

Editor :  
L. SCHEPENS MD  
GENERAL SECRETARY :  
BRUYSLAAN, 78  
B-8000 OSTEND (BELGIUM)  
(059) 80.08.60 - 23.46.18



1985

Of the World Federation of Doctors who respect Human Life

## NEWS EXCHANGE

News Exchange has correspondents in Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Dubai, Eire, Finland, Føroyar, France, W. Germany, Great-Britain, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, The Netherlands, New-Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Uruguay, U.S.A., Viet-Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia,

YEAR 11

N° 89 OCTOBER 1985

(Published in English and French)

### ETHICS AND BIOPOLITICS

BY

MICHEL SCHOOYANS

PROFESSEUR À L'UNIVERSITÉ DE LOUVAIN

ADDRESS OF THE AUTHOR :

UNITÉ DES RELATIONS INTERNATIONALES  
Collège Jacques Leclercq  
Place Montesquieu, 1  
B. 1348 - LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE  
Tél.: 010/43.41.30 (Secrétariat)



## ETHICS AND BIOPOLITICS

Paper delivered at the 10th anniversary Congress of the World Federation of Doctors Who Respect Human Life, Ostend 1984, by Professor Michel SCHOONYANS, University of LOUVAIN (UCL) Belgium. Translation by Ph. SCHEPENS, MD.

Everything which has something to do with BIOTICS, that is all what is related to the human life, to its care its developpement, is matter of interest for politics. Scientific disciplines which are devoted to the study of life, are since long ago within the sphere of interest of politicians. Conversely scientists who work in those disciplines became aware of their own importance, real or potential, within the politics. What we stated here is definitely valuable for three of those disciplines which we will deal with in this paper, i.e. for biology, for medicine and even for demography. The use of the possibilities of biology, medicine and even demography, for the conquest and the exercise of political power will be coined as BIOPOLITICS. (1)

The use for political purposes, of those three disciplines, be it by international organisations, by governments, by private groups or by the scientists themselves, does raise serious questions in the fields of social ethics.

### Science and Politics

Relations between science and political power have always been close but rather ambiguous (2). Science must be understood as an organic whole of knowledge, wich covers a sector of the material reality. Biology is for instance the whole of acquired knowledge in the field of life, while medicine is the whole of the knowledge which is related to the health, how to keep it and how to regain it. Demograhpy being the whole of the knowledge which deals with population, its actual state and its evolution.

Science offers, by its efficiency, an unprecedented capacity of intervention on nature, on man and on society. The idea that one is able to use this capacity for ruling purposes, will always exert a fascination upon politicians. We see here that, in this matter, the politician is actually subdued by or at least dependent from the scientist.

But, on the other hand, the scientists are also subdued by and dependent from the politicians. This insofar they will not be able to define or conduct their own research without the agreement of governmental bodies.

Those strange relations between science and politics are practically manifestated by different ways. They may be observed, for instance, in the interference between political power on one hand and economy, finance, physics and applied sciences, and military sciences, on the other hand (3). This kind of relation has very often led to reductive theories of the political power. This last expression means that the political power is emptied from its specificity and is reduced to and identified with something else than itself. It is being reduced here to the financial or industrial capital, or to production forces, or to army forces etc. ...

We will say that the capital, the physical knowledge, the army forces will be, each in its own way, factors of power. Those who take control of those power dispose de facto from a capacity to influence the behaviour of men, who are unable to give their own consent to this take-over which is exerted on them. Power, which is understood that way, gives to the one who exerts it, the possibility

to impose a submission. If I am, military or economically speaking, the strongest, I am able to compell the weaker to submit themselves to me. I am able to exert a coercion on them, that they will not be capable to avert. This coercion will be going even to the most radical violence, that means to the death.

To reduce the political power to such power factors has been performed very early in history of thought and political action. One may even say that the startpoint which led very slowly and progressively to a fully human conception of the political power, emerged from a critical reflection on power itself. "Power" was, for certain Sophists, linked with force. The same was valuable for the Law.

The Sophists were in this a reflection of the current opinion of their surroundings and were an emanation of the current practice in their epoch. The french seventeenth century poet Jean de LA FONTAINE spoke out in the same direction when he demonstrated that 'The reasons of the strongest are always the best ones'.

This way of fundamenting the "power" upon force has as consequence a special conception of justice - if I am the strongest, I will be the one who defines the law, and I will do this according to my interests. Law will be utilitaristic, beneficial only to some people. Only what I will declare as such will be called 'Justice' and this definition will only be correct insofar it serves my own interest. Everything which will put in question my superiority, which is settled by my own force, will be felt as a menace. I may have agreements, for reasons which are utilitarian and of mutual interest with those people who have a power similar to mine. But in front of the weaker I will have no duties, and they will have no right in front of me.

#### Political Power and Biomedical Sciences

-----

Today's issue is principally constituted by the relation established between the political power and the biomedical sciences (4). We will make this clear by means of a very simple reminder.

Forty years ago, nuclear physicists did put their skills and findings at the service of their heads of State. Today biotics, to which one must include demography, offers their resources to the masters of the world (5). Furthermore, some scientists, experts in those fields, try to pull power from the forces they dispose of, and which they try to increase, in order to mix up into the ruling of people. We see that the interference of biological scientists (biologists, physicians, demographers) into the government of people tend to become both direct and indirect.

This new situation yields sophisticated issues to the ethicist. Which are the various concrete manifestations of this power? Who are the victims from it? Who are the producers of it? To whom does this benefits? What are their goals? What kind of ideology do they propose for the justification of their action? What are, above all, the moral issues raised by those practices? So, those are some of the questions who come struggling into the scope of the ethicist. Imperialists no longer need to selfaffirm with economical or military power. They may now use new scientific practices, new discoveries, among which those coming from the sciences of life are the main ones.

Let us see further some of those issues which are challenging ethically on an unprecedented way today's humans.

First, we will summarize some new practices. We will disclose the raised issues afterwards (6). We give a brief account of the following practices :

- Manipulations on spermatozoids. They may be preserved at  $-196^{\circ}$  C during an indefinite time, so that they may be used even after the death of the donor. The use of other donors, in case of the incapacity of the husband is widespread today, when solving infertility problems.
- Manipulations on ovocytes are more tricky. Ovocytes can not be preserved.
- Manipulations on embryos (from fertilisation till three months of age) are no longer exceptions. Implantation of an embryo into its mother or someone else, freezing embryos into 'embryo banks' ...
- Similar actions on fetuses. One uses them for laboratory trials, for drug-making and even for cosmetics.
- Special mention is deserved by the ante-natal monitoring methods. They lead to a generalized elimination of unborn humans suffering from congenital diseases.
- In Vitro Fertilisation (IVF) procedures are among the most publicly discussed issues today. But the label IVF covers various practices.

Let's consider the most current case in IVF. When the Fallopian tube is blocked, it is possible, after a suitable hormonal treatment, to pick up under anesthesia, ripe ovocytes on the ovary and fertilize them in vitro with spermatozoids from the husband. One of those fertilised ovocytes will then be implanted in the uterus, so that a pregnancy will proceed. What will happen to the other fertilised ovocytes (zygotes) which are not readily implanted? They will be probably freezed and utilised in case of pregnancy failure at the first implantation attempt. This gives the woman several chances for one operation for removal of ovocytes.

The question which raises immediately is - What will happen with the zygotes which will never be reimplanted? What will be their fate? Who will decide on them, and for what reasons?

The issue is really a very important one, because biologically speaking, it is absolutely sure and definite that individualization occurs at fertilisation. To be more accurate - the melting of gamets, who are both already partly different from the genetic inheritance of their parents, since they underwent a meiosis, this melting is the very startpoint of the new biological individual. Starting from this point, the genom possesses its genetic identity chart, which is different from all the other ones. This individualisation is therefore anterior to nidation. This stage allows the zygote to grasp and fix itself to the uterine wall and find by this everything which is needed for its further development (7).

#### From UTOPIA to POSSIBILITY

-----

The important issues who come from this practice may be perhaps more easily grasped by the mentioning of another case which is actually far from being hypothetical. It is actually possible to bring to life a human being who will not be able to know who his father is or his mother or even his incubator. An ovocyt, picked up on donor X may be fertilised in vitro by the sperm of donor Y and be implanted in an uterus Z. This means that he will be a human being without any familial relation. We know that the most obvious and spontaneous way of relating a human being to others will be his filiation.

This is clear when one sees that in most countries many surnames include a reference to the father by the term of 'son of'. In the case that we consider, the human individual should become without any reference to anybody - any interpersonal relationing will be suppressed. Hurlled on such a way into

existence, he will be exposed to all denials of recognition and will feel responsible for nobody. He will be at the mercy of the technician who has brought him to exist, and possibly to the people who gave the orders to the technicians.

One realises the inextricable problems which are raised by those practices, now already. If a Government, a Party or an 'elite' (racial, scientific, etc... ) or a mere 'nomenklatura' should arrogate to one's self the control on the production of human beings, they will be able to exert their power on subjects who ignore their origin.

The fading out of the interpersonnal relations of paternity or maternity, together with the rooting-in which such relations include, does bear upon the love relations between man and woman, together with the sexual commitment implied by this relation. The dream of Pierre SIMON comes true : 'the human individuals are sent back to their solitary pleasure, and the 'society mediatized by the physician' takes all their own responsibilities towards partners and descendants away' (8). This is confirmed by Mrs. Simone VEIL who stated 'a definite tendency to privatized sexuality and reproduction is being felt. They are more and more seen as the couple's own business, while their consequence (this is the child) becomes more and more socialised' (9). We are at the brink of the nationalisation of human reproduction. Indeed, at the end of the scattering of those interpersonal loving, parental and fraternal relations, it is the whole of the family tissue which is being deteriorated and destroyed. The concept of family as such is being crashing down (10).

To reach that goal, the weakest link of the chain must be scattered - this is the child and especially the unborn. It is clear that some secret brotherhood, abundantly represented in all kind of organisations, did put this as first issue of their action program.

So, for the first time in human history, the biological resources offer the technical possibilities to realize the dreams of totalitarian utopias. PLATON and CAMPANELLA could perhaps dream of a Radiant City which could control the quantity and the quality of children. Today the 'total mastery of fertility' is offered as a possibility at the disposal of Governments or particular groups which can afford it.

It is not simply, as MALTHUS put it, a question of no longer preventing the natural selection. One must, as GALTON (1822-1911) advocated, create an eugenism which will be at the scale of the ready-for-use techniques and political projects. The standards and norms to which the production of the human stock will have to obey will have to be defined by the Government or by a well defined organisation, taking into account the qualitative and quantitative demands which are imperatively laid down in the society project which must be created (11).

#### The PUPILS of the REPUBLIC

One will, of course, not stop when going on such a 'nice' way ! State or organisation will have to provide for the education of the individuals, called by them into life. A huge system of standard education founded of course on purely secular bases will have the purpose to shape the individuals. We are here at the very heart of the issue which was raised in France with the bill of SAVARY. The Government and the petty group which will 'occupy' it, become then the new Providence. This new Leviathan, this new mortal deity,

this political idol, will, after having decided (by means of doctors and biologists) who may live and who may or has to die, who may or has to give his/her germinal cells, put into question this 'material' called life, at the first rank of its goals.

The happy few, selected by the government will be at its entire service - they become all of them the pupils of the republic. This was already advocated by the Marquis de SADE - "In France where the population is far too numerous, ... we must limit strictly the number of children and drown merciless what is left over ... The government being thus master of those children and of their number, will have as many supporters as people raised by him." (12)

A nearly as ambitious eugenic program is to be found in Adolf HITLER's 'Mein Kampf' (13). We find there already the licence for and even the patriotic duty of procreation for the individuals who correspond to the standards of the racist ideology. And as negative counter part of this, we find the denial and even the actual prohibition of reproduction, imposed on individuals, who are found to be too divergent regarding the dictated norms. (14) Henceforth however, since the manipulations are at present much more sophisticated and the techniques much more efficient, the norms will be defined with much more precision and applied with the merciless vigor imposed by the categorical imperative of mere efficiency.

#### Towards an INSTITUTIONAL IMBROGLIO

-----

But, if those new practices have a direct incidence on the level of education, they will also have some on the level of law. Law has as only function to organise the relation between individuals, or persons. More precisely, all juridical institutions of our democratic societies have as fundament the protection of the human individual. If the law does no longer take into account the individual human and genetically distinct character of the zygote, we will go towards a multiplication of contradictions, deadlocks and incoherencies which we already denounced ten years ago, when dealing with the abortion issue.

Starting from the moment where law abandons this basic biological fact, everything becomes 'allowable', without exception. Everything will be allowed, in name of the fact. The reference to the fact, to the current practice will be the justification for the law. Law will be purely positive, in that sense that it will sanction certain practices, without bothering about other considerations than those emerging from facts and efficiency. Law becomes the pure expression of the will of the strongest.

Debates about abortion had already shown a double tendency - the infant-individual takes less and less importance to the benefit of the adult-individual. But here comes a new difficulty - the concern of the individual at large begins to fade away, and gives way to the minority who directly or indirectly takes control of the medical techniques. It is the whole universal reach of the 'UNIVERSAL DECLARATION of the HUMAN RIGHTS' which is directly and radically denied.

So, the juridical difficulties turn into inextricable political difficulties. Putting forward the singularity, the genetic originality of the human individual, from its fertilization onwards, gives an irreducible fundament to the idea of universality, which is one of the major characteristics of democracy. In democracy, indeed, there is made no difference between persons - all humans are equal and free, notwithstanding their physical, intellectual, moral, religious and other differences. And the whole of the institutional apparatus, with both its juridical and its political aspects, has as purpose to protect

this singularity and to promote individuals in their personal realisation.

This realisation will be performed with recognition, reciprocity and participation, that means in the frame of a relational tissue, rich and complex, on which the law will look after.

But as soon as this genetical originality of the human individual is established, we notice that his marvelous acquirement is being reccuperated by active minorities, which want to strenghten their power by the exploitation, for their own benefit, of new medical and biological techniques.

As soon as the human individual as such is being discarded as fundamental reference, the arbitrary and discriminating character of all definitions given to him will appear. All definitions will actually appear as emanations of the pure arbitrary decision of those who will be able to let their own decision prevail. Once again, we see that we dwell here in the fullest positivism.

But this positivism, very useful for the goals of the mighty, will turn itself quickly against those who thought to find in it their own benefit. This, because after discarding the essential biological reference, the need will be felt to give a new biological definition of the human individual. Here, we see that the difficulties, mentioned in the abortion issue, appear now multiplied in number and in gravity. On which bases will the biological definition of the human individual rely at present ? Where will the limits be laid down ? When will the human individual starts its own life - at the moment of nidation ? Or at six weeks after fertilisation, at three months, or at birth ? Every odd statement will be affirmed once the most solid and less denied facts of todays biology are no longer taken into account. Every odd statement - this means that everything which does no longer take those fundamental scientific facts into account, will actually be part of obscurantism and of the world of prejudices. What will be declared a human individual overhere, will be declared a clump of cells in a neighbouring country. The same reality will be protected here and disposed of there.

And if it will not be enough with that kind of incoherences, the prospects of cloning will even add a lot to them. Abortion first, IVF afterwards have already shown how difficult it was to give definitions of the human being modulated according to conveniences and interests of particular groups. If the realisations would give life to what some dream or imagine, cloning would aggravate still further an imbroglio, which is already quite complex. In abortion and in IVF it was a matter of intervention only (if we dare to use this expression) on 'ordinary human individuals'. But in the case of cloning, there is an explicit will to produce an indefinite number of identical individuals, who are chosen in function of well determined criteria. What will be the sense of speaking about identical human beings ? And in those realisations made from human genetical material can we any longer speak about human beings ? And when to decide, in the name of what will we do so ?

#### A NEW CHALLENGE for SOCIAL ETHICS

-----

As we can see above, biomedical realisations and performances are full of educative, juridical and political implications. They demand directly an answer to the moralist, who, more than ever must be watching the signs of the time. Moreover, we notice that there is, regarding our problems also an ethical quasi vacuum besides the juridical one. Quasi, since people do much too often consider those questions by reducing them to the sectorial dimensions of familial and sexual ethics. But, although this dimension is obvious, it cannot be forgotten that those issues are first of all a new investigation field which belongs to social ethics.

In a previous work, abortion and its liberalisation appeared to us as an issue of political and social ethics (15). This is in no way difficult for what concerns biomedical techniques, especially IVF and genetical manipulations.

In social ethics, the moralist is of course right to be concerned about peace and its conditions. But this does not give him the right to be one war too late. Weapons used by the superpowers in their already old match between East and West, do mostly need the mastery over nuclear and space sciences. But when dealing with the match North vs. South, the huge international organisations and other empires mostly use scientific biomedical resources. This is confirmed by the reactions provoked by the altering of the USA policy on the matter, by President REAGAN. Those organisations are less concerned by the expansion of the communist world than with the demographic growth of the 'Third-World'. The Second World Population Conference, held in Mexico from 6th till 13th August 1984, disclosed that, at the end of this century, World Population would pass from 4.8 to 6.2 thousand million habitants. 80 % from those 6,200,000,000 inhabitants will live in the 'Third-World' and 50 % of them will be aged under 25 years. The whole of the arsenal of biomedical resources must be used against this uprising of young people. This has been recommended by the FNUAP, the WHO, the IPPF, the World Bank, just to cite some of those international organisations (16). But we must not forget that the same arsenal, al be it less sophisticated, is used in China as Government methode, in order to impose a natality planification which has a coercitive character.

So, still staying vigilant concerning ethical questions raised by the weapon race, the moralist has to imagine already what will be the next war, the one who is been fully fought right now ; within the countries and on international level. This war mobilises the biomedical arsenal for the defence of the interest of the strongest at the expenses of the weakest.

It is in ethics as in law or in politics - it is the duty for the moralist to pull all consequences out of what today's biology teaches on human individualisation. To handle other criteria than biological ones for the humanisation is, even for a moralist, to dwell in the realm of fantasy. This biological given fact, to which one must always go back, will enlighten the role of the parents, the meaning of human sexuality and fertility. The capacity of giving new individual human life is never given by a parent to him/her self. None of the two parents is totally master of the genetical capital (s)he possesses, and this will only be potentialized at fertilisation. The parents received this capacity together with their own life. They bear it.

Human sexuality and fertility do consist in the management of a capacity to transmit human life, with its fantastic potential of originality, its potential of genetical individualisation which flourishes mainly and first in the frame of the family on a mode of personality (17).

Debates on the abortion issue have already shown that when moralists disconsider elementary biological facts, they announce a shift which, from nidation till birth, opens the gates to the greatest variability in definitions of man. In today's IVF era, moralists are giving way to variable definitions of man and will therefore readily back governments and organisations devoid of any scruples in their utilisation of new biotechniques for their own goals : to found a new society. More - they incitate them to develop more and more accurate new techniques, much better than those which are available today.

#### NO to the TRIUMPHANT AMORALITY

---

As a consequence of this on the level of moral criteria which must be taken into account when enouncing ethical judgments in matters of bioethics.

It is of course out of question to give an absolute character to the right to be absolutely free when performing research in science. Nor to search only in it the ultimate criterion of scientific morality. Unfortunately,



when following the recent actuality regarding those issues, it becomes rapidly clear that the fields of biological research which we are dealing with are one of the most conspicuous grounds for a triumphant amorality. Only efficiency, performance, escalation and results do count here. 'If we don't do it, others will do it and strike with the honor !' The liberty of the researchers knows no limits - everything possible or seemingly realisable is allowed and desirable without any restriction or condition. And this receives even the agreement of misinformed clergymen and resigning moralists.

The researcher is consecrated as irresponsible. (18)

Clergymen and moralists heavily contribute to confine researchers purely in their biological sphere, their political sphere or their juridical sphere.

But, when the moralist lacks to intervene handling norms, he will automatically agree with a generalised moral positivism, which invades the whole of the field of biology, politics and law. A moralist should first remember for himself what he has to remember for others - the supremacy of the human individual upon everything material, notwithstanding its stage of development. Any interpersonal relation is actually rooted in this fundamental recognition.

If the moralist, culpabilized by the consequences of Galilei affair, chooses to withdraw, he will automatically become an accomplice of an unbridled and irresponsible madness which has already invaded laboratories, some hospitals and numerous clinics. Intimidated by the facts which are pouring into the mass media, clergymen and moralists become even more frightened, since they already cultivate an inferiority complex towards the laboratory people. Nevertheless, the moralist must refuse the worship of the new Golden Calf, which power is pulled out of the mastery of the new biotechnics. (19) If he does not do this, led by ignorance, resignation or compromise, he will open largely the doors to the KHOMEINI and other STALIN of this ending century.

The task of the moralist seems here to reach new and unexpected heights. The attitude towards the human life becomes now the cornerstone of the whole of ethics. This attitude leads as well the private as the social ethics. The fading away of the respect for the individual is altogether a sign for the disappearance of the sense of the human person.

The moral sense died and with it the sense of sin, when one puts oneself as measure for the existence itself of an other individual. When we behave as creators and owners of a genetic heritage to which we are only managers, the sense of finitude of creation and of Providence dies away.

And when man, by his way of acting as well as by his way of thinking, has eliminated from his own heart and mind any idea of loving, parental, brotherly, existential relation, he finds himself naked and pulled down to the tragic condition of a solitary individual, vulnerable, exposed to the power of his rivals - and being at the same time a merciless lord, in so far he will be able to use his own power on others.

#### From STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE to GENETICAL VIOLENCE

-----

We see that what actually happens in the secret of aseptic rooms goes undoubtedly beyond the boundaries of private ethics. Practices as sterilisation and abortion are, as we have seen above, of extremely grave importance regarding social ethics. They can indeed be linked to the artificial selection as advocated by GALTON (20) and to the structural violence as described by GALTUNG (21). The last having the function of a positive bridle in the process of a natural selection as described by MALTHUS (22). But now, a new step is being made. Political power may use now two new forms of violence - surgical violence and genetical violence. The first one is being performed

by abortion and by sterilisation, the second one is being perpetrated upon the genetic heritage in order to fabricate (human ?) beings which are produced by wild technicians.

The increase in political power resulting from the selection as described by MALTHUS and by GALTON was actually essentially negative - the life expectancy is lowered, human beings are prevented to be born or to mature in utero.

Now this increase of power becomes positive in the sense that it offers possibilities of initiatives to the governments on the quality itself of life.

Life becomes thus only a material-to-manage, and its management is left over to mere technicians - everything or nearly everything becomes now possible and what is possible becomes desirable. Human stock will be managed, its production and reproduction must be planned, and the number of more fit and that one of the less fit must be regulated.

The challenge of those research and experiment programs becomes now clear. The human being must be mastered from its very origine onwards. Ordinary parents must be discarded. The only function they are entitled to keep - for the time being, and because there is not yet found an alternative - is to provide, after a 'rigorous selection', cellular material to the manipulators. The genetical capital is being robbed to its owners. They are robbed by scientists, by governments, institutions, manufacturers, etc. ...

After that, they will master the originality of the individuals. The traditional methods of transmission of life did leave much to the imprevisible and uncertainty. It is possible, on that level to predict the genome of an individual. It is this singularity of everyone which makes the wealth of humanity. There will now be people who will capture this uncertainty and leave nothing to the chance. Cloning techniques opens a new era which will see whole groups of identical individuals. But even the originality of the species is endangered. Hybridations of races are already well known in humans, now one starts with hybridation of human species with other ones. What (or who) will be the monster, born out from those experiments ?

Those assaults against the biological originality of the individuals or of the species are most concerning since they are preceded, as we know, by multiple assaults against the psychological originality of humans by means of a depressive use of psychiatry. Endoctrination, ideological domestication, pave the way towards biological uniformisation.

Finally, this life, which is being mastered in its origin and its quality, has also to be mastered in its duration. Euthanasie will seal off the taking over upon the whole of the biological process on individuals, by giving them over to death.

#### PROMETHEUS and LEVIATHAN

-----

Those few remarks on the relation between ethics and biopolitics leads us to notice that today's man finds himself confronted on a even more than dramatic way with the two fundamentals of existence - the issue of life and the issue of death. This twofold confrontation takes a tragic bend insofar man rejects the existential link with his Creator and Father. But at the end of this act of rejecting, man soon rejects as well his finitude. Much more - having lost the sense of divine Paternity, man tries to eliminate any uncertainty and is no longer capable to believe in a Provident God. Man wants thus to master his own death.

Alike a new PROMETHEUS, today's man is being eroded by the blasphematory image of a God - jealous-of -His-creature. Then, thinking he is enchained and a playball of a capricious God, man wants to free himself by robbing the fire from ZEUS (23). Man has to imitate God for affirming himself, and has to rob his own essence. Once this is perpetrated, he thinks that nothing will be capable to stop him in the total mastery of life, since he is no longer satisfied of being only its manager. Is it still possible to deny that the fiddlings of some of our biotechnicians, being at the same time genial and derisive, proceed out of this implacable will to succeed on the spot where ICARUS failed lamentably ?

But, this God, that man wants to be himself, is only a mortal God. As LEVIATHAN the biblical monster who reigns, he wants to be almighty but has to die himself. He may amuse himself, he may, as a new NARCISSUS, be bewildered by his deeds of valor, ineluctably, he will see, in his own life the emergence of the spectre of death. Then vexed by his failure to master totally life, his own life, he yields to an ultimate reaction of arrogance, by wanting to master his death. So, having reached the end point of a diabolical alchimy, man, cooperator of God in the work of life, is being transmuted into a cooperator of Satan in the work of death.

The psalms proclaim that the entire Nature manifests its Creator. But, in this Nature, man is much nearer to God than any other creature. Man is, in the whole creation, outstandingly and from his most concealed origins, the dazzling image of God. Therefore, as the Holy Books tell us, Satan is a liar, in the same way as PROMETHEUS, and a homicide, in the same way as LEVIATHAN. He is the enemy of life, enemy of human life, because, in the created world, man emerges as the indefinitely diffracted image of the munificence of God.

Consequently, if human life doesn't tell anymore something from its Creator how could the death of man remain a passage towards God, following the One Who God constituted as the first-born among the dead. We see thus PROMETHEUS and LEVIATHAN confound themselves in the same nonsense, fall together into the depth of the same arrogance, and go down into the same desperation.

After having pretend to rob us life, they plot now for robbing our death. Since the death they offer us is no longer dath as passage, a pascal death, but death as deadlock, which signifies a priori the rejection of the idea itself of Ressurrection

May this Congress, tenth anniversary of our World Federation of Doctors Who Respect Human Life, be for each of us an opportunity to find ourselves situated in front of those fundamental questions.

#### NOTES :

1. This text has ~~been~~ made in collaboration with Philippe CASPAR MD, Ph. D. We express to him our deepest thanks.
2. Cfr. J.J. SALOMON 'Science et Politique', Ed. Seuil - Paris 1970
3. Further analysis of the interventionism of modern governments can be found in 'Le poids de l'Etat' (The weight of the State) by Jean MEYER (Collection Histoire. P.U.F. Ed. - Paris 1983).
4. The issue is being analysed by Pierre THUILLIER in 'Les biologistes vont-ils prendre le pouvoir ? La socio-biologie en question, I. Le contexte et l'enjeu' (Collection de la science. Ed. Complexe - Bruxelles 1981).

5. On the enslavement of science to a political ideology, Cfr. JOHN-PAUL II Encounter with scientists and students. Köln (W-Germany) 15 november 1980 (in French translation : Documentation Catholique n° 1798 - 21.12.1980, p. 1130). And 'Liberate science from violence of the rich and the mighty. Speech to the plenary assembly of the Pontifical Academy of Science' (in French : ibid. n° 1864 - 18.12.1983, p.p. 1133 - 36).
6. Up to date vulgarisation of this topic will be found in -
  - 'La Recherche' special issue on genetics and heredity n° 155 - May 1984
  - 'Génétique : les sorciers de la Vie' in the French weekly 'L'Express' issue of 31.08.1984, p. 16-24
  - 'The new origine of life' in 'Time' magazine, issue n° 37 - 10.09.1984, pp. 34-43.
7. 'L'individuation des êtres : Aristote, Leibnitz et l'immunologie Contemporaine' by Dr. Philippe CASPAR. Edition Lethielleux, Collection le sycomore Paris-Namur 1985. See also two papers from the same author and published under the title 'Les fondements de l'individualité biologique' in 'Communio' t. X, November-December 1984, p.80-91. And also 'Pour un principe d'individuation des êtres vivants' in 'Revue des Questions Scientifiques' 1984, 155(4).
8. One of the most revealing books on the scientists and free-masonic inspiration of some aspects of today's biocracy is 'De la vie avant toute chose' by Dr. Pierre SIMON (gynecologists and Great Master of the 'Grand Orient de France'). Editor : Mazarine - Paris 1979. The quoted expression is to be found in p. 222.
9. Sic ! Simone VEIL, French former Minister of Health, well known for her pushing through in 1975 of the French abortion liberating laws. 'Exposé' published in Mexico 1977 'International Population Conference Proceedings'. Paperback, p. 678. French version published by 'Union Internationale pour l'Etude Scientifique de la Population' - Liège. The quotation is to be found on p. 598.
10. Pierre SIMON, ibid. Loc. Cit.
11. This point is part of the Governmental program of the State of SINGAPORE, and appears also clearly in the policies of the Popular Republic of China. 'Mr. LEE KUAN YEW, Prime Minister of SINGAPORE has declared officially in August 1983 that, if it is necessary that the families of the ordinary people should have no more than two children, it should be better that the families of intellectuals and upper class people should have more children so that the economical and intellectual level of the country, should be maintained and even become higher' (translated from Jacques DECORNOY, L'Asie du Sud-Est en crise de développement, article published in the french daily news paper "LE MONDE" 23.11.1983.
12. SADE, Les prospérités du vice, collection 10/18, Union Générale D'Edition - Paris 1969, p. 55.
13. HITLER develops those ideas 'passim' but more specially in pp. 398-404 of his book 'MEIN KAMPF' - French translation 'Mon COMBAT', nouvelles Editions Latin - Paris, no date.
14. The idea of a 'permit to procreate' is gaining field. It is promoted by several authors among them by René DUMONT, L'UTOPIE ou la MORT, collection l'Histoire Immédiate, Editions du Seuil, Paris 1973; cfr. p. 48-50.
15. L'AVORTEMENT APPROCHE POLITIQUE, 3th Edition followed by VERS UNE TECHNOCRATIE MEDICALE ?, Université Catholique de Louvain - Louvain-La-Neuve 1981.

16. People who still are skeptical may have a glimpse from what is already perpetrated and what is prepared for the future by reading the Eleventh Year Report of the World Health Organisation (WHO) which presents the 'Special program for research, development and teaching in research about human reproduction'. Geneva November 1982.
17. Marie-Odile RETHORE has dealt with this in her paper 'Recherches Génétiques et conscience Chrétienne' in 'Amour et Famille' (CLER) n° 137 November 1982, p. 3-14 and especially p. 5.
18. Dealing with the relations between science and ethics, JOHN-PAUL II develops frequently ideas which can be applied to bioethics.  
For example : 'Einstein, Galilei. Discours à l'Académie Pontificale des Sciences, in 'Documentation Catholique' n° 1775 from Dec 2th 1979, p.1009-1011  
'La rencontre de la science et de la théologie'. Discours à un groupe de 'Prix Nobel', Ibid. n° 1800, Jan 18th 1981, pp. 63-65.  
'Le service de l'homme à travers la science et la recherche', Homélie à la messe pour les universitaires, Ibid. n° 1825, March 7th 1982, p. 245-247.
19. John PAUL II has spoken many times on those new medico-ethical issues.  
For example : 'Liberté de conscience et défense de la vie'. Allocution aux médecins Catholiques Italiens, in DOCUMENTATION CATHOLIQUE n° 1756, Jan 21th 1979, p. 51-53.  
'Discours à des médecins et chirurgiens', Ibid. n° 1796, November 23th 1980, p. 1037-1039.  
'L'Inviolabilité de la vie humaine'. Discours aux participants du premier Congrès pour la famille d'Afrique et d'Europe, Ibid. n° 1802, Feb 15th 1981, p. 158-159.  
'Le médecin au service de la vie'. Discours au Congrès Mondial des Médecins Catholiques, Ibid. n° 1840, Nov 21st 1982, p. 1029-1032.  
'L'expérimentation en biologie doit contribuer au bien intégral de l'homme'. Discours devant l'Académie Pontificale des Sciences, Ibid. n° 1840, Nov 21st 1982, p. 1028-1029.  
'L'Intervention chirurgicale sur l'être humain avant sa naissance'. Allocution au Congrès International du "Mouvement Pour La Vie", Ibid. n° 1846, Feb. 20th 1983, p. 189-191.  
'Le médecin et les Droits de l'Homme'. Allocution à l'Association Médicale Mondiale (World Medical Association), Ibid. n° 1863, Dec 4th 1983, p.1067-1069.
- Lest we forget that the Apostolical message "Salvifici doloris" has been entirely devoted to the Christian sense of human pain. (Documentation Catholique n° 1864, March 4th 1984, p. 233-250).
20. Francis GALTON (1822-1911) published in 1869 'Hereditary, Genius, an enquiry into its laws and consequences', Mac Millan and C°, London 1892 (Second Edition).
21. A summary of GALTUNG's theses is to be found in 'Entretien avec Johann GALTUNG' in 'Alternatives non violentes', dossier 'désobéissance civique' n° 34 - Lyon 1980, p. 66-74.
22. MALTHUS (1766-1834) author of the 'Essay on the principle of population' published in London in 1798. French translation by Eric Vilquin, Editions de l'Institut National d'Etudes démographiques. Paris 1980.
23. Cfr. Pierre SIMON, opus citatus P. 258 and Edward WILSON, le Feu de Prométhée, Editions Mazarine 1984, especially page 192 and following.

