



# PROVITA

## The University Faculty for Life Newsletter

Vol. 12, No. 1

Fall 2024

### Table of Contents

Letter from the President ..... 1

Member News & Publications..... 2

Upcoming scholarly opportunities..... 3

Legal Realities ..... 4

A Scholar’s Analysis ..... 5

Reminders..... 7

Masthead ..... 8

Web Resources for Research and Education ..... 8

### Letter from the President

Hello Everybody,

On the plus side of this election, we have a candidate who dared to say in a debate that abortion kills. On the negative side, this candidate and his party are currently cowering behind Dobbs and failing to press the case that the radical abortion agenda of Democrats—as adopted and practiced in Walz’s home state—involves killing viable preborn babies and refusing to aid those that survive abortion. We need to make it known that the Harris-Walz abortion agenda is too extreme for America.

In other news, our June 2024 conference on Biotechnology at the Beginning and End of Life was lively and informative on the issues of brain death, the sneaky techniques that can be used in nursing homes to euthanize patients, and the importance of language in pro-life discussions.

Our conference on June 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> will once again be held at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul. The theme is "*Life issues and Liberty.*"

This theme raises many multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary questions. **One set of questions** focuses on those working on life's front lines: Is prolife feminism indispensable for changing minds and hearts; is it helpful? What role does faith play in motivating prolife work? Ought prolife work be recognized as a type of religious exercise or an expression of free speech? Do First Amendment liberty rights provide adequate post-Dobbs protection for prolife work, given that so many states have revised their constitutions to guarantee abortion access? Are state governments that fund Planned Parenthood Centers but not pregnancy centers in violation of the First Amendment's Establishment Clause? Are hospitals and professional associations threatening the right of medical professionals to exercise informed judgment on life issues? Are there special legal, moral, or theological challenges confronting individuals and faith-based organizations exercising their religious liberty and conscience rights when opposing contraceptive abortifacients, the killing of prenatal children, or physician assisted suicide? How can the liberty and conscience rights of prolife medical practitioners, students, and institutions such as hospitals best be justified and protected? What are the legal and cultural threats (nationally or internationally) to the liberty rights of prolife citizens who peacefully demonstrate or pray in the public square? What possible responses to these threats could be helpful?

**A second set of questions** concern the popular argument that while autonomy and liberty rights justify not only a legal right to abortion but also a legal right to assisted suicide, they do not justify a

medical professional's right to autonomy in exercising conscientious objection and refusing service: Is this argument simply inconsistent? What are conscience rights and how are they best justified? What is the nature of autonomy? Is it a right protected by the U.S. Constitution? What justifies legal restrictions on autonomy? Is autonomy a liberty right only when exercised morally? Is there an American morality capable of placing parameters on liberty and protecting human life both in the womb and on the hospital bed? Does autonomy in medical decisions require informed consent and is the bar of informed consent being met? What does history teach us about the autonomy of patients and that of medical professionals? Does history contain any lessons about unbounded autonomy? What are the philosophical, theological, medical, political, and legal arguments that the rights to liberty and autonomy can justify neither killing prenatal children nor killing suffering patients?

A **third set of questions** falling under the theme of *Life Issues and Liberty* focuses on public policies: How would a national single payer system of health insurance impact the liberty of protecting human life from conception to natural death? Are there any lessons to be learned from the British healthcare system? Does the Dobbs decision restoring the abortion decision to individual states advance or hinder the prolife cause? Does Dobbs undermine or otherwise compromise the unalienable right to life proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence? What new prolife challenges have arisen from the legalization of the abortion pill? Are brain death determinations being used as a cover for euthanasia? Are current HIPPA laws hindering the ability of families to protect the life of their loved ones? What is the impact on a nation's culture or political philosophy when the killing of prenatal children or oneself is legalized as a right? Does the history of euthanasia in the Netherlands hold any relevant lessons for Americans?

Besides exploring *Life Issues and Liberty*, papers focused on any life issue at the beginning of human life and on its natural end are always welcomed.

The [2025 Call-for-Proposals](#) can be found on our [website](#). All proposals should be a maximum of

one page and should include the paper's working title, a brief abstract, your institutional affiliation, and your email address. If your proposal is accepted, plan on a 20 minute presentation followed by a 10 minute Q&A. Presentation papers can be considered for publication in our peer-reviewed, open access e-journal, *Life and Learning*.

Deadline for priority consideration is January 22<sup>nd</sup> and the final deadline for submitting proposals is April 29<sup>th</sup>. Email proposals to Dr. Bernadette Waterman Ward at [ward@udallas.edu](mailto:ward@udallas.edu).

Finally, we have a major shortfall in the amount of 2024 dues received this year. Please either pay electronically on our website or watch for the reminder that will be shortly mailed to you. If your email or mailing address has changed, please contact our Secretary, Dr. Margaret Hughes at [provita.editor@gmail.com](mailto:provita.editor@gmail.com).

May God bless you for all that you do for life.

Mary  
**R. Mary Hayden Lemmons, Ph.D.**  
UFFL President

## 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) published “John Witte, Jr.’s Contributions to the Study of Sex, Marriage, and Family Law” in *Faith in Law, Law in Faith: Reflecting and Building on the Work of John Witte, Jr.*, ed. Rafael Domingo, Gary S. Hauk, and Timothy P. Jackson. Boston: Brill, 2024.
- **Teresa Collett, J.D.** (Law, University of St. Thomas Law School) published “Personhood and the Post-Dobbs Abortion Debate” in the *Drake Law Review*, 71:2 (2024).

- **David Deavel, Ph.D.** (Theology, University of St. Thomas, Houston) contributed “Fathers in the Image of God the Father” to *Lived Experience and the Search for Truth: Revisiting Catholic Sexual Morality*, ed. Deborah Savage and Robert Fastiggi. St. Louis: Enroute Books & Media, 2024.
- **Richard Fehring, Ph.D., R.N.** (Nursing, Marquette University) received the Catholic Medical Association Distinguished Guardian of Faith Award at the 93<sup>rd</sup> CMA Annual Education Conference in Orlando, Florida. The Distinguished Guardian of Faith Award is presented to individuals who exemplify faith and love of God in their personal lives and in their healing profession by special service and dedication to the Catholic Medical Association.
- **Dr. Fehring** presented “The Origin and Importance of the Term Natural Family Planning” at the 12th Annual Marquette Method of NFP Research Summit, Sept 2-3, 2024, in Orlando Florida.
- **Dr. Fehring**, with Rene Ecochard, Joseph B Stanford, Claude Gronfier, and Mary Schneider published “Evidence that the woman's ovarian cycle is driven by an internal circamonthly timing system” in *Science Advances*, 10:15 (April 2024).
- **Dr. Fehring** published, with Maria Meyers, and Mary Schneider, “Case Reports from Women Using a Quantitative Hormone Monitor to Track the Perimenopause Transition” in *Medicina*, 59:10 (2023).
- **Dr. Fehring** published, with Qiyang Mu, “A Comparison of Two Hormonal Fertility Monitoring Systems for Ovulation Detection: A Pilot Study” in *Medicina*, 59:2 (2023).
- **Jeff Koloze, Ph.D.** (English, DeVry University) reviewed *American Multiculturalism and the Anti-Discrimination Regime: The Challenge to Liberal Pluralism* by Thomas F. Powers in *Catholic Social Science Review*, 29 (2024).
- **Fr. Joseph Koterski, S.J., Ph.D. (†)** (Philosophy, Fordham University) wrote “The Thomistic Account of Prudence and the Ignatian Account of the Discernment of the Spirits” for *Ignatius of Loyola and Thomas Aquinas*, ed. Justin Anderson, Matthew Levering, and Aaron Pidel, S.J. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2024.
- **Margaret Hughes, Ph.D.** (Philosophy, Thomas Aquinas College, NE) contributed “Ignatius and Thomas on the Ordering of the Passions and the Glory of God” to *Ignatius of Loyola and Thomas Aquinas*, ed. Justin Anderson, Matthew Levering, and Aaron Pidel, S.J. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2024.
- **Dr. Hughes** also published “Dancing at the Wedding: Dance, Song, and the Absence of Pictorial Art in Dante’s *Paradiso*” in *Logos*, 27:3 (Summer 2024).

## Upcoming scholarly opportunities

- The [University Faculty for Life](#) will host its thirty-fourth annual meeting from June 6 - 7, 2025 at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, MN. The theme of the conference is “[Life Issues and Liberty](#).” The deadline for proposals for priority consideration is January 22, 2025.
- The [Society of Catholic Social Scientists](#) will hold its annual conference at St. Vincent College in Latrobe, PA, October 25 – 26, 2024.
- The [diNicola Center for Ethics and Culture](#) will host its annual conference at the University of Notre Dame, October 31 – November 2, 2024. The conference theme is “Ever Ancient, Ever New: On Catholic Imagination.”

## 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.*

It's been two years since the United States Supreme Court's momentous decision in [Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization](#). Dobbs, which overruled *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, was a great pro-life victory. Before Dobbs, states had very little freedom to restrict abortion. After Dobbs, which rejected the view that the Constitution conferred a fundamental right to abortion, the authority to address the profound moral question that abortion presents was remitted "to the people and their elected representatives." But the Court did not outlaw abortion. The Court largely left the issue to the democratic process.

Since Dobbs, states have taken a wide range of approaches. Some states have protected access to abortion while others have limited abortion significantly. Dobbs was not, therefore, a complete pro-life victory. Dobbs did, however, afford states the opportunity to protect the unborn. Most of the action has been in state legislatures and courts.

The Supreme Court did though consider abortion in two cases in the summer of 2024.

The first case, [Food and Drug Administration v. Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine](#) (which was consolidated with *Danco Laboratories LLC v. Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine*), involved challenges to the FDA's approvals of the abortion drug mifepristone. Mifepristone is part of a two drug regimen given to women seeking a medical abortion. The FDA approved the drug in 2000 and then expanded its availability in 2016 and 2021. The more recent actions allowed these abortions without in-person doctor visits. The 2016 actions also allowed abortions later in pregnancy; these abortions used to be limited to the first seven weeks of pregnancy but are now allowed up to ten weeks of pregnancy. Moreover, the abortion drugs can be prescribed by telemedicine and no longer need to be prescribed by physicians.

A federal district court judge rejected the FDA's approvals. The Fifth Circuit upheld important parts of the district court's order and the Supreme Court agreed to hear the case.

On June 13, 2024, the Court unanimously ruled that the plaintiffs (pro-life doctors and pro-life organizations) did not have standing to challenge the FDA's conduct. The plaintiffs were not injured by the FDA's actions, in significant part because federal conscience protections prevent the doctors from being required to engage in conduct (treating patients with mifepristone complications) to which they conscientiously object. The Court's ruling preserves access to the abortion drugs. Importantly, the Court did not rule on the merits (i.e., whether the FDA acted properly in expanding access to mifepristone).

The Court noted that other plaintiffs might have standing to challenge the FDA's actions and that pro-lifers could object to the FDA's conduct in the political and regulatory process. On July 24, 2024, the Ninth Circuit did, however, [deny Idaho the right to intervene to challenge the FDA's actions](#). States still have the power to limit the use of mifepristone through state laws. Moreover, the Court did not consider whether the federal Comstock Act might apply to prevent sending abortion drugs through the mail. So, this important battle over medical abortions is far from over.

The second case, [Moyle v. United States](#) (which was consolidated with *Idaho v. United States*), involves the interaction between a federal law that requires hospitals receiving Medicare funding to offer "necessary stabilizing treatment" to pregnant women in emergencies and an Idaho law that makes it a crime to provide an abortion except in limited circumstances, including to save the life of the mother. The Biden Administration argued that the federal law, the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act, preempted the Idaho law. The Administration argued that EMTALA requires abortions to be performed when necessary to provide health care to pregnant women even when Idaho law would make such abortions illegal. Pro-life groups contended that the Administration's position would

turn emergency rooms into elective abortion facilities.

A federal judge in Idaho barred the state from enforcing the Idaho law. On June 27, 2024, a badly splintered Supreme Court dismissed the suit and returned the case to the lower courts. The Ninth Circuit will now entertain Idaho's appeal and all indications are that Idaho will prevail on the merits.

The Supreme Court split 3-3-3. Three Justices (Alito, Gorsuch, and Thomas) would have ruled for Idaho on the merits. Three Justices (Kagan, Jackson, and Sotomayor) would have ruled for the United States. Justice Barrett (for the Chief Justice and for Justice Kavanaugh) thought it appropriate to return the issue to the lower courts because the Biden Administration had clarified its position about the meaning of the federal law. According to the view the Administration presented at oral argument, federal conscience protections would prevent pro-life doctors from being forced to perform abortions. In addition, the Administration agreed that “necessary abortion” did not include abortions for mental health. That interpretation would have largely eviscerated the Idaho law. It seems likely that the Idaho law will largely be upheld by the lower courts or by the Supreme Court if the case returns there.

There is a great deal of activity in state courts about the legality of restrictions on abortion. Most of this litigation involves the scope of state constitutional law. There have recently been several important rulings in Florida, Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas.

The Florida Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Florida’s ban on abortion after fifteen weeks gestation. The Court’s ruling also means that Florida’s ban on abortions after six weeks gestation (a so-called heartbeat law) does not violate Florida’s Constitution. At the same time, however, the Florida Supreme Court approved a [ballot initiative that voters will address in November](#). That proposal would largely protect access to abortion.

The Iowa Supreme Court upheld the [constitutionality of Iowa's ban on abortions after 6 weeks gestation](#). A Missouri court [rejected a](#)

[religious freedom challenge to Missouri's law](#) that prohibits most abortions. The religious freedom objection has been increasingly popular since Dobbs and this ruling could prove to be important as other state courts consider these arguments.

In contrast, [the Kansas Supreme Court has continued to protect access to abortion under the Kansas Constitution](#).

Since the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Washington v. Glucksberg*, which rejected the argument that the United States Constitution protects a right to assisted suicide, the legal battle over the legality of physician assisted suicide has been largely fought at the state level. State courts have typically rejected the argument that state constitutions protect assisted suicide. There has been a trend towards legalization through the legislative process.

Delaware is the most recent state to have legalized assisted suicide. On September 20, 2024, [the Delaware Governor vetoed the law](#). Other states, such as [California](#), are [considering proposals to expand access to assisted suicide](#).

International developments are also worth noting. Ecuador's Supreme Court legalized assisted suicide and euthanasia in February of 2024. On the other hand, in June of 2024, [the European Court of Human Rights rejected constitutional attacks on laws banning assisted suicide](#) in a ruling that echoed the United States Supreme Court's rulings in *Glucksberg* and *Vacco v. Quill*.

## A Scholar’s Analysis

*Christopher Kaczor, Ph.D. (Professor of Philosophy at Loyola Marymount University at Los Angeles, Consultant to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops) engages recent scholarship on life issues. This essay was first published by [Word on Fire](#).*

In his recent essay “[A Revolution in Understanding the Embryo](#),” Dr. John Wallingford, the Regents Chair in Molecular Biology at UT Austin and a past

president of the Society for Developmental Biology points to an amazing fact:

*Fifty-four years ago, I did something extraordinary. I built myself. I was a single, round cell with not the slightest hint of my final form. Yet the shape of my body now—the same body—is dazzlingly complex. I am composed of trillions of cells. And hundreds of different kinds of cells; I have brain cells, muscle cells, kidney cells. I have hair follicles, though tragically few still decorate my head. But there was a time when I was just one cell. And so were you.*

Wallingford continues, “All organisms, including humans, *build themselves*. Our construction proceeds with no architects, no contractors, no builders; it is our own cells that build our bodies. Watching an embryo, then, is rather like watching a pile of bricks somehow make themselves into a house, to paraphrase the biologist Jamie Davies in *Life Unfolding* (2014).” The human embryo is actively self-developing his or her body toward becoming a newborn, a toddler, and eventually an adult.

Unfortunately, Wallingford does not stay in his lane of his biological expertise:

*In the modern debate over abortion, the doctrine that ‘life begins at conception’ is now so constantly repeated that it’s often assumed to have an ancient, perhaps even scriptural origin. It does not. In fact, in Catholic canon law, the doctrine dates precisely to 12 October 1869, when Pope Pius IX declared excommunication as the penalty for anyone involved in obtaining any abortion. For the nearly 2,000 years that had gone before, however, many Christian thinkers held the embryo to acquire its humanity only gradually. This concept, linked to the ‘animation’ or ‘ensoulment’ of the embryo, arose in laws first set down more than 3,000 years ago that imposed increasingly harsher penalties for causing the loss of a pregnancy as it progressed.*

Wallingford’s claims are misleading. The Catholic Church has [always condemned abortion](#), not starting in 1869, but from the first century in the *Didache*,

the *Letter of Barnabas*, and the *Apology* of Tertullian. Medieval authors like [Thomas Aquinas](#) and contemporaries like [Pope Francis](#) echo this unchanging teaching.

Moreover, Wallingford confuses moral doctrine and canon law. Moral doctrine holds that the intentional killing of any innocent human being, before or after birth, is always wrong in every circumstance. But canon law, like secular law, determines a penalty for intentional killing that can and does change in various circumstances. A change in legal penalty does *not* mean a change in moral doctrine.

Wallingford also expresses skepticism about “when the Church says life begins.” But this stance is only reasonable if there is a difference between what science teaches and what the Church teaches about the beginning of human life. There is not. Both hold that we begin to exist as embryos.

Wallingford continues, “Science can tell us how the human embryo develops, and it is an undisputed certainty that embryos develop progressively, building complexity and identity only over time. But there is no scientific consensus on when during that progression ‘life’ begins.” This attempt to swim but not get wet fails. Wallingford himself writes, “Human embryos should be kept alive *in vitro* only for the most important, highly regulated reproductive or research purposes.” But if embryos can be *kept* alive, then embryos *are* alive. If an embryo is alive, then the life of that embryo has begun. Of course, an embryo can also *not* be kept alive. An embryo can die. But only something that has life can die.

To make his view coherent, Wallingford needs to distinguish embryos who are alive from embryos who have life. This distinction without a difference “carries verbal wizardry too far, deep into the forbidden land of the sophists,” to use the words of Justice Scalia. As [Live Action](#) points out, “Why is a single cell considered life on Mars, but a preborn child not considered life on Earth?”

Wallingford is also mistaken about a supposed lack of scientific consensus about when an embryo’s life begins. In his article “[The Scientific Consensus on When a Human’s Life Begins](#),” Steven Andrew

Jacob points out that “biologists from 1,058 academic institutions around the world assessed survey items on when a human’s life begins and, overall, 96% (5337 out of 5577) affirmed the fertilization view.”

Wallingford continues, “By the 19th century, the new scientists had reached consensus. The concept of progressive embryonic development of animal embryos was established once and for all. But then as now, the embryos of scientists are not the embryos of the public, or the Church. In an odd synchronicity, science and Church staked out opposite views at essentially the same time.” In fact, the Church and science are in harmony, not opposition. They both *agree* that you and I were once a single, round cell, a new human being at the stage of embryonic development. Modern science and the Church also both accept progressive embryonic development. Wallingford offers not a single example of a modern Catholic thinker who disagrees. Who thinks that you and I were once a tiny but fully formed human infant curled up inside a sperm? This view, called [preformation](#), is as dead as a dinosaur.

Wallingford points out correctly that *there is no consensus among faiths on when life begins. Certain Christian faiths now hold that life begins at conception, and these have an outsized influence. Yet, even within Christianity, that view is a recent stance, and one that reversed centuries of thought. Other Western religious traditions don’t share Christianity’s ambiguity. Cleaving to the ancient gradualist view of development, Islamic tradition generally holds the embryo to become human 120 days after fertilisation, though some use the 40-day mark; in most Jewish traditions, it happens only at birth.*

In fact, orthodox Judaism does not require a funeral unless the baby survives thirty days after birth. So unless Wallingford is willing to deny moral status to newborn babies in the first month of life, appeal to religion will not be of much help in denying the moral status of human beings in utero. Indeed, since we have religious liberty, anyone can make up a religion that holds that the fetus becomes viable when she graduates from medical school. For this reason, and others, we do not make religious views

the basis of our laws. Rather, the foundation for our laws ought to be the equal protection of all human beings. I was a single, round cell. And so were you. And so are other human beings now. If we believe in equal rights, then all human beings deserve to be “[protected by law and welcomed in life.](#)”

## 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](#).
- **2024 Dues Reminder** Many thanks to all those who have already paid the 2024 dues! 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*.
- **Keep your email address updated** Updates can be made by contacting **Dr. Margaret Hughes** at [provita.editor@gmail.com](mailto: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/](http://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 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 Spring 2024 issue by May 1<sup>st</sup>. Any contributions should be sent to [provita.editor@gmail.com](mailto: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](http://uffl.org). Editorial correspondence can be sent to the editor at [provita.editor@gmail.com](mailto: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](mailto:provita.editor@gmail.com).

Beckwith, Francis	Lemmons, Rose Mary Hayden
Bachiochi, Erika	Smith, Janet E.
Colosi, Peter	Irving, Diane
Koloze, Jeff	



<b>Online Resources</b>	
<a href="#">Bad Cripple Blog: A Resource for Pro-lifers</a>	A blog written by William Peace, Ph.D., who advocates for the rights of the disabled.
<a href="#">Before Roe v. Wade: Voices that Shaped the Abortion Debate Before the Supreme Court's Ruling (2d edition, 2012)</a>	“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.”
<a href="#">Culture of Life Foundation</a>	Complex moral issues made simple
<a href="#">Global Health and Human Rights Database</a>	“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.”
<a href="#">Human Life International Truth and Charity</a>	“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.”
<a href="#">Life Issues</a>	Updated daily with articles to provide “clear thinking about crucial issues.”
<a href="#">Mirror of Justice</a>	A blog dedicated to the development of Catholic legal theory.
<a href="#">National Museum of Health and Medicine, Human Developmental Anatomy Collection, Stage 1a</a>	From the Carnegie Stages of Human Embryonic Development.
<a href="#">Social Science Research Network (SSRN)</a>	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.”
<a href="#">USCCB Human Life and Dignity web page</a>	United States Conference of Catholic Bishops
<a href="#">Witherspoon Institute Public Discourse</a>	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.
<a href="#">World Expert Consortium for Abortion Research and Education</a>	International research collaboration, Scientific information dissemination, Professional education, Consultation, Expert testimony, Program evaluation, Grant writing

<b>Journals and Online Publications</b>	
<a href="#">Charlotte Lozier Institute (Susan B. Anthony List)</a>	The education and research arm of the Susan B. Anthony List
<a href="#">Ethika Politika</a>	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.
<a href="#">Human Life Review</a>	
<a href="#">Linacre Quarterly</a>	Journal of the Catholic Medical Association.
<a href="#">Post-Abortion Review</a>	“Documents abortion’s injustice and harm to women”
<b>Organizations</b>	
<a href="#">Americans United for Life</a>	
<a href="#">Bioethics defense fund</a>	<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>
<a href="#">Catholic Medical Association</a>	
<a href="#">Center for Bioethics and Human Dignity</a>	“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.”
<a href="#">Feminists for Life</a>	
<a href="#">Healing the Culture</a>	Promotes the Life Principles of UFFL co-founder Robert J. Spitzer, SJ.
<a href="#">The International Center on Law, Life, Faith and Family (ICOLF)</a>	“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	
<b>News</b>	
Bioedge	LifeNews.com
National Right to Life News	LifeSiteNews