



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 19, 2023

Lawsuit: Doctors' Mandatory "Training" Teaches That "White Individuals Are Naturally Racist"

The program is ostensibly designed to eliminate "implicit bias." Yet it promotes a very explicit one — a real doozy, too.

In fact, [states a lawsuit](#) filed by a coalition of California doctors against their state's medical board, training now compulsory for Golden State physicians teaches that "white individuals are naturally racist."

Of course, anti-white "anti-bias" training is common today. Yet one could wonder about the above. Since "racism" is our most obsessed-upon modern "sin" (the actual Seven Deadly Sins are passé), what are the implications of saying that whites alone carry with regard to it the stain of original sin? Must they be subjected to genetic engineering to purge this defect from them?

Or must we go even further and, as the racialists say, "erase whiteness," which has become a euphemism for erasing white people?

Whatever the case, WGMD.com has the Golden State story, [writing](#):



rawpixel.com

Two California doctors and a medical advocacy group, Do No Harm, filed a joint lawsuit Aug. 1 against the state's medical board to terminate its mandatory "implicit bias training," contending that it infringes on their freedom of speech rights.

The progressive training is required for all medical professionals in the Golden State who seek to advance their education. "Implicit bias" suggests medical practitioners treat patients differently based on factors like race or sexuality, possibly leading to different health outcomes.

The lawsuit targets state legislation passed in 2019, [AB 241](#), which defines health care-linked implicit bias as subconscious "attitudes or internalized stereotypes."

Los Angeles doctors Marilyn Singleton and Azadeh Khatibi and Do No Harm say the law instead coerces medical professionals to violate their freedom of speech rights to "compel speakers to engage in discussions on subjects they prefer to remain silent about," according to the filing.

Do No Harm says the law requires physicians "to adopt an ideology that is unpersuasive nor unsupported by evidence to presume all healthcare providers are infected with implicit bias and thus treat patients differently."

"The government cannot condition a speaker's ability to offer courses for credit on the



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 19, 2023

requirement that [he] espouse the government's favored view on a controversial topic. This case seeks to vindicate those important constitutional rights," the lawsuit reads.

"The case, formally titled *Azadeh Khatibi, et al. v. Kristina Lawson* [president of California's Medical Board], et. al, was originally filed by the Pacific Legal Foundation (PLF) on behalf of Dr. Azadeh Khatibi, an ophthalmology specialist who immigrated to the United States from Iran when she was six," Just the News [adds](#).

Khatibi, who's also a continuing medical education instructor, filed the case because, among other reasons, she dislikes being compelled to discuss "implicit bias," as it is irrelevant to her course topics, states the PLF complaint.

The irony here is that while "'implicit bias' suggests medical practitioners treat patients differently based on factors like race ... leading to different health outcomes," this is precisely what they're *supposed* to do.

As the late Dr. Walter E. Williams [wrote](#) in 2013 after pointing out that diseases don't plague groups equally (e.g., black men have America's highest prostate-cancer rate), "Simply by knowing a patient's race or ethnicity, a medical practitioner can be alert to and better customize a patient's screening needs."

As for the races' "different health outcomes," while whites (average lifespan 78.9) do outlive blacks (75.3), they are *outlived* themselves by [Asian-descent Americans](#) (85.7) and Hispanics (82.2). Is this attributable to "implicit" medical-practitioner bias against whites? Or are groups' different lifestyle choices a better explanation (e.g., blacks have our country's highest obesity rate)?

The kicker is that implicit-bias training is actually counterproductive. As Do No Harm [wrote](#) in a press release, "'The implicit bias requirement promotes the inaccurate belief that white individuals are naturally racist,' said [Dr. Marilyn Singleton](#), a visiting fellow of the Do No Harm organization and California anesthesiologist who teaches continuing medical education courses in California. 'This message can be detrimental to medical professionals and their patients as it creates an atmosphere of suspicion and animosity, which goes against the fundamental principle of doing no harm.'"

Yet the problem lies with implicit-bias training itself, not just with a few of its prescriptions. In fact, [studies have shown](#) that it *does not work*, period; far from eliminating prejudice, [it strengthens it](#).

Of course, people, even [babies](#), do exhibit [in-group preference](#). People also will have prejudice, properly defined as rashly and incorrectly *pre-judging* someone, something, or some group negatively. But Original Sin doesn't plague just white people, and the concept was formulated long ago — correctly — by far wiser minds than today's flash-in-the-pan, race-oriented biological determinists.

Not only did the wiser minds define sin *in its entirety* — i.e. greed, pride, sloth, lust, gluttony, envy, and wrath (and there are sub-categories, too) — but they provided the actual remedy: virtue, cultivated via the grace of God.

You don't eliminate a negative by focusing inordinately on the negative, but by focusing on the positive that negates it. For example, you don't eliminate lust's pitfalls by fixating on lust, but by cultivating Chastity.

Likewise, you don't eliminate bigotry just by focusing on bigotry, but by cultivating Kindness, Justice, and Charity.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 19, 2023

What's more, inordinate focus on a negative as it relates to just *one* group often means that you don't want to eliminate the negative, but the *group* — if not physically, then as a factor in society.

And if you can make money in the process, all the better. Note here that the “diversity & inclusion training market was recently valued at nearly \$8 billion annually,” [related](#) *Applied* in 2019.

My, my, has racial hatred ever been so profitable?



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.