

# There is Worthiness in Life to the Last Moment

This submission explores concerns regarding the proposed legislation: “End of Life Choice Bill” a member’s bill currently before the New Zealand Parliament.



Paul Norman Before the Parliamentary Justice Select Committee Auckland July 2018<sup>1</sup>

## A Christian New Zealander’s Contribution

God in His great grace helped me make a submission in person, on July 30th 2018, to the Select Committee considering a Parliamentary Bill, which if enacted, would open a path for the lives of the very sick, old, and invalid people to be terminated by a Government run lethal injection. With doctors being forced to present the “procedure” as an option.

Beyond its utter inherent wrongfulness, I believe that the Bill,<sup>2</sup> as it stands, additionally makes an evilly easy path for people to be taken advantage of, and murdered, or even to feel they must die by the Government’s poison injection, to be less of a burden to their friends and family—while the proposed law would make the death certificate lie and wrongly only read: ‘*death by natural causes*’.

I explained that the danger of the proposed use of psychologists’ reports, is the same slack path by which about 97% of all murders in New Zealand for the year ended December 2015—resulted in no prosecution at all, because it was held that the murderer had to do it, as otherwise they would have suffered psychological discomfort—things like: increased financial burden, interruption to their social, work or school life.

Only 0.2 percent (some 27 out of 13,155) of the babies so killed in New Zealand for that year,<sup>3</sup> were due to perceived physical danger to the life of the mother that might have otherwise possibly caused her death – yet those abortions are considered in modern medicine internationally to be completely unwarranted.<sup>4</sup>

This proposed death Bill has the same kind of Specialist’s reports, so-called “slippage”, as in the present abortion on demand situation. This would allow just countless people effectively unobstructed, through to a New Zealand Government administered poison death injection—that is: death on demand.

The day I was to present my submission, the Holy Spirit led Michael To’o to approach one of the hotel ushers, a young lady, with a word of knowledge concerning a problem in her back. She consented for us to pray for her, and she was graciously healed by the Lord Jesus Christ—just 10m along from the very doors of the Death Committee Hearings—it was so encouraging for the LORD to do this at that very spot!

**Please continue to pray, and ask your friends to pray and seek our Heavenly**

## Father on what you are to do as well.

The following is what the Lord Jesus with the backing of intercession and fasting by others, helped me to say to the Committee last Monday; there is also a written submission

that was forwarded to the Committee weeks before – appended here at the end of this document.

Paul A. Norman,  
Sunday, 5<sup>th</sup> August, 2018.

---

## The Honourable Maggie Barry MP:

*“Thank you Paul, if you’d like to come up, followed up by Paul Quinn.*

*So Paul I don’t know you if you’re someone new today, and haven’t been here, but I don’t know if you were here earlier when I said that we’ve read the submissions, and so you’ll be able to talk in your 5 or so minutes, to the main points that you would like us to take on board.”*

## Paul Norman:

Thank you very much Maggie.

Tēnā koutou katoa,

I’m Paul Norman, I’m a Christian missionary, who’s worked with People at the end of life, beginning of life, and extensively with youth. Which with [indicates friends Michael To’o and Christopher Waldvogel in the public seating area] my friends and colleagues here with us today, there has been an on going concern, about the flagging messages that are coming out of the Bill, as it currently stands—even already through the media – the effects upon people, in terms of perceptions of life and the value of life.

I wanted to explain just briefly the Christian perspective, because a lot of people have been alluding to it even today—to give some understanding of why there is a fervency of feeling about this in an apolitical way.

People often say, that these sorts of issues are, sort of like, up to the individual and things.

But I know that some of the decisions we make on values and life, have incredible ripple effects. And vulnerable [people], and particularly our youth at the moment, and those into early middle age—for which we have some of the highest suicide rates in the world still. The messages we send as a society, and in officialdom, and our approaches in

how we view things, are of extraordinary importance, of greater importance sometimes than we can imagine.

And I have been privileged to be in the extreme situations where people are facing death, facing great immobilisation due to cancers of the spine. And have personally witnessed and seen the doctors, choose to have faith in the end—even some of them being utter atheists, all because of what the Almighty Lord Jesus Christ has done for their patients.<sup>5</sup>

And this has given me a perspective in situations which radically altered (I come from a scientific background originally, Environmentalist) and radically altered my perspective, when I saw that God is Love and He does reach down and He does move in faith on people’s lives.

People often say, that you can take nothing with you out of this life.

But in the writings which God has inspired to be recorded for us, He encourages us that there are three things that we can take.

## Faith, Hope, and Love.

And that **Faith**—first of all is in Jesus Christ death to pay the penalty before God His Father, for the wrongs we do in life, that we would otherwise have to personally give account for on His fixed day of Judgement.

**Faith**—that what He did by willingly allowing Himself to be nailed to a cross and suffer—that He paid sufficient price that God would look at us and forgive us, if we put our simple trust in Him. No great effort on our part, nothing.

**Faith**—that He was raised from the dead, and was seen by 500 people. In fact as you probably know in your own background, [that] had a dramatic effect on history in its day! And down to where we sit right now.

**Hope**—that He will raise us up from the dead if we trust Him, in the same manner as He was raised from the dead. And appeared to people and ate food and they could even put their hands in his side where the spear had punctured His heart and things like that.

That we will be raised in a body also that will never know death or sickness again. And in that **Hope**, God also, even occasionally, miraculously in this life now, does those kinds of healings I'm speaking of, that turn doctors to Christ!

And then **Love**—that He went there [to the cross] willingly, and calls us to **love**.

Which sort of brings me back full circle, because He instructs us to **love** our neighbours as ourselves.

— Now if we foster a concept of this [death] kind, of how we would treat ourselves. How we would say to people you could treat yourselves [euthanasia, government death injection, suicide], I'd like to really strongly suggest that we are setting up a very bad psychology [not of **love**], because if we are suggesting human life can go that way, and so easily—I feel this bill is just so easy, its just so easy, the slippage just scares me. If you've read my submission, you will see that I was speaking in really polarised terms. Because I saw in this a great danger.

A danger which we're starting to openly talk about with the abortions situation, where we are looking at how many are going through [solely] on psychological grounds—when we've only got 0.2 percent of abortions — for the actual physical safety of the mother—you know – of actual death.

*Honourable Maggie Barry MP made some kind of a grunt of acknowledgement.*

So we've got something wrong, that's come out in a few of the submissions I've been able to hear here today, where [New Zealand is] just missing something in getting the pitch right on certain levels with this [psychology stuff]. And so I'm very concerned about this [Death] Bill's reliance on "Specialists" that don't exist. No one trains for this [determining when the Government should kill people].

**No one could train for this in any positive fashion.**

So my submission is, I just want to really put to you, and my appeal is, there is an extraordinary flag that is going out on this kind of proposed legislation—that is really really dangerous, and takes from people the **Faith**, the **Hope** and **Love** that we heard Di Willis speaking of [from the Christian Elevate Trust who look after tetraplegic, blind, impaired people – helping them to meaningful full lives. **Faith**, the **Hope** and **Love**] that can be maintained and helped all the way through.

Now as a Christian, I believe that there is more than death, and I believe how we die is very important. That we die in **Faith**, with **Hope** and **Love** and look forward to a promise that God has made for those who would receive it, of **Eternal Life**—that He will raise from the dead at His return, when Jesus comes back, those who have trusted in Him.

I have to acknowledge a personal influence in my life on this, is that in Wellington hospital some years ago, and I have spoken to three witnesses who were present; my father was "*morphed out*" against his wishes. He never wanted to have palliative care or anything withdrawn, and unfortunately it was actually over heard what was happening, and what took place.

And I am really concerned, knowing that there is incredible accountancy pressure on our hospital system—if we don't address these issues the right way, we are going to lose the opportunity for many people to actually still have a positive input in life [and be saved such deaths].

The way people go out has a very big effect. I have stood with families who've had members who are suffering dearly—and have stood with those people.

Not all of them are healed by Jesus, but those who are,<sup>6</sup> go on to say how easy it would have been to have given up.

And then those who aren't, when they have actually composed themselves looking at Eternal issues, the reality that God will judge our lives for every idle thought, every heart attitude, and realised that they could've just blown it! What they refer to later on—as murdering themselves.

And those who have held on, as I have

suggested in my submission (I've given printed copies to the adviser there), those who have held on, have often deeply enriched the lives of those around them.

And for those who don't, who have [been] known to have found private means of accomplishing the same [bad] ends as this Bill, they have set up ripples of depression [in others].

Now we are often, in the lines of work that I do, the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff.

If you could hear my plea and relate it to the other parliamentarians please:

**we need strong fences at the top.**

One person choosing to wrongly take their life, can...

In Economics we say, one new job, somewhere in a district that hasn't many,

generates 10 more. Its a concept we understand with networking in that way.

...So, the effect of someone going out of life badly—is so enormous in its ripple effects, so enormous it can absolutely throw other people into despair that immobilises them. Now their lives are wrecked, their contributions to society are wrecked.

And I do believe that with the high standards that we can attain in palliative care in New Zealand. With the advances of technology that we have seen to be able to help with pain relief towards the end. . .

**I believe we can be world leaders, if we can set our hearts and minds to it—to demonstrate that:**

**There is worthiness in life to the last moment.**

### **The Honourable Maggie Barry MP:**

*“On that uplifting note Paul we thank you, thank you for this thoughtful submission and for your background material, which we will certainly [take back to the others].”*

### **Paul Norman:**

I hope that it helps in some way.

### **Paul Anthony Norman**

[www.PaulANorman.info](http://www.PaulANorman.info)

Avondale Auckland  
New Zealand

---

*Paul Norman's Appearance Was On The Afternoon of July 30<sup>th</sup> 2018*

*About ten minutes was granted.*

*Previously lodged Written Submission follows. . .*

## **Notes**

1 Paul Norman Before the Parliamentary Justice Select Committee

Composite photo prepared by Michael F. To'o. from video footage ©2018 Paul A. Norman Michael F. To'o

2 <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/bill/member/2017/0269/latest/DLM7285905.html>

3 [http://abort73.com/abortion\\_facts/new\\_zealand\\_abortion\\_statistics/](http://abort73.com/abortion_facts/new_zealand_abortion_statistics/)  
and crossreference at

[http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse\\_for\\_stats/health/abortion.aspx](http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/health/abortion.aspx)

4 [http://abort73.com/end\\_abortion/is\\_abortion\\_ever\\_justified/](http://abort73.com/end_abortion/is_abortion_ever_justified/)

5 [http://thejesusway.info/ie6/books/green\\_mandarins.html](http://thejesusway.info/ie6/books/green_mandarins.html)

6 <http://paulanorman.info/Auckland-Outreach/video-previews/>

This submission explores concerns regarding the proposed legislation: “End of Life Choice Bill” a member’s bill currently before the New Zealand Parliament.

I would like to be available to appear before the Committee perhaps with a couple of friends please.

*Appearance: Tentatively scheduled for Auckland July 30th 2018*

The submission is addressed to:

Justice Committee Secretariat

Committee Secretariat

Justice Committee

Parliament Buildings

Wellington

A Christian New Zealander’s Contribution:

**Given that for just the drawing of a lottery winner, a policeman has often been required to be present and observe - this Bill as presented treats our elderly and any sick, potentially as worth less than a lottery prize - with fewer real safeguards, fines smaller than a mediocre Lotto result, and potential bonanzas for those who easily work out how to criminally make use of the legislation - greater than a golden kiwi win!**

Summary:

- In this modern technological age, the alleviation of pain and suffering through the unnecessary use of death to achieve it - is a dreadfully cheap cheat; with much wider and even sadder consequences in over all society, discussed below.

It is submitted that this Bill has no more place on the Statute Books, nor before the people in a referendum, than would a Bill styled:

‘Permitting the Murder of Your Pain Inflicting Neighbour’.

Misdirected or ill informed polling does not justify following generalised whims, where true and wider consequences have not been recognised and canvassed.

As the ‘specialists’ envisaged in s3 and Part 2 do not, and could never genuinely exist, the Bill fails at this significant, and I believe fatal point.

This submission reviews what are believed to be foundational flaws in various detailed Sections below. Later exploring how a wrongly motivated shift in the underlying principles seeking to replace how our society is motivated and regulated, is resulting in death-moves which are contrary to both the individual’s and the common good.

This current move, no matter how words are played with - represents a form of suicide, employing other people, and needs to be treated publicly as such:

**– as suicide via means of various Parliamentarians’ contrived State manslaughter.**

The prospects of an out of date “living will” being able to set all of this in motion, is at the very least extremely daunting - but not deterred by the legislation.

I have worked with youth at risk

extensively both here in New Zealand, and overseas, for some 37 years, and their interaction leads me to see great worries ahead - should such legislation succeed in any form.

Approval of such sentiments will flag an acceptance of suicide, blurring the lines over all on premature death - a most dangerous scenario - we have enough problems with suicide right now, and do not wish to add any fertilizer to this travesty.

In reading the Bill and noting its at

first seemingly meticulous steps and detailed provisions for recording everything so thoroughly, I think I now understand how Nazi Germany managed, in its own eyes, to sanitize and make virtuous its death camps, gas showers, and ethnic cleansing. Often recording and planning things just as meticulously.

Please don't make the same kinds of mistakes with this.

*There are proposed amendments below.*

### Discussion:

Very sadly those really wishing to pursue the ends this Bill seeks to miscast and re-sanctify as human dignity, have in the past individually pressed through the hurdles, and always found a means, and it has either gone unrecorded or been mis-characterised as 'death by misadventure' and like.

Others held back by whatever internal personal constraints, have suffered, but often been delighted at the personal interactions they would otherwise have failed to both receive and give to others - this is the story not being told at present at all.

This Bill actually makes it too easy, and removes many spiritual, psychological, familial and societal pressures against premature natural death in general.

This current proposed procedure with its flaky safeguards, in the end, is still the taking of life by other people, making it relatively very easy, with no real consequences for the practitioners of death.

It is submitted here that the issue of asserted consent - is ultimately, in reality, unrelated to the proposed acts of manslaughter, or even as the Bill itself contemplates in s27 (1) (a) & (b), the possibility in some circumstances - while yet avoiding admitting, naming or dealing with it: - "murder" itself.

Consent does not of itself legitimise a moral crime even in law.

An act may be neutral until consent is withheld, but a crime is a crime - you can not

agree to have your car stolen - for some other benefit - say insurance or something, even to alleviate your felt financial pain..

A life, more important than a car, may not be taken so you have less pain.

You can not agree to take a life, you can not give consent to take any one's life, be it your own or an other's.

You can not agree to participate in murdering someone - yourself or another.

The prospects of an out of date "living will" being able to set all of this in motion, is at the very least extremely daunting - but not deterred by the legislation.

The cheapness with which s27 (1) (a), (b), & (c) offences are dealt with in s27 (2) (a) & (b) speaks to the lack of overall ethical integrity in the whole concept itself.

Filling out Death Requests and Death Orders - with out the man or woman or child's request, resulting in their death even, is apparently on the face of it: only worth 3 months imprisonment or a maximum \$10,000 fine - such immoral cheapness speaks again to the worthlessness of any supposed safeguards, and to the whole proposal itself..

As written, and until tested in Court s25 may mean s26 proves to be redundant any way, and any otherwise associated criminal acts won't exist in law - how can there be an illegal death when otherwise the procedures have been legally signed off on as natural causes? Taken with s28 The Coroner's and Police hands appear to be potentially tied I

suggest sadly, by design here.

Or is the final administer of the death always innocent even when up stream misconduct has taken place? - An unreal solution, yet again cheapening the value of Your life.

- I fear this is truly the intention of the Bill, and the proposed low consequences of any misdemeanour - supports this contention.

On just this point, let alone too many others, its all far too woolly, leaving the elderly at too greater a risk.

### So-Called Specialists:

The lack of strong effective “non-medical-psychological” safeguards in Part 2 in entirety, with no real push in the legislation to make help available to patients to look at other views or options, is distressing to say the least, and again characterises this as only an: **immoral fast track death Bill.**

Associates in psychology or psychiatry would not wish to have even studied such matters in their training, let alone contemplate participating in implementing such legislation.

Current doctors and psychiatrists or psychologists (defined as the “specialists” in s3) have never been trained to help people work out when to take either their own, or their patient’s life.

There could never be a true fix-it catch up course. – say a post graduate diploma in:

**Administering Death to People’s Relatives and Friends.**

- The use of the word “specialist” is there fore, it is submitted, to be seen as highly

inaccurate and incorrect.

No such acceptable specialists exist.

There is no such valid training that could be ethically given.

There can never be available to the Bill’s implementation, the required genuine specialists - to make such a proposal work.

Beyond contrived Micky Mouse Diplomas being merely academically invented...

The Bill fundamentally fails at this significant and I believe fatal point.

In civil non-military society, apart from gang enforcers, professional murders, psychopaths, and trial Judges in capital punishment jurisdictions, no one trains themselves or gets trained on when others’ lives are to be taken - **its plainly inhuman.**

Other than some of the criminally insane: neither New Zealand nor the whole world can supply such genuinely authentically trained “specialists” - as again it is submitted here: it is all substantially medically and legally unethical.

### Masters and Ministers of Death

Consequently I submit that s3 and s21 be amended to try and keep a proper sense of propriety and what is actually being done here - the word ‘Registrar’ appearing there, and throughout the Bill, ought be substituted by the words:

‘Master of Death’.

Again to help keep a sense of propriety:

s3 “SCENZ” Support and Consultation for

End of Life in New Zealand and in s19, should be replaced by “DSNZ” - detailed as:

“Death Squad New Zealand”.

Again for accuracy and propriety:

Pharmisicts and Doctors, (‘specialists’ - ) psychiatrists and psychologists, envisaged as executing these Death Orders ought be renamed in the act as:

“Ministers of Death”.

## Detailed recording procedures - are no substitute for Morals

The seemingly benign smiling way in which this legislation has been introduced reminds me of I think(?) Goebels or Himmler or some such, who at his death said his conscience was clear - while having never recanted. In reading the Bill and noting its at first seemingly meticulous steps and detailed provisions for recording everything so thoroughly, I think I now understand how Nazi Germany managed in its own eyes, to sanitize and make virtuous its death camps, gas showers, and ethnic cleansing procedures.

Please don't make the same kinds of mistakes with this.

Detailed recording procedures and nice sounding titles and seemingly professional standards by themselves do not make anything right of themselves - any more than the Nazi program did.

I have worked with youth at risk extensively both here in New Zealand, and overseas, for some 37 years, and their interaction leads me to see great worries ahead - should such legislation succeed in any form.

Approval of such sentiments will flag an acceptance of suicide, blurring the lines over all on premature death - a most dangerous scenario - we have enough problems with suicide right now, and do not wish to add any fertilizer to this travesty.

To troubled young minds and hearts there is no essential difference between saying:

'my experience of current life, is so bad and painful I want to end it [prematurely]',  
and,

'my experience at possibly what is the end of life, is so bad and painful I want to end it [prematurely]'

Here moral leadership is needed by the Select Committee and Parliament, to instead guide the nation away from being seen to condone the civil taking of life under - any circumstances, what so ever.

The elevating of pain and suffering is one thing...

But - in this modern technological age, the unnecessary use of death to achieve this - is a dreadfully cheap cheat, with wider sadder consequences over all.

And must be called out for what it is by those practitioners who are envisaged to implement it: as only a candied dressed up manslaughter - and no less, even as murder.

Of concern: in Part 3 s20 (a) "a medical ethicist" - how can there be such when it is submitted the whole thing is unethical?

s25 "Effect of death under this Act "A person who dies as a result of the provision of assisted dying is taken for all purposes to have died as if assisted dying had not been provided."

- would leave the person even in such circumstances as appearing to have died from natural causes - underlying sickness etc... perhaps even in the most fowl of circumstances a murder enquiry would in legal terms be fruitless - never noticed, nor started?

Over all - historically even the hanging of a paedophile murdering misogynist rapist required the actions of a High Court Judge - this is not in first instance merely a medical procedure - it is the taking of a human life and can not be so flippantly treated - again underlies the lack of ethical and moral base to the matter.

Given that for just the drawing of a lottery winner, a policeman has sometimes been required to be present and observe - this Bill as presented treats our elderly and sick as worth less than a lottery prize - with fewer real safeguards, fines smaller than a mediocre Lotto result, and potential bonanzas for those who easily work out how to evilly make use of the legislation - greater than a golden kiwi win!



## Development of Underlying Themes:

When Helen Clark campaigned to first become Prime Minister, she set a vague non-understood mandate before the Electorate of three main spiritual areas, with consequent civil legal outflows she would seek to enact if elected.

On the hustings among other spiritual things, she declared that there would be repeal of what she styled as something like:

1. Judeoistic-Christian Ethic Based Laws, she declared in doing this that:

2. the State is Sovereign, and subsidiary to this but just as foundational, that:

3. the State is Parent.

You may line up most, if not all of the moral, gender, relationship, family and children type law changes that have been made or enhanced since then, against that vague non-understood mandate she claimed to seek. It has happened in an almost a knee-jerk reactionary way, carried out here and overseas almost blindly.

The current death legislation being considered by Parliament, is an ongoing outflow of that paradigm shift Helen sought both to reinvigorate from the days of the 1980's abortion and homosexual legislation, and new moves she wished to help others usher in.

To give credit, Helen and her team has been very effective in this so far.

This submission then seeks to address the

influences of that paradigm shift, challenging the foundational shift in philosophical base, that has led to these present developments being submitted on here, arguing that there were no solid grounds to move from the millennially safe and proven standards for humanity, represented in Judeo-Christian Ethics and the laws - which naturally outflow by pursuing them; noting here the phenomenon: that through the school of hard knocks, or otherwise left to themselves, many ethnic groups over time have developed many similar standards and codes as fundamental to successful human behaviour and achievement.

And from there this submission seeks to say that the very basis then of the present legislative proposals are spiritually and morally flawed at root, and there fore can only out branch out with consequences detrimental to society and the individual, and are not at all Progressive - but in fact very harmful.

This submission then unashamedly presents the long-term honoured Judeoistic-Christian Ethics as the most time tested and valid basis for laws as soundly recognised through the test of time and hard knocks, by our fore-bearers; and briefly touches upon the considerable damage being done to individuals, communities, and society in general by breaching from the safe moral standards our forebears lived by and passed down to us.

## Changing Society From the Top Down:

Since at least the 1970's there has openly been a widely acknowledged belief that there was a case to argue for the adaptation of a nation's laws, and even concepts of international law development, with a view to reshaping the norms of how individuals and societies ought behave and conduct themselves.

It has been conceived that in the same way punishments and deterrents in law against perceived bad behaviour - ought to convince

a man to reform his behaviour, so too social change and agendas might be implemented from the top down through law change, so that rather than say Common Law developing from the ground up from societies heart as it were, law from the top down itself could change the common behaviour of individuals and society.

Who then in a society has the right to determine the basic principles from which laws might grow and develop - what social

change so driven, is beneficial or even acceptable, and who checks that it really is working out?

It is no minor question.

It is fundamental to any truly functional democracy.

A useful whakatauki: tika me te pono

(I am not in the following, pretending to speak for my Maori friends, on their deep seated abhorrence of such death itself as envisaged in this current legislative proposal. They are doing so for themselves.)

Some of my Maori friends have held the view that any “kaupapa here” for the direction of general and specific projects, behaviour of men, or overall directions of a people, might properly rest upon a bed of much deeper “kawa” even kawa wairua - that is: concepts, ethics, philosophical basis of what is: tika me te pono - correct and true, and that variously with each new need, new kaupapa grow from it, as many kumara (sweet potato) shoots might come from a well prepared and maintained garden.

Its a bit like saying worthwhile designs for making things fly successfully in the air, spring from the fundamental precepts of physics,

which themselves can inspire concepts of application, while attempts to self expressively and ignorantly ignore those under-girding principles, will crash - and oh the harm.

In the Treaty of Waitangi the Europeans brought the Crown and all its represents as their supreme contribution, but what is that rooted in?

What is the well prepared kumara bed that Western Culture springs from? And Who maintains it?

Western Culture grows from early Christendom, and long ago started to recognise the need to separate Executive power from Judicial oversight, Military from Civil, and eventually Church from State.

Western Culture never denied that the spiritual existed and guided us by underlying principals, it always recognised that our Creator, Almighty God is that Spirit, and that He has set out His requirements for the conduct of mankind famously encapsulated in essence in the moral aspects of the Commandments He gives to a Jew called Moses and rarefied through His Son the Lord Jesus Christ.

### Western Societies Moral Foundation

These moral ordinances are reaffirmed by God’s Son the Lord Jesus Christ, another Jew, and later in the New Testament of the Christian Scripture are laid out by the Lord Jesus’ special envoy (apostle), another Jew called Paul as:

9 Love must be sincere. Hate what is evil; cling to what is good. 10 Be devoted to one another in brotherly love. Honour one another above yourselves. 11 Never be lacking in zeal, but keep your spiritual fervour, serving the Lord. 12 Be joyful in hope, patient in affliction, faithful in prayer. 13 Share with God’s people who are in need. Practise hospitality. 14 Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse. 15 Rejoice with those who rejoice; mourn with those who mourn. 16 Live in harmony with one another. Do not be proud, but be willing to associate with people of low position. Do not be conceited. 17 Do not repay anyone evil for evil. Be

careful to do what is right in the eyes of everybody. 18 If it is possible, as far as it depends on you, live at peace with everyone. 19 Do not take revenge, my friends, but leave room for God’s wrath, for it is written: “It is mine to avenge; I will repay,” says the Lord. 20 On the contrary: “If your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him something to drink. In doing this, you will heap burning coals on his head.” 21 Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

1 ¶ Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established. The authorities that exist have been established by

God. 2 Consequently, he who rebels against the authority is rebelling against what God has instituted, and those who do so will bring judgement on themselves. 3 For rulers hold no terror for those who do right, but for those who do wrong. Do you want to be free from fear of the one in authority? Then do what is right and he will commend you. 4 For he is God's servant to do you good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword for nothing. He is God's servant, an agent of wrath to bring punishment on the wrongdoer. 5 Therefore, it is necessary to submit to the authorities, not only because of possible punishment but also because of conscience. 6 This is also why you pay taxes, for the authorities are God's servants, who give their full time to governing.

7 ¶ Give everyone what you owe him: If you owe taxes, pay taxes; if revenue, then revenue; if respect, then respect; if honour, then honour. 8 Let no debt remain outstanding, except the continuing debt to love one another, for he who loves his fellow-

God had repeatedly passed these basic tenants to ancient societies for thousands of years, even right down from the Flood of Noah.

God simply asserted these, while backing it with supernatural attestations to His Power and Authority.

Historically Western Society did not start with this direct connection to Moses' moral ordinances. The West was made up of numerous factors Celtic, Germanic, Hiberian, Greek, Roman and others.

But fundamentally much we inherited in these areas was Greco-Roman in nature.

And the Romans had held later that their emperor was Divine - god. He was also their high priest - pontiff maximus. And law giver, sometimes mediated through their senate, but mostly unfettered.

With the fall of Rome their denomination in Church matters assumed an unbiblical authority, even claiming to rule as pontiff maximus over princes and kings. The Latin priests even acted as local magistrates in their sect's own right.

Down to relatively modern English history,

man has fulfilled the law [Moses]. 9 The commandments, "Do not commit adultery," "Do not murder," "Do not steal," "Do not covet," and whatever other commandment there may be, are summed up in this one rule: "Love your neighbour as yourself." 10 Love does no harm to its neighbour. Therefore love is the fulfilment of the law.

11 ¶ And do this, understanding the present time. The hour has come for you to wake up from your slumber, because our salvation is nearer now than when we first believed. 12 The night is nearly over; the day is almost here. So let us put aside the deeds of darkness and put on the armour of light. 13 Let us behave decently, as in the daytime, not in orgies and drunkenness, not in sexual immorality and debauchery, not in dissension and jealousy. 14 Rather, clothe yourselves with the Lord Jesus Christ, and do not think about how to gratify the desires of the sinful nature..

*Found in the New Testament in the letter to the Romans chapters 12-13 NIV1984*

which we closely inherit, and which itself directly inherited from Rome, the Church ran its own Courts which could require capital punishment or banishment from the country and anything in between.

All not found in the Bible.

And so not surprisingly people sought separation of Church and State. For even the Lord Jesus has said - My Kingdom is not [presently] of this World.

And so with the separation of the apparent Church and State - we had the separation of civil and spiritual.

Yet the spiritual still under-girds the civil.

Neither ought trample on each other.

**Questions of self inflicted death are not primarily civil, they are first of all spiritual. Such speak to the very core of our nature as mankind and not androids..**

But the question of who then is the Law Giver was tritely addressed by Karl Marx simplistically asserting among other things:

1. that there is no God, and 2. that man defines Truth, 3. children are not property of their parents.

—Tritely and inadequately.

## Karl Marx

Karl Marx wrote quite a lot about New Zealand, hating the Christian intentions followed by the Wakefields and their New Zealand Company - in its settlement plans.

Marx inspired his followers to do something about the situation in New Zealand. Which inter-generationally they have set themselves steadfastly to do - take it a hundred years or more.

Helen's three foundational objectives attempted to implement their aims through what was then fledging neo-Marxist Globalism or if you like, a recent evolution of international socialism/communism.

1. Marx: there is no God == Helen: Remove Judeoistic-Christian Ethic Based Laws (based on God),

2. Marx: man defines Truth (Reality) == Helen: the State is Sovereign,

3. Marx: children are not property of their

parents == Helen: the State is Parent.

It all makes a rather dark contrast backdrop to the Life Giver, Jesus, Who says-

*"I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through Me."*  
John 14:6

Helen and friends often ascribe to the basic Fabian type view that you do not have your violent revolution to remove the potentially resurgent conservative elements, until after you have followed Marx's dictate to "re-educate the masses", first.

The ensuing social damage and chaos all this has caused in degrading our societies in the West, has infamously been described by its proponents as mere "collateral damage" in their staggering march stumbling onwards towards their golden revolution of human behaviour and mores.

## Conclusion

In brief then, we have a situation where a tidal flow has been engineered to wholesale break away from Christian traditions, seeing them as only oppressive fabrications of man - claiming a fictional 'god'.

Not perceiving or acknowledging their true purer origins in God Himself.

Ignoring the dreadful outflows of this foundational policy shift, truly the baby has been thrown out with the abortion forceps, the family has been suicidally neutered through false views of equality, and now the other end of life is endangered as well - in the creeping advance of this dark deathly tide.

**Paul Anthony Norman**

Avondale Auckland

New Zealand

I remain Available to be heard by the Committee, possibly with one or two supporting friends please.

*Appearance: Tentatively set for July 30th 2018*

**Please lets not allow our elderly or sick to be murdered for any reason! And certainly not by this Bill or anything like it.**

Do not as Parliamentarians have this on your conscience or hide behind a referendum - its a non question, no better than asking: have you stopped beating up your grandmother yet? Yes or No?

Likewise: **Statute or Referendum? - Go for neither!**

Between the four Jews:

Moses, the Lord Jesus Christ with His emissaries like Paul, - Choose not Karl Marx—follow Jesus as your Lord - and Saviour!

- and so keep everyone else safe!