## Behind the Lamm scandal: Establishment seeks euthanasia policy

by Kathleen Klenetsky

On March 31, the Trilateral Commission, a middle-level outlet for the international oligarchy, came out openly in favor of euthanasia. In a report detailing "The Trilateral Agenda for the Decade," the group wrote that in the area of social welfare, "A particular problem is posed by the very old—those aged eighty and over—since the proper care of this age group is very expensive in terms of medical treatment and residential accommodation" (see article, page 55).

The Trilateral report makes it clear that when Colorado Gov. Richard Lamm on March 27 called for the elderly "to die and get out of the way," he wasn't airing his personal perversion. He was serving as the public spokesman for the Trilateral faction, who are set on bringing the Nazis' war on "useless eaters" to America. As Joseph Califano, secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in the Carter-Mondale administration, recently said, euthanasia is the decade's "burning issue."

## Campaign issue

Lamm's remarks thrust the euthanasia issue into the middle of the U.S. presidential campaign. A close friend and political ally of presidential candidate Gary Hart, Lamm told the Colorado Health Lawyers Association that the elderly and others whom the Nazis called "useless eaters" have "a duty to die and get out of the way."

Invoking Gary Hart's "generation gap" theme, he continued, "Let the other society, our kids, build a reasonable life."

Angry individuals and groups castigated Lamm. The international Club of Life released a statement March 29 demanding that Lamm be tried for "crimes against humanity." Lamm holds the same outlook as the Nazis, charged the group's U.S. chairman, *EIR* contributing editor Nancy Spannaus, and "morally, is already responsible for the death of millions of eldery and sick, now being cut off life-support or smothered in our nation's rest homes and hospitals."

Spannaus drew the parallels between Lamm's remarks and those of Third Reich officials, and quoted from Dr. Leo Alexander, who participated at the Nuremberg Tribunals: Alexander passionately observed that the Nazis' extermination policies "started with the acceptance of the attitude, basic in the euthanasia movement, that there is such a thing as a

life not worthy to be lived."

The American Life Lobby issued a call for Lamm's resignation, and sent a telegram—as yet unanswered—to Gary Hart, asking him to reveal "whether this statement by one of your top supporters is one of your new ideas."

The controversy hasn't fazed Lamm, who, backed by the national media, has continued to speak out in favor of euthanasia and to criticize his opponents as "contemptible" and "a tiny minority."

Although Hart, under questioning, told reporters that he "totally disagrees" with Lamm's remarks, neither he nor the other front-runner, Walter Mondale, has felt under any moral obligation to call on Lamm to clarify his remarks, much less retract them. Ronald Reagan, the hero of the anti-abortion lobby, put on a remarkable performance at his April 5 press conference when he was asked about Lamm's statements. The President professed to be "as shocked as anyone to hear such a statement," but quickly added that he had seen reports indicating that Lamm had not really made the remarks attributed to him. "I'm not going to speak out until I know" what Lamm actually said, the President stated. Then, in what could easily be interpreted as conditional approval for "pulling the plug," Reagan noted that Lamm apparently had been "referring outright to terminal cases of the kind that have been under so much discussion over recent years, of someone who had a very lmited time and was, for example, in a coma and simply being artificially kept alive."

The only presidential candidate who has denounced Lamm's statements has been Democrat Lyndon LaRouche, whose national television broadcast March 26 had dealt in part with the current revival of Hitlerian genocide against racial minorities, the sick, and the elderly. LaRouche's campaign has distributed 300,000 leaflets in Pennsylvania blasting Lamm for his Nazi statements, and held campaign rallies in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia on the issue.

The major media have been quick to applaud the Colorado governor—a former director of Zero Population Growth who has praised cannibalism and once referred to himself in a newspaper interview as "Adolf Eichmann" for his "courage" in raising the question of when medical treatment should be withdrawn or withheld.

56 National EIR April 17, 1984

## Documentation

Governor Richard Lamm, the Democratic governor of Colorado, made the following statement March 27 to the Colorado Health Lawyers Association:

Like leaves which fall off a tree forming the humus in which other plants can grow, we've got a duty to die and get out of the way with all of our machines and artificial hearts, so that our kids can build a reasonable life. . . . I'd take the money we could save in reforming the health-care system and put it into . . . restarting America's industrial engine and in the education system.

The following day, Lamm told representatives of a Denver senior-citizens' group:

We are really approaching a time of almost technological immortality, when the machine and the tubes and the special drugs and the heart pacemakers . . . literally force life on us. I believe we really should be very careful in terms of our technological miracles that we don't impose life on people who, in fact, are suffering beyond the ability for us to help.

On March 29, Lamm appeared on NBC's Today program and asked:

How much high-technology medicine can society afford?... In my case, I want them to pull the plug. The era of natural death is really being replaced by high-technology medication where they can really prolong suffering rather than sustain life.

Governor Lamm's statements were defended by the many of the Eastern Establishment media. While criticizing Lamm for being "crass" in the way he raised the issue, the press applauded his "courage" in doing so. A sampling:

The Washington Post, April 1, editorial, "A 'Duty to Die'?":

. . . Despite the initial outpouring of criticism, Governor Lamm, to his credit, did not retreat into accusations of misquotation or poor staff work. . . .

Government spends tens of billions of dollars each year caring for elderly and severely disabled people. Not surprisingly, a high proportion of expenses goes for care in the last year of life. At the same time millions of people who aren't elderly—39 million, according to a recent Urban Institute estimate . . . have no health insurance coverage at all.

If health-care resources are truly limited—a question that depends more on the society's preference for other goods than on any absolute scarcity—first priority should to to filling in the gaps in medical coverage than providing more

extensive benefits to those already covered. But it won't be easy to decide how that should be done. The governor has raised an important subject. . . .

New York Times, March 31, editorial, "Life, Death and Governor Lamm":

. . . Every year brings another means of prolonging life, and with it decisions for which society has as yet no clear guidelines. . . . Governor Lamm's fast-moving tongue was off, but his mind was in a decent place.

New York Daily News, March 30, editorial, "Governor Lamm Bungles the Issue":

"Lamm was crass—but correct—in saying the issue has big financial implications. . . . Of course, such life-saving procedures are modern blessings much of the time. But in many cases a point comes when the question must be asked if the treatment serves a humane purpose or is simply an end unto itself.

"The question hits close to home because of a recent grand jury report accusing LaGuardia Hospital in Queens of having unofficial codes to identify patients who are not to be saved if they slip under. . . . The point is that the life-ordeath decision is one that doctors and hospitals must deal with daily, and they have little or no guidance.

"Governor Cuomo has asked Health Commissioner David Axelrod topropose some guidelines. In doing so, Axelrod should take a close look at the report of a presidential commission chaired by New York lawyer Morris Abram. The panel urged that ethics and compassion be blended with common sense: When prolonged life has meaning and purpose, keep it going at any cost. Otherwise, let nature take its inevitable course while minimizing suffering. Each case must be decided individually, but that's a good framework for deciding.

Washington Post, April 1, column by Haynes Johnson, "Furor Over 'Duty to Die' Remark Obscures Serious Question":

Given the bluntness of [Lamm's] words and the seemingly insensitive manner in which he delivered them . . . the outrage is understandable. Yet the governor deserves credit—and respect—for boldly raising what is certain to become one of the nation's most important issues, if it isn't already. Even more refreshing in this age of media-packaged politicians . . . Lamm has not backed down in the face of condemnation.

The Baltimore Sun, April 5, guest editorial by Richard Reeves:

Reeves declared that Governor Lamm is "the Colorado politician with the brains to understand the future and the courage actually to think and talk about it—to begin the debate."

EIR April 17, 1984 National 57