



# Newsletter

November 2001

Vol. 9. No. 2

## *From the Desk of your Coordinators:*

We are writing this letter with heavy hearts, just a week after the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington. Like so many others, we are struggling to sort through our complex emotions (horror, fear, anger, worry) and make sense of an event that is, in so many respects, senseless. As teachers, and as people with particular interests in ethics (and its intersection with politics) we feel a responsibility to help our students and our fellow citizens find an appropriate perspective from which to interpret our dramatically changed world. Even as we struggle to come to terms with our own sadness for the many victims of the attack and their families, we watch with apprehension as the USA seeks to lead the world into a 'war footing' from which to launch reprisals. Never has it been more urgent that we connect our theoretical analyses of ethics and politics with the public discussions whirling around us. In such troubling times, we are deeply grateful for the care and concern and the many thoughtful analyses being expressed by FAB members around the world.

So many of you have written messages of condolence to our American colleagues, and Rosie wants to express her appreciation on behalf of all our American members for the many heartfelt letters and emails pouring in. Many of you have also used the FAB list-serve to share your own interpretations of the events that are unfolding before us and to initiate a dialogue among FAB members about what should happen next. We are proud to be associated with such a caring, thoughtful, open international community and we hope that FAB can model, in its own way, the possibility of morally responsible dialogue within an international context.

This Newsletter includes a collection of excerpts from some of the early postings to the list-serve on this subject. A full list of the texts of members' opinions from the list-serve can be found on our FAB website (at [www.fabnet.org](http://www.fabnet.org)). We are very fortunate to have some resourceful and hardworking members supporting our ability to share this correspondence. Maggie Little edits the Newsletter and

has worked to adapt it to the late-breaking correspondence on this subject. And Hilde Lindemann Nelson manages the list-serve as well as our newly revamped website with the support of our very own web-mistress, Alison Crane. Thanks, Maggie, Hilde, and Alison, for creating these forums for discussion and for managing to adapt them so quickly to these unforeseeable circumstances.

While the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11 brought home some of the worst effects of living in a global community, FAB continues to be a focus for the positive value of global living. We are, first and foremost, an *International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics* and we are committed to promoting international exchanges on feminist bioethics. One of our principal means for accomplishing this task is our bi-annual conference. Hence, we are very pleased to report that planning is already well underway for the Fourth Conference of FAB to be held in Brasilia, Brazil October 29-30, 2002, in association with the Sixth World Congress of the International Association of Bioethics. Please note the call for proposals included in this newsletter and begin your own planning to ensure that you will be able to join us there. A local organizing committee, headed up by Debora Diniz with assistance from Maureen Alexandra Sampaio, Fabiana Paranhos, and Marilena V. Correa, is now at work to make certain that we will be well looked after when we arrive. They are working in association with the co-organizers (Debora Diniz and Sue Sherwin) and our outstanding Advisory Board. Suggestions for sessions and activities can be directed to the co-organizers, Debora or Sue. We are hoping to be able to manage sessions in Portuguese (the language of our host country) and Spanish (the language of neighboring countries) as well as in English for this meet-

### **In This Issue:**

<b>Reactions to September 11</b>	pp. 3-6
<b>Job Announcements</b>	p. 7
<b>Book Review Section</b>	pp. 8-11
<b>FAB Announcements</b>	pp. 12-13
<b>News From Around the World</b>	pp. 14-16
<b>FAB Contacts</b>	p. 17
<b>Calendar of Events</b>	pp. 18-19

ing, so it promises to be a particularly exciting opportunity to interact on a truly international scale.

We are also exploring with Glenn McGee of the American Journal of Bioethics the intriguing possibility of making this conference accessible to everyone with Internet access around the world. If we can negotiate some logistical problems with the conference site, the journal is prepared to broadcast our proceedings in real time so all our members can be “virtually present,” even if they cannot be there physically. We’ll keep you posted as to whether or not we can meet the technical and financial requirements to allow them to deliver a virtual presence at our meeting.

Still, we prefer to interact in person. Toward that end, it is important that we try to ensure that the Audre Lorde fund is in a position to offer grants to support travel costs of members in need of such help. We hope that you will be able to make a contribution to this fund. Please try to contribute generously. Make checks payable to: Audre Lorde Memorial Fund for Bioethics Research (tax deductible in the U.S.). Mail to: Lenore Kuo, FAB Membership Secretary, 850 W. 176th Street, Apartment 1-B, New York, New York 10033.

This is also an occasion to mark the many years of FAB work invested by our co-founders, Anne Donchin and Becky Holmes. Both have worked tirelessly over the past nine years to get FAB on a stable organizational footing and to provide leadership in the realm of international perspectives on feminist bioethics. They have done a wonderful job and we are very grateful for their ongoing efforts on our behalf. Becky will be passing on her records and responsibilities to our new membership secretary, Lenore Kuo. And although Anne will continue to serve as FAB’s Treasurer, she will be relieved of her duties as chair of the scholarship committee thanks to Rachel Ankeny’s willingness to take on this job. Thanks so much, Becky and Anne, for all the wonderful work you have done to create and nurture our organization; and thanks to Viola Lehnhardt-Schubert and Susana Sommer as well as Anne for continuing to serve on the Grants Committee.

We also wish to thank Carolyn Ells for volunteering to serve as FAB’s Archivist. To see if you have materials that might find a home in FAB’s Archive consult the Archivist Section of the FAB Policies on the Web page. Carolyn’s landmail address is: Department of Bioethics, Dalhousie University, 5849 University Avenue, Halifax Nova Scotia.

We look forward to hearing from you through the wonders of electronic and print media, and we sincerely hope that we will have an opportunity to meet many of you in person in Brazil next fall. Personal hugs seems especially precious right now. In the meantime, we send each of you a very firm “virtual” hug and our very best wishes for a safe and more sane world.

***Rosie and Sue***

The following are some helpful websites for discussion of U.S. foreign policy, the origins of anti-U.S. sentiment, and appropriate responses.

- [www.alternet.org](http://www.alternet.org)
- The RAND corp’s list of publications through their Center for Middle East Public Policy (RAND is explicitly a military and policy consultant for the U.S. government, so these reports are very enlightening as to what goes into the human calculus of foreign policy decisions): [www.rand.org/nsrd/cmepppubs.html](http://www.rand.org/nsrd/cmepppubs.html)
- The Cato Institute’s terrorism page, including an assessment of the huge problems involved in Colin Powell’s suggestion of a “global assault against terrorism in general” (the Cato Institute is a libertarian thinktank): [www.cato.org/current/terrorism/](http://www.cato.org/current/terrorism/)
- A sampling of comments from Asian leaders and newspapers including “China urges NATO to Consult Other Regions Before Taking Action” and “World ‘Cop’ Must Not Become Terrorist”:  
[www.isop.ucla.edu/eas/web/sept112001.htm](http://www.isop.ucla.edu/eas/web/sept112001.htm)
- A comment on the role of Israel, and what the author perceives as the dilemma the U.S. faces (to respond with great force, or to respond with pacifism):  
[www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=74074](http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=74074)
- An article in British newspaper The Economist, “The Sufferings of Afghanistan come to New York”:  
[http://www.economist.com/printedition/displayStory.cfm?Story\\_ID=780398](http://www.economist.com/printedition/displayStory.cfm?Story_ID=780398)
- Report from Times of India on Indian defense experts’ analysis of potential U.S. military action: [http://www.timesofindia.com/articleshow.asp?art\\_id=242479959](http://www.timesofindia.com/articleshow.asp?art_id=242479959)
- Intelligence analysis by STRATFOR corp (freelance global intelligence) of Russian considerations regarding U.S. actions: [www.stratfor.com/home/0109152130.htm](http://www.stratfor.com/home/0109152130.htm)
- Columbia University’s Middle East Studies site. There is a LOT of detail here: [www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/indiv/mideast/cuvm/](http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/indiv/mideast/cuvm/)

***Alison Crane***

# Reactions to September 11

The following represents just a small sample of the condolences, reactions, and expressions of concern that poured in from around the world to the FAB listserv following September 11. We have also received condolences from the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, German, Italy, The Netherlands, and United Kingdom.

A full compilation can be found on the FAB webpage, [www.fabnet.org](http://www.fabnet.org). Our FAB Webmistress, Alison Crane, has established two webpages regarding September 11. One is dedicated to messages of support and condolence and the other chronicles that listserv's ongoing discussion of the U.S. responses. Both will be updated daily as new messages come in to the listserv.



The agony of the past 2 days, following the terrorist attacks in the US on Sept 11, is simply beyond words or comprehension. To those of you who may have lost someone in the disaster, or who are still awaiting news, my heart is with you.

We need a ray of hope out of all of this. I am appealing to you, my colleagues in health ethics and allies in many other professions, to take an active role in shaping our collective responses to this tragedy all around the world.

A call to action is now imperative. Those of us who work in ethics spend our lives trying to figure out what justice, compassion, reason and virtue really mean -- and right now, the world needs them more than ever. We are called upon to offer helpful alternatives to inappropriate and potentially catastrophic reactions. The stakes are very high, and they are global in scope: responses could easily escalate to war and/or increased terrorism in many parts of the world, perhaps with weapons of mass destruction. But what can we do?

We must call upon our insights and commitments to push the global mindset forward toward lasting human enlightenment and peace, rather than to allow our grief, fear and anger to devastate countless more lives. History has just handed us another decision point: we can learn and grow, or we can fail and suffer even more.

Make this a teachable moment about what is at stake -- and thus the necessity of reflection, compassion and ethics -- in everyday life now that our attention has been caught by this unspeakable tragedy. Help people understand that vulnerability and loss are *always* at stake in human interactions.

We must remind each other in this time of justified outrage that the tragedy is the work of a few individuals. We cannot allow anger at those individuals to be confused with distrust or abuse of entire populations or ethnic groups. Innocent and horrified members of Arabic, Muslim and Palestinian communities in many countries are being flooded with hate messages and threats -- we must find ways to counteract this discrimination. The deeds of a few are not fairly borne by all others of the same faith or heritage, many of whom have also been injured by the actions of the extremists among them.

We must also refocus politics away from ideology and self-interest to embrace our global humanity and seek true justice in our policies. We must recognize how our local choices affect others far away, and that there is always more than one side to any issue. I am a dual American-Canadian citizen who deeply loves my country of origin, but I am painfully aware that many US policies (from both major parties) are frankly selfish and hurtful to the people of other nations. Most nations have similar strengths and failings, it seems. Living outside my country of origin is a privilege that allows me to see multiple sides of many issues in a way that was simply impossible for me when I stayed inside my own borders. I struggle personally to understand what it means to be a global citizen, simultaneously inside and outside multiple nations or cultures; can we work toward genuinely crossing those boundaries of politics and identity to achieve a truly supportive world?

Finally, and perhaps most important, we need to find some positive ideals to embrace that will inspire us. I suggest reclaiming the word and the experience of "awe" -- that we reorient ourselves with the feeling of speechless wonder at the mysteries of the universe, the very existence of the sky or oceans or mountains, and the highly improbable miracle of being alive. Standing in awe demands our attention, and commands our respect. Standing in awe makes it unthinkable to destroy our fragile environment or each others' lives. Whatever faith or world view makes the most sense to you, it has its roots in the attempt to comprehend the eternal mysteries of our existence. Try not to argue over dogma, but to embrace the deepest truths common to all faiths and cultures.

Please do whatever you can to spread a bit of insight, light and hopefulness in this saddened, frightened, darkened world. It will take enormous effort, but rising above our most dangerous weaknesses is the worthiest possible goal.

**Laura Shanner**, *John Dossetor Health Ethics Centre*



I've been hearing a lot of talk about "bombing Afghanistan back to the Stone Age." Ronn Owens, on KGO Talk Radio today, allowed that this would mean killing innocent people, people who had nothing to do with this atrocity, but "we're at war, we have to accept collateral damage. What else can we do?" Minutes later I heard some TV pundit discussing whether we "have the belly to do what must be done." And I thought about the issues being raised especially hard because I am from Afghanistan, and even though I've lived here for 35 years I've never lost track of what's going on there. So I want to tell anyone who will listen how it all looks from where I'm standing. I speak as one who hates the Taliban and Osama Bin Laden. There is no doubt in my mind that these people were responsible for the atrocity in New York. I agree that something must be done about those monsters. But the Taliban and Bin Laden are not Afghanistan. They're not even the government of Afghanistan. The Taliban are a cult of ignorant psychotics who took over Afghanistan in 1997. Bin Laden is a political criminal with a plan. When you think Taliban, think Nazis. When you think Bin Laden, think Hitler. And when you think "the people of Afghanistan" think "the Jews in the concentration camps."

It's not only that the Afghan people had nothing to do with this atrocity. They were the first victims of the perpetrators. They would exult if someone would come in there, take out the Taliban and clear out the rats nest of international thugs holed up in their country. Some say, why don't the Afghans rise up and overthrow the Taliban? The answer is, they're starved, exhausted, hurt, incapacitated, suffering. A few years ago, the United Nations estimated that there are 500,000 disabled orphans in Afghanistan--a country with no economy, no food. There are millions of widows. And the Taliban has been burying these widows alive in mass graves. The soil is littered with land mines, the farms were all destroyed by the Soviets. These are a few of the reasons why the Afghan people have not overthrown the Taliban.

We come now to the question of bombing Afghanistan back to the Stone Age. Trouble is, that's been done. The Soviets took care of it already. Make the Afghans suffer? They're already suffering. Level their houses? Done. Turn their schools into piles of rubble? Done. Eradicate Their hospitals? Done. Destroy their infrastructure? Cut them off from medicine and health care? Too late. Someone already did all that. New bombs would only stir the rubble of earlier bombs. Would they at least get the Taliban? Not likely. In today's Afghanistan, only the Taliban eat, only they have the means to move around. They'd slip away and hide. Maybe the bombs would get some of those disabled orphans, they don't move too fast, they don't even have wheelchairs. But flying over Kabul and dropping bombs wouldn't really be a strike against the criminals who did this horrific thing. Actually it would only be making common cause with the Taliban--by raping once again the people they've been raping all this time.

So what else is there? What can be done, then? Let me now speak with true fear and trembling. The only way to get Bin Laden is to go in there with ground troops. When people speak of "having the belly to do what needs to be done" they're thinking in terms of having the belly to kill as many as needed. Having the belly to overcome any moral qualms about killing innocent people. Let's pull our heads out of the sand. What's actually on the table is Americans dying. And not just because some Americans would die fighting their way through Afghanistan to Bin Laden's hideout. It's much bigger than that folks. Because to get any troops to Afghanistan, we'd have to go through Pakistan. Would they let us? Not likely. The conquest of Pakistan would have to be first. Will other Muslim nations just stand by? You see where I'm going. We're flirting with a world war between Islam and the West. And guess what: that's Bin Laden's program. That's exactly what he wants. That's why he did this. Read his speeches and statements. It's all right there. He really believes Islam would beat the west. It might seem ridiculous, but he figures if he can polarize the world into Islam and the West, he's got a billion soldiers. If the west wrecks a holocaust in those lands, that's a billion people with nothing left to lose, that's even better from Bin Laden's point of view. He's probably wrong, in the end the west would win, whatever that would mean, but the war would last for years and millions would die, not just theirs but ours. Who has the belly for that? Bin Laden does. Anyone else?

**Tamim Ansary, an Afghan-American writer**



Only wisdom, restraint, compassion and insight can help the world in the aftermath of the American tragedy. This act used an ordinary domestic plane, not a sophisticated bomber or missile. Deep pain and rage must have fueled these terrible and cruel acts. No defense system, which drains money that could be used to feed a million, could have stopped this. No energy and effort put into outrage and revenge, which could go into aiding peace and healing in Palestine, in Afghanistan, will stop another simple and terrible act of terrorism.

Can we all act please, and demand of our leaders, to examine our hearts and minds for our greatest and best effort at compassion. In Australia let us welcome and rehabilitate whoever comes in desperation in leaky boats to our shores. Let us learn the lessons from this of what disdain and disenfranchisement of peoples creates in the world and pour our energy and money into helping and healing the hurt of aboriginal Australia.

This act can only have been born from past acts of cruelty and injustice which have created the `monsters' talked of now. Please Australia, all those of us who live in this truly blessed country and benign society, ask our leaders to act in

compassion and generosity and not to narrow our joint lives into the kind of bitter, selfishness which have created this horror in the world.

**Heather Dietrich**, Australia



There are hundreds of people wanting to help with the rescue effort, wanting to give blood, waiting in line to help in any way they can. What about asking these people to walk over to the homeless shelter or the battered women's shelter or to escort and protect Muslims and other minorities from racist violence? A Sikh temple was attacked in Queens today, and a woman friend of mine was punched in the stomach by a man shouting "f—ing Arab". What about collecting blood and other medical supplies for countries that desperately need them? Why not ask people and corporations to donate ten cents to world hunger for every dollar they give for victims of the attack? Ditto with all the taxpayers' money which is going to be spent on rebuilding financial buildings and that wing of the Pentagon. Why not hold a referendum on whether we really want that stuff rebuilt?

**Sophia Isako Wong**, *Columbia University*



I am as shocked as everyone else all over the world when I learned about the attacks in NY and Washington and elsewhere. My deepest condolences for those families who lost their loved ones, and to those who have suffered from these events, my deepest solidarity to the American people.

I watch CNN and BCC nearly 24-hours a day since that happened—right now I am still glued to the television, the first thought that came to my mind when I watched the first video clips was oh, my god, so many innocent people are going to die or be hurt! I'm listening to the "ordinary" people who are waiting for word about their missing loved ones, and feeling their anxiety and grief. I watch the volunteers and other people helping in the cleaning of the debris and looking for the dead and injured. My heart goes out to all the peoples of the US who now live in fear. I condemn the senseless killing, the devaluing of "ordinary" lives, but I also, as a person in the former colony of the US, and belonging to the "third world," realize that many international policies of the US have negatively affected many countries around the world. I don't think however that despite this, anyone has the right to attack any country in the manner that we all saw.

But, on the other hand, as soon as those thoughts left my head, another thought came in. What about the thousands, perhaps millions of women, children, men in those countries who had died as a result of some of those US interventionist

policies? What about the peoples of Palestine and Israel who daily put their lives on the line because of historical hatred and anger against each other, fanned by "western" countries' policies? In Vietnam, thousands died because of the war waged against the Vietnamese people in the name of "democracy."

That's why there are terrorists, people who believe that the US cannot be the world's policeman, but don't have the same level of power or resources to put the US government to task, take this senseless violence as their strategy. Now, Bush is talking about retaliation, then another retaliation from the countries that will be implicated with the terrorists, and so on. The cycle of violence will merely escalate; is this the way to avenge the death of those who perished in NY and Washington and Pennsylvania?

I fear for our planet. I fear for the innocent lives that will continue to perish in this escalating violence. I fear for the Arab world, which consists of women, children and men who share the ideals of peace and democracy in its real sense who will die because they are Arabs.

Where do we go from here? We can grieve, feel the solidarity among us, but we need to build new agendas that go beyond this patriarchal vision of how the world—and war—could be played out. We will survive this horror, but at what cost?

The ethics of patriarchal politics must end.

**Aida Santos**, *Philippines*



It has been encouraging to me to hear the calls for compassion and restraint coming from members of this list. Around me everyday, whether in conversations with family and friends or from televised commentaries, I see people attempting to deal with our shared grief and sorrow. Understandably, the emotions which often follow are those of anger and fear. Unfortunately, this seems to be all too naturally and easily followed by pleas for retaliation, even if after careful deliberation and investigation. While it is justified to seek punishment in this case, most people seem to be missing the point of it all. What has lifted my heart are the FABlist's feminine voices which have the equanimity and perspective to fall not to anger and calls for retaliation, but which can reside and identify with the sorrow of those on all sides of this conflict and which call us to be agents for change.

I am fortunate to be working this semester as a Graduate Assistant with two outstanding faculty members (Sara Goering and Greta Nagel) from my university in an interdisciplinary citizenship class. In our discussion groups we have been examining how even small acts of prejudice can turn in to acts of hatred. We have explored how the lack of appreciation of our diversity, the unwillingness to understand other's perspectives, and the inability to foster respectful

tolerance turn suddenly into gang warfare in our neighborhoods, racial atrocities in our countries, and acts of terrorism across the globe. Thankfully our class has a service learning component. Our students will spend a minimum of 16 hours working with people (especially children) in our communities to foster and encourage citizenship. I believe our students will be agents for change and I trust that many of them will take this opportunity to demonstrate how citizenship begins in compassion and results in understanding, cooperation, and peace.

While there is little immediate hope that the US government will actually demonstrate the depth of qualities we are calling for (especially after today's 98-0 vote in the Senate for approval of use of force), we can hope that this tragedy becomes the catalyst for change. However, it is up to us (philosophers, teachers, and caring citizens) to facilitate such change and to do so within our own circles of influence. Those circles may be as fundamental as our families, friends, classrooms, workplaces, and communities.

So thank you Laura Shanner, Heather Dietrich, and others for charting the course. Your voices are being heard and your appeals are being headed.

**Russ Daley**, *California State University*



The letter to the editor included below (already sent to the S. F. Chronicle) represents the most concise and complete version of the message I believe we must get out to every member of Congress, every media outlet, and every opinion maker as quickly as possible. I have already contacted all my own Congressional representatives. Please use your own contact lists and forward this message as widely as possible, write versions of it to your own local newspapers, and do whatever else you can to create a buzz.

If you would like to read an excellent and detailed argument for why calling the attack a crime is best, look at Michael Klare's piece entitled "How to Defeat bin Laden" at [www.salon.com](http://www.salon.com) dated 9/13. Klare does not use the moral integrity/McVeigh references, but he includes brilliant ideas about how the crime definition can strengthen our ties to mainstream Islam worldwide and increase American understanding of the suffering of others abroad.

I feel very strongly that this terrible moment in our history as a country offers us an unprecedented opportunity for growth and moral evolution, if we can fully confront the moral gulf between responding to these bombings as crime or as so-called acts of war.

**Susan C. Strong**, *Orinda, CA*

Dear Editor,

It is vital to our moral integrity as a nation that we immediately stop calling the bombings of New York and Washington acts of war. These attacks were crimes against hu-

manity perpetrated by an international network of mass murderers. They demand that justice be done. To react by calling for war brings us down to the same level as our attackers, because modern war involves the massive and systematic killing of innocents. The military's language for this, collateral damage, is exactly how terrorist Timothy McVeigh dismissed the deaths of his innocent victims. Our country and our leaders must rise above this level now, before it is too late.



I have been deeply moved by the correspondence within FAB. There has been a huge response here in London which echoes much of our shared thinking. This is not covered by the media which is almost silencing dissent.

On Friday I went to a meeting at Friends House which overflowed into a second hall and into the garden outside—some three thousand people pulled together by phone and email and no public advertising in a matter of days. It was too white to properly reflect London, but women and men of all generations were there.

There are vigils in London of the Women in Black by the Edith Cavell statue, a nurse shot in WWI saying 'Patriotism is not enough' - so a good woman to stand by. There are mixed groups in black standing vigil by 10 Downing Street called by CND. Also vigils in Edinburgh. In other cities meetings are being held at no notice attracting 200 people. I am sure there is much much more going on but the traditional organisations of the peace movement, feminism and the left are very weak so these are just fragments I know about.

I think it was an old Wobbly slogan which urged "don't mourn, organise." I believe that in the face of this horror and the possible worst case aftermath we must do both. Now working fast and sensitive to our differences we have to build a movement.

There seem to be two calls so far for "Peace and Justice" and "Not in my name" (also a song which I guess we will all learn) against the massive military build up.

**Hilary Rose**, *Gresham College London*



# Job Announcements

The Neiswanger Institute for Bioethics and Health Policy, Stritch School of Medicine, Loyola University Chicago, is seeking an assistant professor of bioethics to serve as the Institute's Assistant Director of Education.

This is a tenure track position. Administrative responsibilities include coordinating a new bioethics graduate program (web-based). A Ph.D. or J.D. ideal. Interest in conducting case consultation preferred. Send a curriculum vitae and a writing sample to Mark Kuczewski, Ph.D., Neiswanger Institute for Bioethics & Health Policy, Stritch School of Medicine, Rm 280, Loyola University Chicago, 2160 S. First Avenue, Maywood, IL 60153.

Submissions can be made electronically <mkuczew@lumc.edu>. Applications accepted until the position is filled. Loyola University Chicago is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer and educator.



Department of Clinical Bioethics, National Institute of Health, Bethesda MD.

Two-year postdoctoral fellowship begins September 2002. Fellows will conduct mentored research and participate in bioethics seminars and clinical ethics consultations. Teaching in a Department of Philosophy can be arranged. AOS or AOC: ethics or political philosophy. No bioethics experience required. Stipend based on prior experience and current US government schedule, approximately \$31,000 per year without prior post-doctoral experience. EO/AE.

Applications should include CV, 1000-word statement of interest, writing sample, official transcript, and three letters of reference. Deadline: January 15, 2002.

Submit applications by mail to: Becky Chen, Department of Clinical Bioethics - NIH, Warren G. Magnuson Clinical Center, 10 Center Drive, Building 10, Rm 1C118, Bethesda, MD 20892-1156; Tel: 301-496-2429; bchen@cc.nih.gov



The Philosophy Department of the University at Buffalo (SUNY) is conducting a search for an assistant professor specializing in Bioethics/Medical Ethics, with competence in one or more of the following areas: Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Biology, Cognitive Science, Ethics. The tenure-track position, which is available subject to final budgetary approval, begins Fall, 2002. Candidates must have the PhD by August, 2002 and must show strong evidence of research productivity. The teaching load is two courses per semester, both graduate and undergraduate. Duties also include acting as Department liaison with the Medical School. Salary will be competitive.

The University at Buffalo (SUNY) is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer, and we strongly encourage applications from minorities, women, and persons with disabilities. Qualified individuals with a disability may request a needed reasonable accommodation to participate in the application process. No person, in whatever relationship with the University at Buffalo (SUNY), shall be subject to discrimination on the basis of age, creed, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, or marital or veteran status.

The deadline for applications, including CVs and letters of recommendation, is November 1, 2001. Applications should be sent to: Prof. Carolyn Korsmeyer, Chair, Search Committee, Department of Philosophy, 135 Park Hall, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York, 14260

University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Fl. Asst. Prof., Tenure-track, beginning fall semester, 2002. 6 courses/year (3/semester), undergraduate. AOS: ethical theory. Special competence in gender theory is also highly desirable. Degree requirements for Ph.D. in philosophy must be completed by June 1, 2002. We are a pluralistic department emphasizing diverse approaches to teaching and research. A strong commitment to undergraduate teaching is required, and a substantial portion of the teaching load will be lower division, introductory philosophy courses that meet general education requirements. The successful candidate will have an opportunity to participate in UNF's Center for Ethics, Public Policy, and the Professions.

Evidence of scholarly promise required. Usual non-teaching duties. Some summer work available. We encourage applications from women and minorities. Send complete dossier, including a letter of application, at least three letters of recommendation, graduate transcripts, a writing sample up to 25 pages, and evidence of successful teaching experience, to: Philosophy Search #2, Department of Philosophy, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL 32224. Deadline for applications: postmarked November 17, 2001. For more information, visit our Web Site at <http://www.unf.edu/dept/humanres/> "UNF is an Equal Opportunity/Equal Access/Affirmative Action Institution."



The Philosophy Department at the University of Utah is seeking to make an appointment in Applied Ethics. Candidates should specialize in at least one of the following applied ethics areas: bioethics, environmental ethics, legal ethics, business ethics, professional ethics, or engineering ethics. The appointment will be either at the Associate or Assistant Professor level, effective Fall Semester, 2002. Duties include research, teaching, supervision of both M.A. and Ph.D. students, and standard committee service. The teaching load is two courses per semester. The Area of Competence is open. Affiliation with the Division of Medical Ethics at the University of Utah School of Medicine is a possibility. A complete application should contain a letter of application, CV, three letters of recommendation, a statement of research and teaching interests, evidence of teaching excellence, and a sample of written work. Salary competitive. Send applications to Search Committee, University of Utah, Philosophy, 260 Central Campus Dr Rm 341, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9156.

Applications will be accepted until the position is filled but those received by November 5, 2001 are guaranteed full consideration. The University is an AA/EO employer and encourages applications from women and minorities, and provides reasonable accommodation to the known disabilities of applicants and employees. For more information please contact Bruce Landesman at: Tel: 801 581 - 8361 (office); 801 355-4342 (home); Fax: 801 585 - 5195; E-mail: Bruce.Landesman@mail.hum.utah.edu

# Book Review Section

---

A review of **Globalizing Feminist Bioethics** edited by Rosemarie Tong with Gwen Anderson and Aida Santos. Boulder and Oxford: Westview Press, 2001. 368 pages.

This anthology aims to ‘globalize’ feminist bioethics by challenging dominant conceptualizations of the intersection between global and local. The twenty-two essays that compose the book were originally presented at the bi-annual conference of the International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics (FAB), which was held in Japan in 1998. This international event gathered professionals from various disciplines, including medicine, philosophy, genetics, gender studies and bioethics, and with different socio-cultural backgrounds, coming from Asia, Europe, the United States and Latin America.

The topics are extremely varied, ranging from theoretical discussions of the role of feminist bioethics and the tensions between universalism and relativism in its approaches, to a broad array of specific bioethical concerns such as pregnancy, abortion, female genital circumcision, and HIV/AIDS examined in certain socio-cultural and geographical contexts. Interestingly, however, some common themes can be easily identified. Most authors are concerned about the suitability of Western clinical models and technologies to address people’s (especially women’s) health needs and take into account body experiences that are deeply integrated with people’s social and existential being. If the responsible use of technology and science remains a preoccupation in the Western world, the indiscriminate export of such values and practices to developing countries seems even more worrisome, since it may disrupt the functioning of existing health care services and negatively affect people’s well-being. Hence, scientific developments and applications should be carefully scrutinized by civil society and feminist groups, and if necessary opposed.

From this, it does not automatically derive that tradition and local cultures are necessarily “good.” On the contrary, various authors are very well aware that many traditional practices, such as female genital mutilation, are harmful to women and should not be condoned just because of a self-proclaimed respect for cultural values. And, here lies the greatest challenge for feminist bioethicists: can universalism in upholding women’s rights be combined with a sincere appreciation for local realities? Or, are calls for the understanding of different socio-cultural contexts to be immediately dismissed as soon as such contexts harbor disregard for women’s rights as defined by feminist (Western?) theories? Or, on the contrary, should relativist views

be maintained at all costs, even if such desire to respect cultural diversity may prevent feminist bioethics from condemning oppressive features of Third-World communities (p. 30)?

The anthology does not resolve such fundamental questions, but makes a serious effort to deal with these (apparent?) contradictions, especially in the first part of the book, dedicated to theoretical perspectives. As Anne Donchin states in the introduction, both Susan Sherwin and Rosemarie Tong point in their essays ‘to tensions between specific cultural practices and features of our common humanity that override geographical, cultural and racial difference, most conspicuously childbirth, illness, disability and death.’ Still, these two authors vary in the degree in which they choose to emphasize global similarity vis-à-vis local diversity. On one side, Rosemarie Tong believes that the global ‘sameness’ of women’s oppression and their universal right to attain freedom and well-being takes precedence over contextual diversity. On the other side, Susan Sherwin, warns that emphasis on global features can obscure alternative moral systems and power structures, and argues for the necessity to find new approaches ‘if we hope to understand where moral intuitions can legitimately be shared cross-culturally, and where they founder on differences in experience and cultural values’ (pp13-14). She then proposes to view alternative moral theories and positions as a set of lenses that can be switched or layered-up depending on the specific aims and needs. Diverse, or even contrasting, cultural positions should be considered as additional lenses that might highlight the same moral issue from different angles, thus expanding our moral vision, although not necessarily providing definitive solution to moral dilemma (pp. 23-25). As she states: ‘the metaphor of lenses helps us appreciate that what appears to be a satisfactory resolution to a problem may well vary with the perspective we adopt. It challenges us not to settle too quickly for the most familiar and comfortable perspective...’ (p.25).

One clear example of ‘lenses’ is the concept of *kagandahang loob* (good will/deeds), which is central to ordinary Filipino ethical thinking, and according to the author, Leonardo De Castro, may provide important clues for understanding bioethical issues in the Filipino context. Although I would have expected some critical remarks on the concept of ‘feminine’ bioethics as used by the author, this essay remains important in that it clearly demonstrates how diverse global bioethics would look if more practitioners would start to employ conceptual frameworks that use indigenous language and concepts ‘expressive of a people’s own experiences, concerns, traditions, perceived problems, dreams, hopes and aspirations’ (p. 60). And it is exactly in the name of

such diverse reality that the last essay in this theoretical section, written by Debora Diniz and Ana Cristina Gonzalez Velez, strongly emphasizes the necessity of claiming the particularity of the local context (in this case, Brazil) and the urgency for bioethicists to be as attentive as possible to local particulars. The authors also argue against the transfer of bioethical theories developed in the United States to Brazil and other 'peripheral countries.' Interestingly, however, in their opposing foreign dominance, the authors call for a 'unique bioethics for Brazil' as if no diversity exists within the boundaries of a nation state.

In the second part of the book, the local-global dialogue is contextualized in a series of essays on particular reproductive, genetic and sexual health issues. Issues that emerge include the diversity of women's moral experience with regard to pregnancy, family planning and abortion, notwithstanding some transcultural similarities; the potentiality of reproductive technologies to undermine women's autonomy rather than strengthen it; men's responsibility in protecting women from unwanted pregnancy; the implication of genetic knowledge and related technological development for human and more particularly women's welfare; and the impact of moral state ideologies on marginalized groups.

One issue that reserves particular attention, in view of the emerging discourse on men's participation in reproductive health, is whether greater men's involvement is desirable from a feminist perspective since it may end up disempowering women even further. How does greater men's involvement affect women's autonomy and control of their body? And how are different, more equitable, gender roles to be attained: through legal sanctions, as proposed by Naoko Miyaji, or through an awareness raising process?

Finally, the essays in the third, and final, part of the book focus on medical research and treatment. I find this section particularly interesting for the strong emphasis on human rights as the key concept of feminist analysis. The central question can be summed-up as follows: do medical research, trials and treatment respect the rights and dignity of women? The authors seem to conclude negatively, and stress that medical science and technology is not value free, and that fragrant abuses can occur due to the dominance of patriarchal values held by health professionals and their connivance with authoritarian systems. As Jonathan Mann, quoted in the last essay, states, it is time for health professionals 'to consider their responsibility not only to respect human rights in developing policies, programs and practices, but to contribute actively from their position as health workers to improving societal realization of rights' (pp.327-328).

Similarly, this book shows that there is much work to be done by feminist bioethicists in conceptualizing and practicing a global feminist bioethics respectful of human rights and diversity. As Nancy M. Williams notes in her epilogue, the task of assimilating diverse, and oftentimes conflicting, cross-cultural perspectives is incredibly challenging (p.334).

Still, this anthology in itself proves that there is willingness from many sides to work on such a daunting task. Hopefully, future readers will feel called to make an effort to build cross-cultural understanding in an increasingly divided world.

**Rosalia Sciortino**, *Rocke Feller Foundation*



A review of **Health Care and the Ethics of Encounter: A Jewish Discussion of Social Justice**, by Laurie Zoloth. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1999. 323 pages, \$45.00 cloth, \$19.95 paper.

This is a beautiful book. One should read it for that reason alone, since we could all use more beauty in our lives.

It is beautiful because it is passionate. Zoloth's deep concern about the injustice wrought on millions of real people by the current system of health care allocation in the U.S. is evident from the first page. This passion provides the text with a feeling of urgency, of concreteness, of reality. The book likewise glows with Zoloth's deep love for the Jewish tradition and communal life. Immersed in that tradition, Zoloth convincingly constructs a compelling alternative discourse for considering questions of the medical common good from the texts, language, and history of Judaism.

It is beautiful because it is well-written. Not only is Zoloth's prose a delightfully refreshing change of pace from the arid, abstract, or puffed-up tone which plagues so many bioethicists; it is also clear. In Part One, she provides one of the most accessible accounts of the crisis of health care reform and the Oregon Health Care Decision Making Project that I have yet encountered. And if that were not enough, she then turns to an even more complex beast—the liberal account of justice from Locke through Veatch, complete with its critics from various communitarian camps (philosophical, sociological, feminist, and Christian). Again, her display of the various parties to the conversation is clear and understandable. This is no mean feat.

It is beautiful because it is substantive and carefully-crafted. Zoloth is clearly in command of the material on Oregon Health Decisions and the critiques of liberal political theory. As she turns to the Jewish tradition in Part Two, however, the substantive power of the work becomes even more impressive. Zoloth seeks to provide an alternative to the regnant anthropology of the moral agent, rooted, as it is in liberal theory, in an individualistic autonomy. She finds such an alternative in the Jewish tradition, elaborated within

the ethical theory of theologian Emmanuel Levinas as “an ethics of encounter.” Talmudic texts, Jewish theologians (e.g., Levinas, Buber), contemporary Jewish scholars, and Holocaust texts are woven together to create a richly construed, deeply communal world in which the reader is immersed.

It is beautiful because it is feminist. Zoloth’s reconstruction of the Jewish tradition in chapters six and seven is then crystallized through an amazing exegesis of the Book of Ruth in the penultimate but climactic chapter of the argument. It is in the story of these two women—Ruth and Naomi—that she finds “a new vocabulary for justice: personal, intimate, relational, and yet directly normative.” The book is worth picking up just to read this exegesis.

Clear writing distills complex ideas. Consequently, this book would be wonderful to use with undergraduates to explore health care reform, theories of justice, the vitality of religious traditions in bioethics, and creative feminist analysis. Equally, however, this book ought to be read by any serious bioethicist. A short review cannot do justice to the Zoloth’s careful analysis, the multiple resources brought to bear, and her brilliant display of the power of both religious traditions and feminism to provide compelling alternatives to stagnant and intractable debates. True to the model Zoloth puts forward, the book requires the reader to enter into conversation, to engage in a “face-to-face” encounter.

**M. Therese Lysaught**, *University of Dayton*



A review of **Sexual Harassment as an Ethical Issue in Academic Life**, by Leslie Pickering Francis. Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000. 265 pages, \$73.50 cloth; \$21.95 paper.

Leslie Francis, professor of both law and philosophy at the University of Utah, is author of roughly half of this book, which appears in Stanley Cahn’s series, *Issues in Academic Ethics*. The other half of the volume is made up of reprints of some of the most varied and influential work on sexual harassment and a generous selection of sexual harassment policies from a variety of academic institutions.

Francis begins by working her way through the complicated conceptual terrain of sexual harassment, using five categories of behavior to launch the discussion. These are gender harassment, seductive behavior, sexual bribery, sexual coercion, and sexual assault. She then

articulates the central ongoing questions in conceptualizing sexual harassment: What is the role of pervasiveness in making an environment hostile because harassing? What are the links between power and harassment? Do the ideas of female-to-male and same-sex harassment make sense? From whose point of view should harassment be identified? All of these questions are addressed in the book, in Francis’s own chapters or the collected selections.

After laying some groundwork, Francis frames the discussion of sexual harassment as an ethical issue in academia within a consideration of freedom of expression and the purposes of higher education. Here, she nicely shows how the responsibility to ensure that all students in the academy have equal access to education can conflict with both freedom of expression and the obligation of the academy to transmit knowledge. For example, she asks: What if maintaining the university as an open forum for speech results in hate speech, harassment, or discussions that marginalize groups for whom access is particularly central? What if insistence on access deflects attention from the development and transmission of knowledge? (21)

Different answers to these kinds of questions flow from different points of view. Francis divides these points of view into liberal commitments to both knowledge and equality in the academy, conservative commitments to the preservation of traditional cultures and the traditional canon, and radical critics’ commitments to moving away from the myth of liberal neutrality and to undermining the reproduction of repressive culture. Because harassment has expressive components, Francis completes her account of the conceptual geography with a helpful discussion of the purported distinction between speech and action, including the embedded question of whether some speech constitutes wrongful harm.

Francis follows her articulation and clarification of the conceptual issues with a discussion of sexual harassment in the law -- an equally difficult and often confusing terrain. Here, she divides the discussion between sexual harassment in employment law and sexual harassment in education law, returning to several of the conceptual issues she isolated in the chapter on conceptualizing sexual harassment.

Next, Francis devotes two chapters to the question of moral wrong as it arises in assaults, threats, and offers. She offers an illuminating discussion of the very tricky business of distinguishing offers from threats and offenses from harms in the context of the special features of campus communities which create special obligations for certain members of these communities. This links to a discussion of consensual sexual relationships and the concerns they raise about educational quality and opportunity, and the quality of consent.

Having drawn some conclusions along the way, in

her final chapter on sexual harassment policies and procedures, Francis brings these conclusions together to make a number of practical suggestions, including the suggestion that the academy needs to explore alternatives to disciplinary paradigms “to reduce the frequency of harassment and mitigate its effects” (126).

This first half of the book is, then, a book in itself. Its chapters begin with stories, some accurate real-life stories, and some composites of accurate real-life stories. The stories move us through the issues to the hard theoretical and practical questions. Beautifully conceived and expertly executed, Francis gives us an enormously helpful and richly detailed discussion of sexual harassment as a moral issue in the academy, complete with useful suggestions for practice.

As already indicated, the second half of the book is collection of selections from other authors, many of them well known in the literature on sexual harassment. Included here is a selection from Catharine MacKinnon’s ground-breaking *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination* (1979), in which MacKinnon introduces the now familiar distinction in feminist jurisprudence between a difference approach and an inequality approach to understanding sexual harassment. Embracing an inequality approach, MacKinnon argues that sexual harassment of working women “integrally contributes to the maintenance of an underclass or a deprived position because of gender status,” constitutes sex discrimination in employment, and thus violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

The selection from MacKinnon is followed by a sampling from Billy Dziech and Linda Weiner’s *Lecherous Professor* (1990), a book that drew considerable attention to the problem of sexual harassment on university campuses. The selection is loaded with very concrete clues to the behaviors of sexual harassers and how administrators might approach them.

Nancy Tuana’s contribution is an excerpt from her 1983 “Sexual Harassment in Academe: Issues of Power and Coercion,” which concentrates on the distinction raised earlier by Francis between offers and coercion, and provides an analysis of ‘coercion’ that allows (against the standard liberal analysis of ‘coercion’) even nonthreatening offers to be coercive.

In a portion of her 1990 “Sexual Harassment as Sexual Discrimination,” Ellen Frankel Paul rejects MacKinnon’s analysis of sexual harassment as sexual discrimination, arguing instead that sexual harassment needs to be understood as a violation of an individual’s right, rather than as “a wrong to women as members of an oppressed and legally protected group” (165). As such, according to Paul, the violation is appropriately remedied via tort law.

In “A Feminist Definition of Sexual Harassment,” (1993), Anita Superson returns to the group analysis

of sexual harassment, developing and defending a view of sexual harassment “that accounts for the group harm of all forms” of sexual harassment (176). Superson’s analysis in this selection raises one of the questions isolated earlier by Francis, namely, whether there can be female-to-male sexual harassment. Superson’s answer is no, because of the power distributions across groups -- only those in the dominant group (in this case, men) can participate in the group harm of sexual harassment.

The selection from Robert Holmes’s “Sexual Harassment and the University” (1996) returns us to the academy. Like Paul, Holmes offers an individualistic analysis of the wrong of sexual harassment, contending that the wrong done is privacy invasion.

The excerpt from Jane Gallop’s highly controversial *Feminist Accused of Sexual Harassment* (1997) addresses the issue of so-called consensual amorous relations between professors and students. Gallop argues that “[a]t its most intense -- and I would argue, its most productive--the pedagogical relation between teacher and student is, in fact, a ‘consensual amorous relation.’ And if schools decide to prohibit not only sex but ‘amorous relations’ between teacher and student, the ‘consensual amorous relation’ that will be banned from our campuses might just be teaching itself” (203). “Sexual harassment occurs,” says Gallop, “when sex is split off from teaching, when pleasure is procured at the expense of imparting knowledge” (208).

The final two selections are from Linda Fitts Mischler’s “Reconciling Rapture, Representation, and Responsibility: An Argument Against Per Se Bans On Attorney-Client Sex” (1996) and David Archaud’s “Exploited Consent” (1994). These very short pieces extend the discussion to medicine and law, allowing us to draw connections between sexual relations with clients and professor/student relationships. Both papers add interestingly, if very differently, to the discussion of coerced consent.

Leslie Francis’s *Sexual Harassment as an Ethical Issue in Academic Life* is a substantial contribution to the literature on sexual harassment generally and academic ethics in particular. It should not be missed by anyone with interests in either or both of these issues.

**Joan Callahan, University of Kentucky**



# FAB Announcements

## RECENT APPOINTMENT TO FAB OFFICES

### New Archivist Appointed

FAB is proud to announce that Carolyn Ells, of Dalhousie University, has been appointed as FAB archivist. Consult the FAB webpage for the Archivist Policy. It has information about what FAB members should/should not send to the FAB Archivist. When in doubt about material for the Archive, contact Carolyn directly. Her contact information is:

Carolyn Ells, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor  
Coordinator, Hospital Collaboration  
Department of Bioethics  
Dalhousie University  
5849 University Avenue  
Halifax, Nova Scotia  
B3H 4H7  
TEL: 902-494-3801  
FAX: 902-494-3865  
email: cells@tupdean2.med.dal.ca

### Membership Secretary Changes Hands

After serving FAB as Membership Secretary for many years, Becky Holmes is stepping down from her position. FAB owes her an *enormous* debt of gratitude for all the work she has done for FAB in this and other capacities.

Fortunately, Lenore Kuo has agreed to continue Becky's good work. Lenore Kuo has just completed her first book, *Revolutionizing Prostitution: Gender and Policy*, for New York University Press. She is currently on leave from the University of Nebraska at Omaha where she teaches Philosophy and Women's Studies. Lenore's work in bioethics includes articles on surrogate mothering, the state-mandated use of Norplant, and secondary discrimination in public policy. Lenore's contact information is:

Lenore Kuo  
lkuo333@aol.com  
850 W. 176th Street  
Apartment 1B  
New York, NY 10033

### Anne Donchin Changes Roles

Anne Donchin, one of FAB's co-founders, has decided to step down as Chair of the Grants Committee. She remains on active duty, however, as she will continue to serve as FAB Treasurer.

It is people like Anne who have made FAB the thriving organization it is today!

## The FAB Listserv

The purpose of the list is to provide a forum for a feminist discussion of issues in bioethics and to publicize items of interest to feminist bioethicists, including upcoming events, calls for papers, and announcements of publications. It is NOT a forum for discussing the merits of feminism, although it welcomes discussions that refine and build feminist theory.

Hilde Nelson monitors the list to weed out spam and messages that were intended to be private but were inadvertently posted to all the subscribers. So do feel free to speak up, although lurkers are also welcome.

To subscribe to the list, send an email message to listserve@list.msu.edu with this command in the body of the email: SUBSCRIBE FABLIST Your Name. To stop your subscription, send the command (once again in the body of the email): SIGNOFF FABLIST. Post messages to the list by sending them to fablist@list.msu.edu.

## The FAB Webpage

To visit our Web site, go to <http://www.fabnet.org>. The site, maintained by Alison Crane with the help of Hilde Nelson, offers a description of FAB, a membership directory, a wonderful annotated bibliography of work in feminist bioethics, posts of announcements of upcoming conferences and calls for papers, a membership application form, a statement of FAB's policies, contact information for FAB's co-coordinators and its board of directors, links to other Web sites, and archived copies of the newsletter.

In the wake of the horrifying events of September 11 in New York City, Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania, U.S. FAB members have received support and condolences from FAB members both within their own country and worldwide. In this as in so many other things, we are all part of a larger community. Gratefully, we have created a special web page where these messages can be viewed and shared. We have also created a page for discussions of the U.S. response to this tragedy.



# FUNDING POSSIBILITIES FOR TRAVEL TO FAB 2002 IN BRAZIL

The following information, forwarded by Wendy Rogers, may be useful to those who are trying to find financial support to enable them to travel to FAB's next conference.

The main source in the past has been the Ford Foundation. Anne Donchin advises that they are very slow in their processes, so if you wish to apply for funding from them, you need to start now. The website address is: They have offices in US, Nigeria, Egypt, Indonesia, Kenya, South Africa, Vietnam, India, China, Brazil and Chile. The contact details are available on the web.

The other suggestion from Anne is for people to contact the Brazilian Counsel in your own country as they may be willing to sponsor people to come to Brazil for the meeting.

## From Ford Foundation Website:

### Grants to Individuals

Most of the Foundation's grant funds are given to organizations. Although it also makes grants to individuals, they are few in number relative to demand and are limited to research, training and other activities related to its program interests.

The Foundation does not award undergraduate scholarships or make grants for purely personal needs. Support for graduate fellowships is generally provided through grants to universities and other organizations, which are responsible for the selection of recipients. Most Foundation grants to individuals are awarded either through publicly announced competitions or on the basis of nominations from universities and other nonprofit institutions. In all cases, recipients are selected on the merits of their proposals and on their potential contribution to advancing the Foundation's program objectives.

### Grants and Program-Related Investments to Organizations

Before a request is made for a grant or program-related investment, a brief letter of inquiry is advisable to determine whether the Foundation's present interests and funds permit consideration of the request.

The letter should include:

- The purpose of the project for which funds are being requested
- Problems and issues the proposed project will address
- Information about the organization conducting the project
- Estimated overall budget for the project

- Period of time for which funds are requested
- Qualifications of those who will be engaged in the project

After receiving the letter, Foundation staff members may ask the grant seeker to submit a formal proposal. There is no grant application form. The proposal should include:

- The organization's current budget
- A description of the proposed work and how it will be conducted
- The names and curriculum vitae of those engaged in the project
- A detailed project budget
- Present means of support and status of applications to other funding sources
- Legal and tax status

In some instances, the Foundation requires the grantee organization to match the Foundation's grant with funds from other sources.

The Foundation supports pluralism and equal opportunity in its grant making and in its internal policies. The opportunities that prospective grantee organizations provide for minorities and women are considered in evaluating proposals.

Applications are considered throughout the year. Normally applicants may expect to receive within six weeks an indication of whether their proposals are within the Foundation's program interests and budget limitations. Activities supported by grants and program-related investments must be charitable, educational or scientific, as defined under the appropriate provisions of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code and Treasury Regulations. The Foundation monitors grants through regular financial and narrative reports submitted by the grantee.

The Foundation's funds are limited in relation to the great number of worthwhile proposals received. For example, in 1999 the Foundation received 38,200 grant requests and made 2,252 grants. Of that number, 22 percent were first-time grant recipients. The Foundation directs its support to activities that are within its current interests and are likely to have wide effect. Support is not normally given for routine operating costs of institutions or for religious activities. Except in rare cases, funding is not available for the construction or maintenance of buildings.

Requests in the United States should be sent to: Secretary, Ford Foundation, 320 East 43 Street, New York, N.Y. 10017

Requests in foreign countries should be directed to the nearest Foundation office. See Addresses and E-mail links for locations of field offices.



# News From

## News from India

From: Shanthi Krishnaraj

The Union Ministry of Family Welfare has given the go-ahead for the introduction of Net-en, the controversial injectable contraceptive for women. Twelve medical colleges in collaboration with the Indian Council of Medical Research would introduce Net-en, manufactured by a German company, on a pilot basis. The colleges would study women's response to the bi-monthly shots. A vial, which costs about Rs120, would be subsidised under the social marketing scheme and would cost about Rs80 per injection. After the Supreme Court vacated the stay on introduction of Net-en on a petition filed by women's groups, which had argued that the side-effects of the invasive hormonal method had not been tried and tested on Indian women, the government decided to introduce it as a pilot project.



The misuse of Pre-natal Diagnostic technique for the purpose of abortion of female foetuses was prohibited under the PNDT Act of 1994 and enforced with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> June 1996 in India. In spite of this prohibition, due to the strong cultural preference for sons, this technique is used to find the sex of the baby and subsequently abort the baby if found female. Hence a strong warning has been given by the President, Tamil Nadu Medical Council in leading newspapers in India (dt 2.9.2001) to the medical practitioners who perform such tests and subsequent abortions with the only intention of making money. Though the punishment (which is imprisonment up to five years with a fine and removal of name from the state Medical Register) is very severe, mushrooming of private nursing homes/clinics which indulge in female foeticide is continuously on the increase. According to the 2001 Census of India the sex ratio of child population in the age group 0-6 has come down to 927 from 945 in 1991. The sharpest decline in sex ratio of the child population has been observed in Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana, Gujarat, Uttaranchal, Maharashtra and Chandigarh.



Sri Padmavathi Women's University, Tirupathi in Andhra Pradesh (a southern state in India) conducted a refresher course for college teachers (the idea of the refresher course is to update the knowledge of the college professors with the latest developments, issues and debates) in women's studies in August 2001. One session was devoted to the discussion of Reproductive Health Care of Women and Feminist Bioethics. The highlights of the discussion were misuse of pre-natal diagnostic techniques for purposes of abortion of female foetuses, subjecting women to harmful contraceptives with the sole intention of reducing population growth, and the possibility of poor, down-trodden women being forced into surrogate motherhood for paltry sums under the New Reproductive technologies. Heated discussion among the participants (35 females and 15 males) revealed that knowledge about bioethics is fairly good among the academia. They also evinced keen interest on FAB; the leaflet "What is FAB" and a sample issue of FAB newsletter were distributed. Many are keen on becoming members though felt that \$10 would have been a reasonable subscription fee. Dr.K.Shanthi, who was one of the resource persons for this refresher course, and who also happens to be the country representative for FAB, utilised this opportunity to speak on the achievements of FAB and the highlights of the London conference of 2000. As the participants are drawn from almost all regions of India, this forum was considered to be ideal for spreading the message of FAB. Since the college teachers organise field visits for the students as part of their curriculum and work with the community they were requested to awaken the conscience of women and men on bioethical issues. It was resolved to introduce one session on bioethics not only in women's studies refresher courses but in all refresher courses of social science disciplines. So a beginning has been made and it is hoped that it will catch up momentum in due course.



The University of Madras in Tamil Nadu (a southern state in India) and the Medical University in Tamil Nadu have worked to devise a bioethics curriculum as part of medical education. Many objectionable clinical trials are carried out especially in developing countries on aborted foetuses and embryos. So to sensitize the medical practitioners and stu-

# Around the World

dents, the two universities have launched a project in association with the European Academy of Environment and Economy (EAEE) of Germany. The thrust of this project is to recommend to the governments and the academy the means to plug loopholes in the existing law and create a regulatory and monitoring body, apart from developing the bio-ethics curriculum. A two-day workshop has been contemplated and is likely to be held in January 2002.



## Country Reports from Ukraine

From: Svetlana Vekovshynina

Ukraine has 50 million inhabitants. It is the greatest part of the former USSR. Now it is an independent state, but bioethics is still in its infancy. Today there are only some pioneers' bioethics courses in Ukraine: in Kiev (Medical Academy), in Lviv (Medical university), in Kharkov (Zooveterinary Institute), in Ternopol (in school). We have only 2-3 brochures on bioethics published in Ukraine (one translated from French). Now there are 2 NGO-s on bioethics in Ukraine: The Ukrainian Association on Bioethics in Kiev and Kharkov' Association on Bioethics-Regional. The First Symposium on bioethics was in September 2000; the next Congress on bioethics will be in September 2001 in Kiev.



## Country Report from France

From: Jennifer Merchant

### France's first "wrongful life" case ?

#### Latest on the revision of the French bioethics laws

"Wrongful birth" or "wrongful life" cases were initiated in the United States at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, it was not until 1980 in *Curlender v. Bio-Science Laborato-*

*ries* (165 Cal. RPTR. 477) and especially three years later in *Harbeson v. Parke-Davis* (98 Wash. 2d 460, 656 P. 2d 483, 1983) that the juridical principle of "wrongful birth/life" was fully recognized by those courts, resulting in damages awarded not only to the parents but to the child as well. Essentially, a "wrongful birth/life" case involves a child born with severe mental and/or physical handicaps that were not diagnosed *in utero*, and who is now forced to live a "wrongful life." Indeed, it is argued that if the error in diagnosis had not occurred, the child would have chosen not to have been born. The *Curlender* case, for example, involved a child born with Tay-Sachs, a severely debilitating disease that usually leads to the death of the child around four or five years of age, and that had not been diagnosed by the laboratory analyzing the results of the mother's amniocentesis.

For the first time in France, in November 2000, the *Cour de Cassation* (somewhat equivalent to the United States Supreme Court) reasoned more or less along the same lines by awarding significant damages to both Nicolas Perruche and his parents. The case involved an error in diagnosing the presence (or absence) of Rubella (German measles) in the mother during her first trimester of pregnancy. Mr. and Mrs. Perruche's four-year old daughter had contracted the German measles, and the parent's fear lay in the possibility that Mrs. Perruche had thus contracted the virus - if such were the case, the parents' choice was to terminate the pregnancy. The laboratory concluded that Mrs. Perruche was immune and could pursue her pregnancy without a qualm, yet at Nicolas's birth, he rapidly presented symptoms linked to the *Gregg syndrome* (severe neurological disorders, blindness, deafness, and severe cardiovascular disorders), a direct result of his exposure to Rubella *in utero*.

From a juridical standpoint, the debate in France revolved not so much around the parents' demand for damages due to the laboratory's medical negligence (general consensus responded affirmatively), but whether Nicolas could also be defined as a plaintiff, the victim of having a "wrongful life" imposed upon him, and thus become the beneficiary of damages as well. For most commentators, such a demand was both unprecedented and inapplicable since it was argued that an individual could not be defined as a victim of "being born." Despite raging polemics in the media, the *Cour de Cassation*, in reversing a lower court opinion, decided that Nicolas Perruche could also receive significant damages (financial aid, medical assistance etc.) for as long as he should live. However, the court underlined that their decision was not motivated by the concept of "wrongful birth/life" (*vie*

*préjudiciable*), but rather by the fact that Nicolas Perruche's severe handicaps "were in a direct causal relationship with the error committed by doctors."

The Court's reasoning did not appease the vast array of commentators, be they editorialists, doctors, lab technicians, bioethicists, philosophers, etc., who generally denounced the "horrific advent of eugenics in France," and condemned the court for opening the way towards "abortion on demand" at the slightest hint of fetal abnormality, or to a situation wherein doctors, fearful of future lawsuits, would easily encourage abortion in doubtful cases. These viewpoints were thus vigorously defended in July 2001 when the *Cour de Cassation* was revisited by three cases resembling the Perruche case. Though the Court rejected the demands for damages to the children by the three families involved, its decision did not satisfy the aforementioned critiques. The three cases involved 1) the birth of a child afflicted with spina bifida and hydrocephalus, 2) a child born without a left arm, and 3) a child born with an atrophied right arm. Contrary to the Perruche case, undiagnosed fetal malformation in these cases involved sonogram exams and not biomedical and/or biogenetic analyses, meant to be more precise and reliable. Hence, the *Cour de Cassation* rejected the demand for damages to be directly awarded to the children; however, it firmly upheld the validity of the Perruche decision, that is to say the possibility for a child to receive damages when the existence of his/her malformation was the result of blatant medical error.

Controversy surrounding these cases will certainly be pursued before the French parliament during its revision of the 1994 bioethics laws, debates now set for January 2002 after three years of postponement. Many have called for an addition to the revised laws prohibiting recourse before any court for "wrongful life/birth." In other areas, and in a surprising about-face on the part of the Socialist government, therapeutic cloning and cloning of embryos for stem cell research will probably be prohibited. Meanwhile, the prohibition of access by same-sex couples and single persons to medically assisted procreation will most probably be maintained in the revision. This continues to be a hotly debated restriction seeing that single people can adopt children, and that many same-sex couples do adopt by simply concealing their personal conjugal status from adoption agencies during the procedures. In FAB's next newsletter, I hope to be able to update our readers on the outcome of these upcoming battles.



## News from Australia

From: Gail Tulloch and Rachel Ankeny

A FAB session is being planned for the upcoming Australasian Bioethics Association conference to be held in Adelaide from February 14-16, 2002. The overall conference theme is 'Global Bioethics,' and the tentative topic for FAB session is women's bodies in the context of global bioethics. We look forward to making our colleagues here more aware of FAB and to an excellent session, and encourage everyone to attend. For updates, see

<http://www.australasian-bioethics.org.au/>

A multidisciplinary centre for research and education in bioethics has been established jointly between the University of Sydney, the University of New South Wales, and the University of Newcastle (called UniSUN). Those of us in the Sydney area are hopeful that this collaborative enterprise will provide more opportunities for multidisciplinary approaches to bioethics and will foster an intellectual community of those with shared interests.

Cheri Pies (currently Associate Dean for Student Affairs, School of Public Health, U-C Berkeley) and Gail Tulloch (who will take up a new position in January as co-Director of a research programme "Biomedical Ethics and Regulation" at the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance at Griffith University, Brisbane--congratulations to her!) are editors of the FAB anthology book based on the London conference, and hope to finalise selection of articles by late November.

All Australian FAB members are encouraged to contact Gail Tulloch or Rachel Ankeny (co-country representatives) for updates on local activities, etc. (See contact page 17)



# FAB Contacts

## FAB OFFICERS

### Co-COORDINATORS

Rosemarie Tong  
Philosophy Department  
Center for Professional  
and Applied Ethics  
The University of North  
Carolina at Charlotte  
9201 University City Blvd.  
Charlotte, NC 28223-0001  
Tel: 1-704-687-2850  
Fax: 1-704-687-2172  
rotong@email.uncc.edu

Susan Sherwin  
Department of Philosophy  
Dalhousie University  
Halifax NS B3J 3J5 Canada  
Tel: 1-902-494-3393  
Fax: 1-902-494-3518  
ssherwin@is.dal.ca

### TREASURER

Anne Donchin  
5 Riverpointe Road  
Hastings-on-Hudson, NY  
10706  
Tel: 1-914-674-0122  
Fax: 1-914-478-2885  
adonchin@iupui.edu

### MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY

Lenore Kuo  
850 W. 176th St., Apt# 1B  
New York, NY 10033  
Tel: 1-212-923-7408  
ikuoFAB@aol.com

### EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Maggie Little  
Kennedy Institute of Ethics  
Georgetown University  
Box 571212  
Washington, DC 20057  
Tel: 1-202-687-2312  
Fax: 1-202-687-8089  
littlem@georgetown.edu

### BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Hilde Nelson  
Ctr. for the Study of Med.  
Ethics & Humanities  
Duke University  
108 Seeley Mudd Building  
Durham, NC 27710  
Tel: 1-919-668-9005  
Fax: 1-919-668-1789  
hilde.nelson@duke.edu

### LIASON TO THE IAB BOARD

Florencia Luna  
Ugarteche 3050 60 139  
1425 Buenos Aires  
Argentina  
Tel/Fax: 54-11-4806-1042  
Florluna@pccp.com.ar

### COORD OF COUNTRY REP'S

Wendy Rogers  
Dept of General Practice  
University of Edinburgh  
20 West Richmond Street  
Scotland  
Tel: 44-131-650-9456  
Fax: 44-131-650-9119  
wendy.rogers@ed.ac.uk

## FAB ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS Jan. 2001-Dec. 2002

**Gwen Anderson**  
gwen.anderson@chomp.org

**Debora Diniz**  
debodiniz@zaz.com.br

**Susan Dodds**  
susan\_dodds@uow.edu.au

**Laura Purdy**  
laura.purdy@utoronto.ca

**Mary Rorty**  
mvr2j@leland.stanford.edu

**Aida Santos**  
afs@pacific.net.ph

**Laura Shanner**  
laura.shanner@ualberta.ca

**Viola Schubert-Lehnhardt**  
kd.Schubert@verwaltung.uni.halle.de

**Susana E. Sommer**  
susana@clacso.edu.ar

## FAB COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES

Contact these members who have volunteered to be country representatives if you want to initiate a group project, receive back copies or membership application forms, etc. If your country is not included and you would like to volunteer, send a message to Wendy Rogers, left.

### ARGENTINA

Maria Victoria Costa  
calle 43 n°1078 dto.E  
(16 y 17)  
1900 La Plata  
Tel: 54-221-4211577  
Fax: 54-11-47870533  
vcosta@huma.fahce.unlp.edu.ar

### AUSTRALIA

Gail Tulloch  
5 Geelong Road East  
Barwon Heads - Victoria 3227  
Tel: 61-3-5254-1008  
Fax: 61-3-5254-1023  
gailt@pipeline.com.au

Rachel Ankeny  
Unit for History and Phil of Sci.  
F07 Carslaw Building  
The University of Sydney  
NSW 2006  
Tel: 61-2-9351-4801  
Fax: 61-2-9351-4124  
r.ankeney@scifac.usyd.edu.au

### AUSTRIA

Herlinda Pauer-Studer  
Institut für Philosophie  
Universität Wien,  
Universitätsstr. 7/3  
A-1010 Vienna  
Tel: 43-1-42-77/47-475  
Fax: 43-1-42-77-94-74  
Herlinda.Pauer-Studer  
@univie.ac.at

### BRAZIL

Marilena Correa  
Estelita Lins 99 Apt# 107  
Rio de Janeiro, RJ 22 245-150  
Tel: 55-21-2250940  
Fax: 55-21-5561241  
mcorrea@ism.com.br

Alejandra Ana Rotania  
Rua Jose Tessarolo Santos, 70  
Nova Friburgo RJ 28.625-140  
Tel/fax: 55-24-523-5282  
alecari@uol.com.br

### CANADA

Dawn Whitehead  
559 Browning Ave.  
Ottawa - Ontario K1G 0T3  
Fax: 1-613-834-6780  
drdmwhitehead@sympatico.ca

### COLOMBIA

Ana Gonzalez Velez  
calle 34 # 14-52 Bogota  
Tel: 57-1-287-2100  
Fax: 57-1-287-5530  
acgonzalez@interred.net.co

### FRANCE

Jennifer Merchant  
7 Rue du Mont Aigoual  
75015 Paris  
Tel: 33-1-455-76724  
merchant@u-paris2.fr

### GERMANY

Viola Schubert-Lehnhardt  
Stresemannstr. 74  
10963 Berlin  
Tel: 49-345-805-4840  
Fax: 49-345-552-7035  
n6n@zuv7.  
verwaltung.uni-halle.de

### INDIA

Krishnaraj Shanthi  
Dept of Econometrics  
University of Madras  
Chepauk, Chennai- 600 005.  
Tamil Nadu  
Tel: 91-44-471-3528  
Fax: 91-44-566693  
Santiraj@md5.vsnl.net.in

### ITALY

Gaia Marsico  
Via Luigi Russo 36  
57121 Livorno  
Tel: 39-586-409258  
Fax: 39-586-428235  
gamarsic@tin.it

### JAPAN

Naoko Miyaji  
Inst. for the Study of Global Issues  
Graduate School of Soc Sci  
Hitotsubashi Univ - Kunitachi  
Tokyo 186-8601 - Japan  
Tel: 81-42-580-8656  
MIYAJI.N@srv.cc.hit-u.a.jp

### MEXICO

Juan-Guillermo Figueroa  
El Colegio de Mexico  
Camino al Ajusco No. 20  
Pedregal de Santa Teresa  
Mixco 01000 D.F.  
Tel: 52-645-59-55, ext. 4067  
Fax: 52-645-04-64  
jfigue@colmex.mx

### NETHERLANDS

Jyotsna A. Gupta  
Kon. Wilhelminalaan 109  
2274 AB Voorburg  
Tel: +31 70 3862206  
jagupta@worldonline.nl

### NEW ZEALAND

Katherine Hall  
Dept. of General Practice  
Dunedin School of Medicine  
University of Otago  
PO Box 913 Dunedin  
Tel: 64-3-479-5766  
Fax: 64-3-479-7431  
KHall@gp.otago.ac.nz

Lynley Anderson  
Bioethics Centre  
University of Otago  
PO Box 913  
Dunedin  
Tel: 64-3-474-7977  
Fax: 64-3-474-7601  
Lynley.anderson@  
stonebow.otago.ac.nz

### PAKISTAN

Kausar S. Khan  
C/o Community Health  
Sciences  
Aga Khan University  
PO Box 3500  
Karachi  
Tel: 92-21-493-0051 ext  
4811  
kausar.skhan@aku.edu

### PHILIPPINES

Aida Santos  
Suite 406, Victoria Plaza  
41 Annapolis St., Greenhills  
San Juan Metro Manila  
Tel/fax: 63-2-927-5572  
afs@pacific.net.ph

### SWITZERLAND

Jackie Leach Scully  
Arbeitsstelle für Bioethik  
Institut für Geschichte und  
Ethik der Medizin  
Universität Basel  
Schoenbeinstrasse 20  
4056 Basel  
Tel/fax: 41-61-332-1519  
scully@bluewin.ch

### UKRAINE

Svitlana Vekovshynina  
ap.11, 12-A Volkova str.  
Kyiv  
Ukraine 02166  
Tel: 38044-518-54-15  
vsv@carrier.kiev.ua

### UNITED KINGDOM

Heather Widdows  
Centre for the Study of Global  
Ethics  
13 Pritchatts Road  
University of Birmingham  
Edgbaston  
Birmingham B15 2TT  
Tel: 44-7799 065 774  
h.widdows@bham.ac.uk

### UNITED STATES

Ruth Groenhout  
Philosophy Department  
Calvin College  
Grand Rapids  
MI 49507  
Tel: 1-616 957 6412  
Fax: 1-616-957-8505  
Rgroenho@calvin.edu

# Calendar of Events

## November

**Fundamentals of Human Research Ethics**, November 5, 2001, Charlottesville, VA. Sponsored by the University of Virginia. This program will focus on key topics in Research Ethics. Nationally prominent faculty members will explore the principles that define the permissible conduct of research, and survey the regulatory structure under which ethical research must be conducted. For more information visit: <http://ethics.acusd>, and then click *The Ethics Calendar*.

**Advanced European Bioethics Course: Life Without Disease**, November 15-17, 2001, The Netherlands. Sponsored by the Department of Ethics, Philosophy and History of Medicine, University Medical Center,

Nijmegen, The Netherlands. For more information, contact Norbert Steinkamp, MA, 232 Dept. of Ethics, Philosophy and History of Medicine, University Medical Centre Nijmegen, PO Box 9101, 6500 HB Nijmegen, The Netherlands. Tel: 31-(0)24-361-5320; Fax: 31-(0)24-354-0254; E-mail: [n.steinkamp@efg.kun.nl](mailto:n.steinkamp@efg.kun.nl) or the website at: <http://www.umcstradboud.nl>

## February - 2002

**American Medical Women's Association (AMWA) 86th Annual Meeting, "Women's Health, Women Doctors, and the Politics of Universal Healthcare"**, January 31 - February 3, 2002, San Antonio, TX. The keynote speaker will be Pamela Peeke, MD,

MPH. For more information or register online visit: [www.amwa-doc.org](http://www.amwa-doc.org).

**Second International Conference on Ethics Education in Medical Schools**, February 3-7, 2002, Eilat, Israel. Contact: [Meeting@isas.co.il](mailto:Meeting@isas.co.il).

**Bioethics Update 2002**, February 14-15, 2002, Honolulu, Hawaii. Presented by: The St. Francis International Center for Healthcare Ethics; Tel: (808) 547-6050; Fax: (808) 547-6049; Email: [janicemi@sfhs-hi.org](mailto:janicemi@sfhs-hi.org).

## March 2002

**Developing Healthcare Ethics Programs (DHEP)**, March 4-8, 2002, Charlottesville, VA. Sponsored by the

University of Virginia the Center for Biomedical Ethics in cooperation with the Office of Continuing Medical Education. This unique 6-day course is designed to facilitate or strengthen the implementation of an ethics program within healthcare organizations. For more information or to register for this program please contact: Carrie Gumm, Center for Biomedical Ethics, at Tel: 434-924-5695 or [cg2b@virginia.edu](mailto:cg2b@virginia.edu) or visit: [www.med.virginia.edu/bioethics](http://www.med.virginia.edu/bioethics).

**UAE International Conference on Healthcare Ethics**, March 10-13, 2002, Intercontinental Hotel, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Contact: [moh.healthcare-ethics-conf@uae.gov.ae](mailto:moh.healthcare-ethics-conf@uae.gov.ae).

The State of Bioethics: From Seminal Works to Contemporary Explorations  
April 5-7, 2002.

Georgetown University's Kennedy Institute of Ethics.

The conference will be held at the Research Auditorium on the campus of the Georgetown University Medical Center. Conference speakers include: Tom Beauchamp, Lisa Soble Cahill, James Childress, Charles E. Curran, H. Tristram Engelhardt, Jr., Ruth Faden, Patricia King, William F. May, Edmund Pellegrino, Robert Veatch and LeRoy Walters. As pioneering contributors to the Kennedy Institute of Ethics and to the field of bioethics, these scholars will be speaking on publications arising out of their time at the Kennedy Institute. They will discuss the origins, development, and current relevance of these works for the field of bioethics. Due to the generous support from parts of the Georgetown community, the cost of the conference for registrants is **\$25**. Space is limited. Please register early. For more information, please visit the website at: <http://www.georgetown.edu/research/kie/kisymposium.htm> or contact the Conference Coordinator ([powelll@georgetown.edu](mailto:powelll@georgetown.edu)) at (202) 687-8099 between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm ET.

# Call for Papers

**Special Issue of Thirdspace Graduate Feminist Journal.** The editors of the electronic graduate feminist journal, *thirdspace*, invite you to contribute to a special issue on the theory and concept of 'thirdspace.' Thirdspace (in some of its conceptualizations) is a place 'in between' the positions of duality scholars have traditionally accepted (white/Black, First World/Third World). We welcome papers from emerging scholars (graduate students, new independent scholars,

and post-doctoral fellows). The deadline for submissions for this special issue is December 10th, 2001. For more information, please contact us at [info@thirdspace.ca](mailto:info@thirdspace.ca). Tel: 919-680-3942.

**Bioethics and Informed Choice: Seventh International Tsukuba Bioethics Roundtable (TRT7),** 15-18 February, 2002, University of Tsukuba, Japan. A cross-cultural looking at current issues of Asian and International Bioethics.

Please submit an abstract and suggest a session that is most appropriate. For more information visit: [www.biol.tsukuba.ac.jp/~macer/Conf.html](http://www.biol.tsukuba.ac.jp/~macer/Conf.html); or contact: Darryl Macer, Email: [macer@sakura.cct.tsukuba.ac.jp](mailto:macer@sakura.cct.tsukuba.ac.jp)

**30<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on Value Inquiry Values in Health Care: Past, Present and Future,** April 4-6, 2002, Milwaukee, WI. Organized by Center for the Study of Bioethics, Medical College of Wisconsin.

Submissions should relate to questions of value in health care broadly defined. Deadline for submissions is Friday, January 11, 2002. Abstracts may be submitted electronically in Microsoft Word format to: [tmay@mcw.edu](mailto:tmay@mcw.edu) or sent to: Thomas May, 30th Anniversary Conference on Value Inquiry, Center for the Study of Bioethics, 8701 Watertown Plank Road, Milwaukee, WI 53226-0509.

**FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF FAB  
(INTERNATIONAL NETWORK ON FEMINIST APPROACHES TO BIOETHICS)  
and  
10th anniversary celebration of the creation of FAB  
October 29-30, 2002 - Brasilia, Brazil**

The FAB conference will be held in conjunction with the Sixth World Congress of the International Association of Bioethics October 30-November 4, Brasilia, Brazil.

We are seeking proposals for papers, panels, interactive sessions, and other forms of presentation relevant to the conference theme and on other topics that fall under the general heading of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics. Papers should run approximately 20 minutes. Panels and other sessions may run a maximum of 90 minutes.

**PROPOSAL FORMAT:**

- Name, affiliation and contact information of proposed presenter(s), including e-mail
- Title of session
- Brief abstract (150 words)
- Brief outline of proposed paper/panel/session (1-2 pages) outlining either (a) reasoning and key conclusions (for papers) or (b) motivation, organizational structure, and presenters (for other types of presentations)

**DEADLINE:** March 1, 2002

**SUBMISSION TO:** Send electronic copies of your proposal to both Co-organizers Debora Diniz and Susan Sherwin (both addresses on p. 17). Submissions may be made in English, Portuguese, or Spanish

**FUNDING:** A very limited amount of funding is available on the basis of need from the Audre Lorde Fund. See FAB website ([www.fabnet.org](http://www.fabnet.org)) for details.

## Get Involved in FAB

### To JOIN FAB

Members receive the semi-annual newsletter which contains helpful announcements of upcoming events and opportunities, book reviews, and articles of interest to those working in feminism and bioethics. To join, send a request for a membership form with your name and address, either by mail or electronically to Lenore Kuo. Or print a membership form from the FAB website: [www.uncc.edu/fab](http://www.uncc.edu/fab).

### To CONTRIBUTE TO THE NEWSLETTER

We welcome contributions of all sorts: articles, announcements of upcoming events, information about articles or books you have published or find useful, reviews of books. Book reviews are organized by Hilde Nelson. Any other contribution should be forwarded to Maggie Little (both addresses on p. 17). *It's particularly helpful if you can send them in electronically.* **Deadline for submissions to the next newsletter is March 15, 2002.**

### CHANGE OF ADDRESS

The newly redesigned and updated FAB website now has a much simpler URL. To visit the site, simply type: [www.fabnet.org](http://www.fabnet.org)  
We hope you will find this address easier to remember!

To subscribe to the list, send a SUBSCRIBE FABLIST command in the body of the email to [listserv@list.msu.edu](mailto:listserv@list.msu.edu), followed by your full name. Example: SUBSCRIBE FABLIST Hilde L. Nelson. To unsubscribe, send a SIGNOFF FABLIST command in the body of the email to [listserv@list.msu.edu](mailto:listserv@list.msu.edu). This time, you don't give your name.

---

---

### FIRST CLASS

Lenore Kuo  
FAB Membership Secretary  
850 W. 176th Street, Apt. 1B  
New York, NY 10033

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED



## Feminist Approaches to Bioethics