#### Australia

# The bioethicists want to kill grandma

by Bruce Jacobs

The Australian Labor government has been one of the most vociferous proponents in the world of the population control measures on the agenda of the U.N.'s International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo in September, as detailed in past issues of *EIR* (see July 1 and 29). As part of this genocidal push, that government is attempting to ram through pro-euthanasia measures as law.

For example, the prime minister's Economic Planning Advisory Council made a chilling proclamation according to the Feb. 1 *Melbourne Age*: "Euthanasia should be considered as a means to curbing health costs involved in caring for the elderly." A push is under way downunder to simply murder people, and with the full protection of the law.

A number of state governments have, over the last decade, marched in step with Canberra. Since 1988, Victoria's Medical Procedures Act has allowed people to refuse unwanted medical treatment. South Australia has had a similar law since 1983. The Australian Nursing Federation has called for state governments to look at extending the laws to permit "active euthanasia." The Australian Capital Territory (ACT) has been debating the Voluntary Natural Death Bill which, if passed, would make the ACT, where Canberra is located, the only jurisdiction outside of Holland where active euthanasia is not a crime.

Death lobbyists masquerading as academics, such as Dr. Helga Kuhse, director of the Human Bioethics Department of Monash University, give an inkling to the influence of the powerful "death lobby." A survey Dr. Kuhse conducted of nurses in 1992 claimed that "active euthanasia is strongly supported by 75% of nurses." In fact, only 707 nurses responded in favor of euthanasia out of the 2,000 nurses who were asked to participate. But could Dr. Kuhse have had a vested interest in a pro-euthanasia result? After all, she is the president of the World Federation of Right to Die Societies as well.

Another recent survey was conducted by Dr. Peter Baume, a former federal parliamentarian, now a professor of community medicine at the University of New South Wales (NSW) and a commissioner of the states' Law Reform Commission. This survey, sponsored by the commission on behalf of the Voluntary Euthanasia Society of New South

Wales, polled 2,000 doctors using the same questions as in Kuhse's survey. It showed that more than 400 of the doctors had, at the patient's request, "taken deliberate steps to end the lives of terminally ill patients." But Dr. John Emery, the head of the medical profession in South Australia (SA), cast doubt on those alarming results, pointing out that similar studies by Flinders University, "which suggested that 19% of SA doctors performed euthanasia at some stage, were flawed and overstated. The way the question was put to doctors, and I was one of them, resulted in some ambiguity in the replies which were given."

Bioethicists make no apology for their warped disregard for human life. The Rev. Colin Honey, director of the Kingwood Center for Applied Ethics, told hundreds of health officials at the national meeting of the Australian College of Health Service Executives, and later repeated on national television: "People over 70 should be denied access to expensive and sophisticated health care available to the rest of the community. It is time that painful decisions were made to restrict the soaring cost of health care." He said that government improvements in health care efficiency and stopping overservicing was "only tinkering around the edges," and suggested some alternatives: "first-come, first-served; random selection; toss of a coin; or judgments based on what people had contributed to society, or would contribute." Honey said in an interview in the July 28 West Australian that "health care for the aged should be kept to a minimum and research aimed only at prolonging life should be stopped."

#### Ban on death culture lifted

The proliferation of the death culture has not only affected the medical profession. Take, for example, the book Final Exit: The Practicalities of Self-Deliverance and Assisted Suicide for the Dying, by Derek Humphry, which is aimed at encouraging the elderly and ill to die. Humphry is a former British journalist, co-founder of the Hemlock Society in California, president of the World Federation of Right to Die Societies during 1988-90, and sits on its board to this day. In his book he claims that his "first wife could no longer bear the pain and deterioration of her body and the distressed quality of her life from cancer, [so] she asked me to help her end her life. . . . A few weeks later, when Jean knew the time had come, she asked me for the drugs. As wrenching as it was, I had to agree." The Jan. 12, 1993 Sunday Age reported: "The integrity of Derek Humphry is being questioned because he seems to have been involved in an inordinate number of assisted suicides. He helped his first wife, Jean, to kill herself. He helped his father-in-law to take his life. And apparently there have been others. His second wife killed herself and left a note accusing him of an unseemly interest in premature deaths."

Humphry's book was originally banned in Australia, but the Censorship Review Board lifted the ban, making the book available "under the counter" through book stores and

EIR September 2, 1994 International 53

libraries, but not to people under 18 years of age. The book, deliberately set in large print for the elderly with poor eyesight, includes charts of lethal dosages for prescription drugs, painkillers, and sleeping tablets, complete with their Australian trade names. Lawyers have warned that the publisher or author could be held liable for inciting suicide. Although suicide is no longer a crime in Victoria, it is illegal to assist in a suicide or to kill a patient.

#### The opposition

The government campaign is not without opposition. Rita Marker, the director of the U.S.-based International Anti-Euthanasia Taskforce who toured Australia recently, and author of *Deadly Compassion: The Death of Ann Humphry and the Truth about Euthanasia*, levels the charges against Humphry made by his second wife.

Dr. Brian Pollard, a retired Sydney anaesthetist and author of Euthanasia: Should We Kill the Dying? argues that "it must be ethically superior to attend to the elimination of human distress before elimination of the human in distress." The book traces the idea of euthanasia to The Right to Die, by Jorst in Göttingen in 1895. A 1920s publication, The Permission to Destroy Life Not Worth Living, by Karl Binding, a lawyer, and Alfred Hoche, a psychiatrist, led to the subsequent legalization of euthanasia in Germany in the 1920s and 1930s. Pollard says that euthanasia advocates are usually utilitarians, and cites the most rigid of these as the adherents of Jeremy Bentham. He concludes that "the case for euthanasia rests on premises that do not respect [human] life . . . and is at odds with society's best interest."

The supporters of euthanasia frequently assert the utilitarian claim that it is an exercise of one's "right to die." But as the president of Right to Life, Margaret Tighe, charged on March 3, 1992: "Euthanasia is killing," and "who's to know what pressure some patients could be subjected to by their families?" The Spring 1994 Senior Scene serves to illustrate one source of such pressure. In a regular section in the magazine, the Voluntary Euthanasia Society said: "Usually we think of suicide as irrational self-destruction by a person who believes that their life is worthless. But when an incurably ill person wants to choose the manner and time . . . we should see such a decision as a rational wish for self-deliverance from unbearable suffering. . . . Decisions such as Dr. [Jack] Kevorkian's acquittal show that many people do not accept the legal prohibition against voluntary euthanasia."

Senior Scene is sold through some 50 private and public hospitals nationally, and 10,000 copies are mailed out to doctors. The psychological warfare being waged against elderly citizens will help the government achieve its health budget targets, and its broader Cairo-related objectives, by convincing them that they have become a burden on society that we can no longer afford. Doctors are being prepared to offer the final solution—the withholding of medical care, or lethal injection.

### **Book Reviews**

## Small booklet takes up big fight against new race scientists

by Marianna Wertz

## Crypto-Eugenics: The Hidden Agenda of Planned Parenthood

by Katharine S. O'Keefe Self-published, Asbury, New Jersey, 1991 45 pages, available at cost of reproduction and shipping

Don't read this little 45-page, self-published booklet unless you're prepared to fight for the truth! Katharine O'Keefe, with whom I've had the pleasure of meeting recently, is a true soldier for the Lord, fighting against the most evil institution on the face of the earth—the British oligarchy which backs the global eugenics movement—with only the weapon of St. Paul: the word.

Her method is that which Lyndon LaRouche recently called "good intelligence": She touched something that bit her, and she decided she had to find out what it was—and do battle against it! What she touched was an exposed arm of the British eugenics movement, an abortion clinic in England at which she led a small band in a "rescue" operation a few years back. As she recounts on the first page of the booklet, she had not been in England for 12 hours before she was arrested, tried, sentenced to five days in jail for contempt of court for not giving her name, and put in the psychiatric section for violent offenders at Risley Prison, Manchester. "My offense?" she writes. "Handing out the 'Freedom of Choice' postcard inside the South Manchester Private Nursing Home, which is an abortion clinic."

O'Keefe asked herself, "Why are the English in particular so harsh?" She had, in fact, participated in 20 rescues—demonstrations at abortuaries—in 7 countries, and nowhere had she been treated in such a fashion. In her typically ironic tone, she writes, "Lord McGregor of Durris spoke of rescue from the safety of the House of Lords as 'psychopathic'