

the highest judge in the country, is also whitewashing Hackethal before his trial even begins.”

Referring to this controversy, Dr. Admiraal reported that he had attended a conference of the European Congress of the Societies for the Right to Die, in December 1985, in Frankfurt, West Germany, and was “disappointed” in the German situation.

“The problem with Germany is that you can’t even use the word, ‘euthanasia.’ The problem, of course, is Hitler. You can’t use the word ‘euthanasia,’ with the way the population is feeling about the Hitler period. But this is all wrong. Euthanasia is not killing innocent people and the disabled, as Hitler did, but it is, rather, helping people to die in a good way. In Germany, the problem is a misunderstanding, which makes it impossible to even say the word. Hitler misused the word ‘euthanasia.’”

In Holland, he said, such touchy problems don’t exist. Admiraal counts on support from a large ultra-liberal base in the Dutch population, supported by gnostic elements in the Dutch Reformed Church, centered in the Dutch InterChurch Council. It is this large constituency for ultra-liberal-gnostic ideas, that has made Holland the center of the European drug trade and for the activities of the Soviet-backed “peace movement.” Nonetheless, Admiraal’s assertion may be shocking

to those among Holland’s older citizens who fought in the wartime resistance against the Nazis.

For Admiraal and others like him, euthanasia is now Holland’s most exportable product. He is in touch with the California-based “Hemlock Society,” headed by British subject Derek Humphreys, which supports actively “suiciding” terminally ill patients. “I hope the United States follows the same path we are on, but it will probably take longer,” Admiraal says.

Admiraal-admirer Berit Hedeby claims that the “Dutch model” had been widely discussed during the meeting of the Fifth International Congress on Euthanasia, which took place in Frankfurt last year. This will also be a subject of discussion at the next international euthanasia congress, scheduled to take place, she asserted in a recent private discussion, in Bombay, India, at the end of this year.

The organizational channel for propagandizing on behalf of these kinds of euthanasia policies, according to Hedeby, is the World Federation of Societies for the Right to Die, whose head is New York lawyer Sidney Rosoff, one of the leaders of the New York Society for the Right to Die (a euphemism for the Euthanasia Society of America). The New York Society for the Right to Die is headed by Evans Collins, a banker at the Kidder Peabody firm, and by members of the

Cardinal denounces judge for backing euthanasia

Joseph Cardinal Höffner, head of the West German Catholic episcopal conference, issued the following statement on Jan. 15, charging the highest judge in the Federal Republic, Wolfgang Zeidler, with acting against morality and against the Constitution. He demanded that the appropriate “consequences” be drawn respecting Zeidler’s legal standing, and called for him to be relieved of his post.

Zeidler, the head of the Federal Constitutional Court, had given a speech in Trier the week before, at a public panel convened to discuss “mercy-killing” and abortion. In it he backed the act of euthanasia committed by Dr. Julius Hackethal, who was recently indicted and will soon come to trial for murdering an elderly patient. Zeidler cynically compared the developing human embryo to a raspberry—ostensibly to demonstrate that the Catholic Church is absurd in its antagonism to abortion.

It is with great astonishment and deep consternation that I note the following remarks by the president of the Federal Constitutional Court, Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Zeidler:

- 1) The prohibition of murder on request (§216 of the Penal Code) is “an island of inhumanity, resulting from ecclesiastical influence on our legal order.”
- 2) Regarding the evaluation of genetic engineering and of human dignity, he fears “a return to religion.”
- 3) It was a step forward, that over the past years religion has been expunged from the legal order.
- 4) A fertilized egg-cell is a “raspberry-like structure,” an “overgrown substance from the very first hour.”

These are monstrous statements, which must be refuted once and for all.

1) The prohibition of murder on request is an expression of respect for the dignity of man. It protects the dying person from becoming the object of the decisions of third persons. The Catholic Church has repeatedly emphasized, that there does not exist a transition between letting a person die, and actively bringing about his death. In the former case, we are dealing with passive assistance for the dying; in the latter, with intentional killing.

Proskauer family, a New York Jewish-name family, whose 1930s claim to fame was in the same tradition: attempting to prevent American Jews from mobilizing against the Hitler regime.

In various countries, there exist national-euthanasia, or "right to die" societies. In Holland, there exists one of the most explicit, the Association for Voluntary Euthanasia, which is listed in the Amsterdam phone book, under the word "Euthanasia." In Australia, too, there is a Voluntary Euthanasia Society, and regional "voluntary euthanasia" groups. But, in most countries, the discrediting of the word "euthanasia" from the Hitler years, has engendered curious cover names, as in the organizations named Exit, in both Sweden and Britain, and the Society for the Right to Die with Dignity in France.

The perversion of constitutional law

The proponents of the "Dutch model" of state-legalized and state-"guided" euthanasia, have chosen Sweden as their next front, with the anticipated visit of Admiraal to Sweden for a Feb. 15 public forum and press conference, and a Feb. 16 private seminar with leading Swedish doctors and lawyers.

In preparation for this event, Hedeby is active on all

2) The dignity of man has its insurpassable foundation and exaltation in the precepts of Christian ethics. These are also binding upon the Federal Republic of Germany's Basic Law, which was adopted in "responsibility before God and men," and which guarantees the "inviolability" of the "dignity of man."

3) If over the past years religion has been expunged from the legal order, then this represents a loss, a step backward. The connection between right, law, and ethics, is inabrogable.

4) On Feb. 25, 1975, the Federal Constitutional Court declared that "the life developing within the mother's body . . . as her legal private possession, [is] protected by the Constitution (Art. 2, Sec. 2, Par. 1; Art. 1, Sec. 1GG)." It is the obligation of the state to protect the development of life. The human being is "human from the very beginning." This fact is not a mere juridical, or peculiarly Catholic statement, but is based on the relevant scientific knowledge. The assertion that the fertilized egg-cell is a "raspberry-like structure" exhibits remarkable ignorance.

In his remarks, the president of Germany's supreme constitutional body has not only departed from the Basic Law, he has spoken contrary to the Constitution. Our Constitution is protected by Article 20(4) of the Basic Law.

fronts, contacting government officials, the media, and leaders of the medical and legal professions, to win support for euthanasia. She has held private discussions with a Swedish television team, which is planning a late-January trip to Holland, to prepare favorable coverage on Admiraal's activities.

Hedeby's main collaborator, former Swedish Chief Judge Bertil Wennergren, is preparing a media barrage on behalf of changing the criminal codes of Sweden to expedite euthanasia. Wennergren cites the cases both of Holland and Switzerland; in the latter, statutes expediting euthanasia exist, but the issue lacks the parliamentary initiative and popular pro-euthanasia propaganda that exists in Holland.

The main argument being cited by Wennergren and Hedeby is so lunatic, that it would seem to have to have originated from a radical Calvinist standing on his head. In a December 1985 piece in *Dagens Nyheter*, "The Swedish Constitution Prescribes Euthanasia," Wennergren's argument was that constitutional guarantees of "individual free will" allow for euthanasia, as long as the euthanasia is "voluntary," since "free will" provides the "right" to kill oneself!

This argument, according to Hedeby, will form the basis for challenges to legal systems, in all Western countries. In a private discussion, she exclaimed, "The wish for euthanasia must be expressed by the patient himself. If we stress this, then we should absolutely succeed, since all countries guarantee free will. In fact, it is *against* the law, it is *criminal*, to treat a person against his free will. In that sense, the Swedish Constitution, and many other constitutions, prescribe euthanasia! Everything is okay, as long as we stick to free will!"

The shrill Ms. Hedeby, however, has little concern for the "free will" of Swedish citizens, to be freed from the psychological and political terrorism of the Euthanasia Lobby. She says: "I will *force* the Swedish population to accept euthanasia! This country has been in a quiet atmosphere for centuries! But we cannot avoid this question any longer, and keep giving meaningless medical treatment to keep people alive who are 80 years old, and very sick, and who are sent to so-called intensive care. This is a crazy situation! We must have a new society! Even the words, 'death with dignity,' mean nothing to me. In some cases, yes, we must give a morphine overdose, to help people die. But passive euthanasia is often not enough. I will struggle to have all these hospitals *stop* these meaningless treatments! All these life-sustaining treatments are a form of torture!"

Ms. Hedeby, however, had better beware. There is a certain brand of traditional conservatism in the Swedish population, and in segments of the medical profession, that could be mobilized in reaction against her chilling advocacy of murder. Indeed, in 1979-80, when it was revealed that she had "helped" an ill journalist friend commit suicide, there was a virtual lynch-mob atmosphere in certain quarters in Sweden, and Hedeby spent six months in a Swedish prison, as a result.

Should a Nuremberg Tribunal be reconstituted, to try her ilk, she might not get off so easy, the next time around.