

PROFESSOR JEROME LEJEUNE
1993 MCGIVNEY LECTURE SERIES
SPONSORED BY THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS
AND THE JOHN PAUL II INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES
ON MARRIAGE AND FAMILY

LECTURE THREE:
"NATURAL MORALITY AND SEXUAL BEHAVIOR"

JL: As I tried to say previously, there is a confession that every scientist should make at the beginning of a talk about human genetics; that is, living matter does not exist. There is nothing like living matter. Matter cannot live at all. Matter cannot reproduce itself and matter cannot be reproduced, and to make that clear, let's look at this statue. A statue can be reproduced, and between the original and the mold and then between the mold and the replica, there would be contiguity of matter, atom to atom. But what will be reproduced is not the matter of the original because it can be reproduced in plaster, in plastic, in bronze, in anything. Then what will be reproduced is not the matter but it is a form which was imprinted by the sculptor, and it is exactly similar in biology. What is transmitted from generation to generation is not the matter because the size of the first body would have been enormous so that a million, billion bodies could be taken out of it. But, nevertheless, the reproduction of a living system is much more complicated than duplicating an inanimate effigy, and reproduction in life is more similar to what is done now with

the television camera in which a tape is modified by menial change of emendation of the band according to signals which have been transduced from the picture to a special system so that the band will now contain coded information that nobody can see but with a special a machine could transfer again and transform in your screen on television as another picture. It is roughly that way that the living systems are transmitting their message from one generation to the next generation. When you, for example, go to an honest merchant and buy a mini-cassette in which it is written that is a recording of the music of Mozart. Now, you know that when you will be home and you put the cartridge inside a tape recorder what will come to you will be a movement of the air similar to the movement of the air produced by the orchestra, but what comes directly to you is not the movement of the air made by the orchestra. It is even not the score written by Mozart. What comes to you directly is the genius of Mozart, and it's what you like. Now, it is exactly the same with life. Life is encoded in a very complex matter and manner that we have not to describe point by point, but on a very long ribbon that we call the DNA, which is very similar to the tape band we have in a tape recorder. But information is written there according to code. You don't see, you can't read it, but it has to be transferred by a special system, a kind of head of lecture, so that now it is transferred no longer in DNA

but in RNA. RNA is a kind of negative copy. And RNA is now transferred by another system into a protein, which is the machine tool that the cell is using to manifest life. Now, when we see that, we realize progressively that really life is a kind of symphony. The symphony is written on a ribbon, but you have to have a special tape recorder so that this can be decoded, and you get the music out of the code of the DNA and the music is life itself. Then when we speak about living matter, we just make a mistake. Matter is not alive but matter can be animated and what animates matter it's exactly the information which is written inside the DNA and the enormous amount of information which is inside the tape recorder because if there were no tape recorder the DNA means nothing. It has to be read. So that the letter does not give life, spirit does. The second fact that the geneticist has to make clear is that we have definitely to exclude the Cartesian dualist. There is nothing like a spirit and a body. There is an animated matter. It is the spirit that animates matter, but they cannot be separated. Otherwise, you kill the living system. And that is true not only for man but for every living system. So, we would say in very simple words that really what genetics is about is to observe that the logos is incarnated; that we are incarnation of the spirit. And when we see a baby progressively developing herself inside the womb of her mother, she is an example of a spirit taking flesh

progressively. What I would like now to discuss with you this evening is not those fundamentals of life because we will have tomorrow again to speak about them but to try to see if with what we know today about life, biology, genetics, to ask us whether this spirit which animates matter has some natural morality. That theory, some technique, how to use it correctly or not and where it could be written and how it could be written. In other words, what I would like to try to discuss with you is whether there is human nature being given by the information included in the DNA and the cell; whether there is some user's manual and whether there is also instructions for maintenance. You know the user's manual is the Decalogue and the instructions for maintenance are just the commandments of the church. Are they written really in the life? At least can we find a connection between those instructions and the life? Well, the first, we can find that there is a curious philosophical fact that essence precedes existence. That's totally demonstrable in genetics because if you remember what I said at the beginning that the information is in the DNA and must be translated inside the nucleus in RNA which should be translated now in protein, then at the beginning before the translation has occurred if you were wise enough to read what is written on the whole DNA of this very particular egg which nine months later we will call Peter or Margaret, for example, which

is already Peter and already Margaret by its information, if we could read we would see its essence written in plain letters but not yet expressed and during the few divisions progressively could express this information so that existence will now follow from the essence. No matter you twist the words you will find that the definition of life is just as simple as that: essence precedes existence. I don't know if it is philosophy because geneticists are not embarrassed by philosophy because they don't know it. Maybe if they knew, they would have some reluctance to say those blunt statements as I do; never mind. The things are like that. Then, to summarize, the best epitome of life would be just to read the beginning of the Gospel according to St. John. In the beginning, there is a message. This message is in the life and this message is life. And if this message is a human message, this life is a human life. That's the most experimental consequence of molecular biology of today, and it is very comforting for the science of today that it took us only nearly 2,000 years just to find that at the beginning there was the logos. Now I said that everything is written on the first cell and probably we will come back to that tomorrow, but I said more precisely was that the human nature was written down there, and you can ask yourself how we know that. What evidence can convince us about that? There is here a great difficulty because we can be sure the amount of information which is inside

the DNA. It is very simple. The number of bases which follow each other on this long one meter of DNA on a sperm and one meter of DNA on an egg we have two meters that is the whole encyclopedia of life. This length is around 10^{11} base, so it's very easy to calculate the amount of information which can contain. But we can hardly calculate the amount of information which is inside the egg that all the machinery to read the DNA, to transcribe it, and to transfer RNA into protein, and we know that machinery contain an enormous number of specific molecules so that finally if we were calculating the real amount of information inside one fertilized egg, this amount of information is probably much greater than the amount you need to describe the whole material universe, but this number cannot be precisely calculated up to the moment. I don't see any reason why it will never be calculated, but for the moment we cannot calculate it precisely. But there is here a difficulty about the theory of information which is we can measure the length of a message, the amount of bytes you need to transmit it, but we cannot measure its quality. And you will immediately understand what I mean that when I tell you that on the egg of a chimpanzee the length of the DNA is roughly the same as in a human egg but obviously the DNA of man tells something more than the DNA of chimpanzee and what it tells is so much more important that man speaks and chimpanzee does not.

It means that the quality is something which cannot be measured accurately by the theory of information, but to know that there is a human nature we can get convinced by very simple experiments. It happens that I travel a lot, too much to be honest, but as far as I can, in many countries I try to visit two very important place. One is a university or the hospital and the other is a zoological garden. Both places are very instructive. In universities, I always meet very learned people asking themselves very gravely whether their children when they are very young are not some kind of animals, but in the zoo, I have never seen a congress of chimpanzees asking themselves that when their children when they are grown up will not become university professors. That seems to be a very little observation, but it means that something must be written that is different in the two nature - the one of the chimp and the one of the man. The very learned colleagues who do not see that are, with due respect to their knowledge, thinking like chimpanzees. Now, how could we convince them that the tiny thing, one millimeter and a half, which contain the whole human nature is really a member of our species. To do that, we have to use all the resources of genetics and embryology. I will discuss that tomorrow. But how could we convince them that a little later when there is not any longer an embryo but a tiny fetus at two months of age that at the moment that it is killed

by abortion, how can convince them that it is really a member of our species? It is difficult to convince man. But an interesting phenomenon is that you can convince easily other bipeds than humans because they are convinced by nature itself. Those bipeds I am thinking of are living on the other part of the Earth in Australia. They are as big as we are. They are walking on their hind legs like we do; they have a big tail; and we call them kangaroos. Kangaroos are very interesting animals because the female has a very tiny uterus, and she is obliged to have a miscarriage at around two month. At that moment, the kangaroo is the size of my thumb or the size a baby is at the moment of ordinary abortion. Now, this little kangaroos when it is expelled from the extremely tiny uterus does not look at all like a kangaroo. It looks like a little sausage. The legs are very small, and the hind legs are very tiny, and he has only rudimentary interior legs with one tiny claw on it. This little sausage really does not look like a kangaroo. Now, it has an extraordinary property already developed that he feels gravity. The mother kangaroo sit down at the moment of expulsion, and when the baby is out, he climb on the fur against gravity, and then by necessity he fall into the pouch, and then he take a tiny nipple inside the orbicular muscle of his mouth and he stay there for seven months because a big kangaroo he needs nine months to develop like we do inside the womb. Now, the

miraculous fact that this tiny little thing is the only living system that mother kangaroo would allow going inside the pouch. She would not allow a mouse to do that. Now, we are obliged to believe that nature has, so to speak, wired in the meager brain of mother kangaroo some system which allows her to recognize, if I can say so, the kangarooiness of this little sausage. Now, if nature has taken the trouble to give that extraordinary intelligence built into the small brain of the mother kangaroo, I cannot believe it has not given to the one liter and half brain of the normal geneticist, it has not built in the possibility of recognizing early members of our species are just tiny human beings. About animals what is interesting is that they can teach us a lot about human nature. I was talking about the chimpanzees. I like very much chimpanzees, and I have got a very nice experience with them. When I was young, I was interested in the palm prints, and then I wanted to look at the palm prints of chimpanzee and I remember that I was entering the cage in the zoo in Paris, and I was having some ink to put on the palm of the chimpanzee, then to put the palm on paper, and then to have the print and then study it in the lab. What was just delightful was that after one chimpanzee had got the hand washed, he was looking at the hand. He could not know what I was interested in, and then he was showing it to another one to see if he had something on there. I decided they were a little

like human beings, a little like scientists, because they were curious. But suddenly I had been told by the keeper that if one of them was beginning to do like that and to have some groaning I should go out very rapidly from the cage because there were six of them and because suddenly from curious, they become furious, and they get entirely mad and springing for no reason; just they cannot understand the situation. And then you realize that their curiousness and their furor are a little reminding us of our own make up but showing us that there is a total impossibility for them and they got excited for nothing because they don't understand it. Now, chimpanzee have intelligence not much more than dogs, but even the most gifted chimpanzee, the best trained one, will never understand when he mounts his female that nine months later eventually a tiny chimpanzee will come out who looks like him. That he will never conceive. And the phenomenon curious that man has always known this relationship between copulation and population, between love and child. It is so true that if pagans when they wanted to represent the patient of love they were not representing a coital scene like you can see now on television sometime but they were just painting, making the figure of a tiny little one. Eros is a baby; Cupid is a baby, the god of love is a little child, and it was not necessary to show anything else than a child to demonstrate the little god of love. Now, this is

extremely interesting because it shows that man has always known this relationship between love and child. It is what gives to man a very peculiar dignity to his conduct about sexual matter. It is that he knows that is eventually the coming out of the sexual intercourse. That's the reason why I think that if we accept, and there are reasons to accept that, that monogamy is the best fitting system for human population. It can be demonstrated statistically, demographically and psychologically. Now, if we consider also that marriage is a kind of prerogative given to the husband to be the only one allowed to this extraordinary deposit of sexual cells inside the sanctuary which is the feminine body. If we just observe those two phenomenon, then it comes out that abstinence if no marriage is engaged are just normal use of our consciousness about what is really the effect of love. Then without going too much in details, I would state that contraception, which is making love without making the baby, in vitro fertilization, which is making the baby without making love, abortion, which is unmaking the baby, and pornography and promiscuity, which are unmaking the love, are contrary to human dignity. They are not possibly contrary to animal dignity, but it happens that we know more than the most clever chimpanzee will never know. Now, people will tell you, and it is a great fashion nowadays, that with all those trick like IUD, like some pills, tricks of that kind, we have

definitely separated love from procreation. I would say recreation from procreation, and they are very proud of that definition, and they say it is a novelty. It is very interesting for the biologist for it's a regression of approximately 3,000 years. This trick has been already played by nature to separate follity from reproduction. That's happened among ants. Ants are exceedingly interesting animals. They are produced to be sterile, and their only slave of reproduction is called the queen. All the other are liberated. They are just working the whole day. They have no children, but they have the greatest follity which is by titillation of the antenna they are regurgitating a little drop of dew that they have taken from some plant and the bewildering phenomenon which is that the ant which has got that foraging around cannot use it herself. There is a special valve which prevent her to regurgitate for going in her own stomach, but she can regurgitate to go in the stomach of the other. That was marvelously described by a poet, Meterlink. Meterlink is a great poet as you probably know, and he wrote that what was the cement of this society is a continuous exchange by titillation of the antenna and regurgitation of this dew between sterile females. It is interesting really to recognize that because nature is a good teacher that what is presented today as a top performance of technicality has been used among social insects

and has been considered by nature to be good for insects but not for higher form of life. Maybe we should sometime be listening to the counsel of Mother Nature. But if we try to be really investigating in depth, can we accept that morality is directly involved in sex? In other words, was a kind of joke which was very popular a few years ago -- if there exists a natural morality it is very well ill placed in the depth of panties. That is not a place to put morality, and this joke is just a misunderstanding of neuroanatomy. Yesterday, I was talking about the way our brain tells us things. I said that our bag of skin is represented in the parietal ascendante, and I said that man is like lying on a sofa up there, but if you look at it carefully, the situation is very curious. At the bottom of the parietal ascendante, we see the head, but the head is not between the shoulder. It has been, so to speak, cut off and the mouth is now on the up. It was a surprise to the anatomists but it is like that. And man looks like a kind of St. Dennis after Decolation. He is handing his own head upside down inside with his fingers. Now, I talked about fingers previously. What we are going to talk about next is the rest of the anatomy, and then you will find the fingers. You remember about Aristotelous. Then you find the thorax, then the abdomen, then the legs, then the knees, and the knees are bending in the cesorial (?) space, and at the end of the knees, you have the

legs, then the toes. At the tip of the toes, you have the presentation of the sexual organs which apparently got out of its normal place and is put at the end of the toes. That was a great surprise when it was discovered around 40 years ago by the anatomists, but this is an extremely interesting teaching because when you look at the end of the parietal ascendante it finished by encountering another enormous ? of evolution which we call the limbic system, and the limbic system is where all the emotions are controlled and moved. We called it emotion because it put us in motion. There you have the portion for thirst, for hunger, the portion to try to find ? and you have also the others which are not for the protection of the person but which are for the protection of the progeny; that is, the search for the partner, that is the sexual drive to have intercourse, and that is this very curious phenomenon which exists even in males some, softening of the behavior when they see beings small, round off with no asperity and looking like an early member of their kin. Now, if you remember the anatomy, you will understand why the representation of the sexual organs is so close to the limbic system. It is because we are not four-legged going, we are not crawling on all four; we are erected. But if we were crawling on all four, you would realize that the sexual organ is at the end of the body, so the neurological representation, like the one I was speaking about

Aristotelous's mistake, is the right one, but it means that the sexual organ are the only part of our anatomy which are, neurologically speaking, directly in contact with the memory of life that we call the instinct - all the motion, all the compulsion, all that drive us so that we would survive and we would have some propensity to transmit life. Then it follows that if we want to control our emotions, our drive of any kind, we are thus made that we cannot control them if we do not control first the sexual one, and morality, as far as sex is concerned, is not an invention of the moralist, it's not a theory of a sociologist, it is a fundamental fact of the way human beings are built for the very simple reason that we have no tail. In the dog, if you don't cut the tail, the tail is where he puts all the emotion, and the tail projects itself on his brain just long after the sexual organs and he prove the emotion with the movement of the tail and you can really understand what mean that dog with his tail. While curiously the cat use the tail also but contrarily. When a cat begins to move it, you better know he is not happy. A cat is not a dog; they have a different way of expressing themselves, but they do not have the constitution we have and for them sex is not related directly to their emotions. But we are like that. Then I think that it comes to evidence that we have to know that our sexual behavior cannot be independent of our control of the rest

of the behavior. It cannot be split of it because of this neurological proximity, because of this very construction of our body model. Now, what we have to consider that if there is a sexual natural morality it has to extend also not only to the behavior of the adult but to their behavior regarding their own progeny, their own children, and it is a very recent phenomenon that some nations who were civilized for a long time have suddenly renegated by a vote what all the master of medicine had sworned for millennia, "I will not give an abortion pessar to a pregnant woman." Four hundred years before the birth of Christ, abortion was refused by Hippocrates at a time at which it was legal to kill a newborn if you were considering there was one too much in your family, but he founded medicine on that oath. It is only recently that this oath has been suppressed and that killing your own flesh, your nearest neighbor, the flesh of your flesh, has become supposedly more than a license, a right and a progress. It is obvious that in all the species now alive on this earth there is a built-in system which protects the newborn and which protects the baby against attack either from the male or the female. It is very diverse in the whole living kingdom, but nevertheless, there are mechanisms to protect the progeny. Otherwise, there would be a stop to life. Now, what we have to discuss briefly is whether those mechanisms which were existing still 20 years ago in civilized country whether those mechanisms

are a ? or a stumbling block. That is, whether it prevents the progress of science respecting babies or whether it is a real safe world. I would just look at three points. The first would be the point of view of the couple. A married couple are united in one flesh. That's a theological definition. I would say that is a physiological definition very clearly demonstrated. Then there was a question whether a technician could be for a moment allowed the privilege and title of the husband. That is, to put sex cell inside the body of the woman. The reason why in donum vitae, this artificial fecundation, or in vitro fertilization, which have a slight difference because in in vitro fertilization the egg has been removed from the mother, it has been considered as not legitimate because the man is replaced by the technician so that there is a substitution personarum; that is one person is substituted to another person. On the contrary, when we repair a fallopian tube which is closed by infection, when we graft a new one, when we suppress an infection which was blocking the process, then we are acting as an adjutorium noturea, a help to nature, and that is a typical function of medicine. No matter how complex this function is, how sophisticated are the means, it's not the technicalities that are involved. It is whether we are replacing one person with another person and then rupturing the marriage bond or whether we are helping nature and then being exactly the servant

of nature. To make you understand that, I would quote a very curious exclamation made by a woman, it was around 10 years ago, and it was one of the first in vitro fertilization in France and it is published in the book of Mr. Testa, and he said that one of the first in vitro, after the embryo had been in the incubator for few days, it was implanted delicately inside the womb of her own mother. I say "her" mother because an embryo should be more precious to a geneticist than a ship is to a sailor. The sailor said about his ship, "she is a good ship" and we would say about the embryo "she is a nice embryo." Well, nevertheless, it was replaced inside the uterus and at that moment they had some music to soften the atmosphere, and the gynecologist said to the mother, "Madam, vous etes enceinte," which is "Lady, you are pregnant," which was the correct description. Then they went out, there were three of them, and then the husband came, and he was rather anxious, and he said to his wife, "How it happened?" and she had this extraordinary phrase, "I made love with all three." It is an extraordinary expression that only a woman could invent because it is extremely super-realist because how to describe to her husband the three technicians united to put a baby inside her womb without telling him she made love with all the three. While evidently they were perfectly correct, those doctors, but she was precisely describing what seroticians (?) would call

"substitutional personare." So, it is not necessary to be a moralist to understand the whole thing. It is better to be a woman who feel the truth instead of a man who try to discover it. Now, whether the respect of the embryo is not at some disadvantage with those technique; obviously it is. But I understand that very well one day. It was near Hiroshima. I was giving a talk to a Little Sisters. There were 12 of them and they had a big school with 2,000 Japanese girls, but the sisters, part of them were coming from France, one of them was from France, who translate in Japanese what I was saying. They had asked me to give them a little briefing about what was fecundation, in vitro fertilization so they could explain all those things to their pupils, and I tried to explain it very simply, and I said spontaneously about the sexual organ of the female that it was a kind of a secret temple in which a tiny baby was blossoming progressively. At that moment, I was interrupted by the Mere Superior, Mother Superior, and she said something in Japanese which I could not understand and then we continued, and at the end the Little Sister who was doing the translation told me "You know what the Mother told me?", and I said, "No," and she said, "She asked me if you were really speaking Japanese," and I said, "Why she said that?" and she said, "Because I translated what you said about this 'secret temple' and in Japanese the word uterus is written with two

congee, one is "shi" and the other is "que". Uterus is "shi que." Now that is a scientific name. "Shi" means a palace and "que" means an infant. And it is really marvelous that anatomist of Japan when they tried to describe what was this little ? where the baby would live they invented "the temple of the child," and probably when I thought about that I had the impression that Japanese anatomists were better than we are because, maybe I would say certainly, the shi que, that is the temple inside the woman, is surely a place which is more dignified than a test tube for the beginning of a being which is directly bound to eternity. We should respect the embryo just because they are members of our species, but some have proposed that we should consider them as some experimental matter, and I remember 12 years ago, it was in England in Parliament, I had to testify because they were beginning a campaign to have the right to use human embryos up to the 14th day as experimental material. At that time, they were saying that they would cure cystic fibrosis of pancreas, which is a very bad disease of which baby can die, they would cure muscular dystrophy, trisomy 21, and hemophilia, for example, if they were allowed to play with human embryos less than 14 days, and when I testified in the British Parliament I was obliged to tell them that it was not true because you cannot study the muscle in an embryo of 14 days because the muscle will appear after the 18th day, you cannot

study the blood because the blood will happen at the 20th day, and you could not study the brain because the brain happens one week later. They could not make the experiments they were pretending to do on embryos of less than 14 days. That was very badly received. Next week the scientific paper *Nature* published an article, the title of which was marvelous. It was "French Influence in Britain"; that was really the top scandal. They proposed a free subscription to *Nature* to any scientist who would send to them a protocol of an experiment that would show that I was wrong. That is now more than 10 years, and I can tell you that no one received freely this interesting publication because they have not published any paper showing that I was wrong because they were wrong. Now, a day, I would say, two days or three days ago, there was a publication in your country about cloning of embryo; very curious phenomenon. They are not doing cloning whatsoever because cloning means that you get a new individual out of tissues which have not been obtained by sexual reproduction. That is the definition of cloning. Now what they did was splitting of embryo, which is artificial twinning which has nothing to do with cloning. Cloning would be to take one cell of living individual and have it grown into a baby, and I will tell you tomorrow that we have the proof that it is not feasible. But they use the word cloning just to sell the paper. But this artificial twinning is not a breakthrough

because it has been made previously in goats, in sheep, in cattle, and it is not a breakthrough of science, it is a breakdown of common sense because they are using human beings as if they were animals and that is a big biological mistake. Now, whether it could be used to improve the efficiency of in vitro fertilization it is very difficult to tell the future. I have no crystal ball to be sure, but honestly when you try to split an embryo in two parts so they can regenerate, most of them do not and they die. So, the yield is very little. So saying that they will split the embryos of a poor woman not able to produce many embryos but only one in a blue moon, obviously they are not telling that it will be used safely. Because this technique has been used in animals and in cattle, they are not using in husbandry because it cost a lot and it is not efficient. They have used it to know whether or not it is feasible, and they found that it was feasible, which is not a surprise because we know that twinning does exist, we know that since long time, but to pretend that it will be used for the good as far as I can tell is just pretension. It is not honest reporting of experiment. There is another use of embryos nowadays which is another curious phenomenon that is a cannibalism of two months embryos by old man. You know that some people started in Mexico -- they decided that they could take some cells of the brain of babies of two or three months of age and include those cells of

the brain of the baby inside the brain of people affected by Parkinson's Disease. The result of more than 50 experiments is very poor. There was no cure whatsoever, but there has been articles in all the newspapers of the world because it was presented as a useful system exploiting the good things which was abortion because with abortion you would get those spare pieces. Now, you have to read if you have time what was written about that, and it was extremely curious because a man wrote a very learned paper in *Lancet* and he said what was the technique to take the brain cells of the tiny fetus, and he said the best is between two months and four month, and he said the best for him was three months of age of the fetus, and to take the brain when the heart of the fetus is still beating so that you get good cells in good shape. Now, when you read that, it is written in very nice English, plain English, and you have the impression of reading a film of horror, and the name of the man who wrote that paper you would not believe me but it is true. His name is Hitchcock. It is unbelievable how sometimes destiny is playing with words and telling us, "Just look; understand; just listen," and we don't. There is a pretension that we can do everything with the wrong; that we can even change the right, and that has led to a very curious and tricky system in England. If I was Hamlet, I would say there is something rotten in the kingdom of somewhere because they voted finally two years ago

that law allowing experiment on embryo less than 14 days old, and they have issued recommendation from a special embryo authority and it is plainly written the only thing which is forbidden is to, after manipulation, implant that embryo in a non-human animal. That is written in English "in a non-human animal," which means on good logic that for the writer there are human animals because if he has to specify that there are non-human animals existing then man is an animal, and that is a very interesting phenomenon because if this law of England tells the truth this law does not exist because any law can be enforced in England only after the assent of the king or the queen. Now, the queen has signed the law, but the law says that there is no human being until the 14 days, so the law apply to the queen as well. And the law was applying to the father and mother of the queen and all the ancestry of the queen, so that if the law tells the truth, the transmission of the crown of England has been interrupted in every generation by an intermediary animal at least for 14 days. Because there is no proviso in the law of England that any animal, whatever the age it has, can inherit even providentially the crown of England, then if the law tells the truth there is no Queen of England, and if there is no Queen of England, that law cannot be enacted and then that law does not exist. That is very interesting to see if you look at the facts as they are and they are written that the law cannot do

everything. The law cannot negate nature and it cannot negate itself, and when they have decided that humans were not humans until 14 days they had, without knowing it, suppressed the whole legitimacy of the Constitution of England. What can we do to that? Because I was speaking about the respect of the embryo, the respect of the couple, we have to fight now for the respect of mankind. I am a little ashamed to speak about that because I am coming from the country of Pasteur, and it is also in France that the first anti-human pesticide has been put on the market, the RU-486, and I have heard and read in the newspaper in France that one of the first statement of the actual administration was to force the Food and Drug to accept the deadly product in your country. Now, this is extremely interesting because this technique of killing babies is now killing one-third of the babies aborted in France. That is the official statistics; they are not mine. One-third of abortion is now made in France with that technique, and that technique is curious because it is made with two products. One is mifepristone which is an anagram of Mephisto and this product destroy the mucosa of the uterus because it is an anti-progesterone. It blocks the site at which the hormone which helps the pregnancy is working, but it is not enough to kill all the babies, only 80% of them are killed so that they use a second one which is prostaglandin, which provokes the contraction of the uterus, and what they use is

really a binary ammunition, and it is the law generally when you begin the chemical warfare to use binary ammunition. Generally, it is not on the same shelf. The two products are different, and it is only in the explosion that they become toxic.

Exceedingly remarkable to see that the first product of chemical warfare against not-yet-born human being has been of this binary type. Now, what can we do? How can we persuade people that if we continue to kill our own kin we are killing our soul?

Because the children of a country are the soul of that country.

It's very difficult. Because in the newspaper I read this extraordinary statement about those embryos that scientists who routinely clone those animal embryos said that cloning human embryos should be just as easy, and I quote, "I see no reason on earth why it could not be done," said Dr. Robert McKinnell. He does not see any reason on earth. Maybe there are reasons in Heaven. Because you remember the phrases which said do not disregard one of the smallest because the angels see all the time the face of my Father in Heaven. I know it is very difficult today to speak about human nature, and it is even more difficult to speak about supernatural phenomenon, but remember the people will want to suppress natural virtues like love for the child. They know that if those virtues are destroyed, no supernatural virtue would survive. Because natural virtue has, so to speak, the ground, the humus, the earth on which

supernatural virtue can blossom. They are very correct in their deduction that if they refuse to revere the Son of Man, then they have to make the war against the sons of Man. Then what to do? If they are Christians, there is still a little hope. We can maybe teach them very simply because it has been made by the most known doctors of anytime; I mean St. Lucas. You remember that a visitation, the little prophet, was quickening in the womb of Elizabeth. Elizabeth was six months pregnant. The angel told that to Mary, and Lucas, as a good doctor, he transmitted the information to us. But it does not say a word about the age of the human form of our Savior at the moment that the tiny six-month-old prophet recognized him. It says only that after enunciation Maria went to the mount rapidly. In this country, the trips cannot be very long, even riding a donkey or going barefoot. Then Lucas is implying that the human form of Jesus was less than a week, maybe a few days, at the moment an early human being recognized that he was the master carried by Mary. You know that there is a very common subject for paintings which is delightful which is Jesus in front of the doctors as a young boy and they marvel about what he says. What we need now is that it is the doctors who come in front of Jesus.