

the German borders to the east, it made a clear difference also in the exercise, not to have them available, but to be dependent on FAR reinforcements from France—some 150 miles and more away. Thus, “Kecker Spatz” had the smell of a European defense after a U.S. troop pullout.

With, or without the Americans?

A very important question is to be solved over the coming few months; namely, whether the new effort for Franco-German cooperation is to add strength to the existing NATO

The immediate lesson to be learned was clear: Efficient Western action against surprise attacks by Warsaw Pact spetsnaz is still lacking. The other important lesson to be drawn from the exercise disaster was that trying to defend Germany without American troops and their heavy equipment against a vastly superior Red Army, wouldn't work.

forces in Western Europe, or whether it is designed to become a substitute for disengaging U.S. troops.

Two main factions are at work behind the scene of Franco-German cooperation. Those who believe that Europe could do without the Americans are grouped around former French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and former Bonn Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, who stated in a speech in Paris on Feb. 24, 1987, that merging French and German military potentials would suffice to deter the Warsaw Pact in Europe.

Spokesman for the other, more realistic, faction is France's current Premier Jacques Chirac, who warned in an interview with *Le Point* magazine Oct. 5 that the revived Franco-German cooperation could, if not thoroughly planned, “contribute to a salami tactic that may even encourage a disengagement of the irreplaceable U.S. forces from Europe.”

The design for the Franco-German defense council is too vague yet, not allowing any evaluation of where the whole project is heading. If based on an effort to replace, even in part, the current U.S. role in European defense, it is definitely doomed to fail, as “Kecker Spatz” demonstrated drastically. Franco-German cooperation is of use for the West, however, if it works as a complement to U.S. presence in Europe, and if it helps to bind the Americans into new defense structures.

Sweden

New setback for the euthanasia lobby

by Ulf Sandmark and Göran Haglund

Trying to capitalize on developments in Holland, the Swedish euthanasia lobby sponsored a campaign meeting in Stockholm on Sept. 24. Thanks to a forceful intervention by the Anti-Drug Coalition and an organization of handicapped youth, the purpose of the meeting—relaunching efforts to legalize “mercy killing”—was effectively thwarted. Forty youngsters from the handicapped youth organization, ten of them in wheelchairs, demonstrated with placards and leaflets saying, “‘Death Help’ Is Murder.”

The youth in wheelchairs served to dramatize a very simple point. The arguments employed by the “mercy killing” lobby, and the demonstrable outcome of the policy they demand, would have nothing ultimately to do with “mercy,” but lead to mass killings of anyone deemed a “useless eater,” including such otherwise healthy individuals as the handicapped.

The big attraction at the meeting was Stockholm Bishop Krister Stendahl, former professor at Harvard University, whose recent book, *Meningar (Viewpoints)*, had called into question the central Christian concept of eternal life. Also in the panel, giving the meeting official government sanction, was Viking Falk of the National Board of Social and Medical Health.

The organizer of the meeting, Berit Hedeby, has been promoting and practicing active euthanasia since she founded the Swedish “Right to Die” organization in 1973. In her book *Yes to Death Help*, and in articles and speeches, she has advocated active killing of elderly, ill, and handicapped people, just as she herself killed a handicapped journalist, Sven-Olov Handberg. For this she was sentenced to prison, according to the law which the death lobby now wants to “reform.”

The unbalanced Hedeby, and her organization, EXIT, are just public relations frontmen of the euthanasia lobby. The real muscle is flexed by persons in the state-run TV system, at the largest Stockholm daily *Dagens Nyheter*, and in the government, as demonstrated by the promotion of state

commissions working under headings like "Care in the Final Stage of Life," "The New Concept of Death," etc.

'Exceptional cases' or mass killings?

In 1985, a big push began to import the Dutch model into Sweden. Dr. Pieter Admiraal from Holland—infamous for his statement, "If you want, I'll kill you too!"—was invited to a big public event in February 1986. It was meant to be the media event that would pave the way for legalizing active euthanasia, using it to move the Dutch situation ahead, which had begun to reach a stalemate.

While the death lobby spoke of "exceptional cases" only, implying "small dimensions" in the application of their system, some statements revealed much greater ambitions. In *Dagens Nyheter* of Dec. 16, 1985, Hedeby quoted Dr. Admiraal: "The AIDS epidemic will harvest many victims; why deny them liberation from a cruel death?" AIDS victims, however, are no small group.

Dr. Admiraal's own stated reason for euthanasia was the "unbalanced" population pyramid, with "too many elderly." A couple of "mercy killings" will change no population pyramid—only mass murder of elderly will! A Swedish physician addressing some of Hedeby's public events, Dr. Mats Pers, privately put forth the argument about "the overpopulation of the world." The scale of killing which these people intend, would make Hitler blush.

The railroading of a euthanasia law in Sweden came to a halt after the 1986 meeting with Dr. Admiraal. The plan was exposed by the Club of Life, an organization founded by Helga Zepp-LaRouche of West Germany, the wife of Lyndon LaRouche. Several demonstrations were organized. The organizations of handicapped issued a joint statement, " 'Death Help' Is Murder—Not Mercy!" Since the February 1986 flop, Hedeby had not been able to organize any public event until Sept. 24, 1987, when Bishop Stendahl lent his name and person to the project. Stendahl, in his book *Meningar*, had written the following proposal for eliminating Christian precepts in favor of Eastern mysticism: "Man's persistent arrogance, which insists on extending his own importance into immortality, should perhaps be curbed. . . . I think that there is a tendency, and a healthy one, in the religions of the East, which have not glorified man by giving him immortality, but rather consider that man finds himself by assuming a lower and lower position, until achieving Nirvana."

Such ravings were opposed at the recent Stockholm meeting by the Anti-Drug Coalition and the handicapped youth. The 40 youngsters rallying against Hedeby "shook" her, as the evening tabloid *Expressen* wrote in an article on the meeting. Confronted by the invasion of youth in wheelchairs, carrying banners proclaiming their intention to *live*, she mumbled that she was "sorry for the mistake, which there is no basis for." But she reiterated her support for euthanasia: "The Greek word means a calm, peaceful, merciful death."

Bishop Stendahl nominally opposed Hedeby's policy of

active death help, but also said, "It is unreasonable to have advanced medical treatment." He favored "more pain relief," about which "there is knowledge at some clinics of the hospice type." Joining Hedeby, Stendahl stressed the "priority of the individual's free will" regarding treatment in the final stage of life.

Viking Falk explained the current law allowing a patient to decide the fate of his own body, for example, not to receive medical treatment, and also allowing doctors to discontinue medical, food, and water supply to patients. This starving and dehydration of patients in week-long, passive killings, is one of Hedeby's main arguments for active euthanasia.

Hedeby argued that there is no difference between active and passive euthanasia, and that, therefore, the next step must be to permit active euthanasia, based on the "free decision of the patient." This concept of "free decision-making" was strongly attacked by the handicapped youth representatives.

One young man, sitting in his wheelchair, told of a young paralyzed friend, who would not be living today, with a girlfriend and with a strong will to overcome all problems, had he not received the support to live from those around him. He pointed out "the absurdity of even raising the question of voluntary death help with people in a personal crisis."

At that point, Anti-Drug Coalition chairman Ulf Sandmark brought up the question of the Nuremberg Tribunals, which sentenced the Nazi doctors, citing Hitler's euthanasia order and its exact identity with the proposals of EXIT. This created an uproar in the 200-person audience of mostly elderly people. The question was posed, whether Stendahl and Falk considered the Nuremberg sentences for euthanasia debatable, or whether they supported them. Hedeby, visibly shaken, never regained control over the meeting. Both Stendahl and Falk distanced themselves from the discussion—Stendahl, by saying he did "not understand the strange debate."

SILVER

SHORT SQUEEZE

● WHO? ● WHAT? ● WHY? ●

Not what you think! Daily limits soon. Exchange cannot stop this one because it is different. **Send \$5 to SIBBET for information. He is the one advisor who predicted the other two squeezes. Make \$50 per oz.!**

SIBBET PUBLICATIONS

1091 E. WOODBURY RD., PASADENA, CA 91104

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____