

An encounter with evil, or: why the Jesuits are responsible for the murder of your grandmother

by Nancy Spannaus

If someone out to “save money” in a hospital pulls the plug on your grandmother or infant child, there is only one place to put the blame. Blame the Jesuits.

It has long been known to me that the Jesuit order has been the driving force behind the so-called right-to-die movement, from Karen Ann Quinlan to refusing treatment for Baby Doe. The very heart of the movement is at Jesuit-run Georgetown University, where the pseudo-discipline of bioethics was created as a justification for murder. And the two leading propagandists for putting people “out of their misery” in the United States are Jesuits John Paris and Richard McCormick, the latter an editor of the Jesuit *America* magazine.

But when I met with Father McCormick on June 17, I was not quite prepared for the experience. For Father McCormick is not just a propagandist for the Nazi evils of eliminating “useless eaters”; as an individual he epitomizes the Jesuit Aristotelian method of pure evil and corruption. As you listen to Father McCormick, you hear the justifications for genocide that have corrupted millions of Americans to the point where they will kill rather than take responsibility for economic and social policy.

Father McCormick, S.J., works at the Kennedy Institute for Bioethics at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. He is also a member of the Concilium movement, an international grouping of schismatic Catholics who met recently in Tübingen, West Germany to plan a “new Reformation,” and to organize a campaign against the resurgence of a strong nation-state in the United States around President Reagan’s beam weapon policy.

Father McCormick’s habitat itself is notable. Located on the fringe of the Georgetown University campus, it is a fortress-type building, with a tower in the center. Entrance is easy, but from there you are left to wander through narrow halls without any assistance—the building being largely empty, and maze-like.

Then there was the appearance of the Father himself. When I found him, he was ensconced in a comfortable office behind his desk, but looking as unlike a priest as you could possibly imagine. He was wearing bermuda shorts and purple and white striped socks that went halfway up his calves. He showed them off by putting his feet up on his desk.

The first part of our discussion focused on the Concilium meeting, and its relationship to the world strategic lineup that now sees the rulers of the Soviet Union, expecting to become the final center of world empire (the “Third Rome” of unconsecrated cult prophecy), working hand in glove with the Jesuit order, the nuclear freeze movement, and the Swiss to try to destroy the United States and the President’s beam weapon program. Father McCormick was most unresponsive to such questions. He had not even heard anything about what had happened at the Concilium meeting, he said, and implied he had not been invited.

Equally dead-end were his answers to my questions about the overall threat of strategic confrontation in terms of the Third Rome-Jesuit complicity in the Central America affair, and with the nuclear freeze movement. He had never heard of the Third Rome prophecy, he claimed. He really was not very aware of the President’s beam weapon program and its implications. On Central America, why, he had never been there himself and does not follow it. I would have to ask Father Alfred Henle, who has “expertise” in this area.

I was not to discover until after the interview that the good Father was lying through his teeth on the question of the nuclear freeze and opposition to beam weapons—he has admitted to others being “actively involved” in that Third Rome-KGB project.

The method of this fellow had, however, begun to come clear. He could only speak on particular subjects, or areas, where he had personal experience or expertise. For him, the supposed philosophical ethicist, my approach was simply too broad for comment. Nor was there any interest from him in our ideas. It was sort of like talking to a Great Mother, one who sweetly smiles as though you are really quite out of your mind to be thinking such big thoughts, who nods, and says nothing.

Case by case murder

The Jesuit’s profile broke slightly as I moved into the population question, where I knew this guy had quite some murderous experience, first-hand practical experience.

He first denied that he, or the Institute, or the Jesuits had any overall philosophy on population reduction. “That’s not one of my concerns,” he said. I proceeded to explain how

this was being carried out by the Central America policy, the anti-technology drive, the IMF and the World Bank.

Although I pointed out that the philosophical assumptions of McCormick's field—the Aristotelian game of bioethics—were the same as those of the depopulators, Father McCormick continued to demur. Countries differ, he said. Of course, population is a problem. It varies according to the country. "If I were a population expert, which I'm not, I would say that economic growth is not *just* dependent on population, but on many other factors as well." Of course, there are some countries with major population problems—like Mexico.

Challenged on his premise about "too many people" and with the necessary Christian approach to technology in the service of man's mission on earth, Father McCormick waved the implications of his answer aside. "I am uncomfortable with your black and white arguments," he said. "What you are saying is utterly simplistic."

What did that remark mean? Simply that the good Father was determined not to admit any of the consequences of his beliefs. Ignore them, he insists, like the typical Aristotelian. Every situation must be taken case by case; no general principles of causality can be drawn from world history or even current history. Causality is "utterly simplistic"—because it reveals how morally culpable the Jesuits and their dupes and allies actually are.

No absolutes

I pursued the subject, from the standpoint of the cultural matrix of Malthusianism which has taken over the Soviet Union, and has made major headway here in the United States, as well as the West as a whole.

Father McCormick denied that he is a Malthusian in any sense. Nor does he work with the Club of Rome, which he is familiar with. What is the root of his philosophy, I asked. Here was the first strong positive statement from the Father. "Radical equality," he answered. I believe that human beings are radically equal, he said, and that this should be reflected in equal access to the world's wealth and resources.

This argument is a total fraud, as I pointed out to the Father. If there are not sufficient resources to take care of everyone by this radical equal distribution, is it not the moral responsibility of the individual to fight to expand the resources—especially when we are on the verge of breakthroughs in productivity that will allow us to do this easily?

But Father McCormick does not agree. In the here and now resources are limited, he asserts, and we must deal with that. And as far as the history of increases in population density through scientific revolutions are concerned, that's not universally true. Why, he could think of countries which had survived a long time without such revolutions in technology. Like China.

Father McCormick has been to China. What does he think of it? Well, he agreed that human beings there are subordinate to something else. One almost has to be there to get the idea

of how it is to live in a country with so many people. What does he think of their population policy? Ah, here came a classic Jesuitical dodge which amounts to an endorsement of the Chinese population policy.

"Well, coercion is the *last* thing you want, of course. But I would not say that there are *never* times you would use it. That would have to be in the case of a desperate situation. And some would say that the situation in China is desperate. . . . But of course the last thing you want is coercion."

Once more I tried to get him to admit the fundamental issue—the issue of responsibility for the consequences of one's actions. 'If there were a technology, like DDT, which was to be exported to the Third World, and if you knew that preventing its export would leave millions of people to die by disease, would you not consider the person who made that decision guilty of mass murder?' I asked. Father McCormick replied: 'Death is not an absolute evil.' . . . Death may not be, but Jesuits are.

Could this man be a Christian, guided by any respect for the divine spark within the individual? To him every moral judgment depends on the "circumstances" we find ourselves in, rather than what circumstances we can create. Nothing is a matter of principle to a Jesuit, and therefore, we must constantly adapt to the control of the world by the financial oligarchs on a case by case basis.

Yet he claims he is a Christian, guided by "the healthy and balanced Christian perspective toward life and death," as he put it in a 1981 *America* article. He claims the imprimatur of the Vatican in its statements against "extraordinary measures" to keep people alive. He is pleased by this position, because the Jesuits do not always have the cover of an official Vatican position. It provides his type an opening to "balance" life with death—to push for the mass acceptance and promotion of death.

Father McCormick actually moved into an argument—something he definitely did not want to do—in this area. He insisted that we must deal with the crisis of limited resources. His example of why this is necessary is that we cannot—or as he said once, society *will* not—provide adequate care to everyone. In defense of this outrageous statement, he remarks how desperate certain areas of the country are because they don't even have hospitals. Yet, in the next breath he is saying that we have to reduce our reliance on technology! His prime example is that everyone cannot have an artificial heart. When I countered that with the maximum use of NASA technologies, we could have massive use of the artificial heart cheaply in the immediate period ahead, he refused to argue.

Pressed on the question of why we should accept limited resources, Father McCormick leapt to another oh-so-typical amoral Jesuit argument:

"England does it. When a patient is over 55, and has kidney trouble, he cannot get access to a dialysis machine."

How many times have you heard that before? *Some* people do it. . .

Do you agree with that, I asked.

No direct answer, of course. But what the Father would say is that we have to deal with actually existing limited resources now, and that *technology cannot solve the problems*. Instead he raised the question of the *abusive* use of technology! He in particular referenced a case of someone who was kept alive who did not have a brain.

I refused to discuss case by case. This is a philosophical, moral question, I said. With a Judeo-Christian approach, you move to save sacred human life with the exercise of our divine powers in developing technologies. Any other approach, like that of Father Paris (also S.J.), is just like that of the Nazis, I argued. When Father Paris says that he bases his "moral" judgment that someone has to be denied life-saving technology on the basis of "society's limited resources," he is spewing out nothing different than the Nazi philosophy of the "useless eaters."

Father McCormick, who works very closely with Father Paris, neither objected, nor commented.

No, what Father McCormick was concerned about was the "depersonalization through excessive use of technologies." To me there is no greater depersonalization than death, and I argued to that effect. The Father couldn't disagree more.

Father McCormick unequivocally refused my offer to debate this issue publicly. In particular, I suggested debate with Rabbi David Bleich, a respected orthodox Jewish right-to-life spokesman. Bleich argues that mankind has the obligation to fight for every second of life with whatever technology is available.

McCormick insisted that Bleich's view is "fringe." Of course it is fringe in the bioethics field, I said. The field was set up to justify the killing of useless eaters. But there are many people among the population who object to this "living will" idea and the murder of people by denying them tech-

nology. Father McCormick is sure that most of the population is just as amoral as he. He said that his laws for living wills would not be passing all around the country if people didn't basically agree with him. So why debate?

No absolutes

Once more I tried to get him to admit the fundamental issue—the issue of responsibility for the consequences of one's actions. "If there were a technology, like DDT, which was to be exported to the Third World, and if you knew that preventing its export would leave millions of people to die by disease, would you not consider the person who made that decision guilty of mass murder?" I asked.

Father McCormick: "*Death is not an absolute evil.*"

In other words, there are conditions under which such actions *should* be taken, where he as a Jesuit condones mass murder because "death is not an absolute evil!"

Take careful note, dear reader. We are not dealing here with a Jesuit in El Salvador, joining the guerrillas with his M-16. Perhaps there are indeed only 200 of those running around directly instigating brutal violence in Central America. We are dealing instead with a far more evil phenomenon, a "theologian" who specializes in attacking the principle of life.

The reasons vary—they always do for an Aristotelian—but the method does not. The case by case approach, the denial of a ruling cultural matrix, the denial of the absolute value of *life* are systematically used to undermine the unique identity of the human soul. The goal? Wipe out the notion of causality—man's unique responsibility to learn the principles of the universe and to co-create with God according to those principles.

Death may not be an absolute evil, but Jesuits are.

Who are you speaking for?

There is one final piece of evidence of Father McCormick's style as a consummate Jesuit manipulator. Near the end of the interview he suddenly leaned over the desk and asked: "Why do you always say 'we'? Who do you mean by 'we'? I'm used to dealing with people who think as individuals, and speak for themselves. What kind of organization are you speaking for anyway? Is it one where you all think alike?"

My answer. *We* are an organization based on principled agreement, agreement on the principle of the *Filioque* that calls us to fight for the sanctity of human life and our increase in humanity's godlike powers over nature.

That is our strength, Father McCormick. That is the source of "we," the "we" of humankind and our posterity. It is the very quality of humanity which you spend every waking minute to try to destroy. Unfortunately, you will never succeed without destroying the entire world with you. I suppose you really don't care since "death is not an absolute evil." The only question is whether you will be able to drag the rest of the pragmatic Aristotelian population along with you.