
Washington, D.C.

'Death Act' vote now faces the Congress

by Stephanie Ezrol

Here in Washington, an informal coalition comprising members of the three main religious denominations, black political leaders, conservatives, anti-drug organizers, and Democratic Party activists is working to secure a Congressional resolution of disapproval on D.C. Act 4-115, "The Natural Death Act of 1981."

"The Natural Death Act," described by the *Washington Post* as a right-to-die bill for the nation's capital, should more properly be described as a bill enforcing euthanasia. The bill, and the national legislative drive behind it, were drafted by the New York-based "Society for the Right to Die." Founded in 1938, the group was originally called the Euthanasia Society of America, but after the Nazis gave euthanasia a bad name, and Wilhelm Frick, the director of Nazi euthanasia policy, was sentenced to death at the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal, the society changed its name.

Washington, D.C. Mayor Marion Barry signed the Natural Death Act on Nov. 9, 1981; it was sent to Capitol Hill on Nov. 30, where the Congress has 30 legislative days to review the act. Under Public Law 93-198, all bills passed by the District of Columbia (D.C.) city council must go through this process of congressional review, because Congress holds the ultimate constitutional authority to "exercise legislation in all cases whatsoever, over [the] District."

The opposing coalition includes black Baptist ministers, Roman Catholic priests, the American Life Lobby, the National Black Women's Political Leadership Caucus, the Washington D.C. Chapter of the Moral Majority, statewide Right-to-Life groups, local Jewish political leaders, the National Anti-Drug Coalition, leaders of the National Catholic Physician's Guild and Lyndon LaRouche's National Democratic Policy Committee.

Similar death bills have already been enacted into law in 10 states: Arkansas, California, Idaho, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas, and Washington State. The first state legislature to pass a model bill was in Jesuit Jerry Brown's California. The bill was introduced on Feb. 13, 1976 by Assemblyman Barry Keene, who hails from the first Jonestown, cult-

city Ukiah, California. Keene's previous claim to fame was his active role in pushing for marijuana decriminalization when he served as Assistant Attorney General for Mendocino County, California, the marijuana-growing capital of the United States.

A four-part series now running in the semiweekly national newspaper *New Solidarity* under the title "The Genocide Lobby's Plot to Destroy the Nation's Capital" has documented how an elite group which includes the Malthusian Club of Rome, Katharine Meyer Graham of the *Washington Post*, Sol Linowitz of United Brands, D.C.'s Federal City Council (a private entity), and the schismatic Jesuits at Georgetown University, is using the District of Columbia as a testing ground for their social-engineering policies. They have initiated a series of bills including the Sexual Reform Act, which attempted to legalize incest and teacher-student sexual relations, among other things; a bill to legalize gambling; and the euthanasia bill. By passing these bills through the district council they hope to gain a de facto federal stamp of approval for their policies.

D.C. Act 4-69, the Sexual Reform Act, was overturned in Congress through the efforts of a coalition which, despite a *Washington Post* coverup of their opposition, presented 10,000 signatures of outraged District residents to the House District Committee. Most of the signatures were collected by the members of the Baptist Ministers' Conference, representing the District's hundreds of black Baptist churches. The *Washington Post*, in a Goebbels-style big lie, claimed that it was Jerry Falwell who brought his primarily white organization into the primarily black D.C. area and was most responsible for convincing Congress to override "the will of the residents."

'Suicide can be dignified'

The Natural Death Act allows anyone over the age of 18 to draw up a legally binding document called a "declaration," which mandates that any medical procedure or intervention which would serve to "artificially prolong" life be withdrawn in instances of an incurable condition. Once this declaration is signed, it becomes a permanent part of one's medical record. If an individual is admitted to a hospital for any reason, after an accident or with a disease like cancer, his or her doctor is obligated by law, and under penalty of a \$5,000 fine, three years' imprisonment, or both, to ensure that "all life-sustaining procedures which serve only to postpone the moment of death, are withheld," and that only medication necessary "to alleviate pain and provide comfort" will be administered.

The remainder of the bill is a series of definitions and ostensible safeguards focused on protecting the individual from what is implied to be his greedy family, who may choose to prematurely slide him out of the

way to get at his estate. The so-called safeguards also attempt to assure the signator that he or she is protected from doctors and hospital personnel tempted to get rid of patients in the name of cost-efficiency—implying that it is the medical profession that is in the business of killing people. In point of fact, putting them *into* that business is the intent of the legislation's instigators.

A national and international counterattack has emerged as Right to Life groups in Montreal, France, Italy have already contacted the NDPC to register their opposition. The Anti-Drug Coalitions in Europe which have been fighting the euthanasia proposals of Danish Minister of Justice, Ole Espersen, have announced their support for efforts to stop this Nazi-modeled legalized murder.

Pressure is mounting on the Congressional Black Caucus to break their liberal profile and come out against Act. 4-115. Catholic Right-to-Life networks, black Catholics and black Baptists in the home district of Rep. Ron Dellums, the social democrat who chairs the D.C. Committee in the House of Representatives, are calling in to Dellums's office to demand action. Ministers who have been close to Rep. Mervyn Dymally (who favors marijuana legalization in Jamaica) are urging him to cut his ties to the genocide lobby and kill the bill.

Senate subcommittee on the line

On Dec. 3, Stuart Rosenblatt, the National Democratic Policy Committee's spokesman in the District of Columbia, announced at a press conference in front of the Senate Office Building that the NDPC is mobilizing a local and national organizing drive to throw out the Death Act through a congressional resolution of disapproval. Rosenblatt formally presented his demands, along with documentation of the nature of the bill and the "conspiracy of silence" which surrounded its passage in the D.C. District Council, to Sen. Charles Mathias, Jr. (R-Md.), who in his capacity as Chairman of the Government Affairs Subcommittee on Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia is responsible for reviewing the Death Act.

Rosenblatt specified four points of NDPC opposition to the Act: 1) Preventing the physician from prolonging life once the patient is deemed incurable is a return to the Nazis' gradually accelerated process of eliminating those deemed unworthy to survive; 2) Under the rubric of "right-to-die," state and municipal officials have been given the option of saving money on health care by encouraging the sick and elderly to refuse treatment; 3) The Act is part of fostering a broader death-cult attack on progress and the preciousness of individual life, an attack led in Washington, by the Episcopalian Fr. William Wendt, who performs "death counseling," sells matching coffins, wine racks, and

bookshelves from his St. Francis Death Center, and teaches "death education" in three local high schools; 4) Above all, the Death Act conforms to the overall Global 2000 strategy of returning a shrunken population to the Dark Ages, with its insistence that people are nothing but useless eaters in a declining economy, and that high-technology medicine is a waste of scarce resources and an unnatural intrusion into "the dying process."

Journalists in attendance included representatives of four radio stations, the Metromedia-television affiliate, UPI, and AP. A reporter asked: "What about the individual grieving person—aren't their feelings more important than any other consideration as to who has the right to determine death?"

Rosenblatt said, "There is a higher morality of natural law which forms the principles of our democratic republic. That is more important than the immediate feelings of an unfortunate but manipulated individual. The question is whether our country is going to be restored to the spirit of finding solutions to medical problems through technological breakthroughs, or whether we are going to follow the Nazis down the road, step by legal step, to fascism." Reporters pressed for more information about the Club of Rome and about the NDPC's charge that the *Washington Post* and Father Wendt are racially prejudiced in their support for the Death Act.

'An unfortunate will to live'

Father Wendt told this reporter in response to a question about Baptist opposition to the Death Act: "Don't forget, you are talking to *black* Baptists, and in the black cultural perspective, it has been researched that black people have a greater will to live than any other culture in the United States. There's always that feeling that the white man is stepping in and using a genocide ethic or whatever to try to do away with black people. . . . A death educator by the name of Kalish out in California wrote a book on it. . . . I tell you frankly, they [black Americans] are very upset with some of the hospice work, too, because that would seem to be another area where the white man was stepping in to let black people die."

This, I concluded, is a topic that Father Wendt must have discussed with Polly Shackleton, the bill's sponsor, a close friend of his from their old radical political days, and with Mrs. Graham, who funds Wendt through her Meyer Foundation. The solution they found was to keep all mention of the Death Act out of the press until the council voted it up on Sept. 30, 1981 (despite the fact that the *Post* had run a series of articles in the summer of 1980 calling for such a bill), while the council was bombarded with expert witnesses to convince its members that the legislation was a benign "bill of rights."