

5-1-1955

The Refusal of Blood Transfusions by Jehovah's Witnesses (Parts III and IV)

John C. Ford

Follow this and additional works at: <https://epublications.marquette.edu/lmq>

 Part of the [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ford, John C. (1955) "The Refusal of Blood Transfusions by Jehovah's Witnesses (Parts III and IV)," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 22 : No. 2 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://epublications.marquette.edu/lmq/vol22/iss2/1>

The Refusal of Blood Transfusions by Jehovah's Witnesses

(Continued from February 1955 LINACRE QUARTERLY)

JOHN C. FORD, S.J.

III. LEGAL LIABILITY

WHEN physicians or hospital authorities have undertaken the care of a Jehovah's Witness, or the child of a Witness, embarrassing legal dilemmas may arise. Particularly trying are those cases in which the Witness refuses for self or child a transfusion which is judged to be imperatively needed to prevent imminent death.

A series of hypotheses can be imagined. One can inquire about criminal or civil liability or both; about the case of the adult or the case of the child; about the case where the transfusion is given or where it is omitted; about the case where there has been an explicit agreement not to give a transfusion, or the case where no such agreement exists; about the case where the patient survives and resents the transfusion, or the case where he dies because the transfusion was omitted, or even where he dies as a result of a surgical accident connected with the transfusion itself. By combining these suppositions in various ways, and including cases where the surviving relatives take civil action or attempt criminal complaints, one can imagine a large number of hypothetical legal problems. A fur-

ther twist could be introduced by supposing that the doctor himself is a Jehovah's Witness, who by his advice abets the patient in his refusal of a transfusion, or, especially, abets the parent who refuses it for a young child.

It is not my intention or my province to try to solve all the labyrinthine ins-and-outs of these problems. The attempt would be unduly speculative anyway, seeing that precedents in the form of actually decided cases are hard to find. I mention the possibilities in order to illustrate the multiplicity of the legal problems that could conceivably arise. My present purpose is merely to recall some generally admitted legal principles which are apropos, and to make some general suggestions, leaving it to the individual physician or hospital to get professional advice when faced with an actual dilemma.

A recent article has reviewed the state of the law on "Criminal Liability in Faith Healing."¹¹ This interesting essay deals not only with faith-healing cases strictly so-called, but also with cases involv-

¹¹ C. C. Cawley in 39 *Minnesota Law Review*, 48-74 (Dec. 1954)

ing Christian Scientists and Jehovah's Witnesses. Although it does not touch on the specific problems of physicians' liability, some of its conclusions are instructive for our purposes, especially where children are made to suffer for their parents' beliefs.

One of the principles now established is that a *parent* who fails to provide necessary medical care for his child can be held criminally liable. "Since the turn of the century, then, it has been well established that a parent commits a misdemeanor when, due to religious belief, he denies his sick child the medical aid required by statute, and that, if the child consequently dies, the parent is liable for manslaughter."¹² Faith-healing defendants appeal in vain to the religious freedom clauses of the First Amendment. The Supreme Court of the United States in the famous Mormon polygamy case stated: "Laws are made for the government of actions, and while they cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices. Suppose one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice?"¹³

It is anomalous that in the

¹² *Loc. cit.*, p. 57, citing three leading cases: For England, *Reg. v. Senior*, 1 Q.B. Div. 283, 19 Cox C.C. 219 (1899). For Canada, *Reg. v. Lewis*, 6 Ont. L. Rep. 132, 1 B.R.C. 732 (1903). For the United States, *People vs. Pierson*, 176 N.Y. 201, 68 N.E. 243 (1903).

¹³ *Reynolds vs. United States*, 98 U.S. 145 (1878).

United States the pastor or religious leader who abets a parent in the criminal neglect of the child is apparently not held liable. "It is clear," says Cawley, "that in Canada, criminal liability attaches to the pastor or other adult who actively counsels a parent against furnishing his child with necessary medical care. . . . I submit that here is the glaring anomaly in our law that the parent who denies a child medical aid is punished, while the pastor who counsels that denial goes free."¹⁴

It would not be legitimate to infer, however, that a physician would be equally free from criminal liability. Once he has undertaken the care of the child he has affirmative duties in its regard, and for him to advise and abet parents in their neglect of necessary care would put him in a position very different legally, it seems to me, from that of the pastor.

It must be confessed, however, that as far as giving or omitting a blood transfusion is concerned, the physician seems to be caught in a conflict of legal obligations. He is obliged not to undertake a surgical procedure, even if he judges it necessary, without the parents' consent. This rule is so clearly established that it needs no elaboration. On the other hand, is he not obliged to give a blood transfusion which is desperately needed, when the parents who refuse to provide it are guilty of criminal neglect? But then, in doing so, he is really taking it upon himself to decide two questions which in a given case, or in a given jurisdiction,

¹⁴ *Loc. cit.*, p. 72 and p. 74.

might be open to dispute: the question of fact: "Is this transfusion absolutely necessary?" and the question of law: "Is this transfusion part of the reasonable medical care which the law requires parents (and others) to provide?" And finally, as mentioned above, he would be violating the well-established rule that to operate without consent is to be guilty of assault and battery.

In this dilemma it would seem that the physician's only complete legal security is in a court order empowering him to go ahead with the transfusion even against the parents' wishes. But in the absence of such an order, in a clear-cut desperate case, I should imagine that a physician would have little to fear legally from giving the transfusion. It does not seem likely that he would be made to suffer legally if he could show that the life of the child was really at stake, and that the parents' refusal of a transfusion constituted criminal neglect on their part. But conceivably it might involve him in a troublesome and expensive litigation.

It is all very well to hold the parents for manslaughter if the child dies, but is there not available some legal means of preventing the tragedy? In Chicago, in 1951, in the case of the child Cheryl Linn Labrenz, the courts found a method of circumventing the persistent refusal of the parents. A petition was filed in Family Court to the effect that the child was dependent because of lack of parental care and guardianship. The Chief Probation Officer was appointed guar-

dian with the right to consent to necessary blood transfusions. These were given and the child's life was saved. Cawley describes the appeal to the doctrine of *parens patriae* in this Illinois case, and in similar cases in Texas, Missouri, and New York.¹⁵ Sometimes, however, the legal machinery creaks and cannot be put into effect with sufficient dispatch to save the child.¹⁶

If I may be allowed to make some suggestions regarding cases involving children, I would stress the following points:

It is legally inadvisable to make any agreement or contract with a parent not to give a necessary blood transfusion to a child. As was stated above, in Part II, this would also be open to moral objections.

The only complete legal security for physicians and hospital authorities who would give a transfusion contrary to the parents' wishes would be in a court order. Conse-

¹⁵ *Loc. cit.*, p. 57 ff., citing: *People ex rel. Wallace v. Labrenz*, 411 Ill. 618, 104 N.E. 2nd 769 (1952); *Mitchell vs. Davis, et al*, 205 S.W. 2nd 812 (Tex. Civ. App. 1947); *Morrison vs. State*, 252 S.W. 2nd 97 (Mo. App. 1952); *in re Seiferth*, 127 N.Y.S. 2nd 63 (Children's Court, Erie County, 1954). For a discussion of this last case, and further references to the decided cases, see "Recent Cases" in 39 *Minnesota Law Review*, 118-122 (Dec. 1954). See also "Comment: Custody and Control of Children," 5 *Fordham Law Review*, 460 (1936). In a Washington case, where the surgery itself involved serious danger to the child, the court refused to intervene: *In re Hudson*, 13 Wash. 2nd 673, 126 P. 2nd 765 (1942).

¹⁶ Cawley, *loc. cit.*, p. 62, gives the details of the Grzyb case in Chicago, Jan. 1954.

quently those concerned should familiarize themselves with the available legal procedures in their own jurisdiction, and get legal advice ahead of time on the method of obtaining such an order as quickly as possible should the need arise.

When the case is desperate, and no order has been obtained, it would appear that there is not much to fear by way of legal liability in giving the transfusion. And considerations of charity for the neglected child may well weigh the balance in favor of transfusion. But one should get competent legal advice on each case as it occurs.

The case of the adult Witness who refuses consent for an imperatively necessary transfusion, does not cause such troublesome complications. The law seems to allow an adult to run risks with his own life which he may not take with the life of his minor child. In a Supreme Court decision we read: "The right to practice religion freely does not include liberty to expose the community or the child to communicable disease or the latter to ill health or death. . . . Parents may be free to become martyrs themselves. But it does not follow they are free, in identical circumstances, to make martyrs of their children. . . ." ¹⁷ And Cawley remarks: "Society and the courts seem to say: 'We are determined that a child shall grow up safely and in good health to maturity, and we will intervene

when his life or health is threatened by his parent's religious or other eccentricities. But having taken the trouble so to see him into manhood, why, if he thereafter chooses foolishly to endanger his own life—and does not at the same time endanger others—then we wash our hands of him.'" ¹⁸

In some jurisdictions attempted suicide is a crime, and one who aids and abets a suicide or an attempt at suicide is criminally liable. But there are no cases, apparently, to show that an adult who refuses a particular surgical procedure, considered by physicians to be necessary to prevent death, is guilty of the crime of attempted suicide. Indeed, the difference between taking affirmative action on purpose to destroy one's own life, and merely refusing to make use of a highly technical surgical means of preserving it, is a very obvious one. And it would be far-fetched indeed, to imagine that a physician who failed to transfuse could be held criminally liable on any theory of aiding and abetting attempted suicide whether his failure stemmed from sympathy with the patient's beliefs, or from the patient's refusal to permit the transfusion.

The patient's consent is required before a physician may legally perform any surgical operation. "Operation without consent is a trespass. It constitutes a technical assault and renders the operating surgeon liable." ¹⁹ And when the

adult patient who is in his right mind resolutely refuses to consent and positively forbids the operation, the physician is absolutely obliged, legally, to respect his wishes. The patient's persistence may result in his death, but I have not been able to find any authority for the statement that the physician would incur either criminal or civil liability by his failure to force a transfusion or other surgical procedure on an unwilling patient even in these extreme circumstances. ²⁰

If surgeons do not dare to transfuse a child in the face of the parents' refusal, and have to resort to the cumbersome device of a court order for legal protection, even with the child at the point of death, it seems very unlikely that they will expose themselves to legal liability by not transfusing a recalcitrant adult, who, being of right mind, positively forbids the operation. Given a case of acute appendicitis with extreme danger of death, and a patient who in his right mind resolutely refuses surgery, there is only one thing for the doctor to do: omit the surgery and take what measures he can to save the patient's life. The same thing is true of adult transfusion cases.

There does not seem to be any legal machinery by which a court order can be obtained to empower a physician to operate on an unwilling adult or by which surgical

treatment can be forced on him. In my opinion this is as it should be. The bodily integrity of an individual should enjoy a very high degree of immunity from invasion by public authority, as will be asserted below. This is especially true when conscientious convictions are at stake.

Although the physician incurs no liability by omitting the transfusion, yet he may not be in a position to prove that the consent was actually refused. If the patient dies and his survivors want to make trouble, they may be able to do so unless the physician can produce something in writing to show that consent was refused. If a physician decides to undertake the care of a patient who makes a stipulation or is likely to make a stipulation against blood transfusions, it would be wise for him to protect himself by a written, witnessed order from the patient to that effect, together with a written release from all liability in case the lack of transfusion results in harm or death to the patient. One should have professional legal advice in formulating such an agreement and release.

Should physicians and hospitals, then, simply refuse to undertake the care of a patient who rejects or is likely to reject a blood transfusion on religious grounds? Obstetrical cases offer a special difficulty since even though one acceded to the request not to transfuse the mother, it seems legally inadvisable and morally improper to make such an agreement regarding her baby. I doubt if a universal answer can be given to

¹⁷ Rutledge, J., in *Prince v. Mass* 321 U.S. 158, 167 (1944). Quotation of this passage does not indicate agreement with the decision in the case.

¹⁸ *Loc. cit.*, p. 69.

¹⁹ Louis J. Regan, *Doctor and Patient and the Law*, 2nd ed., St. Louis 1949, p. 58.

²⁰ There is a Massachusetts case in which the court held that where a patient refused to have an x-ray taken, the physician was not responsible for the consequences of the patient's own want of care. *Carey vs. Mercer*, 239 Mass. 599, 132 N.E. 353 (1921).

the question either for the obstetrical or for other cases. In some cases the future need of transfusion is so likely that it would be foolish to undertake the case and at the same time deprive oneself of an essential element for successful treatment. I doubt, however, whether a physician's reputation (or the hospital's) would suffer to any extent if a patient is lost through his own refusal of a transfusion. But it is not an easy thing to have to stand by with hands tied while one's own patient makes a martyr of himself on such flimsy grounds. On the other hand where will the thousands of Witnesses get medical care if everyone refuses to have anything to do with them? It seems to me that *acute* dilemmas are going to be sufficiently unusual and infrequent so that it would be too drastic to refuse all Witnesses because of the relatively few desperate cases likely to eventuate. Witnesses may often start by refusing. But under the pressure of imminent death many will doubtless find their native common sense triumphing over their peculiar religious indoctrination.

IV. PUBLIC POLICY

It is obvious from the foregoing that general questions of State power arise whenever there is a conflict or an apparent conflict between what the individual's conscience may demand of him, and what the public good or the rights of other individuals may require. These are the questions of "public policy" referred to here. The general question of Church and State and religious freedom is too

large for our discussion. I intend to speak of public policy only in relation to blood transfusions and closely related matters.

My reason for discussing this aspect of the matter at all is that I consider it important to defend and support the view that it is good public policy to concede to the State the power to give a necessary blood transfusion to a child against the sincere but erroneous religious convictions of the parent and that it is bad public policy to concede to the State the right to force an adult to take this means of staying alive against his own sincere religious convictions.

It would be considerably easier to determine these questions of public policy if we lived in a society in which the great mass of the citizens were all in agreement as to the requirements of the natural moral law and of the positive laws of God. For in such a case there would at least be no conflict between the laws of the State and the objective law of God. But even in such a society one would still have to contend with the individual erroneous conscience. One would still have to uphold the right of the individual to follow such a conscience when he sincerely believed that not to do so would be a sin offending God. And in practical cases one would still have the task of determining when a religious practice based on an erroneous idea of the will of God was so harmful to the common good or so contrary to the rights of other individuals that it had to be restrained.

In the society we live in there

is no such general agreement as to the requirements of the objective moral law. Catholics believe that from reason and revelation they are in possession of those moral truths by which we are expected to conform ourselves to the will of God. And this belief is based partially on the more fundamental one that the Catholic Church was founded by Christ, who is the Son of God, and that this Church has power to teach authoritatively in matters of faith and morals. Obviously these beliefs are not shared by the majority of our citizens. It might seem at first sight therefore, a rather hopeless task to try to formulate a statement of public policy which would be consistent with Catholic teaching, acceptable to the mass of citizens and capable of being put into practical effect.

But the situation is not as bad as it seems. We have a common heritage of Judeo-Christian thought which still pervades many of our political institutions and much of our national thinking. There would be quite general agreement, in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, that the State should be allowed to interfere with the individual liberty as little as possible. And very few would object to the doctrine that the State must be empowered to protect the lives of its citizens, especially young children, against fantastic religious aberrations. It is not impossible, when people agree on general principles such as these, to achieve a considerable measure of agreement on practical problems of public concern as to the life and health of the people. On the great

majority of such problems we can hope to arrive at practical norms agreeable to the mass of the citizens and not at variance with the objective moral law. Exceptions should be of infrequent occurrence.

It is the task of moralists and lawmakers, then, to try to draw a practical line which will delimit the powers of the State and the rights of the individual—a line which will protect against religious fanaticism and at the same time do justice to natural law principles and to sincere religious convictions whether erroneous or not.

At the outset, in drawing this line, two mistakes at opposite extremes are to be avoided. The first exaggerates State power. The second exaggerates individual liberty.

State power is exaggerated when one subscribes to the proposition that any interference by the State can be justified as long as the majority opinion approves. To make public policy a mere function of the will of the majority reduces it in the last analysis to some form of the doctrine that might makes right. Such thinking was utterly foreign to the founding fathers of the American republic. But it has found some modern adherents both on the philosophical and practical level. They reduce law to the organized force of the majority that stands behind it. They use the words "undemocratic" and "divisive" to describe those who dissent from majority views.

Democracy does not mean that

the majority is *right*. Majority rule is a practical way of making a republic work. If it were true that mere force of numbers made the difference between right and wrong, good and bad, then mere force would be controlling. Might would make right. But if anything is clear in the fundamental political thought of our country, it is the idea that minorities have a right to exist and to propagate their ideas. It was a minority that thought slavery wrong and finally abolished it. Right and wrong are not determined by a show of hands. They are determined by a show of minds.

Now one may take the viewpoint of the practical statesman, that in our system the holders of minority views must be protected (within limits) whether they are right or wrong, and that it is hard to say which is which. Or one may take the viewpoint of the Catholic moralist who claims to know what is right and demands protection for the minority view when it is right, and for the erroneous conscience (again within limits) when it is wrong. But in both cases the principle of individual liberty is safeguarded against invasion by mere majority might. In both cases it is possible to arrive at practical formulations largely agreeable to both viewpoints.

The mistake at the opposite extreme is to imagine that any practice, no matter how immoral, or ridiculous, or dangerous must be tolerated in the interests of individual liberty if it is based on sincere religious belief. The ex-

ample of human sacrifices mentioned above in Reynolds vs. the United States speaks for itself.

One may assert further, with varying degrees of assurance, that the State can and ought to prevent the Hindu widow from casting herself on her husband's funeral pyre; or the Japanese officer from committing *hara-kiri*; or anyone at all from committing suicide; or the Mormon from practicing polygamy; or the evangelical fanatic from exposing others to snakebite; or the Christian Scientist from neglecting ordinary medical care for a dangerously sick child; or a Hindu from going about unvaccinated in an epidemic because he has religious scruples about using cows to produce vaccine, or a Church congregation from conducting services when a quarantine has been imposed to safeguard the public health.

But it is to be noted of all these examples that the justification of State interference is based on urgent considerations of the public good, or the imperative need to protect some individual person's right to life and health. The principle that the State should interfere as little as possible with individual liberty, especially where bodily integrity is involved, and most of all where conscience is affronted, is acceptable to most legislators and, I am sure, to all Catholic philosophers. Only strong, clear reasons of the common good, or the clear necessity of protecting the rights of others, especially defenseless children, can justify State intervention in such cases. Catholics, being themselves a minority group, are espe-

cially jealous of their rights in this regard and especially loath to concede to the State a power of intervention which might be turned against them.

What then of public policy where the conscientious refusal of blood transfusions is concerned? Having put the problem in its philosophical setting, where should that practical line be drawn to delimit State power and protect individual liberty in this field? My opinion and the reasons for it can now be briefly recapitulated.

The State should not be empowered to force a transfusion on an adult Witness who is in his right mind and who, because of his religious convictions, refuses it. First, because this would be an unwarranted invasion of his rights of conscience. The State cannot show that interference with individual liberty in such a case is justified. There is involved here no urgent need of protecting the common good, no pressing necessity of protecting the rights of others.

Secondly, for the Witness, given his frame of mind, the use of a blood transfusion is an extraordinary means of preserving life to which he is not objectively obliged by the moral law. This was the tentative opinion defended in Part II, above. The State should certainly not be empowered to force an individual to make use of a surgical procedure to save his own life, when the moral law itself does not oblige him, in the circumstances, to do so. If the moral law leaves him free to risk his life to that extent,

the State should leave him free also.

Thirdly, if one takes the other view and considers that a transfusion is an ordinary means even for a conscientious objector, one should still deny the right of the State to intervene. The State is not competent to enforce every aspect of the moral law. The line between ordinary and extraordinary means of self-preservation is finely drawn and hard to determine. Can we allow the State, in the absence of urgent considerations of public good or the rights of others, to become the moral arbiter, with power to encroach upon the bodily integrity of the citizen? Has anyone ever thought that the State could force a man to undergo surgery for appendicitis, because he was in danger of death without it? Furthermore, in the transfusion case, there is also at stake the right of conscience.

Someone may object: If the State has the power to make attempted suicide a crime and to prevent a person from committing suicide, then, *a pari*, it should have the power of forcing a transfusion on an unwilling, conscientious objector. For to refuse the transfusion is the equivalent of committing suicide. In our opinion there is no adequate parity between the two cases. The person who commits suicide violates a negative precept of the law of God: "Thou shalt not kill." The moral situation of one who fails to take affirmative measures to keep himself alive is quite different, especially when the measures concerned are artificial, surgical procedures. It is not inconceivable

that there should exist a legal tradition of obligatory self-preservation, a tradition which would impose the affirmative legal duty of taking certain minimum measures to stay alive—for instance to take food and drink. But I find it hard to conceive a theory of jurisprudence in which the State would be empowered to impose on me an affirmative legal duty to make use of highly developed surgical techniques in order to prolong my earthly existence. To kill oneself is one thing. Not to avail oneself of surgery is quite another.

Finally, in the case of the child, I believe the State is justified in intervening and giving a necessary transfusion, even if the parents object on religious grounds. First, because the child has a certain, objective right to life and to ordinary medical care to preserve life, no matter what its parents' mistaken beliefs may be. Secondly, where there is a clear-cut case of necessity, to save an innocent person from impending death, the State can intervene even at the

expense of the erroneous conscience. Thirdly, no one objects to the power of the State to supply for the neglect of the parents in other, lesser matters. If the parents are cruel or sufficiently negligent of health, education or morals, the State, for the good of the child, can remove it from the custody of the parents for extended or indefinite periods. *A fortiori* it should be empowered to save the child's life by seeing that it receives a necessary transfusion.

This rather long inquiry into the scriptural, moral, legal and public policy aspects of the transfusion case is justified, I hope, by the importance of the problems it raises. Not the least among them is the very human one of dealing with the stubborn sincerity of the Witness. I suggest patience, when their intransigence becomes irritating, and still more patience when their mistaken zeal attacks the Church of Christ. Our hospitals and physicians can show them by example that the charity of Christ is all-embracing.