



PROVITA

The University Faculty for Life Newsletter

Vol. 9, No. 1

Spring 2021

Table of Contents

UFFL Updates1
 Letter from the President2
 Member News & Publications.....2
 Upcoming scholarly opportunities.....3
 On Campus3
 Legal Realities3
 A Scholar’s Analysis5
 Reminders.....8
 2021 Life and Learning Conference10
 Web Resources for research and education11
 Masthead16

UFFL Updates

➤ **Join us June 5th from 1:45-4:45 EDT for our Zoom conference: *Prolife Feminism, The Law, and Women’s Health.***

UFFL Keynote Talks:

- “Unmasking the Truth about Chemical Abortions,” by **Kathleen Mary Raviele, M.D.**;
- “The Rights of Women: Toward a Dignitarian Feminism” by **Erika Bachiochi, J.D.**;

- “Biopolitics, Sexuality, and Women” by **Angela Franks, Ph.D.**;
- “Half a Century of Strife: The Abortion Controversy’s Inescapable Centrality in Modern American History” by **Keith and Elizabeth Cassidy** (the 2021 Smith Award Recipients).

➤ **Free registration for the conference is available** by emailing **Fr. Joseph Koterski, S.J.** by June 3rd. For additional details please see the [conference poster](#).

➤ **In lieu of a conference presentation, submit a paper to *Life and Learning***, our fellowship’s peer reviewed, annual journal. Email a working title to the Journal’s editor, **Fr. Koterski**, by June 1st and the final paper by July 1st. Submission topics include the reproductive, spiritual, and mental health of women; historical, cultural, environmental, and economic motivations involved in choosing or not choosing to have children; prolife feminism; policies and laws supportive of pregnant women, families, and the culture of life; the rights of parents; embryo and fetal rights; rights of infants surviving abortion; disability rights of fetuses, infants, and those with brain injuries; rights to conscientious objection; abortion; infanticide; and euthanasia.

Letter from the President

Hello Everybody,

This has been a challenging year as President Biden systematically undoes Trump's prolife policies and seeks additional ways to destroy prenatal life. In response, we must redouble our efforts to bring out the truth about life in our scholarly research, publications, and classrooms. I hope that this year's conference topics and keynote speakers will inspire not only your Zoom participation but also the submission of a paper to our fellowship's peer-reviewed *Journal for Life and Learning*, edited by Fr. Koterski. S.J. Ph.D. at Fordham University. (For additional details about doing so, please see our conference poster.)

Also, this issue of *ProVita* continues our tradition of navigating the complexities of recent court cases with Prof. Myer's column *Legal Realities*, providing updates on the prolife activities and publications of our members, and delving into problematic issues with Dr. Kaczor's column *A Scholar's Analysis*. Also please consider sending us micro book reviews of about 250 words.

Thank you for all that you do for life.

Sincerely,

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.*

- **Charles Bellinger, Ph.D.** (Theology, Texas Christian University) published *Othring: The*

Original Sin of Humanity. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2020.

- **Gerard V. Bradley, J.D.** (Law, University of Notre Dame) published "Moral Constitutionalism" in *First Things: A Monthly Journal of Religion and Public Life*, no. 311 (March 2021).
- **Robert Cochran, J.D.** (Law, Pepperdine University School of Law) published "Evangelicals and secularists on abortion, Covid, and death" in *The Christian Post* on April 19, 2021.
- **Peter J. Colosi, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, Salve Regina University) wrote "Suggestion is coercion when it comes to death," which appeared in *The Newport Daily News* on March 18, 2021.
- **John Finnis, D.Phil.** (Law, University of Notre Dame) published "Abortion is Unconstitutional" in *First Things: A Monthly Journal of Religion and Public Life*, no. 312 (April 2021).
- **Christopher Kaczor, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, Loyola Marymount University) published "Faith and Reason and the Consistent Ethic of Life" in *Annales Theologici*, 34.2 (2020).
- **Dr. Kaczor** also reviewed *Reading Genesis Well: Navigating History, Poetry, Science, and Truth in Genesis 1 – 11* by C. John Collins in *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith*, 72.4 (December 2020).
- **Jeff Koloze, Ph.D.** (English, DeVry University) published "Making Abortion, Infanticide, and Euthanasia Funny: Determining Whether Five Principles of Comedy Derived from Ancient Writers Apply to Attempts at Humor by Contemporary Comedians" on *lifeissues.net*.
- **Fr. Joseph Koterski, S.J., Ph.D.** (Philosophy, Fordham) reviewed *Converts to the Real: Catholicism and the Making of Continental Philosophy* by Edward Baring in *International*

Philosophical Quarterly, 61.1 (March 2021): 129 – 131.

- **Fr. Koterski** also reviewed *Aquinas and the Metaphysics of Creation* by Gaven Kerr in *The Thomist*, 84.2 (2020): 334 – 337.
- **James Hanink, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, Loyola Marymount University) reviewed *The Priority of the Person: Political, Philosophical, and Historical Discoveries* by David Walsh in *The Review of Metaphysics*, 74.3 (March 2021): 419 – 420.
- **R. Mary Lemmons, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, University of St. Thomas, MN) published “The Personalist Future of American Law” in *Lex Naturalis*, vol. 5 (2020): 57-96.
- **Melissa Moschella, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, Catholic University of America) wrote “Parental Rights, Gender Ideology, and the Equality Act” for The Heritage Foundation (March 16, 2021).
- **Deborah Savage, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, St. Paul Seminary, University of St. Thomas, MN) reviewed *The Holy Family: Model Not Exception* by Mary Shivanandan in *Nova et Vetera*, 18.4 (Fall 2020): 1423 – 1427.

Upcoming scholarly opportunities

- The annual publication of University Faculty for Life, [Life and Learning](#), is accepting submissions on the annual conference theme, and on prolife issues more broadly. A working title is due by June 1st, and a final paper is due July 1st to [Fr. Joseph Koterski, S.J.](#)
- [The Society of Catholic Scientists](#) will host its annual meeting from June 4 – 6, 2021, in Washington, DC. The conference will be on “[Extraterrestrials, AI, and Minds Beyond the Human.](#)”

- The Catholic Medical Association will host its [Medical Resident and Student Boot Camp](#) from June 13 – 20, 2021, at the University of St. Mary of the Lake in Mundelein, IL.
- The [2021 Educational Conference of the Catholic Medical Association](#), whose theme will be “The Joy of Medicine,” will take place in Orlando, FL from October 7 – 9, 2021.
- The [Society of Catholic Social Scientists](#) will host its [29th annual national conference](#) at Franciscan University of Steubenville from October 29 – 30, 2021. [Paper proposals](#) are due on June 1, 2021.
- The [Society of Catholic Social Scientists](#) will also host a [Conference on Parental Rights](#) at Franciscan University of Steubenville from October 15 – 16, 2021.

On Campus

- [National Right to Life](#) is accepting applications from college students for [Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 internships](#).
- [Lifesitenews](#) offers [internships](#) to college students over the summer and throughout the year.
- An extensive list of available jobs and internships for college students and recent graduates is available at the [Students for Life](#) website.

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*.

There have been significant developments on legal issues in 2021. This column will explore some of the more important developments.

Elections have consequences. The election of President Biden has brought about many noteworthy changes. The Biden Administration quickly made a [number of changes to support abortion rights](#) in the United States and internationally. The most significant changes include repealing the Mexico City Policy, which prohibited US taxpayer funds from going to groups that promote abortion overseas, and beginning the process of changing the Trump Administration's Protect Life Rule, which prohibited family planning funds from going to abortion providers and that prohibited recipients of family planning funds from referring for abortions. The US Supreme Court had agreed [to hear three cases involving the constitutionality of the Trump Administration's rule](#), but those cases may well be [dismissed](#) due to the Biden Administration's change in the government's policy.

There have been significant developments in the courts. The US Supreme Court agreed to hear a [Kentucky case](#) that deals with whether the Kentucky Attorney General can intervene in a case to defend the constitutionality of a Kentucky statute that bans dismemberment abortions. The State of Kentucky initially defended the constitutionality of the law but abandoned its defense after a federal court of appeals invalidated the law. Daniel Cameron, Kentucky's Attorney General, then asked to intervene to defend the law but the federal court of appeals rejected that request. The Supreme Court agreed to hear Cameron's request to address the intervention issue. The Court didn't agree to review the constitutionality of the statute.

There are, however, a number of other cases before the Supreme Court that afford the Court an opportunity to address the continuing status of *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

One such case is [Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization](#). *Dobbs* involves the constitutionality of a Mississippi law that prohibits abortions after 15 weeks. The case has been pending before the Court for quite some time. There has been much [speculation about the Court's failure to act](#) on Mississippi's petition. Some think that the Court will eventually refuse to hear the case and that the delay in ruling on the petition is because some Justices are

preparing a statement dissenting from the denial of review.

Another issue that the Court will have the opportunity to consider is the constitutionality of laws banning abortion due in whole or in part to a diagnosis that the unborn baby has Down syndrome. [The Court refused to hear that issue in *Box v. Planned Parenthood*](#), which involved a 7th Circuit ruling that struck down Indiana's law banning Down syndrome abortions. In a much-noted separate opinion, Justice Thomas stated that states "have a compelling interest in preventing abortion from becoming a tool of modern-day eugenics."

In *Little Rock Family Planning Services v. Rutledge*, the Eighth Circuit invalidated Arkansas's Down syndrome abortion statute. Two judges called for the US Supreme Court to re-examine *Casey*. The state has recently [asked the US Supreme Court to hear the case](#).

Arkansas's chances of convincing the Court to hear the case were increased dramatically when, just four days after Arkansas filed its cert petition, [the Sixth Circuit upheld Ohio's Down syndrome abortion ban](#).

Ohio's statute was passed in 2017. A federal district court judge struck down the statute and that ruling was upheld by a three-judge panel of the Sixth Circuit Judge. Batchelder dissented from that panel ruling. The full 6th Circuit granted rehearing en banc. The en banc argument was held in March 2020. In a long-awaited ruling in a case called *Preterm-Cleveland v. McCloud*, the full Sixth Circuit reversed and [upheld the constitutionality of the Ohio statute](#). This ruling greatly increases the chance that the Supreme Court will review the issue.

Other abortion restrictions are being litigated in the lower courts. Many of these cases involve the appropriate legal standard to use in applying the Court's undue burden test. In particular, the lower court cases have disagreed about whether Chief Justice Roberts's opinion in *June Medical Services* is the controlling legal standard. Two noteworthy cases exploring these issues are *Planned Parenthood of Indiana and Kentucky, Inc. v. Box* (7th Cir. March 13, 2021) and *Bristol Regional Women's Center*,

P.C. v. Slatery (6th Cir. April 23, 2021). In an Indiana case, the [Seventh Circuit affirmed a decision enjoining](#) an Indiana law requiring parental notice before a minor may obtain an abortion. The State of Indiana [has sought Supreme Court review](#) in this case. In a Tennessee case, [the full Sixth Circuit has allowed Tennessee's law](#) requiring a 48-hour waiting period prior to an abortion to go into effect before a full court ruling.

New Mexico recently became the latest state to legalize assisted suicide. The New Mexico Supreme Court had rejected constitutional challenges to New Mexico's law banning assisted suicide, but [the State's governor signed a statute legalizing the practice](#) in April 2021.

Because the courts have largely rejected constitutional challenges to laws banning assisted suicide, the legalization effort has played out primarily in the legislative process. This gives opponents of legalization an opportunity to express their view in the democratic process, [an opportunity that is not available to the same degree](#) with respect to issues such as abortion and same-sex marriage.

The opportunity to participate fully in the democratic process is critical. Despite the impression one often gets that there is an inevitable wave in favor of legalization, efforts to legalize assisted suicide have failed in numerous states. For example, [a legalization effort in Connecticut failed again](#) in late April of 2021.

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 appeared in the [National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly](#).

¹ See too, Janet Smith and Christopher Kaczor, *Life Issues, Medical Choices* (Servant, 2016) questions 19 and 20, Alexander Pruss, *One Body* (Notre Dame, 2012) chapter ten.

² Melissa Moschella, "Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation." *Theoretical Medicine and*

Some people think of gamete donation to create new human beings as morally neutral act or even a praiseworthy act, like blood donation. The gamete donor seems to harm no one and can help a couple who wants to have a baby.

But in fact, the ethics of gamete donation is more complicated.¹ Gamete donation often does harm someone, namely woman who is donating her eggs. The documentary *Eggsploitation* explores the stories of women who have lost their health, their fertility, and perhaps even their lives after undergoing artificially induced "hyperovulation" in order to donate twenty to twenty-four eggs. Moreover, gamete donation, at least as typically practiced in the United States, involves the creation of more human embryos than are implanted in any woman wanting to be pregnant. The result is "excess" human embryos that are killed, frozen, or otherwise abandoned. Gamete donation both directly and indirectly brings about significant harms.

In her essays, "Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation" and "The Wrongness of Third-Party Assisted Reproduction: A Natural Law Account," Melissa Moschella offers other arguments against the moral permissibility of donating eggs or sperm in order to create a new human being.² Moschella's arguments against gamete donation do not appeal to consequences like the dangers of hyperovulation. Her reasoning would still hold even if only two human embryos were created by gamete donation and both human embryos were implanted in utero. She offers arguments in principle and not just from consequences against the practice of gamete donation.

In examining the ethics of gamete donation, Moschella looks to the nature of the relationship between children and parents, as compared to the relationship between biological offspring and gamete donors. Moschella's thesis is that "gamete donation is inherently wrong insofar as it involves acting in a way that is highly likely to result in the acquisition of a non-transferable obligation to another person, without being willing to fulfill that

Bioethics 35.6 (2014): 421-40. Melissa Moschella, "The Wrongness of Third-Party Assisted Reproduction: A Natural Law Account." *Christian bioethics: Non-Ecumenical Studies in Medical Morality* 22.2 (2016): 104-21.

obligation should it arise.”³ In other words, even if we could remove all the possible adverse physical and psychological consequences of gamete donation, there remains something wrong in principle with the practice.

Moschella depends upon the premise that “personal relationships that create personal dependencies trigger special, nontransferable obligations that correspond to those dependencies.”⁴ Both these presuppositions are explored also in her book *To Whom Do Children Belong? Parental Rights, Civic Education, and Children’s Autonomy*.⁵

In making her case against gamete donation, Moschella defines a human relationship as a “union or interconnection with another human being at the intellectual, volitional, emotional and/or bodily levels.”⁶ These relationships can differ in terms of *intensity* at any particular level. So academic colleagues of similar belief living across the country from each other can write a book together and thereby share a high intensity of intellectual union, but no connection at a bodily level. Relationships also differ in terms of *comprehensiveness* (across levels) of that union. So best friends might relate intellectually (they share the same political beliefs), volitionally (they have lunch together frequently), and emotionally (they are delighted and distressed at the same things). “What makes a relationship specifically *personal* is that the ties that bind one person to another are *unique* characteristics, things about the parties that are not equally true of others.”⁷ This understanding of the *personal* harkens back to the Roman jurists, *persona est sui iuris et alteri incommunicabilis* (a person is a law to himself and incommunicable to another). What is *personal* is, in some sense, non-substitutable.

Moschella defines a personal relationship as “a relationship in which the parties relate as unique and irreplaceable individuals, not merely fulfilling a function which anyone with the relevant competencies could fulfill.”⁸ So the relationship between someone cashing a check and an

anonymous bank teller is not a personal relationship, since this bank teller could be replaced with a totally different person with the same competencies for cashing checks. By contrast, the relationship between best friends is a personal relationship, based on their unique characteristics, including a shared history common to them alone.

Personal relationships generate personal obligations. The shared history and intimate knowledge my best friend has of me places my best friend in a position to aid me that no other person occupies. As a result, my best friend can provide me with what I need and want in ways that another person (even an intelligent and well-meaning person) simply cannot provide. Moschella writes, “If my analysis is correct, then it is a general feature of personal relationships that each person in that relationship will have special, non-transferable obligations to meet the needs of the other insofar as those needs have arisen out of the personal relationship as such. This obligation is, of course, only a *prima facie* one which may be overridden by other, weightier obligations.”⁹ So, for Moschella, personal relationships ground special responsibilities that last as long as that personal relationship lasts.

The weightiness of these obligations depends upon the intensity and comprehensiveness of the personal relationship. So the personal responsibilities that spouses owe to one another are quite weighty because the marital relationship is (often, if not by its nature) the most intense and most comprehensive of all relationships. By contrast, the personal relationship of casual friends does not enjoin the same level of personal responsibility for each other’s well-being.

Having laid out these parameters, Moschella turns to gamete donation. In giving an egg or sperm, the donors consent to becoming biological parents to their children. Genetic parents relate to their children as the cause of both their children’s existence and their children’s identity. Obviously, without an egg and a sperm, the sexual reproduction of a new human being cannot take place. Without *this* egg and

³ Moschella, “Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,” 423.

⁴ Moschella, “Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,” 423.

⁵ Melissa Moschella, *To Whom Do Children Belong? Parental Rights, Civic Education, and Children’s Autonomy*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

⁶ Moschella, “Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,” 425.

⁷ Moschella, “Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,” 425-426, emphasis in the original.

⁸ Moschella, “Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,” 426.

⁹ Moschella, “Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,” 427.

this sperm, this human individual would not have arisen with his or her unique identity. If a different egg were used, if a different sperm were used, a different human being with a different genetic-bodily identity would have arisen. This child's existence and this child's identity depend upon this biological father and this biological mother. No substitutes, no other parents, could possibly have given rise to this child. Moschella points out,

The child-genetic parent relationship is initially the most intense and comprehensive—and therefore the closest—of that child's human relationships. This gives us reason to think that the special obligations of parents to their genetic children are among the strongest of any human relationship, particularly considering the extreme neediness of human beings in the early years of life and (as I will argue below) the unique capacity of genetic parents to meet their children's developmental needs fully."¹⁰

The child's most intense and most comprehensive relationship is, at least initially, with the parents. The relationship between parent and child is absolutely permanent and irrevocable. "I am and always will be the genetic child of my genetic parents, and my genetic parents are and always will be my genetic parents, regardless of what happens to our relationship at the affective, volitional, and intellectual levels."¹¹ The same is true, of course, of brothers and sisters. Jesus taught that the union of husband and wife is likewise indissoluble.¹² A husband and wife remain husband and wife regardless of what happens to their relationship at the affective, volitional, and intellectual levels. Moschella argues that if a relationship is permanent and our ethical responsibilities arise in part from our relationships, then our ethical responsibilities in these permanent relationships are themselves permanent.

For genetic parents, these responsibilities are not simply to see that a child has whatever is needed

for a good life. Obviously, adoptive parents can provide what children need for a good life. Hence she says, "when genetic parents cannot or will not raise their children, others can step in and do an excellent job, even an all-things-considered better job than the genetic parents would have done."¹³ Despite this fact, Moschella argues that genetic parents have not provided what they have a responsibility to provide. Even if adoptive parents do an excellent job, it is still the case that the child has been treated unjustly by the genetic parents who neglected to give the child what the child was entitled to have. Parents have a responsibility to love their children, and by love Moschella means "a high-priority personal commitment to the well-being of another."¹⁴

What benefits can genetic parents *uniquely* provide? Moschella writes, "what genetic parents, and only genetic parents, can provide for their children is to know and love their children *themselves*, and to let their children know and love *them*. No one else can love my genetic children for me or receive their love in my stead."¹⁵ She notes that it is true of everyone that their love is unique and irreplaceable, but what makes a difference here is the relationship between the parties. Not to be loved by some bus driver in Tulsa whom I have never met is one thing. But not to be loved by my own biological father or mother is something else entirely. Many people who are adopted or created through gamete donation mourn the loss of love from their biological parents. But not to be loved in an intimate way by a total stranger is not big loss nor an ethical failing on the stranger's part.

Now, this argument against gamete donation is complicated by the fact that in at least some cases the child may not know that her conception took place via a donor. Perhaps an infertile married couple did heterologous IVF, implanted the embryo in the wife, and then raised the baby on their own without telling the child or anyone else about the circumstances their of conception. The child in such a case may well think that she is being raised by her

¹⁰ Moschella, "Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,"430.

¹¹ Moschella, "Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,"430.

¹² See, Fr. Paul Mankowski, S.J. "Dominical Teaching on Divorce and Remarriage: The Biblical Data," in Robert Dodaro, editor, *Remaining in the Truth of Christ: Marriage and*

Communion in the Catholic Church (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2014) p.36-63.

¹³ Moschella, "Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,"432.

¹⁴ Moschella, "Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,"434.

¹⁵ Moschella, "Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation,"434.

biological mother and father when in fact her genetic parents were gamete donors unknown to her. In such a case, the child would not be psychologically harmed. She would feel no sense of loss about not receiving love from her biological parents.

And yet, it may still be the case that, objectively speaking, she has suffered a loss. However, to be treated unjustly and to be aware of being treated unjustly are two different things. Let's say I am the legal heir of a large fortune from a distant relative. Unaware of the provisions in my relative's will, someone swindles me out of my millions depriving me of what was rightfully mine. In such a case, I have been wronged—treated unjustly—even though if I am totally unaware of being wronged and treated unjustly.

Moschella acknowledges that not having the love of one's biological parents is fully compatible with leading a good life. And yet from the child's perspective, not to have this love involves a significant loss. Genetic parents have special obligations to their own genetic children which are unique and weighty. Unique, since they are the only ones with these responsibilities, and weighty because the responsibilities of parenthood are among the most significant that a person can have. Moschella writes,

Genetic parents have uniquely weighty special obligations to their children, obligations which take priority over most other obligations. For genetic parents to appropriately prioritize their love for their genetic children, they need to situate themselves in the best position (within the limitations of possibility and competing obligations) to love their children. To cede that "best position" to someone else is to fail to do what their special obligation requires. Due to their physical and psychological proximity, those who actually raise a child are the ones best placed to love that child. Therefore, genetic parents can only love their genetic children adequately by raising those children themselves.¹⁶

So, what could defeat such an obligation? Moschella acknowledges that there are such cases in which adoption is the best response to a situation in which the genetic parents cannot or will not care for their child. In such cases, genetic parents of good

will can honestly say to their child that the adoption took place because their love for their child prompted them to put the child under the care of others. Adoption motivated precisely by love and concern for the child's well-being rather than indifference or rejection of the child is ethically acceptable.

But Moschella notes then that adoption differs from gamete donation. In adoption the child actually exists in utero or after birth and a decision about the child's well-being is made. In gamete donation, the child does not yet exist, and a decision is made ex ante not to give that child a high priority and special love.

Moschella provides an innovative and powerful way of critiquing gamete donation that does not depend upon the likely consequences of gamete donation. If her argument is right, gamete donation is seriously wrong, even aside from the consequences.

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](#).
- ***2021 Dues Reminder*** Be sure to pay your dues. Annual dues are \$40. On-line payment is possible through PayPal and our website, as well as by mailing them to **Fr. Joseph Koterski, S.J.**, University Faculty for Life, Dept. of Philosophy, Fordham University, Bronx, NY 10458. Dues are important for receiving the print copies of our peer reviewed *Life and Learning*.
- ***Keep your email address updated*** Updates can be made either by the online [membership renewal form](#) or by contacting Fr. Koterski at Koterski@Fordham.edu. Updated email addresses enable one to

¹⁶ Moschella, "Rethinking the Moral Permissibility of Gamete Donation," 436.

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 over the spring. 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 Summer 2021 issue by July 15th. Any contributions should be sent to provita.editor@gmail.com.

2021 Life and Learning Conference



31th ANNUAL CONFERENCE 2021
JUNE 5th AFTERNOON ZOOM CONFERENCE
 KEYNOTE SPEAKERS & CALL FOR LIFE & LEARNING SUBMISSIONS

PROLIFE FEMINISM, THE LAW, AND WOMEN'S HEALTH

2021 Smith Award Recipients: Drs. Keith and Elizabeth Cassidy (History & Psychology)

"Half a Century of Strife: The Abortion Controversy's Inescapable Centrality in Modern American History."

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

		
<p>Kathleen Mary Raviele, M.D. F.A.C.O.G. American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology Fellow; USCCB Consultant; Secretary of the Georgia Life Alliance <i>"Unmasking the Truth about Chemical Abortions"</i></p>	<p>Erika Bachiochi, J.D. Ethics & Public Policy Center, Fellow Abigail Adams Institute, Senior Fellow <i>"The Rights of Women: Toward a Dignitarian Feminism"</i></p>	<p>Angela Franks, Ph.D. Professor of Theology St. John's Seminary, Boston <i>"Biopolitics, Sexuality, and Women"</i></p>

<p>SCHEDULE</p> <p>1:45 EDT: Welcome Social 2:00-2:30: Kathleen Raviele</p>	<p>2:30-3:00 EDT: Erika Bachiochi 3:00-3:15: Coffee Break 3:15-3:45 EDT: Angela Franks</p>	<p>3:45-4:15 EDT: Keith & Elizabeth Cassidy 4:15-4:45 EDT: Open Mike & Fellowship 7:30 EDT: Evening Fellowship</p>
--	--	--

FREE ZOOM REGISTRATION: Email Fr. Koterski at Koterski@Fordham.edu by June 3RD
LIFE AND LEARNING SUBMISSIONS:
 Email Working Title to Fr. Koterski by June 1st with Final Submissions by JULY 1ST

Submission topics include the reproductive, spiritual, and mental health of women; historical, cultural, environmental, and economic motivations involved in choosing or not choosing to have children; prolife feminism; policies and laws supportive of pregnant women, families, and the culture of life; the rights of parents; embryo and fetal rights; rights of infants surviving abortion; disability rights of fetuses, infants, and those with brain injuries; rights to conscientious objection; abortion; infanticide; and euthanasia.

Web Resources for research and education

<i>Life and Learning</i> The Journal of the University Faculty for Life	http://uffl.org/pastproceedings.html	
UFFL Blog	http://www.uffl.org/blog/	
Americans United for Life	Americans United for Life (aul.org)	
Member web pages and blogs		
Please forward any other member's web pages to provitanews@yahoo.com .		
Beckwith, Francis	http://www.patheos.com/blogs/returntorome/	
Bachiochi, Erika	http://bachiochi.com/erika/	
Colosi, Peter	http://peterjcolosi.com/	
Lemmons, Rose Mary Hayden	http://courseweb.stthomas.edu/rmlemmons/	
Smith, Janet E.	http://www.janetesmith.org/	
Irving, Diane	Lifeissues.net: Irving Library	
Conferences		
Cardinal O'Connor Conference on Life	http://www.oconnorconference.com/home/	Held in conjunction with the annual March for Life in January.
Notre Dame Center for Ethics and Culture Fall Conference	http://ethicscenter.nd.edu/programs/fall-conference-videos	Held in November
Prolife World Congress	http://www.prolifeworldcongress.org/	The most recent Congress took place in Guatemala in October 2016. The site is in Spanish.

Online resources

Online resources		
Academia.edu	https://www.academia.edu/	A place to share research.
Bad Cripple Blog: A Resource for Pro-lifers	http://www.badcripple.blogspot.com	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)	http://documents.law.yale.edu/before-roe	“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	http://www.cultureoflife.org/	Complex moral issues made simple
Global Health and Human Rights Database	http://www.globalhealthrights.org/	“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	http://www.truthandcharityforum.org/	“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.”
LifeIssues	LifeIssues.net : Clear thinking about crucial issues.	Updated daily with articles to provide “clear thinking about crucial issues.”

Mirror of Justice	http://mirrorofjustice.blogs.com/	A blog dedicated to the development of Catholic legal theory.
National Museum of Health and Medicine, Human Developmental Anatomy Collection, Stage 1a	https://www.medicalmuseum.mil/assets/documents/collections/hdac/stage01.pdf	From the Carnegie Stages of Human Embryonic Development.
Social Science Research Network (SSRN)	http://ssrn.com/en/	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 Dignity web page	http://usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/index.cfm	United States Conference of Catholic Bishops
Witherspoon Institute Public Discourse	http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/	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	http://www.wecareexperts.org/	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)	http://www.lozierinstitute.org/	The education and research arm of the Susan B. Anthony List
Ethika Politika	http://ethikapolitika.org/	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	http://www.humanlifereview.com/	
Linacre Quarterly	http://cathmed.org/issues_resources/linacre_quarterly/	Journal of the Catholic Medical Association.
Post-Abortion Review	http://www.theunchoice.com/pblresearch.htm	“Documents abortion's injustice and harm to women”
Organizations		
Bioethics defense fund	http://www.bdfund.org/	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Catholic Medical Association	http://cathmed.org/	
Center for Bioethics and Human Dignity	http://cbhd.org/	“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	http://www.feministsforlife.org/	
Healing the Culture	http://healingtheculture.com/	Promotes the Life Principles of UFFL co-founder Robert J. Spitzer, SJ.

The International Center on Law, Life, Faith and Family (ICOLF)	http://icolf.org/	“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	http://www.ncbcenter.org/	Publishes the <i>National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly</i>
Prolife Center at the University of St. Thomas	http://www.stthomas.edu/law/academics/prolifecenter/	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	http://catholicsocialscientists.org/Content/Organization/	
Women Deserve Better	http://www.womendeservebetter.com/	
News		
Bioedge	http://www.bioedge.org/	Bioethics News around the world
National Right to Life News	http://www.nationalrighttolifenews.org/news/#.Sp5dWSo	
LifeNews.com	http://www.lifenews.com/	
LifeSiteNews	http://www.lifesitenews.com/	
Anti-life resources		
Guttmacher Institute	http://www.guttmacher.org/	Research arm of Planned Parenthood Federation. Guttmacher Policy Review Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health. International

		Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health
RH Reality Check	http://rhrealitycheck.org/	Reproductive and Sexual Health and Justice News, Analysis and Commentary

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

ProVita 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.