

The Interim PLUS + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

Curriculum Supplement For Schools

The Interim Plus is a periodical dedicated to educational matters and specifically designed to assist teachers in integrating relevant life issues in their lesson planning.

Editor: Dan Di Rocco

Editorial Board: Dan Di Rocco, Alissa Golob,
Matt Dineen, Suresh Dominic

Design & Production: David Bolton

The Interim Plus is published Bi-Monthly by
The Interim Publishing Company
104 Bond St. Toronto, ON M5B 1X9

Date: November 2013

Edition: Volume 13 No. 2
interimplus@theinterim.com

Contents:

Remembrance Day	p. 1
Recognizing Rights and Personhood	p. 4
Woodworth Pro-Life Motion	p. 7
Science, Technology, Medicine and Personhood	P. 9

November is the month for remembrance and sober reflection. The mood is often somber, with darker days, less sunlight, and howling winds. In schools the feeling is one of achievement and also creeping fatigue as we approach Christmas festivities and a welcome break.



Great wars have been fought for human freedom and the protection of human rights against tyranny and imperial pretensions of nations and ruling classes. Great sacrifices were made by ordinary folks at the front lines and on the home front. Each November

there is a pause to reflect on these happenings.

It is known as Remembrance Day. Its meaning and place in our society is one of the themes in this edition of *The Interim Plus*.

Related to the central theme is that of personhood, and how the concept is denied or defined in a convoluted manner despite clear scientific and medical evidence to the contrary.

Finally, there is a reminder that the deadline for submission of essays and application packages for the **Father Ted Colleton Scholarship** is fast approaching. Please remind your students that the deadline is December 1, 2013.

Part I Remembrance Day

Remembrance Day is the annual commemoration of the many sacrifices that soldiers made on behalf of their country. It celebrates their bravery, their devotion and love of country.

This is done right across the nation. It usually involves a moment of silence at 11:00 am the traditional hour when the armistice was declared on November 11, 1918, thus ending the First World War, a conflict that resulted in huge losses of human life both during the war, in the immediate aftermath due to diseases, and then in the dislocation and turmoil that followed as revolutions wracked many nations. More tragedy would follow with totalitarian regimes taking over, communist and fascist respectively. These in turn generated another world-wide conflagration taking many more millions of lives.

The violence has not subsided since 1945, despite the establishment of the United Nations as an international body to bring about peace and avoid new wars.

How should Remembrance Day be celebrated? What does it mean for Canadians today? Here is an article from the November 9, 2012 edition of the *Toronto Sun*, two days before Remembrance Day in Toronto.

Assign the students to read the article and the comments of readers, then have them answer and discuss in class the questions posed on the material.

Canadians want Remembrance Day to have bigger role

By Simon Kent, *Toronto Sun*

The world will pause to remember the fallen at 11 a.m. Sunday and the hushed two minutes that follow will be heard all over Canada.

As it should be and always has been.

If you find this year's traditional Remembrance Day commemorations a little more respectful and somehow more meaningful than before, you're in good company.

Latest research shows more Canadians than ever want Remembrance Day to play a major part in our lives out of respect for the fallen in all wars. They are also doing something about it.

Three in 10 Canadians say they will attend a Remem-

brance Day ceremony in 2012 (up eight points from 2010) and 80% of Canadians say they will observe two minutes of silence at 11 a.m. (up five points from 2010).

These figures come from the Historica-Dominion Institute, Canada's largest independent historical society. It has a specific interest in developing broad community knowledge of our shared heritage and it finds something special happening at the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month.

"We're seeing engagement in Remembrance Day growing steadily in recent years," Institute president Anthony Wilson-Smith said. "Canadians are making clear their awareness and appreciation of the service and sacrifices our veterans have made and continue to make on behalf of our country."

So, why are Canadians so prepared to stop and honour those who made the supreme sacrifice in war?

Perhaps having our men and women serving in Afghanistan for the past decade holds a clue.

Historica-Dominion research reveals 27% of Canadians say they personally know someone who served in Afghanistan.

This heightened awareness may also explain why 63% of those surveyed agree Canada does not do enough to honour its veterans; three quarters agree (32% strongly and 44% somewhat) that Canada should replicate the Vietnam Wall in Washington to honour our personnel who have died in modern conflicts, up to and including Afghanistan.

Dave Gordon, executive-director of the Royal Canadian Legion Ontario Command, finds merit in the wall proposal – although he concedes that might be some way off yet.

In the shorter term, he says, the fact more Canadians want to stop for two minutes and reflect is much more encouraging.

"It shows that across all age groups there is a huge amount of community honour ready to be bestowed on our veterans, no matter what conflict they served in," Gordon said.

"Canadians realize the sacrifices made by the fallen.

They also know that the loved ones who are left behind have a huge personal burden to carry.

"When we stop as a nation to remember then we also honour those who are left to mourn the dead. It shows we are together as a sharing community no matter what our background or race or creed.

"We are Canadians."

While the two-minute silence on Remembrance Day is a tradition that dates back to the First World War, the bond of shared suffering that war delivers might be better served with a longer time to reflect.

That shows in the survey response.

With respect to how we honour veterans, 85% of Canadians agree (57% strongly, 27% somewhat) that Remembrance Day should be a statutory holiday across Canada.



The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is seen with a poppy at the National War Monument in Ottawa. (QMI Agency files)

A majority (57%) feels a statutory holiday would increase the day's significance because Canadians would have more time to mark it.

At the other end of the scale, 16% feel it would lessen the day's significance because people would take the opportunity to shop or vacation.

Either way, Gordon sees nothing but positives emerging from

Sunday's community observances.

"The simple fact that Remembrance Day has lived as long as it has around the world should be applauded.

"Maybe one day there will be an end to all wars and suffering caused by them. That would be the greatest triumph of all," he said.

<http://www.torontosun.com/2012/11/09/canadians-want-remembrance-day-to-have-bigger-role>



Following are reader comments on the *Sun* story regarding celebration of Remembrance Day in 2012

"So, why are Canadians so prepared to stop and honour those who made the supreme sacrifice in war?" That's an easy one.

Most Canadians understand that this is one of the best countries on the planet to live in, but the privilege of living here did not come without the sacrifices made by others to preserve our way of life. Honouring those that made the ultimate sacrifice for the betterment of the rest of us is what decent people do.

Unfortunately, we also have a small but loud population of leftist-type misfits who would rather whine and criticize our institutions and anything that resembles some kind of authority....To those that see fit to ignore or protest November 11 - go somewhere else !! You're useless to the rest of us who contribute to Canada being what it is today.

We should never forget these people [soldiers] and need the schools to start teaching this or we will forget the people who died for us to be free. There is always a high price for freedom lest we forget.

That Remembrance Day is not a national statutory holiday is a disgrace. This day should be reserved solely for the privilege of observing a day of remembrance to honour those who have gone before us. Nothing should be open, no stores or businesses, no pubs or restaurants, only emergency medical services should be available, public transit should run only to enable people to attend Remembrance Day services and to return home.

Quite a few of our service people want to talk about their experiences now, but someone has to be there to listen. It would be a great way for students to get their 40 hrs of community service, volunteering, listening to, and learning from, individuals that have much to share.

BC students don't attend school on that day and haven't for decades. Not sure why other provinces and territories don't have this designation. Also, the school Remembrance Day assembly is the only REQUIRED assembly under the BC School Act. So if BC can do it (and has done it for years), why not others?

Sons of war did pay the price, so we could have this life so nice.

Sons of mothers, sons of fathers, not coming home to raise their daughters.

A soul for country a life for kin, The reasons many, a need to win.

Honour, Duty , men so brave gave it all right to their grave.

In Flanders field the poppies sway, So we'll remember every day.

Carve the names on every stone for all our soldiers coming home,

A sacred place for all who gave should never have to pay that grave

Many of us will attend Remembrance ceremonies just to remind ourselves that Canadians fought to save Canada before so many immigrants could hold Canadian citizenship as well as flying the flag of their 'home' country as well as holding citizenship in that 'home' country. True Canadians are Canadians. They don't need a foreign country crutch to fall back on. And that goes to you Canadian-born who live in the states as partial Americans.

Remembrance day is nothing more than political propaganda and jargon. Just a way to garner support for the war in Afghanistan and Iraq by the government.

I fear that this day is largely ignored and not understood by many of today's youth. I bet that if it was a holiday, most would be home working on their mobile devices and texting and whatever else one does on these things. Both of my grandfathers fought in WW2 (on the Axis side) and it occurs to me that regardless of their loyalties, Remembrance days works for both sides. Try explaining that to some of the stupid kids today, you know they don't even teach decent war history any longer so our youth either pick it up on their own or not at all. It's a shame because were it not for Allied soldiers, all of these posts would be in German or perhaps Russian.

In retrospect, would those who gave blood and life be happy with what their descendants have done with the freedoms either gained or preserved?





Questions and Activities for Remembrance Day

1. Does the day have meaning today? If the poll quoted in the Sun article suggest that “We’re seeing engagement in Remembrance Day growing steadily in recent years”, why is that?
2. What could be done to make the day more meaningful for contemporary youth?
3. Should Remembrance Day be a statutory holiday day or should there be at least the 2 minutes of obligatory silence everywhere across the nation including workplaces and schools? What are the pros and the cons?
4. How can the three R’s [Respect. Reflect. Remember] be implemented re Remembrance Day? Can there be contests, poetry reading, speakers from veterans’ groups, dramatizations, role playing, special prayer services?
5. Last year there was a protest in Toronto by some Afghani women against Remembrance Day, are such protests an insult to Canada’s war dead?
6. Are our war veterans treated justly and respectfully by our government?
7. What feelings are being expressed in these letters to the editor?
8. Do any of them hit home for you? Why or why not?
9. Does the media give good coverage to Remembrance Day?

10. Are we betraying the sacrifices of these sons and daughters that served their country when we permit or even welcome anti-life and anti-family developments like abortion on demand and same-sex marriage?

11. The headline suggests an increased desire for “bigger role” for Remembrance Day. However, observance of the day causes controversy as well. It was not always so. What has changed?

Part 2 Recognizing Rights and Personhood

The following exercise is appropriate for history studies, but it is also applicable for courses in law or politics. It is intended to demonstrate that protecting the unborn child is a present-day civil rights movement, like those of the past where people defended their personhood. It is an appropriate counterpoint to the first article on Remembrance Day. Did we forget someone’s rights?

As an example, for Grade 11 American History, this exercise combines the specific course expectations “Forming the American Identity,” which addresses citizens who were denied rights in the past, and “Interpretation and Analysis,” which challenges students to connect this with modern examples. For Grade 12 World History: “The West and the World”, this exercise fulfills the course expectation “Women’s Experience,” which focuses on individuals, such as Susan B. Anthony, who fought for women’s equality in society. Teachers should follow up with a discussion to make connections to the pro-life movement clear.

Have students read the article written by Mary Krane Derr honouring Susan B. Anthony. It appears below and was first featured in the Spring 1998 issue of *The American Feminist*, a publication put out by Feminists for Life and updated in a later article appearing in 2007,

<http://feministsforlife.org/-taf/2007/spring-2007.pdf>

<http://www.feministsforlife.org/taf/1998/spring/Spring98.pdf>

Students can then be assigned the questions that follow.

The Feminists for Life believe that abortion is a reflection that their society has failed to meet the needs of women. They state that they are dedicated to systematically eliminating the root causes that drive women to abortion—primarily lack of practical resources and support. They claim to promote the resources women

want and need to make nonviolent choices, and that their efforts are shaped by the core feminist values of justice, nondiscrimination, and nonviolence.

herstory
Worth Repeating

By Mary Crane Derr
co-editor of the an-

thology *Prolife Feminism: Yesterday and Today*.



“Vinegar-visaged virago.” “Stiff.” “Cold.” “Aggressive.” “Constantly howling.” “A dangerous, undermining effect on the characters of the wives and mothers of our land.” “Laboring under strong feelings of hatred towards men.” “What will become of ... that healthful and necessary subordination of wife to husband?” “Taking women down from that pedestal where she is today.” “Will man be consigned to nursing the babies, washing the dishes, sweeping the house?”

These charges against feminists could have been made today, but they were made over a century ago against Susan B. Anthony. As Lynn Sherr points out in her wonderfully eye-opening book, Failure Is Impossible, Anthony was actually “selfless, diplomatic, elegant, charming, generous, friendly, determined, polite, curious, open, amusing, self-possessed, and, once again, selfless.” Anthony tirelessly campaigned for suffrage, poor and professional women’s employment rights, the liberation of prostitutes, children’s rights, abolition of slavery and the death penalty, and temperance (this last because substance abuse caused much family violence). She illegally voted, took part in the Underground Railway, and sheltered a domestic-violence victim and her child.

Anthony, a Quaker, had a gift for befriending women – and men – of different races, economic backgrounds, religions, and political affiliations and drawing them into activism. Though happy with her personal choice not to marry or have biological children, she was told that as a single, childless woman she had no right to speak on matters of family and motherhood. Anthony praised egalitarian marriages, and described sexuality as “the highest and holiest function of the physical organism.” Thus she often decried in plain language the ways in which a male-dominant culture forced women to “sell themselves cheap” in marriage, sex and motherhood. She helped raise the seven chil-



dren of her beloved friend, Elizabeth Cady Stanton. She doted on her nieces, writing that “a child one loves is a constant benediction to the soul.” She called younger feminists her “nieces” too, and they called her “Aunt Susan.” Anthony supported one “niece’s” choice to adopt a baby while single. Anthony took on laws that denied mothers’ wishes in custody decisions. During the 19th century, if a child were still unborn at the time of the father’s death, the child could be forcibly taken from the mother at birth and given to a guardian previously appointed by the father – even though this arrangement traumatized both mother and child. Anthony once remarked: “Sweeter even than to have had the joy of caring for children of my own has it been to me to help bring about a better state of things for mothers generally, so that their unborn little ones could not be willed away from them.” Anthony referred to another violent rupture of the mother/child bond: abortion. The Revolution, the radical women’s paper she published with Stanton, editorialized against abortion, terming it “child murder” and “infanticide”

while compassionately addressing its root causes in women’s oppression and advocating family planning. Anthony, the paper’s proprietor, spurned a lucrative revenue source for most periodicals of the era: ads for patent-medicine abortifacients. The lost income eventually forced her paper into bankruptcy. Her 1875 speech “Social Purity,” reprinted in Ida Husted Harper’s 1898 Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony, specifically discussed abortion and postnatal infanticide—along with rape and prostitution—as male wrongs against women. Anthony argued that laws pertaining to these matters, made and enforced exclusively by men, further victimized women while absolving men of all responsibility. Yet she declared: “The work of woman is not to lessen the severity or the certainty of the penalty for violation of the moral law, but to prevent this violation by the removal of the causes which lead to it.”

“Social Purity” is remarkably similar, even identical in places, to an earlier piece focusing specifically on abortion: “Marriage and Maternity” (The Revolution, July 8, 1869). Anthony was almost certainly the author of this piece, which was signed “A.” Anthony was often called “Miss A.,” and The Revolution staff commonly signed articles with



their initial (if they signed at all).

Anthony showed that feminism has never been about destroying the fabric of human relationships. It was and is about empowering women and men—whatever their marital or parental status—to give life to one another and to children, including the unborn. In honor of her birthday, Feb.

15, let us remember and commemorate her work.

Worth Repeating Spring 1998

Mary Krane Derr

When I was in college I felt enormous pressure to support abortion. I bought all those stereotypes about pro-lifers being “anti-choice fanatics” who wanted women to be butchered with hangers. I knew I would be ostracized if I told anyone that I felt abortion was inconsistent with other principles I held dear—justice for the oppressed, empowerment to the disenfranchised, addressing the root causes of problems faced by society. So this closet pro-lifer kept mum.

The first time I felt the power of the name “Feminists for Life” was when an ad appeared in *The New Republic*. I saw quotes from the feminist foremothers about abortion, and I instantly recognized that I was “home.” I was still not prepared to deal with the reaction of my peers, so I did not join *Feminists for Life* right away. But I clipped the ad and put it on the bulletin board on my dorm wall, and it cost me a relationship. When men say “pro-life,” women hear “women-hater.”

Later I saw Nat Hentoff’s article, “Pro-Choice Bigots,” in *The New Republic*. It focused on the intolerance among current echelons of liberalism towards anybody who is both liberal and pro-life. That is when I began to think about the phony multiculturalism that is pervasive on campuses across America – the cultural hostility toward all pro-lifers that requires everyone to think alike in the name of “diversity.” Abortion is the issue that indicts the current left. How can they speak about compassion when they give up on the unborn? Hentoff’s praise for FFL was the closest thing I had seen to a decent hearing for pro-lifers. FFL al-



lowed me to stiffen my spine and gain the courage to come out of the pro-life closet.

The biggest gift of feminism that we can pass on to others—especially college women and men – is the knowledge that FFL exists. How many times have we heard, “I wish I had known you were there?” How many of us have known for years in our hearts that abortion was wrong, but were afraid to speak out? In celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Seneca Falls

Convention, let us carry on the tradition of pro-life activists such as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton who spoke out proudly and publicly of their support for women and children—by declaring our consistent opposition to violence and discrimination and enlisting others to help make our vision a reality.

Questions

1. What were some of the stereotypical charges leveled against Anthony in her day? Are those charges still applicable today?
2. What was Susan B. Anthony’s role in influencing American feminist culture? List some of the ways that she advanced the status of women in her society.
3. Has her message of equality for women been distorted since? If so, how? How is she proving to be a controversial figure to feminists today?
4. What are the two terms that Anthony uses to refer to abortion? What are her arguments for defending women and the unborn child? Are they convincing? Why or why not?
5. In the article Anthony is quoted as follows: “The work of woman is not to lessen the severity or the certainty of the penalty for violation of the moral law [abortion], but to prevent this violation by the removal of the causes which

- lead to it.” What does she mean by this statement? Do you agree or disagree? How is this applicable today?
6. Can one be both feminist and pro-life? Is Susan B. Anthony a good model of this? Why or why not?
 7. Examine the parallels between the movement that sought women’s equality and the contemporary pro-life movement. How are they the same/different? Why do the unborn need our protection?
 8. Watch the video titled “Persecution and Social Reform” (found here: warning there are some graphic images. The video is from the Canadian Centre for Bioethical Reform (CCBR) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U5QRLTsUxgI&feature=share&list=PLB04AC432B51E4051>). How does it make connections between other social rights movements of the past and the pro-life movement?
 9. The video explains that many contemporary accepted truths – that child labour is wrong, women are equal to men, all races are equal, etc. – resulted from movements that were unpopular or even illegal in their time. What is the relationship between legality and moral reforms?
 10. How did Mary Krane Derr “convert” to a pro-life position? What pressures did she face? What convinced her?
 11. Who is Nat Hentoff and what makes him an interesting and surprising pro-life supporter and advocate?
 12. How was the concept of personhood advanced in the feminist struggle for equal rights?

Defining Personhood

The following is an excerpt from **A SECULAR CASE AGAINST ABORTION**

By: Kristine Kruszelnicki

The question of personhood leaves the realm of science for that of philosophy and moral ethics. Science defines what the preborn is, it cannot define our obligations toward her. After all, the preborn is a very different human entity than those we see around us. Should a smaller, less developed, differently located and dependent being be entitled to rights of personhood and life?

Perhaps the more significant question is: are these differences morally relevant? If the factor is irrelevant to

other humans’ personhood, neither should it have bearing on that of the preborn. Are small people less important than bigger or taller people? Is a teenager who can reproduce more worthy of life than a toddler who can’t even walk yet? Again, if these factors are not relevant in granting or increasing personhood for anyone past the goal post of birth, neither should they matter where the preborn human is concerned.

One might fairly argue that we do grant increasing rights with skill and age. However, the right to live and to not be killed is unlike the social permissions granted on the basis of acquired skills and maturity, such as the right to drive or the right to vote. We are denied the right to drive prior to turning 16; we are not killed and prevented from ever gaining that level of maturity.

Similarly, consciousness and self-awareness, often proposed as fair markers for personhood, merely identify stages in human development. Consciousness doesn’t exist in a vacuum. It exists only as part of the greater whole of a living entity. To say that an entity does not yet have consciousness is to nonetheless speak of that entity within which lies the inherent capacity for consciousness, and without which consciousness could never develop.

As atheist Nat Hentoff points out, “It misses a crucial point to say that the extermination can take place because the brain has not yet functioned or because that thing is not yet a ‘person’. Whether the life is cut off in the fourth week or the fourteenth, the victim is one of our species, and has been from the start.”

The inherent capacity for all human function lies within the embryo because she is a whole human entity. Just as one would not throw out green bananas along with rotten bananas though both lack current function as food, one cannot dismiss a fetus who has not yet gained a function, alongside a brain-dead person who has permanently lost that function. To dismiss and terminate a fetus for having not yet achieved a specified level of development is to ignore that a human being at that stage of human development is functioning just as a human being of that age and stage is biologically programmed to function.

<http://www.prolifehumanists.org/tag/nat-hentoff/>

- ### Questions
1. What are considered markers for personhood and right to life?
 2. Are these four arguments which Kristine Kruszelnicki offers for the personhood of the preborn human being valid?
 3. What is her green banana analogy? Is it convincing?

4. Discuss the following statement regarding personhood: *“It defies common sense and the natural law to base ‘personhood’ on abilities, size, age, or health, rather than on the nature of what the being is”* Geoffrey Cauchi, lawyer

Editorial February 2012

Paul Tuns, *The Interim*

When the 41st Canadian Parliament returns from its winter recess, Stephen Woodworth, MP for Kitchener Centre, will initiate a debate on the very subject which Jonathan Swift (in his satire, *Modest Proposal*) thought self-evident enough to withstand his satire: the question of young life’s status in law. Woodworth will immodestly propose that legal protection of unborn life – which currently relies on an antiquated definition of personhood, old even in the days of Swift – be expanded in light of modern science and Canada’s long-standing commitment to human rights. But, although his is an eminently reasonable suggestion, if history offers any hint, Woodworth’s proposal will elicit spluttering outrage from defenders of our country’s shameful status quo.

Indeed, with a predictability which would be poignant if it were not so perverse, advocates of abortion have, on cue, hissed their hysterical hyperventilations against Woodworth’s mere mention that it is time to begin a measured, mature debate on this subject. For vocal social liberals, the trauma of abortion’s past prohibition will be revisited through their counterfactual fantasies of totalitarian theocracy. Repressions unprecedented in Canada’s proud history will be pictured for the public by these pundits in curiously lurid detail.

Why do such extreme phantasmagorias of fascism appear whenever anything even obliquely relating to the issue of abortion enters the public arena? Perhaps these unhinged imagining of extremes – which undermine the very sobriety that Woodworth would create – are invoked to obscure the fact that Canada is actually at another extreme. In other words, social liberals conjure despotic dystopias because, in this county, the advocates of abortion have no battles left to win; since there is no protection for the unborn in law whatsoever, such nightmares are necessary, lest we wake to a reality more frightening than their dark and dubious dreams.....

A Canada which prohibits prenatal infanticide is our dream; it is the end we ardently desire, the ideal for which we strive without ceasing....

Let us hope, then, that Woodworth’s clarion call for civil debate will be a bracing encounter with sanity and will deliver us from our current state of untenable

and unjust legal contradictions. Perhaps, in another age, Swiftian hyperbole could have done Woodworth’s work and brought us to our senses. Ours, however, is a situation

Stephen Woodworth beyond satire.

Woodworth Answers Critics

Paul Tuns, *The Interim*, October 2012

www.theinterim.com/politics/woodworth-answers-critics/

Woodworth answered the critics of M-312 by stating what the motion does and does not do and remarked on some of the peculiar or ironic criticisms launched against him and the motion since he announced in January his intent to ask Parliament to shine the light of modern evidence on the issue.

Woodworth stated clearly what the current law says. Section 223 (1) of the Criminal Code says: “A child becomes a human being within the meaning of this Act when it has completely proceeded, in a living state, from the body of its mother, whether or not: (a) it has breathed; (b) it has an independent circulation; or (c) the navel string is severed.”

Woodworth has spoken against this archaic understanding of human being for years at the annual National March for Life in Ottawa and in the House of Commons, complaining that it does not make sense that the preborn child is not recognized as a human being in law as long as “it has one toe” inside her mother. The child does not “magically transform” from non-human to a human being simply because it is separated from his or her mother.

Woodworth said that the basis of the law goes back at least four centuries, but that scientific knowledge has progressed since then and much more is known about fetal development than the age in which the original law was written.



He said regardless of the policy implications of a possible redefinition of human being, it is wise to follow the science and recognize the child in the womb as a human being. Section 223 (1) “dehumanizes and excludes a whole class of people,” Woodworth said, and if the state can deny “basic human rights” by denying “the inherent human value” of a group of people, then the government denies the value of all human life because of the implicit message that “you have only the value the government assigns to you.” He described such thinking as dangerous.

Woodworth noted that “no opponent of M-312 defends Section 223 (1)” saying “they will talk about everything else but Section 223 (1).” He condemned the political climate that resists honest debate on his motion, asking “Have we lost the consensus that every law must be based in fact? Should a 400-year-old law be forever immune to democratic review and remain frozen in law forever?”



Kaiba with his mother April

healthy baby boy. But then one night, while at dinner at a restaurant, Kaiba suddenly stopped breathing and turned blue. Bryan placed his son on the table and began frantically performing CPR.

Kaiba survived this episode. Doctors sent him home from the hospital 10 days later. But two days after that, he again stopped breathing.

That was when doctors diagnosed him with *tracheobronchomalacia*, a condition in which the trachea is too weak and periodically collapses, making it impossible for the patient to breathe.

Kaiba’s case was grave. While in the hospital his breathing and heart would stop almost daily. Doctor’s weren’t hopeful.

“Quite a few of them said he had a good chance of not leaving the hospital alive. It was pretty scary,” said his mother, April. “We pretty much prayed every night, hoping that he would pull through.”

Fortunately the parents were put in touch with researchers at the University of Michigan who were working on cutting edge medical treatments involving the burgeoning field of 3-D printing.

The researchers were able to “print” a splint specifically fitted to Kaiba’s windpipe using a 3-D printer, a ma-



A 3D model of Kaiba’s windpipe with the “printed” splint in place.

Questions

1. What was the objective of Stephen Woodworth in his motion M-312?
2. How did opponents of the motion react to it?
3. What was Woodworth appealing to? How were science and the law in conflict?
4. What was dangerous about the situation?
5. The motion in the end was defeated. The question of personhood is left unaddressed. What can Canadians do to advance a civil debate about the issue?

Science, Technology, Medicine and Personhood

The following activity can be integrated in any high school science class, especially those units that focus on technological advancements in medicine and its social and ethical implications.

Teachers can adapt the material with a follow-up discussion to suit the appropriate grade level.

Have students read the two contrasting articles and then assign them the questions that follow.

Doctors save life of 3-month old by 3-D ‘printing’ splint for collapsed trachea

by John Jalsevac, May 23, 2013 LifeSiteNews

Six weeks earlier April and Bryan Gionfriddo had proudly brought their newborn son, Kaiba, home from the hospital. To all appearances he was a perfectly

chine that creates a 3D object by spraying successive thin layers of material, usually some form of plastic.

“It’s magical to me,” Dr. Glenn Green, an associate professor of pediatric otolaryngology at the University of Michigan, told CNN. “We’re talking about taking dust and using it to build body parts.”

Green’s colleague in the risky venture, University of Michigan biomedical engineer Scott Hollister, described his emotions on being asked to help Kaiba as, “a mixture of elation and, for lack of a better word, terror.”

“When someone drops something like this in your lap and says, ‘Look, this might be this kid’s only chance’ ... it’s a big step.”

The researchers had already tested the technology on animals, but this was the first time it had ever been tried on a human being.

After receiving emergency clearance from the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Green implanted the splint into Kaiba. Almost immediately the scientists were able to see the fruits of their labors.

“When the stitches were put in, we started seeing the lung inflate and deflate,” Green said. “It was so fabulous. There were people in the operating room cheering.”

Kaiba is now 19 months old, and has not had any more breathing episodes since being sent home a year ago. The splint is designed to disintegrate within about three years, by which time Kaiba should be able to breathe on his own.

According to scientists, this is just the first success of what is likely to be a brave new frontier in medicine – using 3D printing to create replacements for any number of body parts.

<http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/doctors-save-life-of-3-month-old-by-3-d-printing-splint-for-collapsed-trach>

Disabled newborns are being killed LEGALLY in The Netherlands: here’s the proof

by Peter Saunders, May 14, 2013 LifeSiteNews

In an interview this morning on BBC Five Live on the Paul Lamb case I was asked by the presenter Nicky Campbell about evidence for a slippery slope following the legalization of euthanasia in other jurisdictions.

In my answer I mentioned the steady escalation in numbers of cases in Belgium and the Netherlands and said that one third of nurses had carried out euthanasia illegally in Belgium and that one third of cases in some parts of Belgium had been involuntary, although the law did not allow this.

I also mentioned the ‘Groningen Protocol’ under which disabled babies had been given lethal injections in the Netherlands.

Campbell appeared not to know about this and asked me on air to email him information about it to which I agreed. Another BBC journalist phoned me after the interview to check my sources.

Babies with spina bifida are being killed legally in The Netherlands. I sent her a link to the original paper on the ‘Groningen Protocol’ from the *New England Medical Journal* in 2005.

The full reference is *Verhagen E, Sauer P. “The Groningen Protocol–Euthanasia in Severely Ill Newborns.” New England Journal of Medicine 2005; 352(10):959-62*

It says that ‘Twenty-two cases of euthanasia in newborns have been reported to district attorneys’ offices in the Netherlands during the past seven years’ but also highlights underreporting:

‘Given that the national survey indicated that such procedures are performed in 15 to 20 newborns per year; the fact that an average of three cases were reported annually suggests that most cases are simply not being reported.’

The 22 babies killed all had spina bifida and/or hydrocephalus – conditions which many disabled people live with in Britain today (Here is another report on the protocol from CBHD citing the 22 documented cases).

Under the ‘Groningen Protocol’ the termination of a child’s life (under age 12) **is acceptable if four requirements were properly fulfilled:**

1. The presence of hopeless and unbearable suffering
2. The consent of the parents to termination of life
3. Medical consultation having taken place
4. Careful execution of the termination



More recent reports suggest there has been a reduction in cases of direct newborn euthanasia in the Netherlands since 2005 because of 1. More efficient prena-

tal detection and late abortion 2. More use of 'terminal sedation' not recorded officially as euthanasia 3. Continued underreporting

Questions

1. What condition did baby Kaiba have? What did it make impossible for him to do?
2. What advances in technology made medical treatments such as this possible? How does the machine work?
3. How does this article exemplify science as a force for good?
4. Compare and contrast this article with the one titled "Disabled newborns are being killed LEGALLY in The Netherlands: here's the proof" (found here: <http://www.lifesitenews.com/blog/disabled-newborns-are-being-killed-legally-in-the-netherlands-heres-the-pro>). How is science being used recklessly in this example?
5. Why is legalizing euthanasia dangerous in any case? What does the term "slippery slope" mean? How does it apply here?
6. Why do you think cases of euthanasia on disabled infants are underreported? What can be done about it?
7. Why have doctors developed the 'Groningen Protocol'? What is the irony in doctors coming up with it? Why doesn't the Protocol include consent of the child as a requirement?
8. a) What provincial or federal legislation protects disabled newborns in Canada?
b) How could citizens ensure this legislation remains?
c) Are there local organizations who work to ensure that the rights of those who are most vulnerable in society (i.e. the unborn, the elderly, those with physical and mental challenges) are protected?
d) How do they do it?
e) What further action could such groups take?
9. By comparing these two articles it is evident that technological advances are used to aid some infants (as with Kaiba), whereas some infants are quite literally being killed by them. Suggest some reasons why this is the case. What can be done about it?
10. How does this situation influence/affect the concept of personhood? What implications are there for (the sick and elderly) end of life considerations?
11. Should medical professionals always seek to preserve life? Why?
12. Why is personhood is proving to be a difficult concept to implement for the unborn?