

What Would You Do?

Through history there have been examples of how man's morality can be influenced toward destructive ends. If you lived during those days do you know where you would stand? This study is a test will provide four issues to see your consistency and a basic idea of where you stand.

Do you know where you stand when it comes to protecting your fellow man? Are you one who would protect the weak or defenseless or would you abandon them for your own safety and comfort? I will present a few documented moments from history then I will quiz you regarding how you think you would react. So before we begin, get yourself a blank sheet of paper and a pencil. For each of the scenarios, write the letter of the answer that best describes what your course of action or position would be. This test is to examine the consistency of your moral stance from situation to situation.

1. THE BLACK MAN

You are a white colonist in the South during the early settling of the United States. Slavery has been in place for decades. The justification for the servitude of the black man was due to denigrating their humanity down to the level of the animal, or more specifically, the monkey. Henry Louis Gates, Jr. wrote in his book *Wonders Of The African Crisis*,

“...being called a monkey was one of the most common forms of racist abuse that Africans suffered from colonialists.”¹

Since the humanity of the black man was so denigrated, it justified the severe treatment and even death of those in servitude. The black man had very little representation. What few spokesmen they had were eventually effective toward the ending of slavery in the United States. If you were alive during that time and you had the ability to influence your neighbors and community, what would you do?

- A. Agree with assessment of the black man and continue racial slavery.
- B. Agree with the dehumanization, but seek to limit slavery and mistreatment.
- C. Not agree or disagree. Would remain neutral and not speak out.
- D. Advise against such dehumanization, but take no action.
- E. Preach against slavery and seek to protect the black man's human rights.

Write down #1 with the letter that most closely represents how you would react, or perhaps, *wish* to react if you were living in that day. I am sure there are more choices that could have been added for clarification and specificity, however, the closest of the five choices above will suffice. It is merely to establish a rough estimate of your moral temperament.

Let us proceed forward in time another 200 years to see if you are consistent in your stance regarding another event in history.

¹ *Wonders of the African World* by Henry Louis Gates Jr., published by Alfred A. Knopf, 2001

2. THE JEWISH MAN

You are gentile European during the occupation of Nazi Germany in 1941. In order to comply with Adolf Hitler's "Final Solution", the Nazis had to denigrate the undesirable Jews down to the level of vermin or rats. The foreign editor of *Der Stürmer*, Paul Wurm, wrote the following memo to the Foreign Office expert for Jewish affairs, Franz Rademacher in October 25, 1941,

Dear Party Comrade Rademacher!

On my return trip from Berlin I met an old party comrade, who works in the east on the settlement of the Jewish question. In the near future many of the Jewish vermin will be exterminated through special measures.²

With this dehumanization of the Jewish people in place, the Nazis justified the genocide of both them and other innocent individuals and families. The Jew had absolutely no say in regard to their treatment. If you spoke out, you were either shot, or sent to a concentration camp. Once again, if you were alive during that time and you had the ability to influence your neighbors and community, what would you do?

- A. Agree with assessment of Jew and turn over those you knew to be Semitic.
- B. Agree with the dehumanization, but do nothing to help the extermination.
- C. Not agree or disagree. Would remain neutral and not speak out.
- D. Disagree with the dehumanization, but take no action.
- E. Be part of the resistance and seek to protect or hide the Jewish people.

Write down #2 with the letter that most closely represents how you would react, or perhaps, *wish* to react if you were living in that day. Again, I am sure there are more choices that could have been added, so just choose the closest to your possible reaction in that dangerous time. How close did your second answer come to your first?

Fast-forward another 60+ years to the present day and let us look at something a little closer to home.

² Wurm to Rademacher, 23.10.41, in: Political Archives of the German Foreign Office,

3. THE INFIRMED

A female friend of yours is in a hospital wing where patients are in a coma and under life support. Some are considered vegetables because there is brainstem function but no cortical function. There is a family member of hers here that is in a comatose state due to an accident. Unlike the other coma patients around the wing, this family member has both brainstem and cortical function. The heartbeat is normal without need for the assistance of a machine. Though fed through a tube, there is identifiable reaction to outside stimulus and tests.

The doctor enters, has seen a case like this before countless times and is absolutely positive that the family member will be in this state for less than a year and eventually come out. There is a caution from the doctor that there will be a few months without coherent communicative skills or even the ability to walk. However, the doctor assures a full recovery with proper assistance in less than 4 years.

Another doctor comes in but notices that your friend was very distraught and suggests that she have the feeding tube removed and any other life sustaining nourishment. The burden of caring for this family member will put a strain on personal finances and will cause undo stress. He adds that the family member will not be aware of any discomfort and it will be as if the accident never happened and all your troubles would dissolve with one decision.

How would you advise or counsel your friend or any other people facing the same situation?

- A. Agree that the family member is a vegetable and suggest tube removal.
- B. Agree with the dehumanization, but wait until out of coma.
- C. Not agree or disagree. Would remain neutral and not speak out.
- D. Disagree with the dehumanization, but take no stand regarding prevention.
- E. Be part of the movement against such dehumanization and seek to protect those that cannot defend themselves.

Again, write down #3 with the letter that most closely represents how you would react, or perhaps, *wish* to react in a scenario such as this. Now that your third answer is completed, compare it to your first two. Are they consistent? Feel free to change it if you have had a change of heart.

Now, there is one fact I left out, so keep your present answer and write one more number down—say #3.1. Let's revisit the scenario above, with the addition of a few omitted pieces of information.

3.1 THE INFANT

Your friend's family member is in her womb in a state somewhat like a coma—it is a 10-week-old fetus and the pregnancy was accidental and unwanted. Since it is a healthy baby, it has both brainstem and cortical function; the heartbeat is regular without need for the assistance from a machine. Though fed through an umbilical cord, there is identifiable reaction to outside stimulus and tests.

The pediatrician enters and gives news that she will be due in less than a year. You will then teach the child how to walk and talk in less than 4 years.

Another doctor comes in but notices that your friend is very distraught and suggests that she abort the fetus, claiming it is an unviable tissue mass. The burden of caring for this family member will put a strain on personal finances and will cause undo stress. He adds that the family member will not be aware of any discomfort and it will be as if the accidental pregnancy never happened and all your troubles would dissolve with one decision.

How would you advise or counsel your friend or any other people with the same situation now that you have the additional information?

- A. Agree that the family member is a tissue mass and suggest tube removal.
- B. Agree with the dehumanization, but wait until out of the womb for adoption.
- C. Not agree or disagree. Would remain neutral and not speak out.
- D. Disagree with the dehumanization, but take no stand regarding prevention.
- E. Be part of a movement against such dehumanization and seek to protect those that cannot defend themselves.

Write down the final number #3.1 with the letter that most closely represents how you would react, or perhaps, *wish* to react in a scenario such as this.

GETTING CAUGHT UP

It is very easy to get caught up with the tide of human opinion. History has shown us that following the crowd or not standing for the rights of the weak can lead to a drastic reversal in our moral compass. *In order to commit heinous crimes, the perpetrator must first dehumanize the victim, and then get others to agree as a majority for their demise.* With such a mob, overcome the opposition with irrelevant facts and figures and shout them down as mindless people who do not care. It has been done before, it is happening today. When you think of someone who is for abortion rights, do you think “pro-abortion”? No, you think “pro-choice”. When you think of those who wish to preserve the unborn, do you think “pro-life”? No, you think “anti-abortion”. Why is that? Because society wants to limit the effectiveness of those who wish to defend the rights of the unborn. It has become the new abolition movement, the resistance.

CONCLUSION

The slave trade brought 12 million black souls to the United States for servitude. The Nazi exterminated 6 million innocent Jews. Since the U.S. Supreme Court handed down the Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton decisions that brought abortion on demand to the U.S. in 1973, more than 43 million babies' lives have been terminated over a period of 32 years with well-funded lobby groups assigned the task to keep the death count high and the tax dollars coming. Now that we see how easy it is to compromise our moral foundation, the question now needs to be asked. When it comes to the protection of the silent unborn child, what would you do?

Study by Rick Schneblin

No changes will be made or excerpts used without the express permission of the author.

Copyright © 2006