



PROVITA

The University Faculty for Life Newsletter

Vol. 10, No. 2

Summer/Fall 2022

Table of Contents

Letter from the President	1
Member News & Publications.....	2
Upcoming scholarly opportunities.....	2
On Campus	2
Legal Realities	3
A Scholar's Analysis	4
Reminders.....	7
Masthead	8
Web Resources for Research and Education	8

Letter from the President

Hello Everybody,

Planning for our 2023 conference is under way. The conference will be held on the first weekend of June at the beautiful St. Paul campus of the [University of St. Thomas](#), MN. You can find photos of the campus [here](#). Although in a residential area, the campus is only about 15 minutes by car from MSP airport, great hotels, and the amazing [Mall of America](#) with U.S.A.'s largest indoor amusement park. Dorm accommodations will be available by early registration in January. More information on these dorms will be forthcoming.

I am pleased to announce that the recipient of our 2023 Rupert & Timothy Smith Award is Richard Fehring, Ph.D., RN, FAAN. Dr. Fehring is a

professor emeritus and director of the Institute for Natural Family Planning. He is one of the prime developers of the evidence-based and highly effective Marquette Method of natural family planning. Some of his publications are available on the [Marquette server](#).

The conference will start at 1 pm on Friday June 2nd and end after the banquet on Saturday, June 3rd. The overarching theme is *Post Roe: Policy Considerations*. In addition to papers researching issues at the beginning and end of life, papers dealing with the legal, moral, medical, social, economic, and religious principles useful for framing prolife policies are most welcome.

Abstracts for papers are due Jan. 22, 2023 for priority consideration, but early submissions would also be most welcomed by our conference coordinator, Dr. Barbara Freres at bjfreres@strictch.edu.

Finally, this upcoming election is one in which the stakes are very high for prenatal children as one political party is prioritizing their killing and even characterizing that killing as a right. So please vote.

Thank you for all that you do for life,

Mary

R. Mary Hayden Lemmons, Ph.D., President of UFFL, Associate Professor of Philosophy, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN

Member News & Publications

In which we highlight the activities of our organization, members, and chapters, including publications, talks, and consultations.

*Note: all names in **bold** are members of UFFL.*

- **Helen M. Alvaré, J.D.** (Law, George Mason Law) was interviewed for *Morning Edition* on National Public Radio for a segment on “Rolling Back Abortion Rights was Central to Conservatives. What’s the Focus Now?” June 27, 2022.
- **Prof. Alvaré** also published “Families, Schools, and Religious Freedom” with the Liberty & Law Center, Research Paper 22-05 (May 2022).
- **Fr. Thomas Berg, Ph.D.** (Theology, St. Joseph’s Seminary) published, with Timothy Lock, *Choosing Forgiveness: Unleash the Power of God’s Grace*. Huntington, IN: *Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division*, 2022.
- **Gerard V. Bradley, J.D.** (Law, University of Notre Dame Law School) published “Death and Resurrection of the Establishment Clause” with the Liberty & Law Center, Research Paper 22-06 (May 2022).
- **John Crosby, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, Franciscan University of Steubenville) published “Reflections on Patrick McNamara, Religion, Neuro-Science, and the Self: a New Personalism” in *Religion, Brain & Behavior* (2022).
- **Christopher Kaczor, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, Loyola Marymount University) published “Thomas Aquinas on Gratitude to God” in *Religions*, 13.8 (July 2022).
- **R. Mary Hayden Lemmons, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, University of St. Thomas MN) reviewed Anthony Flood’s *The Metaphysical Foundations of Love: Aquinas on Participation, Unity, and Union* for the

American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly, 95.4 (2021): 745-48.

- **Melissa Moschella, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, Catholic University of America) published “Sexual Ethics, Practical Reason, and the Magisterium: A Response to Irene Alexander” in *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly*, 22.1 (Spring 2022).
- **Lucia Silecchia, J.D.** (Law, Catholic University of America) published “In the Post-Dobbs Era, Universities Must Step Up to Support Pregnant Students” in the Opinion section of *Newsweek*, August 23, 2022.

Upcoming scholarly opportunities

- The [University Faculty for Life](#) will host its thirty-third annual meeting from June 2 -3, 2023 at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, MN. The theme of the conference is “After Roe: Expertise in Public Policy.” The deadline for priority consideration of proposals is Jan. 22, 2023.
- The Catholic Medical Association will host its [Medical Resident and Student Boot Camp](#) from June 11 – 18, 2023.
- The [American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists](#) will host its [2023 conference](#), in person and virtually, from February 10 – 12 in Tucson, AZ.

On Campus

- The twenty-fourth annual [Cardinal O’Connor Conference on Life](#) will take place on Jan. 21, 2023 at Georgetown University. The keynote speaker will be Jeanne Mancini, the President

of the March for Life Education and Defense Fund.

- Applications for the [Rev. Thomas King, SJ Award](#), given to recognize and reward outstanding collegiate pro-life groups, are due by 11:59 pm, EST, on January 13, 2023.

Legal Realities

Richard S. Myers, J.D. (Professor of Law at Ave Maria School of Law, UFFL Vice-President) provides a brief overview of significant legal developments since the last issue of ProVita.

In [Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization](#) (June 24, 2022), the United States Supreme Court overruled *Roe v. Wade* (1973) and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* (1992). *Dobbs* is a momentous victory for the pro-life movement. *Dobbs* does not, of course, end the battle over abortion. But the pro-life movement now has the freedom to help protect the unborn that *Roe* and *Casey* barred for decades.

In *Roe*, [the Court created a constitutional right to abortion](#). Under *Roe*, the right to abortion was virtually unlimited. States had some ability to regulate abortion but precious little freedom to prohibit abortion at any stage during pregnancy. *Roe* was challenged on many fronts from the beginning and efforts were made to overrule the decision. It appeared that might happen in the late 1980s and early 1990s, but in *Casey* (1992) the Court reaffirmed the constitutional right to abortion. *Casey* brought a new test--the undue burden test--to evaluate laws restricting abortion. But under this test, states still had very little freedom to prohibit abortion.

There was of course a broad political and social movement to challenge the abortion license. With changes to the Supreme Court, particularly President Trump's three appointments of Justices Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett, prospects for a change improved.

In 2018, Mississippi passed the Gestational Age Act, which prohibits most abortions after fifteen weeks. Because the Act was inconsistent with the legal framework established by *Roe* and *Casey*,

lower courts predictably enjoined the Act. After Justice Amy Coney Barrett replaced Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, the United States Supreme Court, on May 17, 2021, agreed to hear the *Dobbs* case. The Court heard oral argument on December 1, 2021. By most accounts, the oral arguments went well for the state of Mississippi and it seemed likely that the Court would uphold the constitutionality of the Mississippi statute. It was far less clear that the Court would overrule *Roe* and *Casey*.

In early May 2022, a Politico report revealed a draft opinion overruling *Roe* and *Casey*. The draft opinion, written by Justice Alito, was joined by Justices Thomas, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett. Not quite two months later, the *Dobbs* opinion was released. The opinion reflected the same line-up as the leaked draft. Five Justices, Alito, Thomas, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett, voted to overrule *Roe* and *Casey* and upheld the constitutionality of the Mississippi law. Chief Justice Roberts concurred, although he did not vote to overrule *Roe* and *Casey*. Justices Breyer, Kagan, and Sotomayor joined in a dissenting opinion.

Justice Alito's opinion is masterful, as Michael Stokes Paulsen explains [here](#). Justice Alito focused much attention on whether there is a fundamental constitutional right to an abortion. He noted that the Constitution doesn't mention abortion. He admitted that the Court has protected unenumerated rights in certain instances. Justice Alito, though, emphasized that that should only happen when the right not mentioned is deeply rooted in the Nation's history and tradition. Justice Alito extensively documented that the right to an abortion doesn't qualify under this approach. Moreover, Justice Alito's opinion rejected the Court's more expansive approach to identifying fundamental rights, which it has used in certain cases. He thought a more expansive approach was not appropriate in the context of abortion, which involves destroying what the Court has described as "potential life." As a result, he concluded, states may regulate abortion for a host of legitimate reasons, including "respect for and preservation of prenatal life at all stages of development."

Justice Alito also rejected the view that *Roe* and *Casey* ought to survive because of *stare decisis*. He explained in detail why *Roe* and *Casey* ought not to be upheld. He stated: "Roe was egregiously wrong from the start. Its reasoning is exceptionally

weak, and the decision has had damaging consequences. And far from bringing about a national settlement of the abortion issue, Roe and Casey have enflamed debate and deepened division. It is time to heed the Constitution and return the issue of abortion to the people's elected representatives....That is what the Constitution and the rule of law demand.”

Dobbs will have enormous impact. The decision does not ban abortion and doesn't require states to ban abortion, and the Court did not resolve the issue of fetal personhood. Justice Alito noted that his “opinion is not based on any view about if and when prenatal life is entitled to any of the rights enjoyed after birth.” But because the Court rejected the view that there is a fundamental federal right to abortion, states now have wide freedom to protect the unborn. The debate about abortion will assuredly continue but that debate will not be distorted by the Court declaring winners and losers in advance.

The abortion debate will now largely move to the democratic process. [Federal legislation to protect abortion is a concern, although such efforts have been defeated thus far.](#) States will largely control the debate and we will likely see a great divergence among the states. Some states, such as California and New York, will allow liberal access to abortion. Other states, such as Mississippi and Oklahoma, will limit abortion significantly. In the short period of time since Dobbs, we have already seen many challenges to these pro-life laws. [The courts have diverged significantly thus far.](#) Georgia's heartbeat law, which bans abortions after about six weeks, was upheld by the 11th Circuit. Other courts have blocked pro-life laws, such as a recent decision blocking Kentucky's pro-life law. This is to be expected in the aftermath of such a watershed decision. In the end, federal courts will likely uphold the constitutionality of most pro-life laws.

State constitutional law will likely have an important role to play. Some states protect access to abortion through their state constitutions. We have already seen litigation on these issues in [Florida](#), and [Michigan](#), for example.

Thinking about the legal situation with respect to assisted suicide is instructive. After the Court rejected the view that there is a fundamental federal constitutional right to assisted suicide, in *Washington v. Glucksberg* in 1997, the debate about assisted suicide has continued. But the debate has

not been controlled by the Court's intervention. As a result, we have seen an ebb and flow on the issue. There has been increasing legalization in the 25 years since the Court rejected the view that there is a fundamental right to assisted suicide. But those opposed to assisted suicide have had a full and fair opportunity to participate in the debate. And the Court's exercise in humility in *Glucksberg* has seemed to influence state courts, which have seemed disinclined to constitutionalize this area of the law.

An interesting case to watch is the [assisted suicide case that is now pending before the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court](#). The plaintiffs have argued that there is a fundamental right to assisted suicide under the state constitution. The case was argued in March 2022 and some observers thought the Justices seemed inclined to support the right to assisted suicide. After the Dobbs decision, the Massachusetts court asked for supplemental briefing on the potential impact of Dobbs. Perhaps the state court will be influenced by Justice Alito's emphasis on history and tradition and on his example of judicial restraint. A decision is expected this Fall.

A Scholar's Analysis

Christopher Kaczor, Ph.D. (Professor of Philosophy at Loyola Marymount University at Los Angeles, Consultor to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops) engages recent scholarship on life issues. A version of this essay appears in the [National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly](#).

In his essay, “The Roman Catholic Church and the Repugnant Conclusion” David Shaw asks us to imagine Earth-C, an Earth-Catholic in which not only is everyone Catholic, but also official Catholic forms social policy and law across the entire globe.¹ “Earth-C is a thought experiment designed to illustrate the consequences of global rule according

¹ David Shaw, “The Roman Catholic Church and the Repugnant Conclusion.” *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* 13.1 (2016): 11-14.

to classical Church doctrine.”² Shaw writes, “This editorial uses the thought experiment of a world ruled according to Catholic doctrine to suggest that the global implementation of such policies would lead to a planet that resembles that of Derek Parfit’s (1987) *Repugnant Conclusion*, where there are tens of billions of people with lives that are barely worth living.”³ In Shaw’s view, Earth-Catholic is dystopian nightmare.

On Earth-Catholic, Shaw writes, “Women cannot access contraception or abortion, meaning that their reproductive autonomy is limited and that there are many more unwanted pregnancies as well as deaths from complications of pregnancy and from childbirth.”⁴ In fact on Earth Catholic, the number of unwanted pregnancies would radically diminish. A large proportion of all the unwanted pregnancies result from sex outside of marriage, such as adultery, rape, and premarital sex. All these practices, since they contradict Catholic doctrine, would be greatly discouraged on a Catholic earth.⁵ There would also be fewer unwanted pregnancies for married couples as well, since according to Catholic teaching, married couples should together decide the number and spacing of their children.⁶ Multiple studies indicate that the use of fertility awareness methods, natural family planning when used as recommended is a highly effective way of limiting family size.⁷

² Shaw, “The Roman Catholic Church and the *Repugnant Conclusion*.” p.13.

³ Shaw, “The Roman Catholic Church and the *Repugnant Conclusion*.” p.11.

⁴ Shaw, “The Roman Catholic Church and the *Repugnant Conclusion*.” p.11.

⁵ Whether discouragement of these practice is legal or merely social on Earth Catholic remains an open question. Shaw seems unfamiliar with the teaching of Thomas Aquinas (and the Catholic Church more broadly) that not all practices that are immoral should also be made illegal. So, earth Catholic might legally permit premarital sex and adultery (while socially condemning them) while at the same time legally forbidding rape. See, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I-II, 96, art.2.

⁶ *Catechism of the Catholic Church* 2368.

⁷ As with all forms of birth regulation, there is a gap between perfect use and typical use. See, Rachel Peragallo Urrutia and Chelsea B Polis, “Fertility Awareness Based Methods for Pregnancy Prevention.” *British Medical Journal* 366 (2019): 14245. Sensiplan double check and the Marquette method are highly effective not only in perfect use but also typical use.

Catholic doctors and hospitals already work for minimize as much as possible the dangers of pregnancy. In the very rare case in which indirect abortion is necessary to save the life of the mother, such as removal of a gravid cancerous uterus, the death of the unborn is accepted a side-effect of the legitimate lifesaving action for the mother. Since abortion increases the likelihood of ectopic pregnancy,⁸ those who follow pro-life teaching lower their likelihood of ectopic pregnancy, the leading cause of maternal death in the first trimester in the United States.⁹

Moreover, on truly Catholic earth, reproductive autonomy would not be limited. “Autonomy” is a self-given law. On Earth-Catholic, women and men form their consciences properly so that they seek *as their own ideal* to live in accordance with God’s revelation as understood by the Church. Such women and men are disgusted by abortion and would never intentionally kill their prenatal sons or daughters under any circumstances. Likewise, such people have no desire to use contraception but seek to be open to life in their marriages in part because they view children as the supreme gift of marriage.

Shaw writes, “Of course, on Earth-C, there is no declaration of human rights, only the Holy Declaration of God’s Truth upon which all laws are based.”¹⁰ In fact, many scholars hold that the very idea of human rights was first proposed by a Dominican bishop Bartolomé de las Casas (1484-1566) well before John Locke (1632–1704).¹¹ The distinguished Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain

⁸ J. Debnath, S. K. Gulati, A. Mathur, R. Gupta, N. Kumar, S. Arora, and R. B. Krishna. “Ectopic Pregnancy in the Era of Medical Abortion: Are We Ready for It? Spectrum of Sonographic Findings and Our Experience in a Tertiary Care Service Hospital of India.” *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of India* 63, no. 6 (2013): 388–93. Lawani, O. L., O. B. Anozie, and P. O. Ezeonu. “Ectopic Pregnancy: A Life-Threatening Gynecological Emergency.” *International Journal of Women’s Health* 5 (2013): 515–21.

⁹ Josie L. Tenore, “Ectopic Pregnancy.” *American Family Physician* 61, no. 4 (2000): 1080–88, p. 1080.

¹⁰ Shaw, “The Roman Catholic Church and the *Repugnant Conclusion*.” p.12.

¹¹ See Paolo G. Carozza, “From Conquest to Constitutions: Retrieving a Latin American Tradition of the Idea of Human Rights” *Human Rights Quarterly* 25.2 (2003): 281–313.

helped shape and promote the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights.¹² Popes before and after the U.N. Declaration, including Leo XIII, Pius XI, Pius XII, St. John XXIII, St. Paul VI, St. John Paul II, Benedict XVI, and Pope Francis have all endorsed human rights.¹³ When Shaw asserts that on Earth-C, there is no declaration of human rights, he shows his ignorance of this long Catholic tradition.

In fact, it is Shaw, not the Catholic Church, who denies human rights to an entire class of human beings, namely to prenatal human beings. His critique simply assumes without justification that it is morally and legally permissible to kill one class of human beings in order to potentially aid some other class of human beings.¹⁴ It is Shaw who denies human rights for all human beings, not the Catholic Church.

For Shaw, the biggest problem with Earth-Catholic is its soaring population. He writes, “Despite the illegal status of sex outside marriage, pregnancy and birth rates have soared under the Catholic regime, to the extent that the world population is already twenty billion and continuing to rise quickly. ... Would God prefer a world made up of one hundred billion sad people or ten billion happy ones?”¹⁵ Is this a fair critique?

Shaw is not the first person to predict that more people will lead to massive starvation. In 1968, Paul Ehrlich's best seller *The Population Bomb* proclaimed that “The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970s the world will undergo famines--hundreds of millions of people will starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now. At this late date nothing can prevent a substantial increase in world death rate”¹⁶ This prediction was spectacularly wrong. What actually happened in the five decades that followed the publication of

¹² See William Sweet, “Jacques Maritain and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights” *Christianity and Global Law*. New York: Routledge, 2020.

¹³ See, Jodok Troy, “The Papal Human Rights Discourse: The Difference Pope Francis Makes.” *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 41 no. 1, 2019, p. 66-90. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/hrq.2019.0003.

¹⁴ For a critique, see Robert P. George, “Embryo Ethics” *Dadalus* (Winter 2008) p.23-35

¹⁵ Shaw, “The Roman Catholic Church and the Repugnant Conclusion.” p.12.

¹⁶ Paul R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1968) 12.

Ehrlich’s book was an epidemic of obesity in much of the world and the percentage of extremely poor people falling to its lowest levels in history. Marian L. Tupy points out, “Between 1968 and 2017, the world’s population increased by 113 percent from 3.55 billion to 7.55 billion. Over the same time period, the average global food supply per person per day rose from 2,334 calories to 2,962 – a 27 percent increase.”¹⁷ In the poorest parts of the world, human beings have made enormous progress eradicating hunger. Tupy writes, “Even in sub-Saharan Africa, the world’s poorest region, food supply per person per day rose from 1,852 in 1961 to 2,449 in 2017—a 32 percent increase. According to one report ‘There is a silent epidemic sweeping through Africa and it’s worse than HIV. Out of the 20 fastest rising countries with obesity, nearly half of them are in Africa. The health burden on the continent is rising.’”¹⁸

Ehrlich’s prediction failed in part because people do not simply consume food, people also produce food. Today, with technological advancement, people can produce more food on less land than ever before. Marian L. Tupy and Gale Pooley point out, “Over this 40-year period, personal food abundance increased by 335.2 percent, while global food abundance increased by 665.1 percent. Since the population increased by 75.8 percent, every one percent increase in population corresponded with a 4.42 percent increase in personal food abundance and an 8.77 percent increase in global food abundance. It’s as if more people are creating exponentially more food to share with the rest of us.”¹⁹ So, contra Ehrlich and contra Shaw, billions more people do not necessarily lead to massive starvation and misery.

But let’s assume the premise that a higher population will, eventually, lead to problems in feeding the population. In a world populated by only faithful Catholics, there would be a good number of people who would forgo marriage entirely. Indeed,

¹⁷ Marian L. Tupy, “The Battle to Feed Humanity Has Been Won” <https://www.humanprogress.org/the-battle-to-feed-all-of-humanity-is-over-humanity-has-won/> February 13, 2020.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Marian L. Tupy and Gale Pooley, “Paul Ehrlich Ignores Abundance Again” October 15, 2021 <https://www.humanprogress.org/paul-ehrllich-ignores-abundance-again/>

in such a world, a vocation to the priesthood or religious life would be highly esteemed, so the number and percentage of people living in this way would almost certainly be much higher than it currently is.

Of course, other Catholics would marry and have children. How many children would they have? The number would vary from couple to couple. According to Catholic teaching, there is no particular number of children a couple should have. Each couple is called to make a prudent and generous decision about family size taking into account all the relevant factors. Indeed, the decision of a couple to have a child, like all decisions governed by practical wisdom, cannot be made outside the context of the concrete particularities of the situation. One important consideration is the resources available. So, if the population began to outstrip the resources of the community, then faithful Catholic couples would take this factor into account in determining the number of children that they have. In Earth Catholic, well before the resources were stretched to the absolute limit, well before everyone was just barely alive, Catholic couples exercising their practical wisdom would decide to limit their family size due to the diminishing resources available for their family and the human community.

Shaw's misrepresentation of Catholic teaching continues, "the Church regards the 'pro-life' position as being an imperative to maximize quantity, rather than quality of life—the very problem posed by the Repugnant Conclusion."²⁰ Shaw cites no evidence that the Church seeks to maximize the quantity of human beings on planet earth for a good reason. There is no such teaching. If the Church sought to maximum reproduction, then why would the Church ask priests and sisters not to marry and have children? If the Church sought to maximum reproduction, then why forbid polygamy? Polygamous societies are able to reproduce much more rapidly because, on average, women in polygamous societies marry and have children at younger ages in comparison to women in monogamous societies. If the Church sought to maximum reproduction, then why would the Church forbid divorce in the case of infertility of a spouse? If the Church sought to maximum reproduction, then

²⁰ Shaw, "The Roman Catholic Church and the Repugnant Conclusion." p.13.

why would the Church allow couples to use natural family planning and fertility awareness methods to avoid having children? If the Church sought to maximum reproduction, it would encourage premarital sex as early as possible, adulterous affairs as much as possible, as well as rape and incest, since these sexual unions can and do result in pregnancies. In fact, the Church condemns all these actions as mortal sins. Only someone ignorant of basic Catholic teachings could assert that the Church has an imperative to maximize the quantity of human beings on planet earth.

It is true, as Shaw implies, that the Catholic Church does not care for the quality of life of people? Perhaps Shaw could name an institution that educates more people than the Catholic Church does worldwide. Or an institution that cares for more homeless people, or helps more immigrants, or cares for more who are imprisoned.²¹ On Earth-Catholic, everyone would love their neighbor as themselves. Everyone would use their money and their power to serve the common good. Everyone would see Jesus in whoever is hungry, whoever is thirsty, whoever is ill (Matthew 25:40). Does that earth really sound like a hellish dystopia?²²

Christopher Kaczor
Loyola Marymount University

Reminders

- **Lifetime membership** UFFL offers Lifetime Membership. Five hundred dollars will enable you to support our mission more easily throughout your golden years. More details are posted on our [website](#).
- **2022 Dues Reminder** We will begin collecting dues for 2023 in January. Please be sure to pay your 2022 dues before the end of

²¹ See, Christopher Kaczor, *The Seven Big Myths about the Catholic Church* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press) Chapter 2.

²² An earlier version of this essay appeared in the National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly.

the year. Annual dues are \$40. On-line payment is possible through PayPal and our website, as well as by mailing them to **Dr. Margaret Hughes**, University Faculty for Life, Thomas Aquinas College, 231 Main Street, Northfield, MA 01360. Dues are important for receiving the print copies of our peer reviewed *Life and Learning*.

- **2021 *Life and Learning*** was mailed to members this summer. We hope the 2022 edition will be prepared and mailed to members later this fall.
- **Keep your email address updated**
Updates can be made by contacting **Dr. Margaret Hughes** at provita.editor@gmail.com. Updated email addresses enable one to receive our *ProVita* electronic newsletter as well as important messages about UFFL.
- **Social Media** UFFL is on Facebook and LinkedIn. On Facebook, you can “like” the “University Faculty for Life” page. Our blog can be found at www.uffl.org/blog/. There is also an active “University Faculty for Life” subgroup of the “Pro-life Professionals” group on LinkedIn.

Please begin to think about items for next issue, which will come out in the fall. We need:

- Notices of member’s publications, presentations and other activities,
- Calls for papers and notices of upcoming conferences.
- Citations of relevant significant research in any discipline, whether from a pro-life perspective, neutral, or the opposing perspective.
- Useful online and print resources.
- Reviews of promising prolife publications.

Please submit all contributions for the Winter 2023 issue by January 10th. Any contributions should be sent to provita.editor@gmail.com.

Masthead

Publisher **University Faculty for Life**
Editor **Margaret I. Hughes, Ph.D.**
Columnists **Richard Myers, J.D.; Christopher Kaczor, Ph.D.**
Web Support **Stephen Feher of the Ridgefield Group**

Pro Vita is the quarterly online newsletter of the **University Faculty for Life**. Its purpose is to promote research, dialogue and publication by faculty who respect the value of human life from inception to natural death, especially focusing on abortion, euthanasia, and infanticide. More information about UFFL can be found on our web site at uffl.org. Editorial correspondence can be sent to the editor at provita.editor@gmail.com.

Web Resources for Research and Education

Life and Learning
The Journal of the University Faculty for Life

UFFL Blog

Member web pages and blogs Please forward any other member’s web pages to provita.editor@gmail.com .	
Beckwith, Francis	Lemmons, Rose Mary Hayden
Bachiochi, Erika	Smith, Janet E.
Colosi, Peter	Irving, Diane
Koloze, Jeff	
Online Resources	
Bad Cripple Blog: A Resource for Pro-lifers	A blog written by William Peace, Ph.D., who advocates for the rights of the disabled.
Before Roe v. Wade: Voices that Shaped the Abortion Debate Before the Supreme Court's Ruling (2d edition, 2012)	“In this ground-breaking book, Linda Greenhouse, a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist who covered the Supreme Court for 30 years for The New York Times, and Reva Siegel, a renowned professor at Yale Law School, collect documents illustrating cultural, political, and legal forces that helped shape the Supreme Court’s decision and the meanings it would come to have over time.”
Culture of Life Foundation	Complex moral issues made simple
Global Health and Human Rights Database	“The Global Health and Human Rights Database is a free online database of law from around the world relating to health and human rights. Developed by Lawyers Collective and the O’Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law at Georgetown University, in collaboration with a worldwide network of civil society partners, the database offers an interactive, searchable, and fully indexed website of case law, national constitutions and international instruments.”
Human Life International Truth and Charity	“The <i>Truth and Charity Forum</i> is an online publication of Human Life International (HLI), dedicated exclusively to the sacredness and gift of all human life, the mission and vocation of the family, and the right to live in accord with our Catholic faith.”
Life Issues	Updated daily with articles to provide “clear thinking about crucial issues.”
Mirror of Justice	A blog dedicated to the development of Catholic legal theory.
National Museum of Health and Medicine, Human Developmental Anatomy Collection, Stage 1a	From the Carnegie Stages of Human Embryonic Development.
Social Science Research Network (SSRN)	SSRN (the Social Science Research Network). “Our vision was (and still is) to enable scholars to share and distribute their research worldwide, long before their papers work their way through the multi-year journal refereeing and publication process.”
USCCB Human Life and	United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Dignity web page	
Witherspoon Institute Public Discourse	Public Discourse is an online publication of the Witherspoon Institute that seeks to enhance the public understanding of the moral foundations of free societies by making the scholarship of the fellows and affiliated scholars of the Institute available and accessible to a general audience.
World Expert Consortium for Abortion Research and Education	International research collaboration, Scientific information dissemination, Professional education, Consultation, Expert testimony, Program evaluation, Grant writing
Journals and Online Publications	
Charlotte Lozier Institute (Susan B. Anthony List)	The education and research arm of the Susan B. Anthony List
Ethika Politika	Ethika Politika is a publication of the Center for Morality in Public Life. Its purpose is to put the search for wisdom at the service of good practical decisions, and to engage contemporary ethical and cultural issues from an elevated yet common sense perspective.
Human Life Review	
Linacre Quarterly	Journal of the Catholic Medical Association.
Post-Abortion Review	“Documents abortion's injustice and harm to women”
Organizations	
Americans United for Life	
Bioethics defense fund	Bioethics Defense Fund (BDF) is a public-interest law firm whose mission is to advocate for the human right to life via litigation, legislation and public education. BDF provides legal expertise and public education on the issues of healthcare rights of conscience, abortion and its impact on women, human cloning/destructive human embryo research, and end of life issues including physician-assisted suicide and healthcare rationing.
Catholic Medical Association	
Center for Bioethics and Human Dignity	“The Center for Bioethics & Human Dignity explores the nexus of biomedicine, biotechnology, and our common humanity. Within a Judeo-Christian Hippocratic framework, we anticipate, interpret, and engage the pressing bioethical issues of our day. As a center of rigorous research, theological and conceptual analysis, charitable critique, and thoughtful engagement, we bring clarity to the complex issues of our day.”

Feminists for Life	
Healing the Culture	Promotes the Life Principles of UFFL co-founder Robert J. Spitzer, SJ.
The International Center on Law, Life, Faith and Family (ICOLF)	“The International Center on Law, Life, Faith and Family (ICOLF) was established with a view to producing, compiling and providing a broad range of resources and materials for a number of interested parties working on “Law, life, faith and family” issues on the national, regional and international levels.”
National Catholic Bioethics Center	Publishes the <i>National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly</i>
Prolife Center at the University of St. Thomas	Founded and headed by UFFL member Teresa Collett to defend the sanctity of human life by training law students and lawyers, by assisting government officials in drafting, passing and defending prolife laws, and developing the necessary legal scholarship necessary to create a culture of life.
Society of Catholic Social Scientists	
Women Deserve Better	
News	
Bioedge	LifeNews.com
National Right to Life News	LifeSiteNews