

November 1991

Letters to the Editor ...

Catholic Physicians' Guild

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq>

Recommended Citation

Catholic Physicians' Guild (1991) "Letters to the Editor ...," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 58: No. 4, Article 1.
Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol58/iss4/1>

Letters to the Editor . . .

Dear Colleagues in Medicine:

This letter is intended to bring to your attention a serious problem in our profession. We are slowly and intentionally being ensnared by a vocal group of activists who promote their personal views at our expense. They claim a 'right to abortion' and a 'right to die', and have chosen our profession as the executioners. Even though a limited number of us have succumbed to their requests, the activists are becoming stronger and more political, placing *all* of us in danger of legislation or court orders, forcing us to act against our consciences.

In case you think that this is an exaggeration, there are already early signs of trouble, and a similar scenario in our history. Judges in New Jersey, New York and Rhode Island have explicitly told resisting hospitals and their staffs to withdraw life-sustaining support from patients, regardless of their ethical concern. A New York Supreme Court Justice said, "When a legal order comes down to remove a feeding tube it is the legal duty of health care professionals to obey the order." Nurses have been fired from their jobs for refusing to comply. Physicians in two large cities are presently refusing to perform abortions, requiring the abortion industry to import abortionists. How long do you think it will be before the activists get a court order demanding that doctors do abortions regardless of their moral views?

As Santayana said, "Those who do not learn from history are doomed to relive it". Abortion-on-demand was already in place in Germany when the Nazi party took over in 1933. The conscience of the medical profession had been numbed to the killing, allowing Hitler to introduce his nefarious plans to exterminate the physically and socially unfit, as a form of 'mercy death' for the incurably insane, seriously ill, the handicapped and the aged. It was only one step more to genocide of Poles, Russians, Jews and Gypsies. In spite of this striking

example of the recent past, we are blindly being led down the same path as the German physicians, who probably never initially intended to become merchants of death.

The medical profession is highly intelligent and well educated, but our education does not confer wisdom. Wisdom is a gift of the spirit. It is possible to deceive the medical profession, in spite of our learning, as easily as the other members of society. Otherwise, why would some of our doctors believe that a mother has a 'right to kill' her preborn child, when they know that no member of society has a right to mutilate or kill themselves, much less another. How could they agree that abortion helps poor women "solve" social problems, when they are aware of the intense bond between mother and child — a bond stronger than the instinct for self-preservation. Certainly, physicians know that no woman kills her child without paying the price of bereavement and grief — a grief which they leave her to carry alone.

As physicians, we cannot hide under the umbrella of legality. Laws in direct opposition to the divine law are morally wrong and cannot be obeyed by persons of integrity. Hitler *legally* exterminated millions of people with help from the medical profession. Psychiatrists in the Soviet Union *legally* held political dissenters against their wills in mental hospitals. Even in the United States, though guaranteed the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness by our Constitution, false interpretation of this document has denied these basic rights to certain groups by **denying their personhood**. People of the black race were denied personhood at one time, by *law*, in this country. The preborn are still denied personhood, resulting in absurd conclusions. For instance, a seven-month *premature* baby has all the rights of personhood, and any attempt to kill it is legally considered murder, but a nine-month *preborn* baby can be legally butchered and dismembered by an abortionist.

Somewhere the erroneous conclusion has been drawn that the preborn baby is a part of the mother's body and can be disposed of at will. Yet, who would deny that from the moment of conception each one of us is unique, and though we contain genetic material from both mother and father, we are not a part of either body. We are separate, and we rely upon our mother, after conception, only for life support until viable. As physicians, we insist (and rightly so) that life support be given to terminally ill patients with a life expectancy of 2 weeks, but some doctors help a mother remove her child from life support — a child with a life expectancy of 72 years. Physicians have always recognized two patients, when treating a pregnant woman, avoiding drugs and x-rays otherwise beneficial to the mother's health in order to protect the baby. Why would a doctor choose to kill one patient for the convenience of the other?

To avoid confusion, there is no conflict about situations such as ectopic pregnancy or malignancy, where treatment deleterious to the child must be performed. These treatments, which secondarily affect the baby, are acceptable as they are not a direct attack upon the child. Other medical conditions, such as hypertension, heart disease, kidney disease and diabetes are rarely aggravated until the last trimester of pregnancy, at which time the baby is already viable, allowing early induction of labor.

Those responsible for monitoring the integrity of the medical profession have been of little help. The AMA contends that abortion is necessary lest a woman be denied her choice of medical treatment. But medical treatment must be both safe and effective to be approved. Abortion is almost 100% lethal to the baby — definitely effective, but hardly safe. In addition, how can abortion be considered medical treatment, since it is almost always performed for non-medical reasons?

It is not the purpose of this letter to assign guilt. We are all guilty in varying degrees. Those who stand by silently and watch the slaughter are also guilty. Even those of us who have been Pro-Life from the onset, have rarely approached our medical colleagues for fear of ridicule. We

keep our Pro-Life activities outside of our professional life. But the 'active guilt' of a few members reflects on the whole profession, and the medical profession is in danger of being dragged into degradation twice in one century.

We must look at the reasons a physician would become a party to abortion and euthanasia. There are only two motivating factors: greed and a misplaced sense of kindness. We will not deal with greed as it requires no explanation, but our confused kindness allows us to be influenced by the activists' slogans and cliches. They begin by calling themselves Pro-Choice, rather than Pro-Abortion or Anti-Life. Even though they make the issue of choice central to their cause, no one denies a woman the choice of whether or not to become pregnant. It is only *after* she is already pregnant, that her choice to *destroy* another life is challenged. Next they say that abortion reduces child abuse, but certainly doctors are aware that abortion tears preborn babies apart without anesthesia — the ultimate child abuse.

Then the Pro-Choice activists proclaim that doctors have a duty to perform 'safe' abortions to prevent women from seeking 'unsafe' abortions. But where does society demand that police help felons safely rob banks? And what do they mean by safe? Less than 100 women a year (still an unacceptable number) died from illegal abortions in the United States before 1973. Now, that abortion is legal, they still die from 'safe' abortions (the exact numbers are not being recorded), and 1,500,000 preborn babies also die. Is this the work of a healing profession? Why can't we expand services to women with unexpected pregnancies to provide mother and child the emotional and physical help to survive to term?

Activists claim that polls show a majority of women in the United States want abortion-on-demand. They ignore the Gallup poll of July 1989 showing that 68% did not want abortion-on-demand. But regardless of polls, taking an innocent life is murder. And there is no question that life is present from the moment of conception. In a recent court case over the ownership of *frozen embryos*, the judge ruled that the scientific evidence was

irrefutable that life begins at conception. Because of a misplaced sense of kindness, physicians have allowed themselves to become accomplices to murder.

Pro-Choicers dwell on the issue of rape and incest, though very few abortions fall into this category. Even in those cases, society does not demand the death penalty for rapists. Why kill one of the victims? How can an additional act of violence against both mother and child absolve the horrible crime of rape?

Some physicians with a misplaced sense of kindness apparently believe that abortion and euthanasia are a social good, because they reduce the number of 'unwanted people', requiring financial assistance. Are they aware that the United States and many Western nations have already slipped into negative population growth, because their birth rates are below replacement levels? Do they know that the rate of social security tax required to keep the system financially sound in the next century will become prohibitive, as this nation ages? Do they realize there will be a **glut** of physicians (since medical schools expanded to meet an expected surge of population) now that abortionists have killed off an entire generation (22,000,000) of their patients? Now plans are underway to legalize euthanasia. It is only one small step to genocide.

How was it possible to deceive the medical profession twice in one century? First of all, we must recognize that our greatest attribute, our compassion toward suffering humanity, is also our greatest weakness. Physicians, as a group, are vulnerable to deception by people who present an evil as a good to help others. We need to learn discernment, and we can start by observing the Pro-Choice activists on TV. Look at their hardened faces; listen to their strident voices as they demand their 'rights'; read their obscene placards (many of them unprintable); be aware of the other radical activists who support them; watch as they go into churches, where they commit blasphemy and sacrilege, and then ask yourselves; do you want to be an indentured servant of **this** group? Do you want your profession to be allied to **their** cause?

For when they speak of 'choice', they are referring only to themselves, not to the unborn or to you. While demanding their 'right to kill', they deny the first amendment rights of free speech or freedom of conscience and religion for others. These activists, assisted by the ACLU, filed a fraudulent FICO suit (later dropped) against Judie Brown, publisher of a Pro-Life magazine, for conspiracy to interfere with their business (they finally admit abortion is a business). A similar suit is pending against Conrad Wojnar, because he gave a Christian burial to 5000 corpses of aborted babies, found in dumpsters behind abortion mills in Chicago. These actions should not surprise us. After all, Roe vs. Wade itself was a fraudulent case, based on the lie that the plaintiff had been raped; also the woman named in Doe vs. Bolton has asked that her case be opened and the decision reversed, because she was used by the abortion advocates. Just remember, they have chosen the medical profession to act as executioners for them, in order to give a semblance of respectability to their evil deeds. It is only a matter of time until they try to force our compliance through the courts.

In the book, *Doctors of Infamy: The Story of the Nazi Medical Crimes*, Dr. Andrew Ivy, the American scientific consultant to the prosecution at Nurnberg, said that he believed the death factories for genocide would never have occurred, if the medical profession had taken a strong stand against the killing before the war. We must heed this advice without delay. The time has come to stop the killing. Our salvation may lie in the Hippocratic Oath — an oath which preserved the integrity of the medical profession for centuries.

We are asking all physicians in the country to renew or take their Hippocratic Oath and to **live by it**. Through our individual integrity, we can stand together against the evil that threatens us, our patients, our profession and our country. **Physicians, let us heal ourselves, before our name becomes an everlasting disgrace upon the face of the earth.**

— Sally Holm-Linlor, M.D., FACP
Fortuna, CA