

one regarded their interview as an appalling intrusion into their lives.

R. MACG. AITKEN,

The Surgery,  
Church Street,  
Spalding,  
Lincs.

#### REFERENCE

McCarthy, M. (1975). *Journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners*, 25, 286-92.

#### THE TEAM

Sir,

The article, in the October *Journal* was amusing to read at first and it gave the impression of being a satire of other such vague articles you have published. It was only after study that it became obvious that it was meant to be taken seriously.

Eight pages of your *Journal* were used. Without loss of useful information it could have been condensed into a single page.

Venn diagrams and logic flow patterns are given, in this and other articles, a great deal of space, yet it is plain that the authors have studied logic little and modern mathematics not at all. They had better keep to words.

It is true that the whole field is in its infancy and some contribution may be better than one, but could we have more facts and fewer redundant words?

P. J. DOLLIS

Francesca,  
Old Hall Lane,  
Whitwell,  
Worksop.

Sir,

I would like to congratulate you on the article *The Team* by Drs Lamberts and Riphagen which was quite outstanding and in the very highest tradition of organisation. It was a pleasure to read it.

R. M. RIDSDILL SMITH

Thornhills,  
732 London Road,  
Larkfield,  
Kent. ME20 6BG.

#### REFERENCE

Lamberts, H. & Riphagen, F. E. (1975). *Journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners*, 25, 795-52.

#### ABORTION

Sir,

I am writing to express grave disquiet over the contents of the Marie Stopes Memorial Lecture entitled *The Compulsory Pregnancy Lobby—Then and Now*. This is a disgraceful piece of

journalise, unworthy for publication in a journal of any academic standing. It is a blatant piece of propaganda containing partial and inaccurate material much of which is highly emotive. Some of it is so misleading and the rebuse of the truth is to be justly described as malicious. Much of it will certainly be most offensive to Catholic doctors.

An article of this nature advocating unrestricted abortion as a method of birth control, is grossly at variance with the declared objects of the College, and the best aspiration of general practice. It is enough to cause one to doubt whether the College supports those parts of the Hippocratic Oath and the General Declaration 1948, which express an undertaking "not to aid a woman to procure an abortion", and "maintain the utmost respect for human life from the time of conception even under threat".

Can it be true that the College is prepared to compromise the precious trust that she has received from the past. Where does she stand?

J. BEATSON-HIRD

39 Weoley Hill,  
Birmingham, 29.

Sir,

In her article on *The compulsory pregnancy lobby* (October *Journal*) Mrs Madeleine Simms confuses the issue, no doubt deliberately, between contraception and abortion. She also is less than fair to the attitude of the Anglican Church in quoting from the report of the Lambeth Conference of 1930.

The current attitude of the Anglican Church on these subjects was stated in unequivocal terms in the report of the Lambeth Conference of 1958. On contraception, Resolution 115 states:

"The Conference believes that the responsibility for deciding upon the number and frequency of children has been laid by God upon the consciences of parents everywhere: that this planning, in such ways as are mutually acceptable to husband and wife in Christian conscience, is a right and important factor in Christian family life and should be the result of positive choice before God. Such responsible parenthood, built on obedience to all the duties of marriage, requires a wise stewardship of the resources and abilities of the family as well as a thoughtful consideration of the varying population needs and problems of society and the claims of future generations."

On the subject of abortion, the report of the committee studying *The Family in Contemporary Society* states:

"In the strongest terms, Christians reject the practice of induced abortion, or infanticide, which involves the killing of a life already conceived . . . save at the dictate of strict and undeniable medical necessity . . . The sacredness of life is, in Christian eyes, an absolute which should not be violated."