PHACT

Physicians' Ad Hoc Coalition for Truth

FOUNDING MEMBERS

Hon. Tom A. Coburn, M.D. Family Practitioner, Obstetrician Member, U.S. House of Representatives (OX-2)

Nancy Romer, M.D.
Fellow, American College of
Obstetricians & Gynecologists
Clinical Professor, Ob/Gyn
Wright State University
Chairman, Dept. of Ob/Gyn,
Miami Valley Hospital, OH

Pamela Smith, M.D.
Director of Medical Education
Dept. of Ob/Oyn
Mt. Sinal Medical Center,
Chicago, IL.
Member, Association of
Professors of Ob/Oyn

James Jones, M.D.
Professor/Chair, Ob/Oyn
New York Medical College
Chair, Ob/Oyn
St. Vincent's Hospital &
Medical Center, NYC

Curtis R. Cook, M.D. Maternal Fetal Medicine Butterworth Hospital Michigan State College of Human Medicine

Joseph L. DeCook, M.D. Fellow, American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists

William Statter, M.D.
Clinical Associate Professor,
Obstetrics & Gynecology
Wright State University, OH

Denis Cavanagh, M.D. Professor, Ob/Gyn University of South Florida College of Medicine, Tampa FACOO

1150 South Washington Street Suite 230 Alexandria, VA 22314 (703) 683-5004

Communications Counsel: Gene Tame, Michelle Powers January 29, 1997

Fredric D. Frigoletto, Jr. M.D.

President of the Executive Board

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

Dear Dr. Frigoletto:

We write to you on behalf of the hundreds of doctors nationwide who are members of the Physicians' Ad hoc Coalition for Truth (PHACT). PHACT was formed to address expertly one issue: partial-birth abortion. While the coalition includes physicians from all medical specialties, the vast majority of its members are obstetricians and gynecologists. Of these, a sizeable number are also Fellows of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG).

With this in mind, we are writing to express our surprise and concern over a recent statement issued by ACOG, dated January 12, 1997, on the subject of partial—birth abortion. Surprise, because those of us who are fellows were never informed that ACOG was even investigating this subject, with the goal of issuing a public statement, presumably on behalf of us and the others within ACOG's membership. And concern, because the statement that was issued, by endorsing a practice for which no recognized research data exist, would seem to be violating ACOG's own standards.

Let us address the latter concern -- content -- first

The statement correctly notes at the outset that the procedure in question is not recognized in the medical literature. The same, it should be noted, can be said of the name you have chosen to call it -- "Intact Dilatation and Extraction," or "Intact D&X" -- and all the other names proponents of this procedure have concocted for it. We have closely followed the issue of partial-birth abortion -again, it is the only issue PHACT addresses -- and the term Intact Dilatation and Extraction is new to us and would appear to be unique to you. The late Dr. James McMahon, until his death a leading provider of partial-birth abortions, called them "Intact Dilation and Evacuation (Intact D&E)" while another provider, Dr. Martin Haskell of Ohio, calls them "Dilation and Extraction (D&X)." Planned Parenthood, for example, calls them D&X abortions, while the National Abortion Federation prefers Intact D&E, so there is no agreement, even among proponents of this procedure, as to what to call it. Indeed, in its January, 1996 newsletter, ACOG then referred to it as "intact dialation (sic) and evacuation." Your new coinage would seem to be a combination of these various "names" floating about, but to what end is not clear. What is clear is that none of these terms, including your own "Intact D&X" can be found in any of the standard medical textbooks or databases.

It is wrong to say, as your statement does, that descriptions, at least the description in last year's Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, are "vague" and "could be interpreted to include elements of many recognized" medical techniques. The description in the federal legislation is very precise as to what is being proscribed and is based on Dr. Haskell's own descriptions. Moreover, the legislation is so worded as to clearly distinguish the procedure being banned from recognized obstetric techniques, and recognized abortion techniques, such as D&E, which would be unaffected by the proposed ban.

By far, however, the most disturbing part of ACOG's statement is the assertion that "An intact D&X, however, may be the best or most appropriate procedure in a particular circumstance to save the life or preserve the health of the mother."

On what possible basis does ACOG make this rather astounding assertion?

Many of our members hold teaching positions or head departments of obstetrics and gynecology or perinatology at universities and medical centers. To our knowledge there are no published peer-reviewed safety data regarding the procedure in question. It is not taught as a formally recognized medical procedure. We can think of no data that could possibly support such an assertion. If ACOG or its "select panel" has such data, we would, as teachers and practicing ob/gyns, certainly like to review it.

The best that your statement does to back this claim is the very vague assertion that "other data show that second trimester transvaginal instrumental abortion is a safe procedure." While this may be true, it is, as surely you must be aware, totally beside the point. Such data may exist regarding, e.g., second trimester D&E abortion, but this is irrelevant to the fact that no similar data, at least to our knowledge, exists with respect to partial-birth abortion (or, as you prefer, "intact D&X" or whatever other medical-sounding coinage supporters of this procedure may use). To include such an assertion that can only refer to second trimester abortion procedures other than partial-birth is deceptive and misleading at best.

ACOG clearly recognizes that in no circumstances is partial-birth abortion the only option for women. In other words, ACOG agrees that there are other, medically recognized, and standard procedures available to women other than partial-birth abortion. Given ACOG's acceptance of this medical fact, your claim that a totally unrecognized, non-standard procedure, for which no peer-reviewed data exist, can nonetheless be the safest and most appropriate in certain situations, simply defies understanding.

If ACOG is truly committed to standing by this claim, then it would appear to be violating its own standards by recommending the use of a procedure for which no peer-reviewed studies or safety data exist.

In contrast, our research of the subject leads us to conclude that there are no obstetrical situations that would necessitate or even favor the medically unrecognized partial—birth abortion procedure as the safest or most appropriate option. Indeed, we have concerns that this procedure may itself pose serious health risks for women.

Ordinarily, we would agree that the intervention of legislative bodies into medical decision making is usually inappropriate. However, when the medical decision making itself is inappropriate, and may be putting women at risk by subjecting them to medically unrecognized procedures, then the intervention of a legislative body, such as the U.S. Congress, may be the only way to protect mothers and infants threatened by the partial-birth abortion procedure.

In addition to these concerns over the content of the statement, we are also concerned as to the procedure by which it came to be issued.

As mentioned, the vast majority of PHACT members are specialists and sub-specialists (i.e. perinatologists) in obstetrics and gynecology, and many of these are also fellows of ACOG. After them, our membership consists largely of family practitioners and pediatricians. Former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop, perhaps the nation's leading pediatric surgeon, has been associated with PHACT and his public statements on partial-birth abortion are in agreement with PHACT. Our membership is open to any doctor, regardless of his or her political views on the larger question of abortion rights, precisely because our focus is strictly on the medical realities that relate to this procedure. (In fact, doctors who are pro-choice have publicly stated their opposition, on medical grounds, to the use of this abortion method).

We cannot recall receiving any notification whatsoever that the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists was even reviewing the issue of partial-birth abortion toward the end of issuing a statement of policy. We cannot recall ever being informed that ACOG was going to convene a "select panel" to accomplish this. We find it unusual that PHACT, a coalition of doctors formed for no other reason than to investigate medical claims made about partial-birth abortion, was not invited to participate in these deliberations. Those of us who are fellows of ACOG were kept completely in the dark as to what ACOG's leadership was doing in regard to this issue.

In truth, this statement is the product of a panel — whose membership ACOG has not made public — that was working behind closed doors and with no real participation from ACOG's membership itself. In crafting this statement, ACOG simply ignored its own members. There is the danger that in issuing this statement, ACOG is giving the larger public the impression that the statement somehow represents the thinking of its members on this subject. It does not. ACOG members had no knowledge of this statement until it was issued as a fait accompli.

In conclusion, this statement clearly does not represent a consensus among the nation's obstetricians and gynecologists as to the safety or appropriateness, under any circumstances, of the partial-birth abortion method. We ask you to provide the medical data, research and all other relevant materials which could possibly have led to such an assertion. We ask that you also make available the names of those on the select panel who arrived at such a conclusion. We would also ask that the leadership of ACOG officially withdraw this statement until the matter at issue — partial-birth abortion — has been subject to a thorough and open discussion among the members of ACOG and those doctors in related specialties who have significant knowledge regarding this issue. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely:

Denis Cavanagh, M.D.
Professor of Ob/Gyn
Director, Division of Ob/Gyn
University of South Florida
College of Medicine

Curtis Cook, M.D.

Maternal-Fetal Medicine

Michigan State College

of Human Medicine

FACOG

Joseph DeCook, M.D. (108km) R

Ob/Gyn FACOG

FACOG

Don Gambrell Jr., M.D. M.D.

Clincal Prof. of Endocronology

and Ob/Gyn

Medical College of Georgia,

Augusta

V. President, South Atlantic Assoc.

of Ob/Gyns FACOG

Hans E. Geisler, M.D.

Gyn Oncology and Gyn Surgery

Clinical Staff, Dept. of Ob/Gyn

Indiana University Medical Center

FACOG

Nancy Romer, M.D.
Clinical Prof., Ob/Gyn
Wright State University
Chairman, Dept. of Ob/Gyn
Miami Valley Hospital, OH

FACOG

Pamela Smith, M.D.

Director of Medical Education

Dept. of Ob/Gyn, Mt. Sinai

Medical Center, Chicago

Member, Assoc. of Professors of

Ob/Gyn FACOG William Statter, M.D.

Clinical Assoc. Prof., Ob/Gyn Wright State University

FACOG

Stephen H. Cruikshank, M.D.

Nicholas J. Thompson Professor and Chairman Deptartment of Obstetrics and Gynecology

Wright State University, OH

CC: Vicki L. Seltzer, M.D.

George Wilbanks, M.D.

Philip N. Eskew, Jr. M.D.

John Gibbons, M.D.

John Boyce, M.D.

John Choate, M.D.

Jan Schneider, M.D.

Dale L. Taylor, M.D.

James W. Gell, M.D.

Lance A. Talmadge, M.D.

Dennis J. Lutz, M.D.

Daniel A. Chester, M.D.

Thomas F. Purdon, M.D.

William J. Peters, M.D.

Vivian M. Dickerson, M.D.

W. Gordon Peacock, M.D.

John D. Nash, Capt, MC USN

Nathana L. Lurvey, M.D.

Sarah S. Brown, MPH

American Medical Association (AMA) Task Force on "Intact Dilatation and Extraction" [Partial-Birth] Abortion