

as Queen in 1558 and ordered the monastery closed. Fr. Chauncey relocated to Belgium. It was he who wrote the first accounts of the martyrdom of his confreres, and to his dying day he regretted that he had not won with them the martyr's palm and crown. (They were beatified by Pope Leo XIII in 1886 in a group of 54 English martyrs of the Reformation, and the three Priors — Houghton, Lawrence, and Webster — were canonized by Pope Paul VI in 1970.)

What have these men to teach those today who protest the papacy, who call it an anachronism, an error, and an obstacle to ecumenism? These men stood for the universal headship of the pope against a reform that resulted in the frag-

mentation and then dissolution of Christendom. They stood for obedience to divinely appointed authority amid a whirlwind of spiritual vanity and ambition. They knew their place in the order of God's plan, as they knew Henry's place too — and they knew that even the greatest king may not sit also on the Throne of Peter.

Well, there are no more kings like Henry — and no more Christendom. So is there any lesson here for today's Catholic? The lesson is that just as the Carthusians stood firm against Henry VIII, we have to stand firm against those legions of little King Henrys in today's Catholic Church who are planning their own little papacies in their own little domains. ■

THE CATHOLIC VIEW OF MAN & SOCIETY

Vol 66, n. 6

THOMAS STORCK

NEITHER STATISM NOR INDIVIDUALISM

Among more than one set of Christians today, the government, particularly the U.S. federal government, is considered an enemy. I understand and sympathize with that judgment. The government protects abortionists and puts defenders of unborn life in prison; spends large sums abroad to corrupt other countries with birth control and sex education; funds agencies such as the National Endowment for the Arts, which gives money to blasphemers; frequently usurps the rights of parents; in short, today the actions of the federal government, and of many state governments, often seem designed to denigrate and destroy Christian life and exalt evil.

It is no wonder, then, that many Christians

regard the state as an enemy and are ready converts to a libertarian philosophy that sees government as a barely necessary evil and seeks to minimize its functions almost to the vanishing point. Is not this the most effective way of protecting ourselves against state encroachment?

Attractive as this might be, I do not think we can accept a point of view that sees the state as an evil, even a necessary evil. In fact, no Catholic can hold a true libertarian point of view and remain orthodox. There are a good many distinctions which must be drawn in this matter, but as a beginning we might look at quotations from two popes that indicate an attitude of great respect toward the institution of civil authority. First from Leo XIII's encyclical *Sapientiae Christianae* (1890): "Hallowed therefore in the minds of Christians is the very idea of public authority, in which they recognize some likeness and symbol as it were of the divine Majesty, even when it is exercised by one unworthy." Then from Pius XI's encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931): "The State...should

Thomas Storck, who writes from Greenbelt, Maryland, is a Contributing Editor of the *NOR* and the author of *The Catholic Milieu and Foundations of a Catholic Political Order*.

threatened to hang them all if they did not give a verdict of guilty. Thus intimidated, they gave in and returned the desired finding.

On May 4, 1535, Fr. Houghton, Fr. Lawrence, and Fr. Webster were led to the Tower Gate. Thomas More, who had been in prison for a year already and would soon win his crown of martyrdom, was looking on with his daughter from his cell window. "Look, Meg," he said, "these blessed Fathers be now as cheerfully going to their deaths as bridegrooms to their marriage!" The martyrs, still dressed in their white religious habits, were tied to a sled and dragged by horses through the dirty streets to the public gallows at Tyburn, a spot not far from the present Buckingham Palace. (Today the location of the gallows is covered by the chapel of Benedictine Sisters of Perpetual Adoration.)

Prior Houghton was hanged first. He dangled for a few moments, then was cut down and disemboweled as he prayed, "O Jesus, have mercy on me!" His last words, as the executioner ripped out his heart, were "Good Jesus, what will you do with my heart?" The Prior was dead. Priors Lawrence and Webster suffered the same. Each had been offered a full pardon if he would accept Henry VIII as head of the Church, but they could not in conscience before God and would not. They were beheaded and their dismembered bodies displayed, with Prior Houghton's limbs nailed over his monastery gate to persuade the Carthusians to yield.

That very day Archdeacon Thomas Bedyll, an agent of the royal commissioner, showed up at the Charterhouse with books and writings against the Pope, intending to convert the monks from Catholics into Henricians. He got nowhere with the Carthusians. A few weeks later Bedyll denounced Fr. Middlemore, Fr. Exmew, and Fr. Newdigate for refusing the Oath. They were sent to Marshalsea Prison and chained to the wall with iron fetters in a standing position.

Henry VIII himself came in disguise to Marshalsea because Fr. Sebastian Newdigate had once been his favorite pageboy. "Sebastian, give in, for God's sake, and acknowledge me as head of the Church in England and I will reward you richly." "I cannot! Jesus has shed his precious blood for my soul and I cannot lose it and let his blood be shed in vain." "Are you smarter than all the clergy and the Archbishop of Canterbury who side with

me?" "I cannot deny what Jesus has established."

Thomas More had been dead little more than a week when, on July 19, 1535, these next three Carthusians were barbarously executed at Tyburn. Henry VIII and some noblemen watched the proceedings from the edge of the crowd, perplexed by the obstinacy of the Fathers. No more Carthusians were killed for nearly two years until two of them, Fr. John Rochester and Fr. William Walworth, were hanged at Hull, in Yorkshire, where they had been sent from London. They died on May 11, 1537.

The London Carthusians were given a new prior whose task was to undermine the community. Food rations were reduced; spiritual books, even the writings of their founder St. Bruno, were removed. On May 18, 1537, the Supremacy Oath was re-administered. Fourteen monks signed it with seven others. Fr. Johnson, Fr. Bere, and Fr. Green would not sign. Neither would Deacon Davy and Brothers Salt, Greenwood, Redding, Scriven, Pierson, and Horne. These ten were thrust into Marshalsea Prison, chained to the wall with iron fetters and collars, and starved to death. Hidden from the world, these monks died one by one between June and September.

The remaining London Carthusians saw the writing on the wall and resigned from religious life altogether. They turned over what was left of their Charterhouse to the King and his cronies. Their surrender and expulsion took place on November 14, 1538. Each departing ex-monk was given an annual pension of five pounds. Friends of Henry VIII received the property, and the "Supreme Head of the Church in England" used the Charterhouse's church to store his hunting tents. By 1540 every abbey, priory, and convent of every religious order in the land was closed and their religious turned out. Many of the houses were torn down, church and all. The London Charterhouse became a hospice for elderly male residents and a Protestant school for boys, with the cloister garth as the playground.

Fr. Maurice Chauncey, one of the expelled monks, went to Belgium and rejoined the Carthusians there, as did Fr. John Fox. When Mary Tudor, Henry's Catholic daughter, came to the throne in 1553, she allowed Fr. Chauncey and a few colleagues to refound the Charterhouse near London, but her half-sister Elizabeth succeeded her

be the supreme arbiter, ruling in queenly fashion far above all party contention, intent only upon justice and the common good...."

These words should give us pause, for they embody an attitude toward public authority quite different from that held by the many Catholic critics of government. But, on the other hand, it would be too simplistic and equally false to embrace an expansionist view of the government, one that sees a new government program as the solution to every ill of mankind or that naively trusts the government never to do wrong. The modern state does overstep its bounds and does so quite often. But in considering government, we must be like St. Peter, who, though he was put to death by the Roman government for preaching the Gospel, had written, "Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether it be to the emperor as supreme, or to governors as sent by him to punish those who do wrong and to praise those who do right" (1 Pet. 2:13-14); or like St. Paul, likewise put to death for the Gospel, yet who wrote even more strongly, "For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of him who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, for he is God's servant for your good" (Rom. 13:3-4).

We must, then, begin with the conviction that for Christians "the very idea of public authority" is "hallowed" and is one "in which they recognize some likeness and symbol as it were of the divine Majesty." This is strong stuff, but it is traditional Catholic doctrine and a matter of public knowledge. What is necessary is that we understand the meaning of this teaching and see what its implications are in the real world of today.

God rules His created universe. He did not simply create a world, establish certain self-executing laws, and then step back to watch what would happen. And this mode of ruling is the "likeness and symbol" which human rulers ought to emulate. St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that even if mankind had never fallen, some sort of government would have been necessary. And, of course, since we did fall from our state of primitive happiness, government must not only co-ordinate diverse human actions but must also restrain and even punish human actions. Holy Scripture and sacred tradition, ratified by the Magisterium, make

it clear that the authority to co-ordinate, restrain, and punish comes from God Himself. This is not to say that there is anything wrong with the leaders of nations being designated by popular vote. But however they may be chosen, whatever authority they have comes from God. Anyone may have power; only God has and can give authority.

This necessity for government is shown by our reactions to the daily difficulties of life. When we see disturbances of the peace and order of the community we expect government to do something about it. It is true that we can be unreasonable in expecting government to solve every one of our problems, but still our instinct is correct. The human community does need a directing faculty. We do need government. Just as a group of people with no structure is a mob, similarly a nation without a government would be an unstable mass, unable to establish the necessary organs and means to take care of the many matters that necessarily arise in human social existence.

Unfortunately, only sinful men are available to govern and punish the rest of us sinful men. And that is why governments have often overstepped their bounds. This is not anything new; King Henry VIII of England is as good an example of the public authority gone astray as anything in our century. But though there has always been this tendency on the part of the state to violate others' rights, there is a particular reason why the modern state seems to do this as a matter of course. The modern state has grown large and burdensome in part because the powerful mediating institutions which once existed have been destroyed. These mediating institutions once did much of the work that today we assign to the state. This is well described by Pius XI:

On account of the evil of "individualism," as we called it, things have come to such a pass that the highly developed social life which once flourished in a variety of prosperous and interdependent institutions, has been damaged and all but ruined, leaving virtually only individuals and the State.... But the State, deprived of a supporting social structure, and now encumbered with all the burdens once borne by the disbanded associations, is in conse-

quence overwhelmed and submerged by endless affairs and responsibilities (*Quadragesimo Anno*).

What is the Pontiff talking about? The “variety of prosperous and interdependent institutions” included, for example, the craft guilds, which had as one of their most important tasks the regulating of economic activity for the public good, as well as for their own material prosperity. After these were finally destroyed, by the early 19th century, powerful and rich men began to amass economic power that enabled them to exploit both their employees and the consumer. As a result of the activities of these huge corporations and trusts, at about the same time throughout Europe and North America, there were demands for something to be done. And by this time, the only entity that could possibly do something was the government. Thus, in the vacuum that was left after the destruction of the guilds, state power seemed the only thing able to resist and control the powerful economic forces that threatened to dominate the citizenry. This was unfortunate, because many of these functions were not the state’s direct business, and because they gave the state a taste for power and for extending its influence wherever there was any sort of a need.

Thereafter, politics in many countries became a constant struggle over the size of the state. One side saw clearly the dangers of big government; the other side saw equally clearly the dangers of domination by private groups and looked to the government to protect the common good. As long as we think of state power as the only legitimate way of dealing with these things, we will continue to have this sterile conflict over how large the government ought to be. But both sides in this debate are wrong: One side defends what has been called the philosophy of a cancer, the bigger the better. The other side is busy outbidding itself to see how much of the government it can eliminate. But whichever of these sides triumphs, its triumph will always be temporary. For if the first side wins, the excesses committed by the state will bring about a reaction, while if the second group wins, the outrages committed by big business will create demands for new laws and regulations. As the French poet Paul Valéry is said to

have remarked, “If the state is strong, it will crush us; if it is weak, we will perish.”

The notion that the state is our enemy, then, is in large part a reaction to the state’s overreaching itself, to the attempt on the part of the state to regulate every aspect of life and society. The state as described in papal social thought is clearly important, even majestic, but it is not competent to deal directly with everything. It has limited but real functions. And I should note that these functions are larger than those of the “law-and-order state,” the state that does nothing else but guard the borders and suppress crime. Pius XI praises Leo XIII because that pontiff had “fearlessly proclaimed the doctrine that the civil power is more than the mere guardian of law and order” (*Quadragesimo Anno*). The whole of Catholic social thought presupposes and teaches that the proper concerns of the state go far beyond preserving law and order. As Leo XIII taught, “rulers should anxiously safeguard the community and all its parts” (*Rerum Novarum*). Nor does John Paul II’s *Centesimus Annus* teach otherwise, for in that encyclical there are many passages that speak of the same kind of role for the state. The law-and-order or libertarian state is concerned with only a small number of things. The liberal state is concerned with everything and seeks to regulate everything directly. The Catholic state is likewise concerned with “the community and all its parts,” but it does not seek *directly* to regulate and control everything. Very often, as we will see below, it simply fosters and watches over the efforts of intermediary bodies.

We have seen, then, that the tendency to regard the state as one of our chief enemies is not consonant with authoritative Catholic thought, and further, that this tendency is chiefly caused by the state’s overstepping its proper bounds, especially by the modern state’s congenital propensity to try to control everything directly, because no other sufficiently powerful bodies exist that can share in the necessary regulation of society for the common good. And we have also seen that the impasse this has created is the cause of the endless squabbling about the proper size of the state — big, little, or in-between. But all these attempts to find exactly the right size are foolish, because they assume that the state and only the state has any important function in shaping society. If the state does not

do it, then turn it over to the vagaries of the free market. This is the modern notion, but it is wrong.

Let me give some examples of how the Catholic theory of the state could be implemented and what this would mean for society. I will give examples of how the central government could be relieved of some of its burdensome duties — duties whose performance often provokes resentment because it is charged that the state is sticking its nose into matters that are none of its business and about which it knows nothing. The solution suggested by Catholic social thought does recognize that there are real evils that need eliminating or regulating, but approaches these things in a manner different from that of both liberals and conservatives in America.

My first example will be OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration of the federal government, created by Congress in 1970. The purpose of OSHA is to make and enforce rules for safety in the workplace. And there is no doubt that OSHA was created to address a real need. Workers are injured on the job, and business often has little economic incentive or ethical desire to make the workplace safe. In fact, there can be a temptation to regard workers as expendable parts of the production process.

But OSHA has also been criticized for imposing needless and silly rules and requirements that are difficult and expensive to implement. Bureaucrats in their Washington offices cannot regulate, it is said, work processes and workplaces of which they have no direct experience. Since they know little about the realities of the work environment they are supposed to regulate, they are apt to issue rules applicable to every workplace without taking account of differences, or to make rules that are so vague that no one can know whether or not he has satisfied them short of having an inspector come and look for violations. And it is charged that the cost of complying with OSHA rules and of the accompanying record-keeping, particularly for small businesses, is prohibitive.

I expect that there is something to these criticisms. Some of OSHA's regulations doubtless are ridiculous and burdensome. But the inference that is intended to be drawn from this, namely, that OSHA should be abolished and things returned to the *status quo ante*, I reject. In ordinary circum-

stances the state should not be burdened with inspecting workplaces and writing detailed rules. This is an instance of its being "overwhelmed and submerged by endless affairs and responsibilities" as Pius XI said. And this is also an excellent opportunity to revive, in some measure, some of those "prosperous and interdependent institutions" the Pontiff spoke of. Specifically, joint union-and-management committees, with the right, if necessary, of appeal to the state, and of enforcement by state authority, ought to be entrusted with setting the rules for workplace safety currently done by OSHA. The members of such committees not only would be familiar with the actual work processes and environment, but would also have a direct interest in the prosperity of their industry. The equal presence of the union representatives would ensure that management's interest in profits could not overrule sensible safety requirements. →

Subscribe to the
new oxford review

1 year \$19 2 years \$35 3 years \$48

Student or unemployed or retired person's subscription (1 year only) \$16

Non-U.S. subscribers add \$10 per year. Payment must be drawn in U.S. Dollars.

This is a new subscription, a renewal , a gift subscription from _____

\$_____ Contribution to the NEW OXFORD REVIEW (all gifts in excess of subscription fee are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law).

NAME (please print or type)

STREET ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP

Payment must accompany order.

Make checks payable to NEW OXFORD REVIEW, and send to NEW OXFORD REVIEW, 1069 Kains Ave., Berkeley CA 94706-2260.

Whenever the parties directly involved with a process can assume more responsibility for making their own rules, then the government can be relieved of a burden it ought never to have had. The correct alternative to direct government regulation is not to do nothing and to give profit-making businesses a free rein. Very often there are alternatives that do not necessitate setting up a new government bureaucracy, but instead rely on those actually doing the work to take control of their own situation.

One of the federal agencies that has often been a target for elimination is the Department of Commerce. Now, Commerce does many and varied things, from forecasting the weather to taking the census to promoting American exports. To a great extent it was established to aid business. But if business truly finds these services important, then there is no reason why some of them could not be taken over by industry groups, preferably representing both organized labor and employer organizations. For example, such industry councils could promote U.S. exports by advertising abroad, by establishing funds to make start-up loans to firms wishing to export, and by sponsoring trade shows and the like. Even much of the information-gathering and data-publishing work of Commerce could be done by such industry councils. Even now, private industry and trade associations collect and publish much reliable statistical data that is used even by the federal government.

One part of the Commerce Department is the National Institute of Standards and Technology (formerly the National Bureau of Standards). This agency "assists industry in developing technology to improve product quality, modernize manufacturing processes, ensure product reliability, and facilitate rapid commercialization of products based on new scientific discoveries" (*U.S. Government Manual*). Some people might call this corporate welfare, but aside from that, there is no reason why industry could not work to sponsor its own research programs and improve its processes and products. This is not an activity that needs to burden the central government and be supported by taxation. It is surely proper for government to encourage such activities, but they are primarily the responsibility of the companies involved and of the industry councils I mentioned

above, which could be formed to deal with matters pertaining to a particular economic sector.

There have been a few attempts in this country to decentralize the institutions that regulate and promote our economic activity. In 1933 the Franklin Roosevelt administration attempted a system of self-regulation by industries called the National Recovery Administration. Although not perfect, the NRA could well have been a means of instituting a system of industrial self-government by owners and workers, very much like what Pius XI had called for in his encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* just two years earlier. President Roosevelt even called the industrial entities created by the NRA "modern guilds" (a phrase often used by Catholic writers of the period) and Msgr. John A. Ryan, the great Catholic writer on social justice, was actually a member of the NRA's Industrial Appeals Board, established to rule on complaints brought by businessmen. During its brief life the NRA showed promise, but the U.S. Supreme Court in 1935 ruled the NRA unconstitutional on the grounds that governmental power had been delegated to non-governmental bodies. Thus Roosevelt was forced to create more agencies and bigger bureaucracies to regulate the economy directly. Had the NRA been allowed to work, it is possible that some of the vast expansion of the federal government would never have taken place.

The fact that so thoroughly practical a politician as Franklin Roosevelt was able to get the NRA approved by Congress shows that such an approach is not alien to American traditions. But the current hostility to the federal government's regulating effort is not based on an appreciation of the proper role of government so much as on a desire to allow private business free play. But Catholic thought, from the New Testament forward, has always been deeply aware that the economic appetite, the "love of money" as St. Paul calls it (1 Tim. 6:10), is responsible for a host of evils. And this is true not only for an individual but for a society also. There is no magic law of economics that allows individuals to indulge an unlimited desire for gain and that somehow channels all this activity toward the common good of society. I am aware, of course, that the tradition of economics descending from Adam Smith teaches otherwise. One should note, though, that

Smith's view was framed in an age of Deism and presupposes a self-regulating sort of cosmos, with a God who stands back and watches and a government that does likewise. But such a view of things is deeply hostile to Catholic social thought, which has always held men responsible for the evils caused by their choices and actions, both when acting alone and in concert with others.

Another promising kind of economic entity whose role could be expanded in the United States is the co-operative. Co-operatives deserve an article to themselves, so here I will confine myself to speaking of only a small part of their possible functions. In the provision of basic services, such as water and power, co-operatives could well supplement or even replace utilities directly owned by local governments or those organized as private businesses. It is true that co-operatives do supply such services, especially electricity, but there are other areas in which government may be relieved of directly providing a service and allowing those directly concerned to make provision for their own needs.

In much of what I have written here I have been critical of the unfettered market. But to be cautious about capitalism is not to embrace socialism. It is only to recognize that the Fall of Man encompassed also his economic appetites. A realization that the government has grown too large should not be an occasion to embrace economic Deism. As I have suggested, there are many other ways of approaching economic regulation that do not rely on direct governmental intervention. The state can be our friend in helping to establish such forms of regulatory bodies and in seeing that, once established, they do not abuse their trust.

But a thoroughgoing rejection of economic Deism must come first. And for Catholics this can probably best be obtained by a deepening of our understanding of the Catholic vision of man. For just as socialism's fundamental error is anthropological in nature, so too is libertarianism's. Likewise, "from the Christian vision of the human person there necessarily follows a correct picture of society" (*Centesimus Annus*). The errors of socialism and the errors of Deistic economics rest on false images of man. We will probably make more progress toward accepting the Catholic conception of the economic order if we first accept its image of man.

If we are to subject all our being, our thinking, and our living to Christ and His Church, we cannot ignore the existence of Catholic social teaching. Whether we like it or not, it is part of our patrimony, and until we embrace it as unreservedly as we embrace the rest of Catholic teaching, we will hardly be able to call ourselves orthodox or faithful Catholics, and we will never be free of the tug-of-war between statism and individualism. ■

GUEST COLUMN

RUNNING TO DO EVIL

The Conservative Jewish prayerbook for the Day of Atonement includes a communal confession listing various sins. Among the expected sins an unusual one stands out: "Running to do evil." This may be based on Proverbs 6:18, but what is this interesting sin? I believe it means embracing evil enthusiastically instead of being drawn into it reluctantly. For example, suppose there is an attractive woman at my workplace. After months of struggling against temptation, I finally give in. I am married, so this is adultery. But suppose I pursue her daily for months until she finally yields. This is adultery *and* running to do evil.

There are other examples. When I was a medical resident four decades ago, one of my colleagues had a pregnant patient with severe heart disease. Neither she nor the baby could survive if the pregnancy continued, and the pregnancy was not far enough along for the baby to be delivered. The perceived choice was: one survivor or none? As was required, two senior consultants agreed that abortion was necessary. The day it was scheduled, the atmosphere on the ward was somber. I paid close attention to so rare an event. Other patients died *despite* the doctors' best efforts; this baby was

to die *because* of them. Even though the mother and baby were not my patients, I felt a sense of failure, because my colleagues were deliberately ending a human life, whereas our fundamental purpose was to save life. Perhaps my sense of failure was due to the prohibition of abortion in the Hippocratic Oath, which young doctors took in those days. Perhaps it was a more basic aversion to taking innocent life. The source of this aversion may have been the Jewish religion I had been taught as a child, or it may have been the respect for human life I had absorbed from parents and teachers, or a combination of these. In any case, I had been taught to be receptive to the inner voice telling me that all human life is precious.

Perceiving that they were forced by circumstances to choose the lesser of two evils, the doctors acted reluctantly and sadly (after all, whatever is deemed a lesser evil is by definition still evil). This perception, and the bad feelings that accompanied it, provided a brake on their behavior. They would be reluctant to do something similar in the future, and unlikely to extend the activity further. Whether or not one agrees with the "lesser of two evils" approach in cases such as this or thinks that the lesser evil was truly chosen in this case — in other words, whether or not one concurs with what the doctors did — everyone can agree, and this is my point, that the doctors had not *run* to do it.

Now things are different. Judges, feminists, and "ethicists" tell us that abortion is not the lesser of evils but a positive good; not an admission of failure but an expression of freedom. Such an attitude evokes no bad feelings. It acts not as a brake but as an accelerator. If we are doing something good, why not do more of it? Why not extend it further? Most young doctors no longer take the Hippocratic Oath. I believe the cause of the oath's demise is its prohibition of abortion. But the oath also prohibits assisted suicide and euthanasia: "I will give no deadly medicine to anyone if asked, nor suggest any such counsel."

The brake is off and we are pressing hard on the accelerator — and racing downhill fast. Assisted suicide and euthanasia are favored by almost half of Americans and have been enacted into law in at least one state. In the Netherlands at least 2.7 percent of all deaths are now "hastened" by doctors. Applied to America, this would

mean over 61,000 deaths annually — far more than the annual toll of deaths from auto accidents, for instance. Worse, over 1,000 Dutch patients are "euthanized" annually without their consent, because their families or doctors think they are better off dead. Indeed, psychiatric disorders are now an acceptable reason for euthanasia. Is the Netherlands really a model to be emulated?

Medical care is largely free in the Netherlands; financial motives are less likely to affect decisions. Medical care is hardly free in America. In addition, "managed care" pressures doctors to deny potentially helpful therapy. But beyond financial motivation is the problem of determining whether we wish to end people's lives in order to spare them suffering or spare ourselves discomfort. Such considerations affect the patient's family, but they affect doctors as well. In psychological terms, repressed fears of death and disability are projected onto the patient. Doctors or relatives then believe that they are liberating the patient from these fears, when they may actually be soothing themselves.

Doctors have at least as much fear of death and disability as other people. Indeed, they rate the "quality of life" of elderly or disabled patients lower than the patients themselves rate it. What doctors (especially young ones) see as "poor quality of life" may seem tolerable to their patients. The same is true for relatives, who sometimes cannot bear to watch the suffering that the patient finds bearable. Christopher Reeve — the actor who broke his neck falling off a horse — reveals in his autobiography that when he was first rendered quadriplegic his mother asked that his respirator be turned off. Reeve later resumed acting and took up directing. Healthy people may say they would rather be dead than old or blind or paralyzed. The old or disabled often feel differently. The young or healthy are poor judges of what is unbearable.

Moreover, physicians need to feel in control, which is why they often make difficult patients when they become ill. This need is a normal companion to life-and-death responsibility. How could a doctor accept such a heavy responsibility if he did not feel in control of the situation? But the need to feel in control may also be related to the doctor's fear of death and disability. This fear is kept at bay, despite daily reminders