

THREE INHUMANITIES

C. Everett Koop, M.D.
Surgeon General, U.S.A.

November 11, 1984

It is absolutely impossible, I believe, to separate one's religion from those things he believes. Anyone in politics who says he is able to do that just hasn't faced the situation squarely. When Cain and Able had their altercation and Abel was killed, God was terribly upset. He said that if there was any retaliation he would repay seven-fold. Not long after that, biblically speaking, and following the flood, God made a covenant with Noah. He said that if by man, man's blood was shed, by man shall that man's be shed. Then came the ten commandments, one of which was "Thou shalt not kill." It has nothing to do with war, nothing to do with accidental death. It has to do with premeditated killing of another individual. Later, Jeremiah, the prophet, was set aside before he was born. "When I was still in the womb," Jeremiah wrote, God called me and set me aside." The same thing is found in Isaiah. David in the Psalms, especially Psalm 139, comments marvelously about how he was formed in secret. I will sum it up. The Bible screams from cover to cover that life is precious to God.

We suffer today from the effects of a disease, the symptoms of which are abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia. But the disease is really one which was brought about by a change in our philosophy, and in our religious concepts, or those things which had their origin in Judeo Christianity. Judeo Christianity gave us our heritage, it gave us our laws, it gave us our method of government. In fact it taught us our cultural relationships and how we can get along with each other. It is the abandonment of that consensus that is the disease.

You can call it one thing or another; I think we probably all understand it best if we call it secular humanism. It is a new religion in this country, but unfortunately it does not have a god. Secular humanism is taught in the United States, whether you are reading a little paper bound book for children that you found in Woolworth's five and ten cent store, or whether you are taking post doctoral courses in one of the country's major universities. God is no longer at the center of the universe. Man is. The universe is just a great big mechanism. This planet is just one complex machine. You and I are brought about in some random fashion from something people call primordial ooze. If you believe secular humanism, we are machines -- to be sure we are a little more complicated than the machines we make -- but we are machines nevertheless. With that philosophy, even the memory of Christian consensus is gone. Where man was once unique because he was created in the image of God, he can no longer still enjoy that same position in this philosophy.

Let me pick up another historical note and go back to Hippocrates, the father of medicine. He not only left us the Hippocratic Oath, which all physicians used to take when they graduated from medical school, but he also wrote extensively on ethics and morals as they pertained to health and medical care. There was no doubt about the fact that throughout all of Hippocrates' writings there was one ethic and that one ethic was the

EQUALITY OF HUMAN LIFE. But Hippocrates has now been replaced by the QUALITY OF LIFE ETHIC. This is one of the major shifts that has taken place in the ethical and moral thinking of medical care, not only in this country, but throughout most of the world. There have been several times when this equality of life ethic has had major setbacks.

The first setback for the equality of life was in pre-Nazi Germany. Long before Hitler came to power there was a group of Bavarian psychiatrists disgruntled about what had happened in World War I. They were practicing abortion, although it was illegal in Germany, and they decided that there were those in the country who were not contributing to the Reich and therefore had quality of lives that were really not worthy to be lived. They formed the Euthanasia Society which was a corruption of medicine. But even as bad as that was, the Euthanasia Society would never have brought about the terrible consequences it did had it not been for the concomitant corruption of law. Because those Bavarian psychiatrists, in the form of the Euthanasia Society, went to the German equivalent of the Supreme Court, they found that it was indeed possible under German law to exterminate people whose quality of life was not worthy to be lived. Out of this foundation came the holocaust.

When there is the crossover in our lives of two major influences like that, there is an opportunity for great good or for great evil. But when in Germany we had the crossroads of the corruption of medicine with the corruption of law, when the equality of life ethic was abandoned for the quality of life ethic, we then ran into the holocaust. It was the Euthanasia Society that taught the Gestapo how to build crematoriums. The first 276,000 people who were killed under the Nazi regime were selected before Hitler came to power. These were people who were retarded children, they were older people who were senile, and they were the criminally insane. Eventually they got so broad in their classification they accepted for destruction those who had tuberculosis and even those who had served their country in World War I, but had ended up with an amputation of one or more limbs. All these things transpired before Hitler came to power, but he was the one on duty when the document had to be signed. For this reason he gets the credit for those first 276,000 deaths in the gas chamber. But remember, it was not Hitler, it was not the Nazis, it was plain ordinary people just like you and me, living in Germany, who had decided that the equality of life ethic was no longer valid, but that the quality of life ethic had superseded it.

The second setback in Hippocrates' various rules of ethics came a little bit later in the 1960's. It began with some ludicrous interpretations of the health of a pregnant woman -- that if any two doctors agree that a woman's health, mental health or convenience, was threatened, they could sign the paper that would entitle her to an abortion. These interpretations were culminated in the law that the Supreme Court passed in 1973, which declared the fetus to be a nonperson, and which removed protection of the Constitution from any unborn child in this country up until the moment of birth. Sixteen million unborn babies have been destroyed because of that decision, and every day in this country 4,000 more abortions are added to that register. It didn't take long after the Supreme Court decision for there to be a tremendous change in this country's ethical stand.

Three years before the 1973 Supreme Court decision there was an editorial in the California Medical Journal, which is the organ of the California State Medical Society. They have been known for almost all of this century, for being avant gard. It is such an historic document, it changed so many minds, and it is such a pillar of what goes on today. In 1970 there was an editorial entitled, "A New Ethic for Medicine and Society." And here are some of the choice passages: "the traditional western ethic has always placed great emphasis on the intrinsic worth and equal value of every human life regardless of its stage or condition. This ethic has been the basis for most of our laws and much of our social policy. The reverence for each and every human life has been a keystone of western medicine."

Absolutely true! But the editor called for a new ethic, which he acknowledged as follows: "It's quite distinctly at variance with Judeo Christian ethic and carries serious philosophical, social, economic, and political implications for western society, and perhaps for the world society. It will become necessary and acceptable to place relative, rather than absolute, values on such things as human lives. The process of eroding the old ethic and substituting the new has already begun -- 1970. And it may be seen most clearly in changing attitudes toward human abortion. In defiance of the long held western ethic of intrinsic and equal value for every human life, regardless of its stage, condition, or status, abortion is becoming accepted by society as morally right and even necessary."

The editorial continued, "One may anticipate further development as the problems of birth control and birth selection are extended inevitably to death selection and death control, whether by the individual or by society."

Finally for the Christian, the concluding statement is absolutely devastating: "It is worth noting that this shift in public attitudes has affected the Church rather than the reverse." And we as members of the Church can remember that to our great degradation.

Abortions are done in this country by multiple methods, dilating and curettage, dilating and evacuation, suction, saline abortions, prostaglandin abortions, and even hysterotomies, which you know better as Caesarian Sections. We have progressed in this country from abortion to other problems in the life issues. They are infanticide and euthanasia. There are several principles that have been used to get from one place to the other.

First, the right to life has become not an absolute but a purely relative situation, depending on the desires of one or more persons. The right to life which was the unborn child's right for centuries, was abrogated to a desire, if not the whim, of its mother. With the absolute gone for the unborn, there can be no absolute for any other class such as infants, or the ill, or the handicapped, or the elderly. The second principle, is that physicians are permitted to kill as well as to offer care and healing. Obviously, if a doctor with equal impunity may deliver a child or abort it before delivery, why should he not proceed with the same impunity to kill as well as to care for an individual after delivery?

I do try to understand the pro-abortion mentality which says that we have a social problem that can be helped by abortion. I do try to understand the infanticide mentality which says we have a social problem which can be helped by withholding nutrition from handicapped newborns. I do try to understand, in part, the euthanasia mentality which says we have a social problem with the elderly and the terminally ill and that euthanasia has an answer for it. What I cannot understand is why my medical colleagues are willing to become the social executioners, whether by abortion, by infanticide, or by euthanasia in order to correct what they consider to be the social ills of our society.

I did not enter into the high calling of medicine in order to have the expertise which I developed over many years to alleviate suffering and to save lives, prostituted to become the medical cure of social ills. I came out of medical school 40 years ago with the idea that I was to save lives and alleviate suffering. Am I to understand that in the twisted concepts of the euthanasia movement (and I include infanticide in that) if the family of my patient is suffering I am to alleviate that suffering of the family by getting rid of my patient? Now there is already a gray area in the abortion business where a child born alive after an abortion (incidentally, abortionists consider a live birth the worst complication of an abortion) and as much as I despise this inhumanity and what little respect I have for those members of my profession who perpetrate it, I can see the logic of their thinking. This is further proof of the reasonableness of the extension of thinking from abortion to the murder of the recently living aborted child to infanticide for whatever cause. What started off to be a woman's right to an abortion has become the woman's right to have a dead baby.

Just two weeks ago in Philadelphia, an abortionist delivered a live baby after a prostaglandin abortion. The baby was of gestational age, that is old enough to be viable. Though it was alive he put it aside in a room to die, which it did, and for some unknown reason the District Attorney of Philadelphia has arrested him and is prosecuting him for homicide. Only in this, the United States, the most enlightened country in the world, only here do you find abortions done at such an age where that so-called complication could have occurred. It is absolutely illegal in every communist country on the face of this globe to do an abortion after the thirteenth week of pregnancy. But in this country, after Roe vs. Wade in 1973, if an abortionist wished to try an abortion up until the minute before normal delivery there is no protection for that unborn baby, nor is there any law under which that abortionist could be prosecuted.

The state that we are in did not come about by any legislation. Never did anybody get together in Congress and propose a bill that went to a conference committee and was passed and signed by the President. As a matter of fact, all of the abortion laws which existed in the 50 states before Roe vs. Wade were abrogated by the Supreme Court decision of Roe vs. Wade. We are the victims of sociologic law and all of the constitutional experts in this country, whether they are pro-abortion or anti-abortion, agreed that the Supreme Court far overstepped its authority when it decided Roe vs. Wade.

Several years ago at the University of Pennsylvania where I served on the faculty for almost 40 years, a student went into the gymnasium and set up 16,000 dominoes. He did it in such a way that when he knocked over the first, it knocked over the second, which knocked over the third, which knocked over the fourth. I'll not go through the whole 16,000, but he did get notation in the Guinness Book of Records. I must say that that colossal waste of time has now passed on to another school, I think it's Nebraska that holds the domino-falling crown for this country. But I mention it because falling dominoes (which we usually think about politically as one country falling before another in time of way) I think has a lot to do with the three inhumanities that face this country today.

Abortion is the first domino. It fell with an extraordinarily loud thud. EVERYBODY knows about it. It is the social issue which has separated our people more than anything that has happened in this country since the days of slavery. Infanticide is the silent domino. No one heard it fall at all in the public sector. Some of us in medicine heard it fall and were very distressed by it. Infanticide is homicide, and homicide is illegal. Though the doctor, and perhaps the nurse, and perhaps the social worker, and the parents of the child who is handicapped and is going to be starved to death are all involved in this homicide, it is still not an event that people climb up on the rooftop to talk about. So infanticide has existed in this country for a long time behind the protected facade of a hospital and in what is considered to be the private relationship between a patient and a physician. That all was the case until Baby Doe was born in April of 1982 in this country in Bloomington, Indiana, and the whole thing turned around. We can thank God for that little baby.

The third domino is euthanasia. It has been struck, and it is falling, and what happens to it will depend largely on how we react in the course of the next weeks, months, and years to see that the world knows what is going on. We must work to stop this problem before it reaches the same tremendous stage as abortion and infanticide.

Infanticide in this country means the killing of an infant. It is quite different from the definition in English law where infanticide is the killing of an infant by its mother. When you ask a British physician (where infanticide by our definition has been going on rampantly for years), "do you have a problem with infanticide in your country?" he would reply, "heavens no, we don't even know what infanticide is here." That is the reason for the dichotomy between British and American thought. Please remember these things about infanticide. Infanticide could never have come about the way it did if it had not been for the liberalized abortion laws in this country. Euthanasia in an age group is really what infanticide is and my great concern before the Bloomington baby was that if we did not stop infanticide in this country the day would come when we would have the practice of euthanasia and when we complained about it people would say, "Why are you worried about it? we've been practicing euthanasia with infants for many years." And so we have.

The other thing I would like you to remember about infanticide is that it is being practiced by that class of physicians who are held up by themselves, and by us, as advocates for children. They are making their decision on the quality of life and they are trying to tell us that the way

to alleviate suffering in families is to get rid of the child that causes the suffering. Just as semantics did a lot to get the abortion movement where it is, these same semantics can lead us astray in the field of infanticide as well. In abortion we talked about the woman's right to her own body; to terminate a pregnancy with abortion (or the killing of a baby); we talked about the fetus being only a membrane; we said the fetus is not a person, and we said every child should be a wanted child.

In a court case that you probably read about in the paper, this little vignette did not appear. Just four weeks ago, here in Washington, the prosecuting attorney kept saying, "and so you cut up the unborn baby." The abortionist said, "stop using that word -- we merely fragmented the fetus." Now, infanticide in this country is called the withholding of nourishment for treatment from a handicapped newborn. People will talk about meaningful life and about the quality of life and about wrongful life. Wrongful life is the life that should never have existed because it creates problems for the people who have to deal with it.

I spent 35 years as a pediatric surgeon. I was the sixth person in this country to devote all my surgical skills to children. When I arrived in Washington I had been practicing that specialty longer than anyone else in the United States. I think it fair to say that when I did come to Washington I had probably operated upon more newborn babies with congenital defects incompatible with life but nevertheless amenable to surgical correction, than any other surgeon probably in this hemisphere. So I know whereof I speak because I dealt with so many potential Baby Does. There's no doubt about the fact that I look back upon that 35 years in pediatric surgery as remarkable years, as years that I felt that I was doing a tremendous service before God for my fellow man, and I know what can be accomplished in the rehabilitation of a child who's born handicapped. I know what can be done for such a family of a child. I know that these children become loved and loving, that they are innovative and creative people, and that their entrance into a family is frequently looked upon in subsequent years, not as a tragedy, but as a blessing and an extraordinary experience.

Abortion set the stage for infanticide and euthanasia. First the unborn were deprived of their right to life, then the newly born were classified as having a potential for having no meaning for life or a life not worth living. What will be the definitions about the elderly? What will be said about them?

I am frequently told by people who have never had the privilege of working with the handicapped child and see him be rehabilitated into society that the correction of a congenital defect has no good purpose. Some say these children should be allowed to die, or should be encouraged to die, because their lives could be nothing but unhappy and miserable. Yet, in dealing with 100,000 patients which I have done, it has been my constant experience that disability and unhappiness do not go hand-in-hand. Some of the most unhappy children that I have known have been perfectly normal mentally and physically. On the other hand, there is a remarkable job and happiness in the lives of most handicapped children. With the affluence of our society it stands to reason that we are merely at the threshold of what can be done for handicapped people both technically and

medically as well as for the pursuit of education and leisure activity. Who knows what happiness is for another person? What about the rewards and the satisfactions in life that come to those who work with and succeed in the rehabilitation of handicapped children? I believe it is stronger character, compassion, deeper understanding of another's burdens, creativity, deeper family bonds, that can result from this so-called social burden of raising a child who is less than perfect. Though from the materialistic point of view it seems that life can be without meaning, from the spiritual point of view life can be extraordinarily useful. Such a life, for example, might provide a source of courage for the treatment of distress that is caused by disease. There is no doubt that the value placed upon the patient by his associates as one who is respected, honored, and loved is a source of inspiration to all who witness it.

There was a day when there was a goal in this country to save every newborn baby. Older pediatricians might have said that this patient is dying and we should not prolong the act of dying. I agree with that. Now the new breed of house officer stands in the emergency room when the newborn handicapped baby is brought in from an outlying hospital. He doesn't ask "How should we treat?" He asks: "Should we treat?" We must feel a certain pity for these new men and women because they have come out of medical school since 1975 and have really been exposed to only one kind of medical ethic.

This is the quality of life versus the old Judeo Christian heritage of the sanctity of human life. In 1978 Francis Schaffer and I made five movies which we entitled, together with a book, "Whatever Happened to the Human Race?" The first three were on the subjects of abortion, infanticide and euthanasia. The last two were on Christian alternatives to those problems. The second film was on infanticide and one of the most compelling scenes I think in that second movie took place in my living room in suburban Philadelphia. I had eight young people sitting around chatting with me, all of whom I had met in the early days of their lives. I met some within a few hours after their births, some within the first month. They had all had extraordinary things done to them. In one child I had had to take the colon and replace the esophagus with it because she was born without such an organ. One child had had a cancer and I had to remove her uterus, her ovaries, her rectum and her bladder. One child had so many congenital anomalies that he ended up with a colostomy on one side and a little bag to drain his urine on the other. For one young lady I had to remove almost all of her tongue because of a tumor shortly after she was born, and so on. These were the problems they faced and the surgery that was done was very dramatic. They ranged at the time that I was talking to them from 11 to 30 years.

I didn't tell them what the movie was all about, I just told them, "You know I want to film some of things that you say because there are people who don't agree with what I did to you. Some people say I caused you too much suffering. Others say I put your family through too much anxiety. Others say it was too expensive. And there are still others who say your life is so rotten now, why did we bother? What do you think about that?" Well, their responses were tremendous. We didn't film all of their anger because we didn't film the questions that I asked. But these are some of the things that some of these youngsters said:

"Because the start of life was a little abnormal it does not mean that we're going to finish that way. I'm a normal functioning human being capable of doing anything that anybody else can do." Another said: "At times it got very hard, but life is certainly worth living. I married a wonderful guy and I'm just so happy." A third said: "At the beginning it was a little difficult going back to school after surgery, but then things started looking up, and with a little perseverance and support I went on to become an anesthetist and I am happily married. Things are going great for me." One said: "I really think that all my operations and all the things I had wrong with me were worth it, because I really enjoy life and I don't let the things that are wrong with me bother me." One young lady said: "If anything, I think I have an added quality to my life and appreciation of life. I look forward to every single morning." One who was up on the history of the space age said: "They spend millions of dollars to send men to the moon; I think they can spend any amount necessary to save someone's life. The human life is so important because it is a gift, not something you can give, so you really don't have the right to take it away either." That little girl tickled my heart because she said: "And besides, if I hadn't met you, Dr. Koop, how would I know I wanted to be a pediatric surgeon?" She is now in the second year of medical school.

I mentioned Baby Doe earlier, and I do so because what is in the newspapers about Baby Doe and what really happened are not quite the same things. Baby Doe was born in Bloomington, Indiana in the Spring of 1982. The obstetrician said the child would be hopelessly retarded and have a terrible quality of life. The surgeon said that the mortality rate for the operation to correct the surgical defect it had was at 50 percent. The child had been born with two problems. One was Down's Syndrome, which always produces a kind of mental retardation, but it is difficult to know how much at first. The other problem was a surgically correctible defect in the esophagus. But as for the mortality being at 50 percent, I must say that I have operated on 475 of those children in my career. In 11 years I have never lost one that was born full term. My survival rate for premature babies was 88 percent, so that I think we have reason to believe that the medical advice given to the family of Baby Doe was not unbiased, it was not conservative, it was not even true. They decided they would like to have nothing done to their child including, no food and no fluids. Pediatricians in the hospital were disturbed enough about this to go to court to see if they couldn't get an injunction. A court hearing was held right at the patient's bedside, and the judge decided that the family had that right. That's the first time in history that ever it was legally decided in a court of law that the parents' had the right to kill a child by starvation. The pediatricians immediately appealed that to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana and the Indiana Supreme Court said that the first judge had not acted outside of his authority and therefore they did not feel that they had any role to play. That case was then appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Meanwhile, the prosecuting attorney in that county, Monroe, Indiana, went to court because he felt that what was happening to that child was child abuse. So there were two court cases in the legal stream in Indiana when Baby Doe died from a combination of pneumonia and starvation, and all of the court proceedings were mooted at that point. It is very important to realize that never on that occasion or since has the substance of Baby

Doe been adjudicated in any court of law. It was always the technicality of what had previously been done and whether that was in line with the authority of the previous judicial officer. So even to this day we have no law that has ever been settled in court about the right to life of a baby with a handicap.

The third domino is euthanasia. Euthanasia really means "happy death," and the euthanasia forces are as broad in this land as they have never been before. I have said this from platforms for the last ten years. But it's still true because they're even more active now. There is discrimination in this country against the elderly and I don't think of myself as one of them, though chronologically I am. I am 68 but I don't feel any different than I did when I was 48. However, the elderly are pushed aside. They have a social death before they have a physical death. They are retired by an antiquated custom at the age of 65. They become either prisoners in their homes or in some institution in which their families place them. When they are placed in nursing homes they really become segregated and they become just communities for the elderly and the dying.

There are organizations in this land and in the United Kingdom and some in continental Europe that seek to help elderly people commit suicide. There are two particular organizations, one called Exit (and just imagine what that means) and the other is the Hemlock Society which takes its name from the old Greek custom of taking an elderly person out to drink hemlock for his last meal when he ceases to be of any use to the Greek democracy. These self-help manuals, I think, are treacherous. I think that in addition to providing ways for suicide and encouraging the rest of us to think that that's a good thing to do, they put the elderly into a position of thinking that they are improperly using a health resource that belongs to somebody else. That is not true. It is important to be aware of the infiltration of the Hospice Movement by the euthanasia forces. The Hospice Movement is one of the finest things that ever happened in this country. It's been abroad for 200 years. Simply, Hospice Movement means to take a patient who is terminally ill and treat him physically, emotionally, mentally and spiritually in the best way that can be done, and make his last days on this earth as pleasant and as happy without recourse to all of the technology that artificially keeps a person alive beyond his time. Well, what an obviously fertile territory for the euthanasia people to step in and seem to be on our side by saying, yes, yes, let's take care of these dear old folks. But while what they have in mind is Exit, what we have in mind is good loving care. If it is believed that I'm being farfetched about this, just remember that since we have forced abortion in China or forced sterilization in India, could extermination of the elderly by force in this country be very far behind? I don't think so.

The subject of the demography of this country is very important when discussing this subject. We probably think of the population of this country as being like a pyramid. Few old people at the top, lots of kids at the bottom, and the middle-aged people in the middle. That is not the shape of our country any longer. In the Year 2005, we will have 50,000,000 people over the age of 65, half of them over the age of 75, so that the pyramid at the top is now beginning to bloom out like the top of a bessemer furnace. The taxpayer, the wage earner, the mover and shaker of society (who is the toddler in the first years of the next century) is not going to

be any more numerous than he is today. One of the reasons for this is that we have polished off 16,000,000 potential taxpayers who would be taking care of those elderly people in the early years of the next century. Now that is a tremendous burden for today's toddler to face in the next century, because he is going to be dealing with the largest group of elderly people that any civilization has had to deal with. That would be bad enough if the story ended there, but it's even worse because in addition to the number of elderly people there is going to be a tremendous number of children. It will not be because their parents have high fertility, but because of sheer numbers. In the early years of the next century, we will be having the echo of the baby-boom. The baby-boom children will be having their grandchildren. So the taxpayer in the early years of the next century will have this big population above and this big population below. We have to be terribly bright to look ahead and see what the ethical situations are going to be or even to predict how they are going to be decided. We may find that the things we talk about in reference to Baby Doe are like a Sunday School picnic in reference to the ethical decisions that will have to be made about the elderly in another 15 to 20 years, if not sooner.

Now there are not many things that we know of on what to do about this. We talk about it in government a great deal, but we don't get very far because no other group of people has ever faced this or has ever had to deal with it before. A very few of us will ever have to deal with abortion as a personal issue. Even fewer of us will ever have to deal with the subject of infanticide as a personal issue. But each of us will have to face this other issue of euthanasia. We may face it first with a loved one, a parent, an uncle, or an aunt. Perhaps eventually we're going to have to face it with ourselves. The decisions that we make now about how the elderly will be treated are the decisions that the next generation will make only more severely about us in the generations down the road.

It isn't enough to be against abortion, against infanticide, against euthanasia. We must have alternatives to offer the woman who is pregnant and doesn't want to be, or the parents of a child who is born handicapped. We must be able to step in and provide surrogate care in the form of surrogate sons and daughters, or cousins, or nephews, or whatever for the elderly. I am not going into those details. It isn't enough to be opposed to these things, we must have other answers.

Since coming to Washington I have found encouragement as I've reflected on the lives of two women that I know. The first of these was the mother of one of my patients. I went to her one time and said: "I have to give a lecture tomorrow in York University in Toronto, and I want to quote you, but I want to quote you accurately. Would you mind answering two questions? What is the worst thing that ever happened to you?" She replied: "It was having our son born with all those defects that required 35 operations to correct." And I said: "I knew you'd say that because I did 22 of them and I was there for the others. Now, what's the best thing that ever happened to you?" She replied: "It was having our son born with all those defects that required 35 operations to correct." That family has made such a splash in the Christian community of Philadelphia, that everybody knows the blessings that come from the extended care that a family gives to a child who is handicapped. That youngster, incidentally,

has gone on to have his last operation, number 56. He graduated as valedictorian in his high school class last year. He was the president of his class, he was on the varsity basketball team, he is a freshman at college and he introduced me at the last talk I gave in Philadelphia.

The other woman that I've found encouragement from is Mother Theresa. She is a great champion of life. I remember that wonderful picture of Mother Theresa in Calcutta when she picked up a tiny premature baby lying in the mud of the gutter. After looking at it she lifted the baby up and said, "There's life in it!"