuation (D&E)—Performed during second trimester (four to six months). Cervix is dilated and then abortionist uses variety of tools to kill the baby, dismember him and remove his body parts.
- Saline Abortion—Performed in second trimester (and early third trimester—four to eight months). Amniotic fluid is withdrawn and replaced with saline solution. Baby breathes and swallows this solution and dies from salt poisoning, brain hemorrhage and convulsions. Baby's skin is burned and delivery occurs within 48 hours after baby dies.
- Dilation and Extraction (D&X)—Partial-birth Abortion, Performed in seven to nine months of pregnancy. Baby is delivered feet first up to his head. His skull is punctured and opened with scissors, then a suction machine vacuums out his brains and the now-dead baby is removed. Estimated 15,000 D&X abortions in the United States every year.
- Hysterotomy Abortion—Third trimester. Mother's uterus is opened and baby is taken out and then left to die on a table, or is killed by the abortionist. Estimated 1,000 such abortions every year in United States alone.
- Intercardiac Injection Abortion—Second trimester. Long needle containing potassium chloride is injected into baby's heart, which causes an immediate heart attack. Dead baby is delivered in a few days.

Approximately 1.3 million surgical abortions take place in the United States every year. Since 1973,

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630

PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/636-7363

WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

Position Paper

ABORTIFACIENTS

Human Life International opposes the manufacture, distribution, and use of all abortifacients. According to the Encyclopedia and Dictionary of Medicine, Nursing and Allied Health, an abortifacient is "a drug or agent that induces abortion"; in effect, a chemical abortion. The Roman Catholic Church forbids the use of abortifacients for the same reason it opposes medical abortion. As taught by the catechism, "Human life must be respected and protected absolutely from the moment of conception" (2270). In addition, some abortifacients are also contraceptive in nature. And, as affirmed in the constant teaching of the Church, "every action which, whether in anticipation of the conjugal act, or in its accomplishment, or in the development of its natural consequences, proposes, whether as an end or as a means, to render procreation impossible" is intrinsically evil (2370).

There are more than 200 abortifacients currently under research. The most commonly used abortifacients are the following:

- Birth Prevention Pill (oral contraceptive)-- The various birth control pills that are on the market all work in a similar way. In general, the Pill "tricks" a woman's body into acting as if it is continuously pregnant. It prevents a woman's reproductive system from functioning normally by causing her ovaries to maintain an unusually high level of estrogen and/or progesterin production. As a result, ovulation either ceases or is drastically curtailed. The Pill does NOT always prevent fertilization (conception), and when fertilization occurs the Pill will usually prevent the fertilized egg from implanting on the uterine wall. In such cases, the Pill acts as a direct abortifacient.
- The Intrauterine Device (IUD)—The IUD is a small "T"-shaped device made of plastic and inserted into the uterus in order to hinder both the fertilization and implantation of the egg. Though researchers are uncertain how the IUD inhibits fertilization, IUDs may immobilize sperm as well as cause the egg to move down the fallopian tube prematurely. IUDs also contain either progesterin or copper that inhibits the implantation of the fertilized egg on the uterine wall; in doing so, the IUD obviously functions as an abortifacient.
- Norplant—Six small tubes, about the size of matchsticks, that are inserted under the skin on the upper part of a woman's arm. The tubes release low-dosage progesterin, an abortifacient that prevents a developing human from implanting himself on the uterine wall.
- RU-486—An abortion pill that can be used in the first nine weeks of pregnancy. Also called mifepristone, RU-486 blocks the action of the progesterone hormone, thus inhibiting a fertilized egg from implanting on the uterine wall. On its own, mifepristone does not work very well. Having prevented implantation—in effect, having killed the embryo through starvation—mifepristone must be followed-up by a dose of prostaglandin. By inducing uterine contractions, prostaglandins expel the embryo from the womb.
- Depo Provera—Depo Provera prevents the ovary from releasing its eggs and thickens cervical mucus to impede the movement of sperm. Depo Provera also functions as an abortifacient by preventing implantation of a fertilized egg by irritating the lining of the uterus. Depo Provera is administered every three months by injection with 150 milligrams of depotmedroxyprogesterone (DMPA).
- Preven—Like RU-486, Preven is an abortion pill or so-called "emergency contraceptive"—a.k.a. "morning after pill." Preven contains estrogen and progesterin. A woman seeking a chemical abortion will take one dose of pills within 72 hours of sexual intercourse and a

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630

PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/636-7363

WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

ABORTIFACIENTS Cont.

second dose 12 hours later. This abortifacient cocktail prevents a fertilized egg from implanting himself on the uterine wall. The tiny human starves and suffocates and is expelled from the womb.

In describing Preven, Brown University associate professor of medicine, Ralph Miech, M.D., Ph.D., argued in the Providence Journal (8/3/98): "This type of pill causes an abortion.... From a pharmacologic perspective, this type of pill should be called an 'abortion-after pill.'" The same could be said for all "morning after pills."

According to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, the makers and marketers of "emergency contraceptives" are misleading the public about the abortifacient nature of their products. "How is this contraception?" asked the U.S. bishops in a 1998 press release. "Women are being falsely led to believe that these pills are contraceptive in nature. But one of their common and intended modes of action is to prevent the development of the embryo, resulting in his or her death."

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL VA 22630
PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/636-7363
WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

Position Paper

CONTRACEPTION

Human Life International opposes contraception. This is in accordance with the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. "[E]ach and every marriage act must remain open to the transmission of life," wrote Pope Paul VI in *Humanae Vitae*. To deny the transmission of life is to contradict the nature of man and woman and the plan of God and His will.

"[E]very action which, either in anticipation of the conjugal act, or in its accomplishment, or in the development of its natural consequences, proposes, whether as an end or as a means, to render procreation impossible" is intrinsically evil (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, #2370). This does not include Natural Family Planning, which cooperates with the human reproductive system as God designed it, whereas contraception conflicts with it.

In giving themselves totally to each other in marriage, a husband and wife include the gift of their fertility, which is an important part of their total being. If they introduce contraceptives into that relationship, the gift is no longer complete, because one has withdrawn and the other has rejected that part of the gift of self.

The definition of "contraception" comes from the Latin (contra = opposed to, and conceptio = conceive). This definition was generally accepted by the medical profession until the beginning of large-scale development of abortifacients—namely the Pill, which acts as an abortifacient as well as a contraceptive—in the late 1960s. (A contraceptive prevents the union of sperm and egg. An abortifacient destroys a fertilized egg, a developing human being.) One of the most common forms of birth control, the Pill works as a contraceptive by suppressing ovulation and affecting cervical mucus; it acts as an abortifacient by causing changes in the woman's body such that a newly conceived baby cannot implant in the womb.

Other types of contraceptives include:

- Surgical sterilization
- Condom (male and female)
- Diaphragm
- Vaginal sponge
- Cervical cap
- Spermicidal foams, gels, creams, suppositories

Surgical sterilization in a male is called vasectomy. With this method, the small vessel (vas deferens) that transports sperm, at a point between the testes, is blocked. This is done by clamping the vas, burning it with electrical sparks, or cutting a segment of it and tying it back. The various methods of female surgical sterilization block the Fallopian tubes to prevent a sperm and an egg from uniting.

The other types of contraception listed work as non-surgical barriers to prevent the union of a sperm and an egg. The user effectiveness rates for such devices are as follows:

Birth Control Pill	89%
Male Condom	88%

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE • FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630

PHONE: 540/635-7884 • FAX: 540/636-7363

WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG • E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

CONTRACEPTION_{Cont.}

Female Condom	79%
Diaphragm	82%
Vaginal Sponge	82%
Cervical Cap	82%

When such devices fail, abortion is the "backup" contraceptive. This is why there is a direct causative association with the increased use of contraceptives and the increased practice of abortion. As Christopher Tietze, the world's most experienced abortion statistician has said: "A high correlation between abortion experience and contraceptive experience can be expected in populations to which both contraception and abortion are available" And the "sexologist" Alfred Kinsey has said: "[W]e have found the highest frequency of induced abortion in the group which, in general, most frequently uses contraceptives."

"Contraception and abortion are often closely connected, as fruits of the same tree," says Pope John Paul II in *Evangelium Vitae*.

Supporters of contraception and so-called "safe sex" claim that condoms, for instance, not only may prevent pregnancy but also may stop the spread of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs). However, a June 2000 "Workshop Summary" on condom effectiveness by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, revealed that condoms do not provide the "protection" claimed for most STDs. The report further showed that the federally run Centers for Disease Control (CDC) sought to conceal these facts from the public, delay their release, and tried to revise the summary.

The summary reportedly found no clinical proof that condoms offer protection from most STDs, such as herpes, syphilis and chlamydia. Concerning Human Papillomavirus, the report said: "There was no epidemiological evidence that condom use reduced the risk of HPV infection" According to the National Cancer Institute, HPV causes more than 90 percent of all cases of cervical cancer. More than 200,000 women die of cervical cancer every year.

Pope Paul VI in *Humanae Vitae* warned that contraception (artificial birth control) would lead to widespread promiscuity, adultery, abortion, divorce, moral decline and other evils. History has proved him right. Today, we live in a Culture of Death.

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630

PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/636-7363

WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

Position Paper

NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING

NFP

Human Life International supports the practice of Natural Family Planning (NFP) within marriage. This is in accordance with the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. As Pope Paul VI explained in *Humanae Vitae*:

"[R]esponsible parenthood is exercised, either by the deliberate and generous decision to raise a numerous family, or by the decision, made for grave motives and with due respect for the moral law, to avoid for the time being, or even for an indeterminate period, a new birth.... If, then, there are serious motives to space out births, which derive from the physical or psychological conditions of husband and wife, or from external conditions, the Church teaches that it is then licit to take into account the natural rhythms immanent in the generative functions, for the use of marriage in the infertile periods only, and in this way to regulate birth without offending the moral principles which have been recalled earlier" (*HV* 10 and 20).

Natural Family Planning is contrary to contraception because NFP cooperates with the human reproductive system as God designed it, whereas contraception conflicts with it. In marriage, a husband and wife make a gift of themselves to each other, including the precious gift of fertility which they have received from God. Using NFP to monitor fertility promotes communication, understanding, sharing of responsibility and generosity. It promotes a very special form of love, in which the husband and wife generously share everything without undue reservations or selfish calculations. The contrast with contraception is immediately obvious in that contraception involves a spouse withdrawing fertility from the total gift of self in marriage and/or rejecting the fertility that was part of the total gift made by the other.

There are four types of NFP:

1. Basal Body Temperature method.
2. Ovulation method.*
3. Sympto-thermal Method.
4. Rhythm or calendar method.

(*This method of NFP is sometimes called the cervical mucus charting method. There are several variations of the ovulation method, including the Billings Ovulation Method [BOM] and Dr. Thomas Hilgers' Creighton Model.)

For detailed information on how each method works, see the Information & Research section of HLI's website (www.hli.org). Or contact the Couple to Couple League, tel. 513-661-7612 or the Pope Paul VI Institute, tel. 402-390-6600.

There are numerous advantages to NFP over chemical and other types of birth control. They include:

- NFP does not interfere with the natural reproductive system and process designed by God.
- NFP is morally acceptable to all religions and cultures.

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630

PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/636-7363

WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING Cont.

- NFP avoids the use of mechanical devices or powerful hormones that may have harmful effects.
- NFP is among the most effective methods of non-permanent fertility regulation known when learned and used properly—up to 99 percent.
- NFP is virtually free of charge, whereas contraceptive and abortifacient methods cost from \$33 to \$365 a year.
- NFP strengthens marriage and family. It allows husband and wife to have the dignity of actual stewardship of the gift of fertility according to their unique circumstances. It fosters sexual self-control, which is central and essential to human freedom, true love and maturity. It also sets a good example of chastity in married life for teenage children.
- NFP is aesthetic. Of all the methods of fertility regulation, only NFP allows the couple to make love as God and nature intended, rather than polluting the act with drugs and devices.
- NFP, unlike all contraceptive and abortifacient methods, lets women and men learn about their bodies and work with them, rather than remaining ignorant and subduing them with chemicals. And NFP allows husbands to more intimately understand the psychology of their wives by understanding the nature of their menstrual cycles.

When a couple contracepts, they say to God: "We will try to frustrate Your will through contraception if it is to create a child," often adding, "and will take action to negate it through abortion if You do create a child." When a couple uses NFP, they instead say: "We will allow every instance of our marriage act to be open to Your will, regardless of whether the probability of conception is likely or remote, and will respect Your awesome gift of fertility in exactly the form you gave it to us."

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™
4 FAMILY LIFE • FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630
PHONE: 540/635-7884 • FAX: 540/636-7363
WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG • E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

The Advantages of Natural Family Planning Over Contraception

Adapted from "The Advantages of Natural Family Planning," brochure by Father Paul Marx, O.S.B. Ph.D., as appears in *The Facts of Life*, by Brian Clowes, Ph.D., (Human Life International™, 2001), p. 98.¹

- (1) NFP does not interfere with the natural reproductive system and process designed by God.
- (2) NFP is morally acceptable to *all* religions and cultures.
- (3) NFP avoids the use of mechanical devices or powerful hormones which may have harmful effects.
- (4) NFP is among the most effective methods of nonpermanent fertility regulation known when learned and used properly — up to 99 percent, as described in, "Contraception."
- (5) NFP is virtually free of charge, whereas contraceptive and abortifacient methods cost anywhere from \$616 to \$2,520 U.S. dollars annually. This point is particularly crucial in areas of developing countries where health care is rudimentary and expensive.
- (6) NFP strengthens marriage and family. It allows husband and wife to have the dignity of actual stewardship of the gift of fertility according to their unique circumstances. It fosters sexual self-control, which is central and essential to human freedom, true love and maturity. It also sets a good example of chastity in married life for teenaged children.
- (7) NFP is aesthetic. Of all of the methods of fertility regulation, only NFP allows the couple to make love as God and nature intended. It is amusing that "lovmaking manuals" try to work condoms, diaphragms, and various messy jams and jellies into the act of making love — "getting rigged to make love," as one noted gynecologist calls it. It is an enduring contradiction that many of the same people who pride themselves on the "natural" aspects of their lives don't hesitate to pollute their bodies with drugs and devices, and cannot let the most intimate aspect of their existence be *truly* natural and human.
- (8) Finally, NFP, unlike all contraceptive and abortifacient methods, lets women and men learn about their bodies and work *with* them, rather than remaining ignorant and subduing them with chemicals. And NFP allows husbands to more intimately understand the psychology of their wives by understanding the nature of their menstrual cycles.

Human Life International © 2004

¹HLI always reminds couples that NFP is not simply a method of "natural" birth control. The Church clearly teaches that NFP is the only method couples may use to space births, but even this method is to be employed only "for grave reasons." In our pastoral care of engaged couples, we must make sure that they understand the mind of the Church on this matter. Note the teaching from *Humanae Vitae*, paragraph 16, which says:

If, then, there are serious motives for spacing births, motives deriving from physical or psychological condition of husband or wife, or from external circumstances, the Church teaches that it is then permissible to take into account the natural rhythms immanent in the generative functions and to make use of marriage during the infertile times only, and in this way to regulate births without offending the moral principles that we have just recalled.

SEMINARIANS FOR LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

Question and Answer Fact Sheet

By Father Thomas J. Euteneuer

amdg

Q: What is the difference between a couple who uses contraception NOT to get pregnant and a couple who uses Natural Family Planning NOT to get pregnant? Aren't they both contracepting?

A: No. There is an intrinsic difference between these two acts. One is preventing conception by a deliberate act, and the other is avoiding conception by cooperation with nature. Both have the same result of not producing a baby, but they achieve this result by very different means. The end does not justify the means; rather the right means lead to the right ends. Thus, when it is necessary to avoid a pregnancy for grave reasons, the Church teaches that there is only one moral way to get there, the natural way.

The difference between natural and artificial birth prevention can be likened to the difference between tax evasion and tax avoidance. Both acts lead to a reduction in the taxes paid, but one is illegal and the other is legal. For example, in tax evasion I am committing a fraud by a deliberate attempt to cheat the system of its due. (I am morally obliged to contribute to the common good.) In tax avoidance I am using the various possibilities for tax reduction that the system itself provides in order to avoid some of its costs. There is a world of difference between the two methods, even though in both cases I am paying fewer taxes.¹

The human reproductive system has a built-in system of avoiding pregnancy. God built into the woman's body cycles of fertility and infertility so pregnancy would not result from every sexual act. By learning the natural cycles of fertility, a couple may morally avoid conceiving a baby when they have a serious reason to do so. Conversely, a couple may also use the knowledge to achieve pregnancy.

The morality of the act has to take into account the intention as well as the method. The immoral intention of artificial contraception is birth prevention while the moral intention of Natural Family Planning is birth avoidance using the natural cycles of fertility. With the one, couples take "control" of the sexual function and nullify or sterilize it. Hence the name birth "control." It turns the divine command "Be fruitful and multiply" right on its head. In the other, the couple cooperates with the natural system consisting of both fertile and infertile periods. If, however, a couple were to use NFP without grave reason for avoiding pregnancy, then their intention would be contraceptive by definition and therefore also gravely immoral. This is a distinction that even many teachers of NFP do not clarify for couples when they teach it, but it is the clear teaching of the Church that couples must not use NFP for "natural" contraception.

We can explain it another way. It all comes down to the "mentality" with which one uses the gift of human sexuality. If couples are masters and controllers of the sexual function, they will be engaging in immoral sex because they will be preventing births with their own selfish designs in mind. However, if they are stewards of God's gift of sexuality in marriage, they cooperate with the Lord and become channels of His life to the world.

¹The American tax system allows deductions for each dependent child in the family. I know a pro-lifer in the U.S. who has nine children and as a result pays no taxes at all!

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

Position Paper

STEM CELLS

Human Life International opposes the use of embryonic stem cells derived from the killing of human embryos for scientific research or for any other purpose. This is in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Catholic Church. The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1987 in *Donum Vitae* concludes: "To use human embryos or fetuses as the object or instrument of experimentation constitutes a crime against their dignity as human beings having a right to the same respect that is due a child already born and to every human person. ... It is a duty to condemn the particular gravity of the voluntary destruction of human embryos obtained 'in vitro' for the sole purpose of research" (Part 1, q. 4, 5).

HLI thus condemned the 2001 decision by President George W. Bush to release federal funds for research on 60 existing "lines" of embryonic stem cells. Following President Bush's decision, Fr. Thomas Euteneuer, president of HLI, explained HLI's stance to reporters at the National Press Club: "Human life begins at fertilization, Mr. President. Human life is precious! And though the Government is not funding the killing of these embryos, it is now funding their killers. ... Human life is an end in itself, there is no greater good than its protection; it is not a commodity to be used even for the most compassionate of reasons. ... For this reason, we cannot endorse any decision that funds research on human beings, albeit limited in scope. The President's decision to fund embryonic research, even in this limited fashion, undermines the fundamental principle of the sanctity of human life and devalues the very life that we are hoping to assist through medical science."

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, in agreement with HLI, also noted that "in the present case the taking of human life was done precisely in order to provide cells for research (and in some cases precisely to qualify for federal research grants). ... Use of embryonic stem cells in successful treatments [for diseases] will increase the demand for future destruction of embryos to provide an adequate supply of tissue for thousands or millions of patients."

In short, the use of embryonic stem cells—even those which are already dead—is as unethical as using the body parts of any other murdered person. Such research was condemned during the Nuremberg Trials and is just as suspect today.

Human Life International also opposes ESC research on scientific grounds. Supporters of embryonic stem cell research (ESC) claim that their studies will lead to great strides in medical knowledge that will benefit the human race. They claim that such research may provide cures for a myriad of diseases: Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, Downs Syndrome, leukemia, cancer, spinal cord injuries and even AIDS. However, the evidence is far from

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630
PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/636-7363
WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

STEM CELLS Cont.

conclusive. Indeed, there is substantial proof that ESC research has failed to produce its promised results.

For example, the *New England Journal of Medicine* (3/8/01), reported that some Alzheimer's patients received injections of embryonic stem cells into their brains in the hope that the cells would create new neural cells. The cells not only failed to form neural cells, but many patients suffered permanent uncontrollable, violent, spastic shaking. Once implanted, the embryonic stem cells cannot be removed.

On a related note, the major media have falsely painted the controversy over ESC as an argument between reasoned science and pro-life zealotry. But the major media, as the New England Journal study shows, have not fully informed the public about the dangers of ESC research. At the same time, the media has failed to inform the American people about the many viable alternatives to ESC research.

HLI supports adult stem cell research as an ethical and scientifically acceptable alternative for the repair and regeneration of damaged or degenerated tissues. There are successful therapies based on stem cells from cord blood and bone marrow. The placenta and the umbilical cord blood of a newly delivered infant can provide a rich source of stem cells. Adult stem cells have also been cultured using the brains of cadavers up to 20 hours after death. Human fat may also prove to be a potential new source of adult stem cells. Likewise, bone marrow has been the source of marrow transplants for some time, and stem cells within bone marrow have been used in clinical application. Focusing research funding and efforts in these areas is the compassionate response to those who are anxious for new therapies.

In the end, however, this scientific debate diverts attention from the central problem with ESC research: The reduction of pre-born children from human beings created in the image of God to mere biological scrap, useful material for others to manipulate and dispose of as they see fit.

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™
4 FAMILY LIFE • FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630
PHONE: 540/635-7884 • FAX: 540/636-7363
WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG • E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

Position Paper

CLONING

Human Life International opposes the cloning of human beings. This is in conformity with the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. "Cloning is the ultimate dehumanizing of human reproduction," says a cloning fact sheet published by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in July 2001. "New human lives are made in the laboratory, tailored to preset specifications to be mere carriers of genetic traits that others find useful. Since new life would issue from manipulation of a body cell rather than from union of sperm and egg, even the usual meanings of 'father' and 'mother' would not apply. This procedure fails to respect the dignity of the resulting child, who has a right to arise from mother and father as a new and valued person with his or her own open future."

In cloning humans, the genetic twin of a person is made in a laboratory. No sexual reproduction occurs. Instead, a human body cell is transferred into an egg taken from a female, but the nucleus of that egg has been removed. This resultant cell is then stimulated by an electric pulse to start development. There is no fertilization, no uniting of sperm and egg. It is asexual reproduction.

"If a woman cloned herself, there would be no contribution from her husband at all," says the Secretariat for Pro-Life Activities at the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. "And genetically, the resulting child would not be her daughter but her twin sister, born decades later than she was. ... Children are manufactured in the lab to preset specifications. They do not arise, but are constructed."

Another evil in cloning human beings is that it involves the destruction of countless embryos. For example, when scientists cloned the sheep "Dolly," they artificially produced 277 sheep embryos—276 embryos died or were thrown away to make the one clone. With humans, cloning would involve the destruction of possibly tens of thousands of embryos (tiny, developing humans).

"These human embryos—produced without true parents, and hence without protectors—would be created at the outset for the sole purpose of experimentation and destruction," said Cardinal William Keeler (archbishop of Baltimore, Md.) in testimony before Congress in 1998. While presenting itself as a means to create life, human cloning actually "shows disrespect for human life in the very act of generating it."

To manufacture human beings in a laboratory reduces the person—human life—to biological scrap. It is equal to the perverse actions of Dr. Frankenstein.

Other evils associated with human cloning, cited by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, include the following:

- 95 to 99 percent of embryos produced by cloning will die
- For embryos that survive into late pregnancy, most will be stillborn or die shortly after birth
- Some embryos may survive with unpredictable but devastating health problems
- Some scientists want to clone large "control groups" to test toxic drugs
- Some scientists want to mass produce embryonic stem cells through cloning for research
- Some scientists and companies want to clone embryos to produce children for infertile couples

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630

PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/636-7363

WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

Eight Problems with Human Cloning

(1) *Human cloning is contrary to the right of the child to grow up in a loving family.* The Pontifical Council on the Family in its document on cloning recognizes that “every human being has the right to be born from the integral love – physical and spiritual – of a father and a mother, to receive their care, to be accepted by his parents as a gift and to be raised by them.” To deny this right is to destroy the very foundation of the family.¹

(2) *Human cloning confuses the role of the parents.* A woman could create a copy of herself without the need of man for reproduction. How then would the donor be related to the child? Can you be a “father” or “mother” to a copy of yourself?

(3) *The cloned person is in danger of losing his personal identity.* A cloned person would be subject to all sorts of expectations. People would expect the clone to be just like his “parent” in personality, talents and achievements.

(4) *The process of human cloning makes science the absolute judge over life and death.* When we give scientists the moral freedom to clone humans they become the judge of which embryos live to become mature children and which die in a lab. Such life and death decisions are based on whether it is good for scientific research.²

(5) *Human cloning favors eugenics.* Some advocates for human cloning extol the idea that it will allow us to improve humanity by weeding out those with possible genetic disorders and the less intelligent. Allowing human cloning would enable the rich elites to reproduce themselves while depriving the poor in undeveloped nations of this ability.³

(6) *Human cloning treats a human person as a manufactured product.* Human cloning separates procreation from any loving human relationship. If the human embryo can be produced in a scientific laboratory at will, is it any different from a car produced on an assemble line? The embryo is simply a spare part to be used or disposed of by scientists.

(7) *The process to create human clones destroys countless human embryos.* The scientists who artificially reproduced “Dolly” the sheep produced 276 sheep embryos before cloning one sheep successfully. How many human embryos do scientists kill to successfully produce one child?⁴

(8) *The possible side effects of human cloning are unknown.* Scientists have already discovered that “Dolly” the sheep suffered from advance forms of arthritis and other ailments not known by normal sheep. Because of “Dolly’s” condition scientists destroyed her in 2003. Human cloning could likewise produce mutations and diseases previously unknown to man.

Human Life International Inc. ® © 2004

¹Cardinal Alfonso Lopez Trujillo, *Cloning: the disappearance of direct parenthood and denial of the family*, Pontifical Council on the Family, (Vatican City, August, 8th 2003) retrieved from www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/family/ on April 1, 2004. This document highlights a number of ethical and medical concerns about human cloning.

²Livio Melina, *Identity and Status of the Human Embryo Proceedings of Third Assembly of the Pontifical Academy for Life*, (Vatican City, second edition, Liberia Editrice Vaticana, February 14-16, 1999), p. 105-109. This book is a great resource for the philosophical and theological foundations on the life issues.

³Eamon Keane, *The Brave New World of Therapeutic Cloning*, (Front Royal, VA; Human Life International Press, second edition 2001). See especially Part 8 on “Eugenics,” p. 29-33.

⁴“Position Paper on Cloning,”(Human Life International 2001). This is available on our website at www.hli.org under the section research and education.

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

Position Paper

HOMOSEXUALITY

Human Life International holds that homosexuals, as fellow human beings created in the image of God, must be treated with dignity and respect. As man's dignity stems from his capacity to freely follow the laws of nature and God, HLI believes that the true freedom of homosexual persons can only be maintained in their choosing to abstain from acts that are contrary to both reason and revelation. It is thus HLI's position that in committing themselves to a life of chastity persons with homosexual tendencies will attain the self-respect and peace that comes from adherence to the truth.

The Laws of Nature

The laws of nature do not refer to the merely biological and instinctual activities of animal or plant life. In speaking of the laws of nature, we mean the rules that exist in order for man to attain his natural fulfillment as a human person. The laws of nature, in other words, are substantially the same as the counsels of reason. These laws are applicable to and capable of being known by every human being, regardless of culture, religion, gender or education. The first law of nature is the law of self-preservation. Homosexuality violates this law insofar as homosexual acts are inherently sterile.

Nature has ordained that sexual activity have a twofold end of being both procreative and unitive. Activities that frustrate either of these two goals are intrinsically wrong. As regards the first end, it cannot be denied that sex exists for the sake of procreation. For this reason, any sexual activity that hinders the procreative potential of the sexual act is intrinsically wrong. Nature has also ordained that human beings, unlike all other animals, are capable of freely choosing when to engage in sexual activity. As nature has allowed that there are times when sexual activity will not necessarily result in conception, a couple that chooses to engage in sexual activity during this "infertile" time also acts in accord with nature. This is because nature uses sex in order to strengthen the natural love of the marriage bond. Acts—rape, for instance—that frustrate this unitive end of sex are immoral. Insofar as homosexual sex tends toward the use of another person for mere physical pleasure, it is unnatural because it destroys the unitive aspect of sex. Homosexuality is thus unnatural because it violates both of the natural ends of sex: the procreative and the unitive.

Promiscuity

As marriage between a man and a woman is ordained by nature as the best means of preserving and cultivating the physical, intellectual and spiritual good of every human person as well as the common good of society, actions that violate the exclusivity of the marital bond are discouraged by nature. The diseases resulting from promiscuity—AIDS, herpes, gonorrhea, syphilis—are well known. Homosexuality as typically practiced, however, is very promiscuous.

Homosexualities, an official publication of The Institute for Sex Research, reported the following:

- 60 percent of male homosexuals had more than 250 lifetime sexual partners.
- 28 percent of male homosexuals had more than 1,000 lifetime sexual partners.

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630

PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/636-7363

WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

HOMOSEXUALITY Cont.

- 79 percent admitted that more than half of their sexual partners were strangers. (Source: Joseph P. Grudel.)

The natural consequences of homosexual sex are severe.

- The average life-span of a male homosexual in America is 43 years; the average life-span of a gay male with AIDS is reported to be 39 years.
- According to the Centers for Disease Control, about 80 percent of all HIV/AIDS carriers in America are practicing homosexuals and IV drug abusers. Eighty-six percent of homosexual males use various drugs to enhance and increase their sexual stimulation.
- Sexual practices typical of homosexuals can affect the oral cavities, lungs, penis, prostate, bladder, anus, perianal areas outside of the rectum, rectum, colon, vagina, uterus, pelvic area, brain, skin, blood, immune system, and other body systems.
- Homosexual sex can lead to a variety of diseases, such as Hepatitis A and B various precancerous lesions such as Bowen's disease and Kaposi's sarcoma. Whenever tissues are traumatized, cracked, or abraded, they are vulnerable to bacterial infection. (Source: Dr. Bernard J. Klamecki, "Medical Perspective of the Homosexual Issue.")

Many homosexuals also suffer from a variety of psychological ailments.

- Homosexual men are six times more likely to have attempted suicide than heterosexual men.
- Twenty-five to 33 percent of homosexual men and women struggle with alcoholism.
- As revealed by one survey, 83 percent of homosexuals would NOT want their sons to be homosexual. (Source: Tim Hughes).

Plato's *Laws* as well as the ancient Roman law forbid homosexuality as destructive to both the person who engaged in such activities, to the institution of marriage and to the common good. Thomas Jefferson proposed punishing homosexual acts with castration—modifying the common law that typically punished sodomy with death. More recently, the Defense of Marriage Act (1996) clarified that "marriage" by definition, "means only a legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife."

The Divine Law

The Bible also clearly forbids homosexuality: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind, because it is an abomination." (Lev. 18:22.)

The constant teaching of the Catholic Church also forbids homosexual sex. According to the Catechism, "Homosexuality refers to relations between men or between women who experience an exclusive or predominant sexual attraction toward persons of the same sex. ... [T]radition has always declared that 'homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered.' They are contrary to the natural law. They close the sexual act to the gift of life. ... Under no circumstances can they be approved" (2357). At the same time, the Catechism recommends that homosexual persons "be accepted with respect, compassion, and sensitivity. Every sign of unjust discrimination in their regard should be avoided. These persons are called to fulfill God's will in their lives and, if they are Christians, to unite to the sacrifice of the Lord's Cross the difficulty they may encounter from their condition (2358)."

"Homosexual persons are called to chastity. By the virtues of self-mastery that teach them inner freedom, at times by the support of disinterested friendship, by prayer and sacramental grace, they can and should gradually and resolutely approach Christian perfection" (2359)."

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630

PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/635-7363

WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

Position Paper

EUTHANASIA

Human Life International rejects the euthanasia, or so-called mercy killing of persons who are incurably sick or injured or dying. This is in accordance with the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, which says: "Whatever its motives and means, direct euthanasia consists in putting an end to the lives of handicapped, sick, or dying persons. It is morally unacceptable. Thus an act or omission which, of itself or by intention, causes death in order to eliminate suffering constitutes a murder gravely contrary to the dignity of the human person and to the respect due to the living God, his Creator."

The sick, the suffering, and the dying should be treated with respect and dignity. This does not mean that a variety of extraordinary means (medicines and medical technology) need to be used to keep terminally sick or dying people alive—they *may* be used dependent upon the person's or family members' desires. However, ordinary means (food and water) must be used and not denied to the patient. Beyond that, one need do nothing.

There are two types of euthanasia.

- Active (direct) euthanasia is action taken for the purpose of causing or hastening death. These measures may include lethal injection or overdose committed by a physician. "Physician-assisted suicide" indicates that a physician has helped a person kill himself.
- Passive (indirect) euthanasia is action withheld for the purpose of causing or hastening death. These measures include the withholding or withdrawal of even basic needs, including food, hydration (water) and oxygenation. Examples of this type of euthanasia are the many infanticides committed each year in the United States by withholding food and water from handicapped newborn babies who would otherwise have lived. Another example is the withholding of food and water from a person in a so-called "persistent vegetative state," or from someone whose health is not improving rapidly enough in the opinion of the attending health care workers.

The willing cooperation of the subject is necessary for voluntary euthanasia. The subject is murdered without his/her knowledge or consent in cases of involuntary euthanasia.

HLI strongly opposes both voluntary and involuntary euthanasia, which the media, following pro-euthanasia organizations, euphemistically refer to using the following slogans: "Right to Die," "Death with Dignity," "Compassion in Dying" and "Mercy Killing." Such terms tend to disguise the ugly agenda that is being pursued by the more radical proponents of euthanasia.

The euthanasia movement is following a three-step strategy in its bid to legalize euthanasia. Its ultimate goal is to allow the State or "society"—instead of Nature or God—to decide who, when, and by what means a person may be killed. The first step in this strategy involves the

HUMAN LIFE INTERNATIONAL™

4 FAMILY LIFE · FRONT ROYAL, VA 22630

PHONE: 540/635-7884 · FAX: 540/636-7363

WEBSITE: WWW.HLI.ORG · E-MAIL: HLI@HLI.ORG

© 2001 Human Life International™

EUTHANASIA Cont.

"Living Will." The primary objectives of a "Living Will" are cost containment and the conditioning of the public to accept the withdrawal of life-saving medical treatment. The "Living Will" is the first step on the road to active, involuntary euthanasia for those people deemed useless to society. As the pro-death Hemlock Society has admitted: "We have to go stage by stage, with the living will, with the power of attorney.... Your side would call that the 'slippery slope.'"

The second step in the euthanasia strategy is to encourage the use of indirect euthanasia: the withholding of food, water and oxygen. People who have been denied the necessities of life will die in agony over a period lasting up to two weeks. In response to a "crisis" of its own making, the pro-euthanasia supporters will reject such "barbarism," calling instead for a more "compassionate" approach of "physician-assisted suicide" or direct euthanasia. At this stage, the patient or his "attorney-in-fact" will ask that the patient be killed by injection.

The final step in the strategy requires involuntary euthanasia: to kill the "unfit" people who are either unwilling to die or unable to defend themselves. As Dr. John Goundry has concluded: "a death pill will be available and in all likelihood will be obligatory.... In the end, I can see the State taking over and insisting on euthanasia." (Source: ALL Pro-Life Activist's Encyclopedia, ch. 110).

53

54

55