



LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY

Center for Christian Bioethics

UPDATE

June 2013

The Jack Provonsha Bioethics Lecture Opens LLU School of Medicine Alumni Convention

On Friday, March 1, the Jack W. Provonsha Lecture opened the Alumni Postgraduate Convention. This year's lecture, titled "Medical Ethics & the Faith Factor," was given by Dr. Robert Orr, former Director of Clinical Ethics at the Loma Linda University Medical Center and former Clinical Co-Director of the Center for Christian Bioethics.

Dr. Orr began by defining the relevant terms for his lecture, "ethics" and "bioethics," and then distinguishing between "medical ethics" and "clinical ethics." He then gave a brief history of medical ethics, discussed the significance of contemporary medical ethics, outlined relevant principles of ethics and principles of faith for medicine, and then presented a few hypothetical clinical ethics cases. Orr concluded the lecture with two points: 1) Many ethical dilemmas at the bedside arise because of varying religious beliefs; 2) The religious beliefs of patients should almost always be honored, even when we disagree.

Orr's lecture suitably complements his book, *Medical Ethics and the Faith Factor: A Handbook for Clergy and Health-Care Professionals*. It is a textbook assigned to third-year medical students at Loma Linda University.

Will You Be a Provider or a Professional?

Robert D. Orr, MD, CM

On the first day of medical school, students in the Loma Linda University School of Medicine read a physician's oath and receive their white coat, at what is called a White Coat Ceremony. The following was the address given by Dr. Orr to the medical students in the class of 2016.

Fifty years ago this month I was in your shoes, entering medical school with a modest amount of apprehension, not knowing what the short-term or long-term future had in store. We had no White Coat Ceremony. This event originated in 1993 as a resurrection of the ancient practice of administering a professional oath to those who were just beginning the study of medicine. But I do recall that as we began our study in 1962 we were told that things would change. I'm not going to talk about changes that might happen in the future. I want to talk with you about some things that are unchanging.

Some say that you will learn in the next four years to be a provider who will develop contractual relationships with consumers. And after your training you will get a job where you can pursue a market share in the business of medicine. Call me a dinosaur, but I still think that you will become a professional who will develop a covenantal relationship with your patients. And after graduation you will follow a vocation where you will develop a practice in the profession of medicine. Let's look at some of the differences in these perspectives, these words.

A provider is a person or thing that provides whatever, such as a family provider; a provider of goods (e.g., a vendor of manufactured

goods); a provider of services (e.g., an Internet provider). There is nothing wrong about doing these things. But that is the point: it is about DOING.

A professional is about BEING. It's about taking on a mantle (like a white coat!). It's about becoming a person who professes something. The term was coined by Scribonius in 47AD when he defined it as a person who is committed to compassion, benevolence, and clemency in the relief of suffering; he emphasized humanitarian values. Over the centuries, professionalism has been attributed to theology, medicine and the law. The definitional aspects of a profession include the mastery of expert knowledge (vs a skill), acceptance of fiduciary responsibilities, and self-regulation.

Unfortunately, modern usage calls anything a profession if it is done for money. Professional athletes. Professional entertainers. I even saw an advertisement recently for a company selling swimming pools, who said their salespersons were professionals who followed high ethical standards. A professional salesman! Is that an oxymoron, or what?

Insurance companies say doctors have a contractual relationship with consumers. A contract is a binding agreement between two parties who are equal before the law. And there certainly are some aspects of a contract in-

volved in the patient-physician relationship. The definition of a professional, however, calls for a fiduciary relationship, a term that is less familiar. It is a relationship between unequals such that the person with more knowledge, authority or power has an obligation to seek the best interests of the other. It is a relationship of trust. The patient must be able to trust the doctor. The depositor must be able to trust the banker. The client must be able to trust the attorney.

Professionals in Covenant Relations

I prefer to think of my relationship with my patients as a (trusting) fiduciary relationship. Even more, I like to think of it as a covenantal relationship. It is a promise. "I promise to always seek your best interests, rather than my own." Some doctors are, unfortunately, more focused on their research project, their income, or their free time. But I promise; I promise to seek your best interests. I promise to be a person of virtue.

Several years ago, Edmund Pellegrino (a Catholic physician and scholar) and David Thomasma (a Catholic philosopher) wrote a book entitled *The Virtues in Medical Practice*. It included chapters on fidelity to trust, compassion, phronesis (practical wisdom), justice, fortitude, temperance, integrity and self-effacement. Not a bad aspiration for you, for all of us in the practice of medicine. A bit later they wrote a follow-up entitled *The Christian Virtues in Medical Practice* with chapters on faith, hope and charity.

Sir William Osler, the consummate bedside clinician, professor at McGill (my alma mater), and one of the four founders of the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine over 100 years ago, wrote, "The practice of medicine is an art; a calling, not a business; a calling in which your heart will be exercised equally with your head; a calling which extracts from you at every turn self-sacrifice, devotion, love and tenderness to your fellow man." He used an important word three times in this short quote: a calling. Medicine is a calling, ie. a vocation.

From the Director— One Generation to the Next

The Center for Christian Bioethics is proud that two individuals, prominent in their fields, share personal statements of conviction. Robert Orr, a clinical ethicist, invites medical students to join in a lifetime of professing their commitment to medicine as a moral enterprise. Marianne Thieme, leader of a parliamentary party, calls all who understand themselves to be responsible, to enlist in a moral crusade to save the environment by respecting the creatures within it. Both leaders are concerned with the ethical importance of health and how to achieve it.

Some of those most likely to respond to the appeals of Orr and Thieme are students. The Center for Christian Bioethics devotes considerable attention to education, and specifically sustains and benefits from Loma Linda University's growing number of graduate students in Bioethics. The 26 M.A. candidates overall include 22 enrolled in programs that will provide them with both the Bioethics M.A. and doctorates in Dentistry, Medicine, or Pharmacy. The students receive credit for attending weekly Bioethics Case Conferences, Bioethics Grand Rounds, lectures, and Roundtables presented by the Cen-

ter through the school year. The Center's Thompson Library, the most extensive library west of the Rockies, provides convenience resources to the bioethics students.

The Center also interacts with students pursuing Loma Linda University's one-year M.A. in Bioethics. One in particular, came to the program last year from Yale University. Upon completing her coursework for the M.A in Bioethics, Alice Kong accepted the position of Coordinator of the Center for Christian Bioethics. She is involved in every aspect of the Center's activities, including assisting graduate students as well as professors embarked on writing research articles and books. She has taken special responsibility to expand the Center's online presence.

It is deeply gratifying to experience the Center as a force drawing together established voices of moral commitment and students into the community of bioethics.



Roy Branson, PhD
Director, Center for
Christian Bioethics
Loma Linda University

A job is a task to be done for a specific price. The dictionary says a vocation is (1) a strong impulse to follow a specific career; (2) a calling; or (3) a divine call to God's service. I hope you all have a strong desire to become doctors. Even more, I hope you envision this as a calling. But a vocation requires a caller and a callee. Who is the callee? That would be you. Who is the caller?

A vocation is what makes medicine more than an occupation; more than an avocation. In a vocation, the focus is on the person. If I go to an accountant, my taxes are the issue. If I go to a mechanic, my car is the issue. If I go to a barber, my hairstyle is the issue.

If I go to a physician, I am the issue. How is a vocation actualized? By taking an oath; by making a promise about future behavior. I promise: no lying, no stealing, no cheating, no tolerance for those who do...and, I promise to always seek the patient's best interests.

Professional Oaths

It is worthwhile to note the difference between a code of ethics and an oath. A code of ethics is a promise made to other people, e.g., the AMA's Code of Ethics. An oath, however, is a promise made to divinity.

I have been interested in professional oaths for a long time. In 1993 I conducted a research study to learn about the practic-

es of all allopathic and osteopathic medical schools in the US and Canada. You might find it of interest that the second author was a medical student who helped me with this project. In researching the past practice of oath-taking, we found that the oath was originally taken at the beginning of medical study, but that oath-taking was not common until the 20th century when they were administered at the time of graduation. In 1928, only 24% of North American medical schools administered an oath; in 1958, it was 72%; in 1977, 90%; and in our 1993 study, 98% of schools did so, using a wide variety of oaths. Several were fairly widely used, a few were unique and specific to the medical school.

Sadly, and I think significantly, our analysis found that the content of medical oaths has diminished over time. The Hippocratic Oath was developed 2,500 years ago, was sworn to several Greek gods, included 14 content items, and was expressed in 335 words. Only one medical school, of the 150 we surveyed, still used the classical Hippocratic Oath in 1993. A modern version was developed over 100 years ago included 165 words, 10 content items and was sworn to “that which I hold most sacred.” That wording successfully avoided Greek polytheism, but it also allowed a student to swear to his or her wallet if that is what they considered most sacred. Significant omissions included: swearing to deity, proscription of sexual contact with patients, and foreswearing abortion and euthanasia.

“A professional is about BEING. It’s about taking on a mantle (like a white coat!). It’s about becoming a person who professes something.”

My coauthors and I speculated on reasons for increased oath usage throughout the 20th century. Perhaps it represented a recognition of how important it is for phy-

sicians to make a public promise to be trustworthy. Or perhaps it is because, when we no longer agree on content, we become more concerned with process.

We also speculated on why the core values of Hippocratic medicine are being diluted. Perhaps it is because we are truly entering a “post-Hippocratic” era. Or maybe it is because specialization has made medicine less monolithic. Or more likely, in a secularized, pluralistic society it is difficult to reach agreement on content.

Physician’s Oath of Loma Linda

In 1993, the Loma Linda University School of Medicine administered the Declaration of Geneva to its graduates. After publication of this study, Dean Brian Bull recognized that LLUSM’s mission—to further the healing and teaching ministry of Jesus Christ—was unique among all medical schools in North America. I was privileged to serve on a committee of four or five individuals whom he appointed to develop the “Physician’s Oath of Loma Linda University School of Medicine,” the oath you will take this evening. The primary content items are: a sacred calling, furtherance of Jesus Christ’s healing, the wholeness of the patient, stewardship, the utmost respect of human life, confidentiality, purity and honor.

I believe it is significant that this oath is being administered to you in a church building rather than an academic auditorium. In front of this church is a statue depicting the Good Samaritan. In Luke chapter three, we read that the Good Samaritan saw the wounded man and took pity on him; he cleaned and bandaged his wounds, he provided transportation, he even paid for further care, and he promised to follow-up. We are not going to ask you to drive the ambulance or pay for your patient’s further care, but the rest fits pretty well with our mission.

But my favorite model of Jesus healing ministry is his interaction with the widow of Nain and her dead son, recorded in Luke, chapter 7: “Soon afterward, Jesus went to a town called Nain, and his disciples and a large crowd went along with him. As he

approached the town gate, a dead person was being carried out—the only son of the mother, and she was a widow. And a large crowd from the town was with her. When the Lord saw her, his heart went out to her and he said, ‘Don’t cry.’ Then he went up and touched the coffin, and those carrying it stood still. He said, ‘Young man, I say to you, get up.’ The dead man sat up and began to talk, and Jesus gave him back to his mother.” What does Jesus model here? He saw the problem. He had compassion. He said words of comfort. He acted. And He provided healing.

“I would urge you to be a professional, not merely a provider; to respond to this sacred calling; to use the healing ministry of Jesus as your model; and to go and do likewise.”

In conclusion, I would urge you to be a professional, not merely a provider; to respond to this sacred calling; to use the healing ministry of Jesus as your model; and to go and do likewise.

As you swear this oath tonight, I remind you that this is not a code of ethics for providers, but a professional oath sworn to God almighty—the God of Creation, the God of History, and the God of our salvation. Amen.

“Will You Be a Provider or a Professional?” will be published in the summer 2013 issue of Ethics and Medicine (vol. 29, no. 2) and is printed here with permission.



Robert Orr, MD, CM, is the former associate director of the Center for Christian Bioethics at Loma Linda University and former director of clinical ethics at Loma Linda University Medical Center.

Animal Rights: A Call To Commitment

Marianne Thieme, LL.M

My name is Marianne Thieme and I am the founder and chair of both the Party for the Animals and its parliamentary group in the House of Representatives, the lower chamber of the parliament of Netherlands, a country of 16 million people.

I studied law at Erasmus University in Rotterdam. Even before my studies, I took a great interest in the plight of animals in our society. To my great disappointment, my law courses devoted precious little attention to the issue of animal rights.

As long as I can remember, I had a great love and admiration for nature and animals, and wanted to protect them. I became a vegetarian when I was a student. I was shocked to learn that my church sometimes blessed bullfights and hunting. I had more or less the same thought as Prince Pierre Troubetzkoy. He said: "Why should man expect his prayer for mercy to be heard by what is above him when he shows no mercy to what is under him?"

Ten years ago I learned about Seventh-day Adventists and their thoughts about vegetarianism. Because of my beliefs and my interest in animal advocacy, the Adventist Church appealed to me. Seven years ago, I became an Adventist.

Our animal rights party is a secular political party. I am in favour of strict separation of church and State. Our voters and members have all different backgrounds—atheist, humanists, Buddhists, Christian, Muslim, agnostic, young, old, liberal, socialistic, conservative—but they all share a common goal: to create a society where compassion, sustainability, personal freedom, and responsibility are the leading principles in everything people do. Neither the short-term interest of the people who are leading, nor the rights of the strongest, but rather, the interests of the weakest, should be first taken into account. Until now, animals have always been at the bottom of people's list.

The Party for the Animals Enters Parliament

On the twenty second of November, 2006, for the first time ever in the world, Dutch voters elected members of a Party for the Animals to a national parliament. With two (nearly three) seats, we achieved a victory, which has inspired animal rights advocates across the globe.

In the Netherlands, animal suffering is often hidden from view. Each year, millions of factory farmed animals are sent to slaughter after living short and miserable lives: 14 million pigs, 450 million chickens and nearly one million calves. Each year almost five million minks are killed for their fur and 600,000 animals are used in animal testing experiments.

In this context, I would like to tell you about the rise of our party and the role that we now play in the advancement of animal rights in the Netherlands.

"Today, it's becoming clear that being a vegetarian or vegan saves 50% more greenhouse gases than switching to a Prius."

Animal welfare has long been a side dish for the few traditional Dutch politicians who, according to their party's manifesto, were willing to defend it. But it is a key issue for those politicians who believe that animal welfare is high-priced nonsense. Animals, in their view, are just beings to serve people.

When our former prime minister came to power in 2002, the farmers' representatives of his coalition parties were keen to reverse all animal welfare measures from the last 20 years as swiftly as possible. All though our law says that animals are sentient beings with inherent value (that means a value apart from the value they have for

people), animals became objects once again, which were only intended to serve the appetite and the economic purposes of people.

This is why the plan to set up a Party for the Animals was hatched in late 2002. It would be a party that would initially serve to remind the parliamentary parties about their good intentions. We started with just five people and no budget.

You can imagine how people mocked us for starting a party for animals. They made fun of us; they couldn't believe their ears when they heard of our existence. What's next: a party for plants? Didn't we know that we were the laughing stock of the country and that we would never make it into parliament? But there were others—feminists, famous authors, intellectuals, opinion leaders—who saw us as the next emancipation movement. After the liberation of slaves, women, and children, the next logical step was to look beyond the interests of our own species and to seriously consider the interests of animals.

I can assure you, all of these emotions of anger, hope, disbelief, and sarcasm are very useful. It takes emotion to start a debate, to move people, to get social change. Many social movements started out being ignored, and then ridiculed, even criminalized, but, in the end, they won!

When we participated in the elections of 2003, it immediately became evident that our strategy worked. Overnight, other parties adopted animal welfare as an issue in their election programs and communications. Many other parties jumped on the bandwagon as a result of our role as a "pace rabbit in the marathon," because they realized that animal welfare was becoming an increasingly important issue for the electorate.

Political analysts said that they were convinced that we were not just a flash in the pan, or a publicity stunt that had gotten out of hand. They called our party a new political movement, which was the only exponent of the 'new politics'. At that time, and still now, people in our country are really fed up

Vegetarianism: The Interface of Science & Values

Marianne Thieme, LL.M, founder and leader of the Party for the Animals in the Netherlands, delivered the remarks, printed here, to over 300 people crowded into Damazo Amphitheater on the Loma Linda University campus, Saturday February 23, the evening before the start of the 6th International Congress on Vegetarian Nutrition. Ms. Thieme and other international speakers participating in the roundtable, Vegetarianism: The Interface of Science & Values, passionately expressed their ethical judgments concerning issues at the intersection of food, the environment, and health.

Claus Leitzmann, PhD, Director of the Institution of Nutritional Sciences at the University of Giessen in Germany, said that years of studies—historically led by Loma Linda University—have established a correlation between a plant-based diet and healthier lives. Two days later into the conference, researchers from Spain announced to the international press the results of the most extensive study to date, demonstrating the connection between vegetarian diets and reduced risk of heart disease by 30%.

with politics and don't trust any politician. A Party for the Animals attracted not only animal caring people, but also people who wanted to protest against the political establishment.

Ever since the establishment of the party, we knew for certain that we were doing something big. Animals would finally be given attention and respect; finally justice would be done to their biological natures, irrespective of their usefulness and value to humankind. I am not a great believer in terms like 'calling', but I know for sure that we were just what was called for. During the TV broadcast of the election results, to everyone's surprise the Party for the Animals scored higher than all of the other new parties combined!

Thanks to many people who invested

Sigve Tonstad, M.D., Ph.D, Associate Professor of Religion, Loma Linda University, underscored that scriptures revered by Jews and Christians understood non-humans as a part of God's creation and exemplify a perspective of healing not only humans, but the humans and non-humans of God's community. In Romans, the entire creation, including non-humans, groans in pain and hopes for healing and redemption (8:19-21).

Joan Sabate, MD, DrPh, Chair of the Department of Nutrition in the School of Public Health at Loma Linda University, acknowledged that the vegetarian diet now endorsed by scientific research, had historically been championed by communities formed by religious and moral convictions.

The remarks of the panel created a context which heightened the plausibility of Ms. Thieme's religiously motivated connection of health, the environment, a vegetarian diet, and the rights of animals.

The roundtable was organized by the School of Public Health and the Center for Christian Bioethics of Loma Linda University.

their energy and money into campaigning with us, and thanks to 2% of all voters, in November 2006, we won two seats in the Dutch House of Representatives. Since that breakthrough, we have been working hard in parliament. Our tools vary, from participating in debates with Secretaries of Government Departments, to asking parliamentary questions. We also propose measures through petitions that the parliament votes on: a ban on enriched cage systems for laying hens, budgets for alternatives to animal experiments, a budget for meat alternative innovations, stronger law enforcement on trade in wild and endangered animals, and research on the animal welfare problems of circus animals and animals in zoos.

We asked our Prime Minister about an official dinner where our Queen Beatrix

served foie gras (liver from force fed ducks and geese) to her guests. The Prime Minister apologized and said this would be a one-time mistake. It would never happen again! The former State Secretary of Environment promised our party that it would serve vegetarian food during official dinners, except when officials specifically asked otherwise. We pushed other, larger political parties to start being more animal-friendly: for example, our two socialistic parties started an initiative to ban fur farms in our country. In 2006 the two parties got the majority of the votes; since last January, there has been a ban on fur farms.

Many environmental and animal welfare organizations and lobbyists have to work hard to get their five minutes in the spotlight of politics. It's really special that we have managed to get in the door, and that we will eventually be a permanent factor (even though we would rather not be needed there).

At this moment, in addition to our two House seats, we have eight seats in regional parliaments, eight seats in parliaments for water management, two seats in the National parliament, and one seat in the Senate. We have a scientific bureau that made the documentaries Meat the Truth <www.meatthetruth.nl.en> and Sea the Truth <www.seathetruth.nl.en>. Meat the Truth, which you can watch on Youtube, premiered in London, Madrid, Fortaleza, Antwerp, Brussels, Dresden, and Hollywood, during a United Nations conference on sustainable agriculture and premiered at Union Square in New York City.

Animals Rights and the Environment

Our Party delivered a message that hadn't been heard before in politics. For example, before, if you were an environment-friendly politician, you drove a Toyota Prius. Today, it's becoming clear that being a vegetarian or vegan saves 50% more greenhouse gases than switching to a Prius. We approach world problems, as the climate changes, from a different perspective. And it works.

The Party for Animals has brought the “soft factor” into politics and are perceived by more and more people as a serious new movement that just might become bigger than a number of traditional parties. Our aims are compassion and sustainability, and we’re choosing no-regret scenarios for people, animals, nature and the environment.

It is possible for us to grow, because eight percent of voters are considering giving their vote to us and more and more people are discovering us and beginning to appreciate our efforts.

First, a lot of people thought we were just a single issue party. But they discovered that a good Party for the animals is also a good party for people. In this world dominated with crises, like the food crisis, the economical crisis, the biodiversity crisis, and climate change, people have become more and more aware that we have lived as though we have three planets to use and harvest from. People have realized that we can’t eat money, and that we have to re-value the things that really matter: clean air and water, compassion not only for our own kind but also for other living beings, sustainability, etc. Our party has a new way of thinking, different from the human-centred way of thinking. This new thinking creates a paradigm shift. It has consequences that affect how much we consume and what we consume.

Vegetarian Diet and Climate Change

A lot of people caring for this planet and all its creatures say to me, “I would like to quit eating animals but they taste so good.” There are a lot of rational arguments for why we shouldn’t use animals for food, but the one and only argument that really counts for a lot of people is an emotional one: it tastes so good. It’s exciting to know that there are new generation meat and fish alternatives. I married a man, an organic farmer of vegetables and a former hunter, who, after we got married, became a “vegetarian butcher.” He successfully developed products that taste better than chicken, veal and tuna etc. The emotional argument of taste can no longer be used as an excuse to justify killing animals. You know, I feel priv-

ileged not only to be in parliament to plead for animal rights, but also to have a husband who actually does something in order to save animals and the planet!

People are constantly searching for new forms of life on other planets. The possibility of there being water on Mars sends scientists into ecstasies, while higher forms of life on our own planet, which hardly differ from humans genetically, are neglected or given selective attention. Dogs and cats are cherished, while the more intelligent pig is debased and abused.

“just as the tobacco industry’s position of power crumbled away, so will progressive social insights into animal welfare also ensure that animals are no longer the pariahs of this planet.”

There are great inconsistencies in the way that we treat other living beings and our living environment. Imagine for one moment that we discovered beings on Mars with the same intellectual capacity as pigs. Would we then subjugate them and use them for our own ends? Would we domesticate these Martians and put them in large-scale stalls, so that we could fatten them up and kill them? What right would we have to do this? Moreover, what would this say about our level of civilization and development? Which criteria should we use to assess other possible inhabitants of the universe, and how should we determine whether or not they should be allowed to live and be autonomous?

Is it not high time to make new agreements about how living beings should be treated on our own planet? And should the old proverb ‘do unto others as they should do unto you’ not be the guiding principle for this? Homo sapiens are the only species that threaten the very survival of the Earth. Humans regard themselves as the repre-

sentative of the highest developed form of intelligence; the very top of the pyramid of civilization. However, this conveniently ignores the fact that wherever human beings go, major problems emerge.

The most crucial difference between humans and animals is their divergent levels of intelligence. Nonetheless, our intelligence and supposed higher degree of development do not usually lead to the moral awareness that we should treat other life forms with respect. When people speak of a moral revival, they seldom refer to our interactions with other species. Our intellectual framework focuses exclusively on our own species. For a long time, we have not been able or willing to think in any terms other than human interests. Initially, only a very small minority took a stand for animals.

I am convinced that we are on the threshold of a new era. Just as our interactions with each other will have to alter, our interactions with other living creatures must change. This new era will not come to pass without a struggle. The established order, which has a vested interest in exploiting animals, will use all of their powers to resist it. Yet, just as the tobacco industry’s apparently unassailable position of power, crumbled away as a result of changing social attitudes, so will progressive social insights into animal welfare also ensure that animals are no longer the pariahs of this planet.

I am proud to be part of a movement that is the exponent of this new era. The time is ripe. The social awareness of the horrors to which we expose animals is irreversible. It is high time that this abuse has real consequences. It is already almost impossible to justify the fact that it has taken us so long to become aware of animal suffering. After witnessing so much animal suffering, it is impossible to justify continuing to shut our eyes to it.



Marianne Thieme, LL.M.
*is the founding leader of the
Party for Animals in the
Dutch Parliament.*

Bioethics at the Alumni Postgraduate Convention

A roundtable Discussion, following the Jack Provonsha Lecture, was chaired by Dr. Roy Branson, Director of the Center for Christian Bioethics. Joining Dr. Branson and Dr. Orr was Dr. Gerald Winslow, the Vice President for Mission and Culture at Loma Linda University Medical Center, and Dr. David Larson, Professor of Religion in the School of Religion at Loma Linda University.

The roundtable progressed from discussions of faith in clinical and institutional settings, to considerations more broadly of religious affirmations, and finally, to biblical visions of the good. Dr. Branson announced, as part of the discussion, that an Institute for Health Policy recently opened at Loma Linda University, under the leadership of Dr. Winslow. In the same way that Christian physicians may not appear to practice very differently than their non-Christian counterparts, the Institute may not use explicitly Christian language in its policies, but its motivations and underlying religious commitments shapes its priorities.

Simulating a Bioethics Case Consultation



In the afternoon, a Bioethics Symposium, led by Dr. Steve Hardin, Associate Director of the Center for Christian Bioethics, featured the LLUMC clinical ethicists. The first hour of the symposium featured an interactive discussion, led by the clinical ethicists and Christian Johnston from Legal Council, of a number of example cases that typically arise in ethics consultations and are discussed in weekly Bioethics Case Conferences at the Medical Center.

The second hour featured a case simulation, with live actors (including Grace Oei, one of the clinical ethicists and an alumnus of the MA in Bioethics program). In the case simulation, a pregnant couple was informed late in the 3rd trimester of the wife's pregnancy, upon initially refusing genetic screening and testing by amniocentesis, that their child had Trisomy 18. The question was how to proceed, given the infant's poor prognosis. In the APC evaluations, attendees commented that the "simulation was an excellent addition" to the program.

Lunch with Judge Nsereko of the International Criminal Court



The following day, on Saturday, March 2, the Center hosted a luncheon in the Faculty Dining Room in the Medical Center with guest Daniel Nsereko, PhD, an Adventist attorney and one of the judges on the International Criminal Court at the Hague. Nsereko had been invited to speak for the APC Friday evening vesper service.

At the luncheon, Dr. Nsereko carried on a thoughtful conversation with the invited lawyers, physicians, and ethicists. Dr. Nsereko explained in detail the appeals process of the International Criminal Court. It became clear that his entire legal career, beginning with the Idi Amin years in his own country of Uganda, he has been involved in human rights and international law. When queried about crimes against humanity committed in Rwanda, he expressed anguish about the convictions of Adventist leaders perpetrating atrocities, including those against other members of their own church.

Obamacare and the Future of Loma Linda

Just after the 2012 presidential election, the Center organized events exploring ethical issues involved in Obamacare. Three weeks after Barack Obama was re-elected President, some 200 people attended a roundtable discussion in Damazo Amphitheater on the Loma Linda University Campus. "The 2012 Election Results and the Future of Loma Linda," led by Roy Branson, PhD, director of the Center for Christian Bioethics, considered the impact of Obamacare on Loma Linda University's mission. Participants included John Goodman, Chief Executive Officer of EPIC Management, Richard Rawson, Vice President for Strategic Planning for Loma Linda University Health, and Gerald Winslow, PhD, Vice President for Mission and Culture at Loma Linda University.

All of the panelists spoke favorably about Obamacare. Several said that health care that stresses prevention fits the Adventist heritage and its deep and enduring commitment to a healthy lifestyle.

A month after the roundtable, over 70 people attended a Bioethics Grand Rounds presentation by Gerald Winslow, "Medical Dollars and Moral Sense: Cost Worthy Priorities in Today's Health Care," at the Loma Linda VA Hospital.

According to Winslow, Obamacare raises the fundamental question of whether health care should be rationed or not. Winslow's Law states: The human capacity to invent new things outstrips the human capacity to pay for them." Winslow identified the increasingly high costs of health care and its role as a major driver of debt in the United States, as indicators that rationing is unavoidable.

His proposal for fair allocation is twofold. On a microallocation level, Winslow proposed that "All citizens should be considered equal and they should receive basic health care according to their needs. On a macroallocation level, Winslow proposed that "Publicly accountable decisions should be made in favor of cost-worthy care that provides the greatest benefits for the greatest number of patients."

Both events pointed to the future, with anticipation of how Obamacare will change health care in the United States. You are invited to watch the roundtable discussion including the questions and answers online at <vimeo.com/55407804>.



LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY

Center for Christian Bioethics

UPDATE

June 2013

DIRECTOR

Roy Branson

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

Steven B. Hardin

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Jon Paulien—Chair
Brian Bull—Vice Chair
Becky Bossert
Beverly Buckles
Roy Branson
Ron Carter
Garry FitzGerald
Steven B. Hardin
Richard Hart
Billy Hughes
Craig Jackson
Odette Johnson
Leroy Leggitt
Tricia Pennicock
Carolyn Thompson
Gerald Winslow
Anthony Zuccarelli

SCHOLARS

Roy Branson—Director
Mark Carr
Debra Craig
Andy Lampkin
David R. Larson
Robert Orr
Richard Rice
James W. Walters
Gerald R. Winslow

For more information, contact:

Email: bioethics@llu.edu
Website: bioethics.llu.edu
Phone: (909)558-4956
Fax: (909)558-0336

Letters to the editor
and comments may be sent to:

24760 Stewart Street, Loma Linda, California 92350

NONPROFIT ORG
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
COLLEGE PLACE WA
PERMIT NO 10

Center's Bioethics Grand Rounds: Poetry at the Bedside

On Wednesday November 21, Brenda Butka, MD, Pulmonary Program Director at Vanderbilt University Medical Center, led a unique Bioethics Grand Rounds presentation, "Half A Miracle: A Case History As Poetry."

According to Butka, the purpose of poetry is to celebrate the heroic in the ordinary, and the ordinary in the heroic. Butka shared original poems that she has written, of real-life ethics cases that she has encountered in her practice as a physician. The poetry reading demonstrated the value of the humanities and arts in understanding illness experiences and providing compassionate and holistic health care.

Butka's poems are published in a number of journals, including *The Three Penny Review*, *JAMA*, *Chest*, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *The Cortland Review*, and *Slant*.

Half a Miracle

*I thought it was a miracle, the hand of God,
reaching down to rearrange things
so when my daddy died, that doctor,
a man who spent his life watching
the image of God,
so that doctor was sitting at the counter eating breakfast
to bring my daddy back to life.*

*It was a miracle, but
what kind of miracle is this--
always needing another miracle to come along
and clean up the mess?*

...

*That was my dad, not miracle man over there.
But, you know, he still looks like daddy,
looks like he's sleeping, just
sick with bad dreams. His hand
is still warm to hold, and he's still breathing,
even if it is a little rattly.*

*Can you kill a man's already died once?
Miracle worked only part-way, and he
never wanted nothing only part-way?*

"Half A Miracle" is printed here with permission.

UPDATE ONLINE

If you would like to receive UPDATE via e-mail rather than snail mail, e-mail your first and last name to <bioethics@llu.edu>.