

From the Desk of your Co-Coordinator

The past few months have been very busy for a number of FABsters working on a range of projects, including new initiatives and planning for the Congress in Beijing, China (August 4-6, 2006). We can't say enough thanks to Jing-Bao and his colleagues on the conference planning committee: Marsha Tyson Darling (USA), Ole Döring (Germany), James Dwyer (USA), Li Haiyan (Wuhan, China), Liu Huawen (Beijing, China), Barbara Nicholas (New Zealand), Arleen Salles (Argentina and USA), Julia Tao (Hong Kong, China), Wang Jinling (Hangzhou, China), Wang Yanguang (Beijing, China), and Xie Peng (Changsha, China). Together with Hu Linying (Secretary General), the organizing committee has worked tirelessly to ensure that our Congress will be a success.

This year, once again, there will be a keynote address from FAB during the joint opening session with the IAB. We are very pleased that Florencia Luna has accepted the invitation to speak. There will also be a commentary by Rosemarie Tong. As well, FAB Country Representatives have requested funding from the WHO Department of Ethics, Trade, Human Rights and Health Law for a workshop at the 6th FAB Congress. The proposal is to develop materials on ethical issues suitable for use by health care practitioners delivering health care to women in developing countries. These printed materials (developed following a half-day workshop in Beijing) would be distributed to health care workers and NGOs to encourage attitudinal change and a gender-sensitive approach to service delivery to women. Debora Diniz (d.diniz@anis.org.br) and Ana Gonzalez Velez (acgonzalez@cable.net.co) are leading that proposal, and can be contacted for further information.

In addition to the above, we hope to hear from many of you at our biennial meeting as the success of the FAB Congress is ultimately dependent on FAB members. Now is the time to submit your abstracts and to make plans to join us in Beijing (instructions are available on the FAB website at www.fabnet.org). We hope to see many of you there and look forward to what no doubt will be lively conversation on important human rights and feminist issues. For those who anticipate a need for financial assistance to attend the meeting, there is information on travel grants on the FAB website.

Our biennial Congress is also the time at which we seek to renew our leadership. This year, there will be a number of vacancies and we encourage FAB members to get involved and nominate themselves or colleagues for Advisory Board membership. The Chair of the Nominating Committee is Arleen Salles and she is currently forming a committee to assist in this task. She will be very keen to hear from you about the ways in which you might become more involved in the running of FAB. You can write to Arleen at arleensalles@att.net. This year we need to fill several vacancies on the Board. As well, there is a bit of an anomaly this year since we need to elect two new co-coordinators. Susan Dodds has completed two two-year terms as Co-coordinator and will be stepping down from this role. She will continue to contribute to FAB in her new role as IAB Liaison, having recently been elected to the IAB Board. Françoise Baylis has completed an initial two year term and, for personal reasons, has decided to step down. We need two good stewards for the organization as we are moving into a critical period for FAB with the introduction of a new FAB Journal.

This past December, after several months of careful deliberation by e-mail, the Board held a teleconference during which the views of all Board members were canvassed about the pros and cons of hosting our own journal of feminist bioethics. Following this very productive discussion, a final vote was held and a majority moved that we begin negotiations with Indiana University Press (IUP) for a new journal in feminist bioethics. This is indeed an exciting time for FAB, but also a challenging one during which the support of our members will be crucial. An Interim Editorial Board has been established which includes: Françoise Baylis (Canada), Donna Dickenson (UK), Anne Donchin (USA), Susan Dodds (Australia), Hilde Lindemann (USA), Wendy Rogers (Australia), Arleen Salles (USA, Argentina), Toby Schonfeld (USA) and Susan Sherwin (Canada). During the next several months, the Interim

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

Editorial Board aims to: develop the terms of reference for the journal, the Editorial Board, and the Sponsor a Feminist Scholar program; finalize the new dues structure (that will include payment for the journal subscription); prepare a general call for an institutional home for the Journal; select a name for the Journal; establish a permanent international Editorial Board; negotiate a contract with IUP; and detail requisite revisions to FAB policies. There is much work ahead of us, in anticipation of much reward.

As decisions are made about the future of the Journal, these will be communicated to the membership via the listserv. This is indeed an exciting venture for FAB.

SUSAN DODDS AND FRANÇOISE BAYLIS

<p style="text-align: center;">- 2004-2006 FAB Advisory Board Members -</p>	<p>Rachel Ankeny, Australia Unit for History and Philosophy of Science F07 - Carslaw The University of Sydney NSW 2006 Australia Tel: +61 2 9351 4801 Fax: +61 2 9351 4124 rankeny@science.usyd.edu.au</p> <p>Debora Diniz, Brazil SQSW 104 F 605 Brasilia DR 70660-406 BrazilTel: +55-61-344-7889 Fax: +55-61-343-1994 d.diniz@anis.org.br</p> <p>Hilde Lindemann, USA Department of Philosophy 503 South Kedzie Hall Michigan State University Lansing, MI 48824-1032 USA Tel: +1-517-353-3981 hlinde@mus.edu</p>	<p>Carolyn McLeod, Canada Department of Philosophy University of Western Ontario London, Ontario, N6C 1H1 Canada Tel: +1-519 661-2111, ext. 85877 Fax: +1-519 661-3922 cmcLeod2@uwo.ca</p> <p>Laura Purdy, USA Wells College Aurora, NY 13026 USA Tel: (315) 364 3244 Fax: (315) 264 3227 lpurdy@wells.edu</p> <p>Arlen L.F. Salles, Argentina/USA Department of Philosophy Montclair State University 4 Meadow Court Midland Park, NJ 07432 USA Tel: 201-251-9863 Fax: 201-251-9864 arleensalles@att.net</p>	<p>Jackie Leach Scully, Switzerland/UK Arbeitsstelle für Ethik in den Biowissenschaften Institut für Geschichte und epistemologie der Medizin Schonbeinstrasse 20, 4056 Basel, Switzerland Tel/Fax: +41 61 332 15 19 and Policy, Ethics and Life Sciences Research Institute Bioscience Centre Times Square, Newcastle NE1 4EP United Kingdom Tel: +44 191 241 8614 scully@bluewin.ch</p> <p>Rosemarie Tong, USA Philosophy Department Center for Professional and Applied Ethics University of North Carolina/Charlotte 9201 University City Boulevard Charlotte, NC 28223-0001 USA Tel: 1-704-687-2850 Fax: 1-704-687-2172 rotong@email.uncc.edu</p> <p>Ana Cristina Gonzalez Vélez, Colombia Calle 34 #14-52 Bogota Colombia Tel: +571 287 2100 acgonzalez@interred.net.co</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">- 2004-2006 FAB Officers -</p>	<p><u>CO-COORDINATORS:</u> Susan Dodds Philosophy Program University of Wollongong Wollongong NSW 2522, Australia Tel: 61-2-4221-3621 Fax: 61-2-4221-4065 susan_dodds@uow.edu.au</p> <p>Françoise Baylis Department of Bioethics Dalhousie University Room C315, 5849 University Ave. Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3H 4H7 Tel: +1 902-494-3801 Fax: +1 902-494-3865 Francoise.Baylis@dal.ca</p> <p><u>TREASURER:</u> Anne Donchin 5 Riverpointe Road Hastings-on-Hudson, NY 10706, USA Tel: 1-914-674-0122 Fax: 1-914-478-2885 adonchin@iupui.edu</p>	<p><u>MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY:</u> Rachel Ankeny Unit for History and Philosophy of Science FO 7 - Carslaw The University of Sydney NSW 2006 Australia Tel: +61 2 9351 4801 Fax: +61 2 9351 4124 rankeny@science.usyd.edu.au</p> <p><u>NEWSLETTER EDITOR:</u> Toby L. Schonfeld Dept. of Preventive and Societal Medicine University of Nebraska Medical Center 986075 Nebraska Medical Center Omaha, NE 69198-6075 Tel: 1-402-559-2921 Fax: 1-402-559-3773 tschonfeld@unmc.edu</p> <p><u>BOOK REVIEW EDITOR:</u> Lisa Eckenwiler Dept. of Philosophy and Religious Studies Old Dominion University Batten Arts and Letters, Room 401 Norfolk, VA 23529-0083 Tel: 1-757-683-3861 Fax: 1-757-683-5345 leckenwi@odu.edu</p>	<p><u>ARCHIVIST:</u> Carolyn Ells Biomedical Ethics Unit McGill University 3647 Peel St. Room 305 Montreal QC H3A 1X1, Canada Tel: 1-514-398-2521 Fax: 1-514-398-8349 carolyn.ells@mcgill.ca</p> <p><u>LISTSERV & WEBSITE MANAGER:</u> Hilde Lindemann Department of Philosophy 503 South Kedzie Hall Michigan State University Lansing, MI 48824-1032, USA Tel: 1-517-353-3981 hlinde@msu.edu</p> <p><u>LIAISON TO THE IAB BOARD:</u> Florencia Luna Ugarteche 3050 60 139 1425 Buenos Aires, Argentina Tel/Fax: 54-11-4806-1042 florluna@pccc.com.ar</p> <p><u>COORDINATOR OF COUNTRY REPS</u> Wendy Rogers Department of General Practice Flinders University GPO Box 2100 Adelaide, SA 5001, Australia Tel: 61-08-8204-3132 Fax: 61-08-8204 5675 wendy.rogers@flinders.edu.au</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">- 2004-2006 FAB Country Representatives -</p>	<p><u>ARGENTINA:</u> Silvia Woods silvia_woods2@ciudad.com.ar</p> <p><u>AUSTRALIA:</u> Sheryl de Lacey sheryl.delacey@adelaide.edu.au</p> <p><u>BRAZIL:</u> Fabiana Paranhos f.paranhos@anis.org.br</p> <p><u>CANADA:</u> Carolyn McLeod cmcLeod2@uwo.ca</p> <p><u>CHILE:</u> Carolina Valdobenita valdebec@chi.ops-oms.org</p> <p><u>CHINA:</u> Dr. Linying Hu hulinying@bjmu.edu.cn</p> <p><u>COLOMBIA:</u> Ana Gonzalez Velez acgonzalez@cable.net.co</p>	<p><u>FRANCE:</u> Jennifer Merchant merchant@u-paris2.fr</p> <p><u>GERMANY:</u> Viola Schubert-Lenhardt kd.schubert@verwallung.uni-halle.de</p> <p><u>GREECE:</u> Vassiliki Petoussi petoussi@social.soc.uoc.gr</p> <p><u>INDIA:</u> Krishnaraj Shanthy santi49@yahoo.com santiraj@md5.vsnl.net.in</p> <p><u>ISRAEL:</u> Eyal Katvan katvane@popeye.os.biu.ac.il</p> <p><u>ITALY:</u> Giovanna Ruberto gruberto@venus.it</p> <p><u>MEXICO:</u> Dafna Feinholz Dafna@netservice.com.mx</p>	<p><u>NETHERLANDS:</u> Jyotsna A. Gupta jagupta@worldonline.nl</p> <p><u>NEW ZEALAND:</u> Barbara Nicholas barbara@nicholas.net.nz</p> <p><u>SOUTH AFRICA:</u> Melissa Stobie stobiem@nu.ac.za</p> <p><u>SWITZERLAND:</u> Jackie Leach Scully scully@bluewin.ch</p> <p><u>TURKEY:</u> Serap Sahinoglu serapsahinoglu@hotmail.com</p> <p><u>UKRAINE:</u> Svetlana Vekovshynina vsv@ln.ua</p> <p><u>UNITED KINGDOM:</u> Heather Draper DraperH@medgp3.bham.ac.uk</p> <p><u>UNITED STATES:</u> Mary Rawlinson mrawlinson@notes.cc.sunysb.edu</p>

CONGRESS 2006

The 6th International Congress of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics Gender Justice and Women's Rights in Healthcare Beijing, China August 4-6, 2006

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics (FAB) announces its 6th International Congress. Focusing on Gender Justice and Women's Rights in Healthcare, the Congress will explore these themes:

- Gender (In)Justice and (In)Equality in Healthcare;
- Development, Globalization, and Women's Healthcare;
- Women's Health Rights as Human Rights;
- Cultural Traditions and Feminist Bioethics;
- Other Theoretical and Practical Issues in Feminist Bioethics.

The FAB International Congress will occur in conjunction with the 8th World Congress of Bioethics organized by the International Association of Bioethics (IAB). There will be joint plenary and concurrent IAB/FAB sessions on the 6th of August, the last day of FAB Congress which coincides with the first day of IAB Congress.

Conference Venue:

Beijing International Convention Centre, Beijing, China

Official Language:

English

Travel or Registration Grants

FAB provides travel or registration grants to some FAB members in financial need who are presenting papers at FAB conferences or at FAB-related conferences. If you are interested in applying for a grant for the upcoming FAB conference in Beijing, the deadline for applications was March 1, 2006. It has been extended to April 15, 2006. All applications should be sent via e-mail to Carolyn McLeod at cmcleod2@uwo.ca.

Information on the application procedure and the criteria for getting applications can be found at <http://www.msu.edu/~hlinde/fab/grants.html>.

Call for Paper and Panel Abstracts

Abstracts should be submitted online at www.artscocs.uow.edu.au. The deadline for submission of abstracts is April 15, 2006. All abstracts will be peer-reviewed. Notification of acceptance of papers and panel presentations will be sent out by May 1, 2006.

Note: If you are an FAB member and wish to apply for travel grant funds to support your participation at the Congress, please see the information and requirements for FAB Grant applications on the FAB website.

The 6th FAB congress Committee welcomes contributions in two forms:

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

- 1) individual oral presentations and
- 2) panel presentations.

Each paper or panel can address one of the conference themes with reference to any ethical issue(s) in modern medicine, health care, the new life sciences, and biotechnology, e.g., missing girls, poverty, population control, AIDS, genetic testing. Individual or panel presentations can also explore conventional or novel perspectives on feminist bioethics as a social practice and an academic field.

The Congress committee is particularly interested in encouraging panel presentations of 3-4 related papers or 2-3 papers with commentaries coordinated by one of the presenters on one of the conference themes.

The time for presentation including discussion will be 30 minutes for individual papers and 1.5 or 2 hours for panel presentations.

Format for Proposals

For Individual Papers:

The proposal should include the following information:

- Name (surname, given):
- Position/Institutional Affiliation:
- Full Mailing Address (as you wish it to appear in conference materials):
- Email Address:
- Paper Title:
- Abstract (300-500 words) including central argument and method or approach:
- Proposed theme (pick one):
 - 1) Gender (In)Justice and (In)Equality in Healthcare
 - 2) Development, Globalization, and Women's Healthcare
 - 3) Women's Health Rights as Human Rights
 - 4) Cultural Traditions and Feminist Bioethics
 - 5) Other Theoretical and Practical Issues in Feminist Bioethics.

For Panel Presentations:

The panel presentation may include a group presentation, a collection of papers or a collection of papers and commentaries. *The panel coordinator should submit all of the following information on behalf of all panel members:*

- Name (surname, given) of panel coordinator:
- Position/Institutional Affiliation:
- Full Mailing address (as you wish it to appear in conference materials):
- Email Address:
- Panel Title:
- Abstract for the panel (300-500 words):
- Proposed Theme (pick one):
 - 1) Gender (In)Justice and (In)Equality in Healthcare
 - 2) Development, Globalization, and Women's Healthcare
 - 3) Women's Health Rights as Human Rights
 - 4) Cultural Traditions and Feminist Bioethics
 - 5) Other Theoretical and Practical Issues in Feminist Bioethics.
- Or specify the feminist bioethical issue the panel will focus on:

Full details for each panel participant whether presenting a paper or a commentary:

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

- Paper 1:
 - Name (surname, given):
 - Position/Institutional Affiliation:
 - Full Mailing address (as you wish it to appear in conference materials):
 - Email Address:
 - Paper Title:
 - Abstract (300-500 words) including central argument and method or approach:
 - Commentary 1: (Abstract is not required for commentary.)
- Paper 2:
 - Commentary 2:
- Paper 3: (etc)

Abstract Referees

FAB members willing to serve as referees for abstract submissions should contact

Susan Dodds

sdodds@uow.edu.au

or

Jing-Bao Nie

jing-bao.nie@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

directly to let us know of your availability. (All abstracts will be reviewed on-line.)

Organizing Committee

Co-Chairs:

Jing-Bao Nie (China/New Zealand, Sue Dodds (Australia)

Secretary General:

Hu Linying (Beijing, China)

Committee Members:

Marsha Tyson Darling (USA), Ole Döring (Germany), James Dwyer (USA), Li Haiyan (Wuhan, China), Liu Huawen (Beijing, China), Barbara Nicholas (New Zealand), Arleen Salles (Argentina and USA), Julia Tao (Hong Kong, China), Wang Jinling (Hangzhou, China), Wang Yanguang (Beijing, China), Xie Peng (Changsha, China)

International Advisors:

Ai Xiaoming (Guangzhou, China), Lynley Anderson (New Zealand), Françoise Baylis (Canada), Wendy Rogers (Australia), Debora Diniz (Brasilia), Qiu Renzong (Beijing, China), K. Shanthi (India), Rosemary Tong (USA)

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

Registration Information

Contact Person:

Ms. Catherine Li, Secretariat for FAB and IAB Congresses
International Convention Service
Chinese Medical Association
42, Dongsì Xidajie, Dongcheng District
Beijing 100710 China
Tel: +86 (10) 8515 8149
Fax: +86 (10) 6512 3754

Email: catherineli@cma.org.cn or cahteringeli@chinamed.com.cn

Registration:

Early-Bird Registration Deadline: April 15, 2006
Pre-Registration Deadline: June 1, 2006
Hotel Booking Deadline: June 1, 2006

Registration Fee (In RMB Yuan):

USD 1 is equivalent to approximately RMB 8 as of December, 2005. The exchange rate is subject to change.

Registration Date	Non-FAB Member	FAB Member
Early-Bird Registration	1800	1400
Pre-Registration	2000	1600
On-Site Registration	2200	1800
Students and Concession Rate*		
Early-Bird Registration	800	600
Pre-Registration	1000	800
On-Site Registration	1200	1000

For more registration information, see

www.chinamed.com.cn/IAB2006

or

www.bioethics-international.org

COUNTRY REPORTS

Italy

Giovanna Ruberto

*Associate Professor of Bioethics, Director Center for Bioethics
University of Pavia, Italy*

It all started with a preposterous immigration law (Ddl 2454-4.5.2002). The year was 2002 and the new neoconservative government was ready to make its mark: only a restricted number of immigrants could ask for temporary visas and only if they were certified by Italian citizens.

There were restrictions for every possible category of person, even for professional athletes, including soccer players (which, of course, had been the main point of contention). When we finally found an exception in the law that would allow us to obtain regular visas for illegal workers -- "*emersione di lavoro irregolare* (to make exceptions for illegal workers)" (art.29) -- we were confronted by a disturbing surprise: the exception only applied to one group, the so-called *badanti* (caregivers), or those who attend to old or disabled persons. This group, of course, consisted primarily of women who had left their families in their native countries in search of temporary employment. These women planned to return home once they earned a sufficient amount of money. The economic logic that guided the legal exception for the *badanti* was evident: not only did the caregivers do the housework for entire families, but also the monthly cost of living for them was less than it would have cost the government to grant them permanent residency. After all, they had no family, no benefits, no holidays, no hourly limit on their workday and no days off, plus no place to go. They worked day and night, seven days a week, inside the homes of Italian citizens.

The rationale behind the exemption granted to caregivers was that women are caregivers by nature; women have the duty to take care of the elderly, the disabled, to do the cooking, and so on. For the *badanti* the problem was even worse: since they were not from Italy, they had even fewer rights. They had left their own children and elderly to come here, to our rich, western nation to care for our children and our elderly. Even the language we use to refer to this group reveals the gender role we have assigned to them. The singular, *badante*, is the feminine form of the noun, and so when we call them *badanti* we mean "women." Thus, it is clear that the reason that the *badanti* alone are exempt from the law is that the benefits their work provides to the country are much greater than their costs. In other words, they are easy to exploit.

Yet, this is only one example of a much larger trend taking place in Italy that involves the erosion of women's rights. Shortly after the first law was passed, the government decided to put into place a policy that would give women financial incentives for having babies. Not only was money to be given to women who decided to have babies, but women who were planning to terminate their pregnancies would also be given money if they agreed to carry the babies to term. The babies would then be adopted. This money, however, was meant only "to buy a life," not to help the mother. The government's message was clear: women who do not want babies are abnormal. There was no regard for the woman's emotions or her situation. Yet the state presented this policy, a policy that gives the women some 3000euros for their babies, as a sign of its concern for its "abnormal" and "delinquent" women.

In February 2004, after years of struggle, the government finally succeeded in passing its assisted reproduction law (Ddl 47, 10.2.2004). Again the philosophy was clear: women must have children, but only in a way that the government deems "natural." The law makes it difficult and, in effect, punishes women who choose a different approach. Assisted reproduction is a therapy, but in many respects it is different from other therapies. There are a few details which make it stand apart from other therapies. Firstly, once a couple has signed an informed consent agreement they cannot rescind it. Secondly, the agreement requires that the created embryos must be

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

protected. (It is "human" by law.) Thirdly, they cannot be frozen unless the mother gets ill, but even in such cases the embryos must be implanted, even if it is against the couple's wishes. Finally, the agreement does not allow for pre-implantation genetic tests unless there is a family history of a severe genetic disease. Even in cases in which the test is positive, however, the couple is required to continue with the assisted reproduction procedure. After the procedure, the couple can then have an abortion, if they wish. The assisted reproduction procedure takes absolutely no account of the stress involved in caring for a baby with a severe genetic defect or the quality of life of a child that has a genetic disorder. Moreover, one is hard pressed to find the logic in a law that allows a couple to abort a fetus but does not allow them to freeze their embryos.

When the law was first passed, most of us thought that Italian citizens would never accept it and that a democratic and general vote on a proposition would turn back the law. In fact, the proposition failed badly. More than 75% of the Italian population did not vote and 14% of those who did voted in favor of the law. At the time I, like many observers, thought that the problem was the influence of the Catholic Church since in Italy assisted reproduction is involved in only a small number of pregnancies. In a certain way we had not considered the increasing problem of the growing number of people acting in the name of their principles even when it meant negating the rights of others. At the time, I was confused. I spent most of my time talking with women and trying to understand why they voted in favor of the law. The common answer was that assisted reproduction was an "unnatural process," and if a couple wanted a baby they should use traditional methods to achieve it or accept their fate even if it meant not having a baby.

I could accept that, perhaps, having a baby should not be considered a positive right, and that the technology used to achieve pregnancy should be subject to debate. But the problem was deeper. In September 2005 I gave my nursing students their bioethics exams for the fall session. Most of them were young women, straight out of high school, who were studying to become professional nurses. The exam question was about assisted reproduction and the new UK law, which allowed a fertile couple to use this technology in order to select the sex of their baby. The purpose of the law, of course, was to avoid genetic diseases linked to one of the sex chromosomes. From my point of view, this was an easy test question because of the proposition we had discussed for months about assisted reproduction. The students were asked to comment on the pros and cons of the law. The results were astonishing: 90% of my students wrote that it was a positive idea to choose the baby's sex because in this way you could have a male baby and this would be better than having a female baby. The reasons they gave for approving of the law varied: a male can pass on the family name (although according to Italian law a female's name can also be passed on); a male can inherit the family business; a male is a good worker and can add to the family income. Only 2 of 78 students answered that choosing to have a female baby could, indeed, have some benefits. One of the students argued that it could be useful to have a female child because she could help her mother with housework. The other student asserted that having a female baby could be positive because a female could have several kids who would eventually help the family by becoming workers. Of course this does not represent the view of the majority of Italian women...well, we hope. Pavia is a northern city, a university city. The students have to pass a difficult test to get into the nursing school. It is clear that the values expressed by the young women in my class come from their families, from their schools, and from watching TV. It is evident that the images of so called "pretty girls" on TV who have perfect bodies, perfect lives and are married to rich men are rolling back some of the progress we made during the feminist era. Or maybe we overestimated the extent to which the changes we struggled for would thrive and develop further younger generations.

Can we go on this way? This is only an Italian experience but the signals are everywhere. We are facing a general revision of abortion law, in many cases with more catches and more restrictions. The entire western world has been told that a war on terror is necessary to avoid another September 11. We have watched the suffering and pain of Iraqi women and the madness of female soldiers torturing prisoners. The terrible photo of

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

the woman at Abu Grahیب prison adopting a "male" attitude as she abused prisoners was probably the end of our innocence: women are not without sin; women can be violent and without mercy. According to my female students, the primary value of women is their housework. The media tells us that women must be forever young and beautiful. Yet in war women can be as brutal as the worst men. We have been too silent in the past few years. If the gains of the women's movement are lost, we have also lost our present and our children's future. Can we afford it?

*Greece
Vassiliki Petoussi*

Reflecting upon feminist bioethics in Greece

Bioethics rarely becomes an issue in Greek public discourse. At times, medical treatments or biotechnology developments - presented either as a panacea or as a catastrophe - attract the temporary attention of the media. On the other hand, it is only very recently that the scientific community has started debating upon issues of bioethics. Medical practice concerns and issues of biology and biotechnology applications appear, at present, to be the focal but not exclusive concerns of scientists in various disciplines. The content and practical implications of legal regulations are also of concern to scientific bioethical debates.

Women's concerns are not addressed, and feminist perspectives are notably absent from scientific discussions and debates on bioethics. This is true even for issues of primary importance for women, as it is the case with assisted human reproduction. Legal scholars, for example, have written extensively on the Greek law (enacted in 2004) of assisted human reproduction and have addressed issues of individual rights, inheritance, property rights, penal accountability, the legal status of gametes, etc. Occasionally, issues of motherhood are addressed but only to the extent that the lack of feminist or women-centered analyses of bioethics, especially those of primary importance for women, reinforce stereotypical, patriarchal notions about women's social status and reinstates social perceptions about women's exclusive role as (biological) mothers and nurturers.

To that extent, to report on feminist bioethics in Greece is to report on the need for the development of research projects and theoretical frameworks focusing on women, women's health needs and concerns, and feminist theory and praxis on bioethics. Furthermore, noted should also be a broader need for the development of social sciences theory and applied research on bioethics.

Bioethics News

Code of Medical Ethics

In November 2005, the Greek Parliament adopted a new Code of Medical Ethics and replaced the previous one, which was in effect for over 50 years. The new Code of Medical Ethics is in accordance with the Geneva Declaration, W.M.A. International Code, and the Helsinki Declaration, as well as the Oviedo Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine and the Greek laws on assisted reproduction.

The bill enacting the Code of Medical Ethics established the general rules of medical practice and regulates rights and responsibilities of health care professionals to patients, colleagues, professional associations, the health care system, and society at large. The Code acknowledges the relationship between health care professionals and patients as a relation of trust and respect, and pays particular attention to matters of patients' informed consent.

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

The new Code of Medical Ethics addresses and regulates, for the first time, issues such as: continuing education of physicians on medical ethics, matters of mental health and treatment of mental health patients, biomedical research, tissue and organ transplantation, and the protection of genetic identity. Moreover, the new Code addresses ethical considerations involved in matters of medically assisted reproduction, abortion, and end-of-life decisions.

Pure Cord Blood Bank

In June 2004, the first Public Cord Blood Bank launched its operation. The Cord Blood Bank is hosted by the Foundation of Biomedical Research of the Academy of Athens (IIBEAA). The IIBEAA, a branch of the Section of Sciences of the Academy of Athens, was established in 1991 as a non-profit Private Legal Entity and is supervised by the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs. Administered by a five-member Board of Trustees - academicians elected among the members of the Section of Sciences of the Academy of Athens - the Cord Blood Bank has as its primary scope to isolate, type, and store progenitor stem cells from umbilical cord and placenta blood. In 2004, the Bank held 258 samples and plans to reach a sample size of 10,000.

Post-graduate program on Bioethics

The interdisciplinary, post-graduate program on Bioethics at the University of Crete is now in its fourth year of operation and will award its first Master's Degrees on 22 February 2006. Alongside courses and seminars, the post-graduate program has organized a series of lectures and a conference on *Bioethics and Biotechnology* with Professors Regine Kollek, University of Hamburg, Germany; Steven Rose, Open University, UK; Hillary Rose, University of Bradford, UK; and Spiros Simitis, Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany as invited speakers. Last September, the program's graduate retreat held in Chania, Crete, provided faculty and students with the perfect opportunity to interact and share ongoing research and work in progress.

India

Shanthi Krishnaraj

BIOETHICS IS HERE TO STAY: A REPORT FROM INDIA

The first National Bioethics Conference of the *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics* (IJME) was held in Mumbai, India from November 25 –27, 2005. The main theme of the conference was “Ethical Challenges in Health Care: Global Context, Indian Reality.” The sub themes were: ethical challenges in HIV/AIDS; ethics of life and death in the era of hi-tech health care; ethical responsibilities in violence; conflict and religious strife; clinical trials; and other cross – cutting themes.

Organized by the IJME, the conference brought together government and non-governmental organizations, research groups, international organizations and educational institutions to discuss, deliberate, and debate on issues pertaining to bioethics. Over 60 papers were presented on subjects ranging from clinical trial ethics to end-of-life care, from disaster response and research to the relevance of community involvement in AIDS research.

The thread of thought running through many papers was the fact that India is being used as a testing ground for drugs on account of its highly skilled medical professionals, sophisticated medical infrastructure and huge diverse populations, and because trials are “much cheaper” in India. Dr. Chandra Mohan Gulhati, editor of the *Monthly*

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

Index of Medical Specialties, New Delhi said, “Drugs that are banned for adults in the west are officially permitted for use on children in India.” He pointed out the inadequacy of legal safeguards and the lack of a drug regulatory body to monitor and check unethical practices. It was imperative to create awareness among policymakers and researchers on these issues.

Bebe Loff, head of human rights and bioethics at Monash University, Melbourne, described India as a country in “epidemiological transition,” meaning that India has moved from being a country that is linked with diseases related to poverty to one that has diseases and ailments associated with industrialized countries. The presence of diseases such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease and cancer make it beneficial for international drug companies and research groups to conduct trials on the Indian population. Bebe Loff emphasized the point that such trials would be justified only if the benefits petered down to these people. But if the experimental drugs were patented abroad and were too expensive for the Indian population, then the subjects would not benefit. In such a scenario, Loff concluded the government should play a proactive role in ensuring safe trials.

Ethical issues in HIV / AIDS were also debated. The organizers made a statement to the effect that HIV / AIDS is an area where massive battles will be fought in the areas of bioethics, human rights and public health. Papers presented in this area brought to light the need for trained counselors, anti-retroviral drugs in smaller towns’ primary health centers, and access to second-line drugs. Also discussed were issues pertaining to informed consent for the AIDS vaccine trial participation in India, gender inequities in conducting trials for HIV / AIDS, and the stigma faced by HIV positive patients while seeking health care.

In the light of the multiple natural disasters and calamities that have hit South Asia in recent times, ethics in disaster management was discussed, with particular reference to discrimination in disaster relief and ethics in dealing with vulnerable, displaced populations.

The dilemmas in decision making faced by medical personnel on issues related to life and death, the duties and responsibilities to patients, ethics in daily medical practice and the ethics of the physician – patient relationship were other issues discussed and debated.

Commenting on the conference, Dr. Amar Jesani, a writer with IJME, said that the Conference had given the medical health movement a boost and had highlighted the moral aspects of medical care. Gaining strength from the success of this conference, the second National Bioethics Conference is slated for November, 2007.

*Argentina
Silvia Woods*

As we stated in our previous report, a key issue for the bioethics situation in Argentina is the second phase of a massive campaign of the Program of Sexual Health and Responsible Procreation. The program includes a vast scheme of public information aimed at the avoidance of sexual diseases and unwanted pregnancies, as well as the free distribution of condoms, oral contraceptives and intrauterine devices (with doctors' intervention). In the same report we presented the opinion of two outstanding specialists, D. Maffia and M. Rosenberg.

At the beginning of 2006, the Government announced that the program was a success and is showing results. The Health Minister, Ginés González García, said on February 12 that there are a million and a half people under the program, and that adolescent pregnancies dropped 6%. Meanwhile, mortality rates of HIV patients were reduced by 36% in the last five years. According to official figures, the goals for the implementation of the programs, the availability of resources, and the follow-up all over the country were 100% achieved by August 2005.

In general terms, it could be said that the approach of bioethics in Argentina - and specifically bioethics from the point of view of gender - is divided in two broad groups. On one hand, there are those who work on topics that are not related to macro social problems (e.g. informed consent, euthanasia, assisted reproduction, cloning,

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

etc.). On the other hand, there are those who expand their activities to other areas, such as: inequity in the access to health services, its privatization and, in turn, its transformation in a new market force. These topics inevitably concern the broad and complex sociopolitical situation in the country and abroad.

In response to the growing reality of the disappearance of young women and men, girls and boys, in different Argentinean provinces, a new organization has been developed. "No a la Trata" - No to the women and other person's traffic - organizes activities of sensitization and consultancy, and has proposed legal reform to protect the victims and reinforce the mechanism to persecute the delinquents and to attack the demand. It fights for the inclusion of the penalties for forced procreation (intending to provide babies for the black market).

Psychologist Leonor Nuñez, one of the "No a la Trata" coordinators, said for the FAB report that the network is composed of NGOs, national, state and municipal organizations, and people from Argentina and other Latin American countries that exchange information. We are certain that the diffusion of information and debate about this issue, which FAB should support, could be an important step toward fighting a global crime that is a heavy burden for the physical, sexual and mental health of thousands and thousands of persons in slavery conditions throughout the world.

Australia

Wendy Rogers, Rachel Ankeny, Sue Dodds

FAB Making a Contribution to Legislation Review

FAB members in Australia have been very active in recent legislative review processes on bioethical issues.

In late 2005, Justice Lockhart headed up a Legislation Review Committee (LRC) to perform a review of Australia's *Prohibition of Human Cloning Act 2002* and *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2002*. Both acts had sunset clauses requiring their reconsideration after three years. These two pieces of legislation regulate the use of human embryos in research and prohibit all forms of cloning. The LRC sought responses on a number of specific issues, including definitions of embryos, currently prohibited practices such as cloning for research purposes, uses of excess ART embryos, creation of a national stem cell bank, creation of human-animal hybrids for research, and regulation of these practices.

FAB members Rachel Ankeny, Sue Dodds and Wendy Rogers made a joint written submission to the LRC; Sue and Rachel participated in a discussion forum; and Sheryl De Lacey, Rachel, and Wendy testified individually to the LRC in hearings held around Australia. We were able to argue explicitly for recognition of the contributions that women make in this area, the need for international regulation to prevent exploitation of women in other countries, and issues of social justice in relation to the uses of technologies developed from embryos and stem cells. We were also able to comment upon the inconsistent ethical frameworks that appeared to underpin some of the reasoning in the legislation.

The report of the LRC was published in December and we were pleased to see that both our written and verbal submissions had been extensively quoted. Information about the review is available here: <http://www.lockhartreview.com.au/>. Our joint submission is number 515. The full report is also available from that website. The Government has not yet responded to the report, which recommended liberalizing research. Parliament is likely to debate the recommendations around the middle of 2006.

In January, Sue, Rachel, and Wendy regrouped to put in a submission to the Inquiry into Therapeutic Goods Amendment (Repeal of Ministerial responsibility for approval of RU486) Bill 2005. Australian women have never had access to RU486 (mifepristone) for use as an alternative to surgical abortion, as its use in Australia had been at the discretion of the Minister for Health. The proposed legislative review sought to repeal the requirement of approval from the federal health minister before importation of and access to mifepristone, and to place

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

approval and regulation of RU486 with the Therapeutic Goods Administration, in line with all other medications in Australia.

This Inquiry provided an opportunity for public debate, prior to a rare conscience vote in both houses of Parliament. The Committee received 2496 submissions and 2292 additional pieces of correspondence, with a total of 4788 public contributions to the inquiry. Over half of the submissions were form letters, as church and other groups opposed to abortion mounted a very organized and effective opposition. The presses ran hot with a range of view points, including allegations that women would have 'back yard abortions' if mifepristone was legalized, and that abortion rates would increase. As far as we know, there is no factual basis to either of these, or many of the other allegations that were raised. Our submission, number 202, was cited in the Final Report. You can access the submissions and report from this website:

http://www.aph.gov.au/senate/committee/clac_ctte/ru486/index.htm

In addition, Rachel participated in an expert forum sponsored by the Australian Science Media Centre, and Wendy and Sue provided comment to various media outlets. An article on the ethical issues was also written for the *Medical Observer Weekly*.

The Bill went to the Senate on February 8th, where it was passed after extensive and emotional debate. It then went to the House of Representatives, and again was passed after debate.

This would seem to be a victory in terms of being able to offer Australian women greater choice in relation to abortion. The limitation at present is that many major pharmaceutical industries have indicated that they will not apply for a licence to import mifepristone because they fear a backlash from those opposed to all forms of abortion.

We were encouraged that both of these submissions were read and quoted by those who wrote the report, and that FAB now has an official place in the legislative processes of Australia!

Book Reviews

A review of *Foucault and the Government of Disability*, ed. Shelly Tremain. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005. ISBN cloth: 0-472-09876-4; paper: 0-472-06876-8.

In an interview first published in the French geography journal *Hèrodote*, Foucault welcomes geographers to make use of his work to investigate the "conflicts of power which traverse [the domain of geography], to confront them and construct the instruments that will enable [geographers] to fight on that terrain."¹ Foucault wants his histories, theories, and methods to be "of service" in the analysis of other domains, and he tells the geographers and us: "If one or two of these 'gadgets' of approach or method that I've tried to employ with psychiatry, the penal system or natural history can be of service to you, then I shall be delighted. If you find the need to transform my tools or use others, then show me what they are, because it may be of benefit to me."² In *Foucault and the Government of Disability*, editor Shelley Tremain and her contributors have made use of Foucault's "gadgets' of approach or method," and have sometimes transformed them, through their analyses of disability and its multiple struggles over power and knowledge. Disability studies scholars, disability rights activists, and anyone interested in further examples of how Foucault's gadgets might be put to use in new domains will be interested in this volume.

Tremain's introduction suggests that the gadgets in which she is most interested are Foucault's concepts of "biopower" and "governmentality." For Foucault, biopower is exercised through the "numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations."³ The medical model of

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

disability, which understands disability as a negative attribute that needs to be fixed through various normalization strategies, including surgery, rehabilitation, and education, demonstrates the exercise of biopower in both its disciplining mode and its regularizing mode, that is, the effort undertaken by the medical model to mold disabled bodies and populations to more closely resemble a particular norm.

Foucault's concept of "governmentality" emerges in his later work on the "technologies of the self" or the "arts of existence," and as Tremain notes, the term "government" refers "to any form of activity that aims to shape, guide, or affect the conduct of some person or persons"(8). Like biopower, government is comprised of a set of practices enacted at both the macro and micro levels: government refers to "not only state-generated prohibitions and punishments, and global networks of social, economic, and political stratification..., but also normalizing technologies that facilitate the systematic objectivization of subjects as deaf, criminal, mad, and so on, and techniques of self-improvement and self-transformation such as weight-loss programs and fitness regimes, assertiveness training, botox injections, breast implants, psychotherapy, and rehabilitation"(8). Subjects are not prior to these macro and micro practices of governmentality; rather, we become subjects through these very practices.

Many scholars and activists have challenged the medical model of disability with a social model that analyzes the multiple ways people with impairments are dis-abled by the attitudes of others, social conventions, and the physical and built environments in which we live. The social model insists that disability is not a stable category throughout history and across cultures; it emerges through particular discourses, practices, institutions, and environments. Tremain uses Foucault and his concept of governmentality to take this analysis one step further. She argues that, "the category of impairment emerged and, in many respects, persists in order to legitimize the governmental practices that generated it in the first place"(11). Impairment is not, then, an essential foundation on top of which disability is socially constructed; it too emerges and is enacted through particular practices of governmentality.

It is clear that Tremain recognizes the rich resource that Foucault's work provides for disability studies, and many of the essays in this volume demonstrate that disability, like sexuality, is "an especially dense transfer point for relations of power."⁴ The experiences and events of disability are multiple: the essays here cover the multiple experiences of disability, including autism, paraplegia, learning disabilities, mental retardation, and gender dimorphism within the multiple domains of disability, including a rehabilitation facility for people with spinal cord injuries, inclusive education discourses and institutions, the law, public facilities, and the internet. These multiple experiences and events of disability also provide a useful lens through which to uncover the richness of Foucault's thought. Many of the essays bring Foucault and disability together in ways that illuminate more clearly both disability and Foucault.

One essay that I found particularly effective in this regard is Licia Carlson's "Docile Bodies, Docile Minds: Foucauldian Reflections on Mental Retardation." In her essay, Carlson explores the "tremendously problematic and complex category that bears the name 'mental retardation'"(133). To do this, she turns to Foucault, because "his work is historically, conceptually, and methodologically relevant to a critical analysis of the classification of mental retardation, and provides the occasion for a philosophical reorientation toward the category"(133). Through analyses like Carlson's, *Foucault and the Government of Disability* demonstrates the many ways Foucault's gadgets might help us to do disability otherwise, historically, conceptually, and methodologically.

Occasionally, however, *Foucault and the Government of Disability* disappoints, because it sometimes offers readings of Foucault that are clichéd or not very nuanced. It's not that I feel the need to defend Foucault against critique, but I do want to suggest that the regard will be greater for disability studies scholars and activists if we explore Foucault's histories, theories, and methodologies as presented in his own work, not in formulaic renderings of his work. Such renderings include my own personal favorite: Foucault's theory of power leaves no room for agency. For me, this is an odd reading of Foucault, who was from the very beginning engaged in

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

looking for and at the conditions of possibility for agency. Indeed, Foucault's genealogical method is interested in bringing into being the "insurrection of subjugated knowledges," that are buried and disqualified knowledges of struggles.⁵ In some of the essays, Foucault drops out of the analysis. While I understand that the object of this edited volume is the experiences and events of disability, and not Foucault, the whole point of the book seems to be that Foucault offers us a framework through which to analyze this multiple object. So, what precisely is that framework, or theory/method, that Foucault provides? How does this supplement or challenge other frameworks? Getting at these questions necessarily requires close readings of Foucault. Still, I'm excited to use and transform this new gadget that *Foucault and the Government of Disability* helps to bring into being: Disability/Foucault.

Lisa Diedrich, *Women's Studies Program, Stony Brook University*

Footnotes

¹ Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, trans. by Colin Gordon, et. al. (New York: Pantheon, 1980), 65.

² Ibid.

³ Michael Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley. (New York: vintage, 1978), 140.

⁴ Ibid., 103

⁵ I discuss Foucault's genealogical method and his concept of subjugated knowledges in more detail in Lisa Diedrich, "Introduction: Genealogies of Disability," *Cultural Studies* Vol. 19, No. 6 (November 2005), 649-666.

A review of *Reconceiving Pregnancy and Childcare: Ethics, Experience, and Reproductive Labor*. By Amy Mullin. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Cloth: 9780521844383; Paper ISBN: 9780521605861.

In *Reconceiving Pregnancy and Childcare: Ethics, Experience, and Reproductive Labor*, Ann Mullin argues that pregnancy and childrearing are "social activities that involve simultaneously physical, intellectual, emotional, and moral work from those who undertake them" (186). One of the most distinctive features of Mullin's book is that she devotes very little space - one short chapter out of six - to childbirth. Part of the reason for this is that focusing exclusively or almost exclusively on childbirth reinforces the general societal tendency to believe that pregnancy is valued solely for the product it produces and not at all for the experience of pregnancy. By illuminating the experience of pregnancy - not by universalizing it, but by looking at women's actual experiences - and by comparing pregnancy to other experiences that women and men have, Mullin reveals that all of us can learn something from the experience of pregnancy regardless of whether or not we are pregnant and whether or not we are capable of pregnancy. Mullin hopes that public recognition of the value of the experience of pregnancy will enable pregnancy to become part of the public discourse (34).

In order to show how pregnancy is active and thoughtful reproductive work, not just a passive physical process, Mullin claims that there are important similarities between the experience of a wanted pregnancy and a consciously chosen project such as writing a novel or improving one's soccer game. Just like the soccer player must work within the physical constraints of her body, respond to bodily changes, depend upon others to reach her goals (such as her coach and teammates), and incorporate soccer into her life along with her other projects and activities, so too does a woman with her pregnancy. Realizing that pregnancy is not a completely unique experience - but rather similar to other projects we undertake - allows us to better understand both pregnancy and these other projects and activities. Mullin's discussion shows us, for example, that it is a mistake to believe that personal projects, unlike pregnancy, are completely subject to individual control. Her discussion, in short, helps

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

us to see how pregnancy is an active and intellectual project in addition to being an embodied one. As she notes, her view stands in stark contrast to the way most philosophers have understood pregnancy. Plato and Nietzsche, for example, distinguished between material and spiritual pregnancy, granting the latter philosophical significance and using it as a metaphor to describe intellectual creativity while denying the former any significance outside of the fetus.

Mullin also compares pregnancy to illnesses and diseases. She explains that they are similar in that both pregnant women and people with disabilities have bodies that are not accommodated in public spaces, thus thwarting many of their projects. Revealing the often hidden role that the body can play in carrying out any project is important both because it helps able-bodied people better understand the experiences of people with disabilities and because it discloses the social aspect of the oppression of people with disabilities - that society refuses to accommodate their bodies.

Turning to childcare, Mullin observes that it rests upon the ideology of essential motherhood in which "mothers meet all the emotional needs of their young children, care of their bodies, and keep them safe, while fathers provide the material resources required for this mothering work" (120). Moreover, according to this ideology childcare should mainly take place in a private home. Resisting this ideology, which treats all caregivers other than mothers as custodial or surrogate caregivers, Mullin endorses sharing childcare among a number of people. She proposes a "three-pronged approach" that focuses on the needs of the care recipients and the care providers while taking into account power dynamics and equality among people of different genders, races, and social classes (149). She argues that sharing childcare is better for both the caregivers and the children: it is better for the caregivers because they have the time to participate in other activities (which benefits both them and the children) and it is better for the children because they have access to different people with different knowledge, skills, and values. Moreover, in working together caregivers learn from one another, thus improving their caregiving skills as well as the caregiving the child receives.

While I found Mullin's discussion of shared childcare quite persuasive, I would have liked to hear more about how this idea could be implemented in our lives and in society as a whole. Reading more about how Mullin envisions shared childcare working in everyday life as well as the structures, systems, and relationships in place that enable some cultures and social groups yet not others to participate in shared childcare would help us move towards making the ideal of shared childcare a reality.

To show that the mother-child and caregiver-care recipient relationship can help us better understand other caring relationships, Mullin compares them to friendship. In examining the work of feminists who affirm the care giving relationship as a model for friendship, as well as those who critique it, Mullin shows that they all make an assumption that reinforces essential motherhood: that the mother works alone to meet the needs of an entirely dependent child. In assuming that the child is completely dependent, they are limiting their discussion to very young children and thus overlooking the fact that reciprocity and mutuality - which are typically denied a role in mother-child relationships, but are thought to be necessary in friendships - are possible for mother-child relationships that involve an older child. Mullin goes on to reveal that feminists on both sides of this care-giving model make a similar assumption in conceptualizing friendship relationships: that friendship involves just two morally component adults people who are in no way dependent on the other. This understanding of friendship, just like the ideology of essential motherhood, is not only inaccurate, but also quite problematic. In the end, Mullin argues that we need to understand friendship not as a dyadic relationship, but rather as involving networks of relationships. As with childrearing, modeling friendship on a network of relationships enables us to acknowledge and deal with dependency instead of denying it. While perhaps outside of her scope, I would have been interested in hearing Mullin's position on romantic relationships and how they fit into her view that networks of relationships are preferable to dyadic relationships.

Overall, Mullin's book is a significant contribution to feminist work on pregnancy and childcare. Her critical

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

analysis of prior feminist work on mothering is useful in understanding this debate and will help move it forward. By examining pregnancy and childcare from the perspective of the pregnant woman and the caregiver, Mullin shows that pregnancy and childcare are active, thoughtful, and moral reproductive work that takes place within a social context. While she approaches these issues from a philosophical perspective, her book is highly interdisciplinary, which makes it interesting and useful both to philosophers - as it adds empirical research and literature to a discussion that has often been quite abstract - and to scholars in other disciplines - as it provides a philosophically rigorous critical analysis and ethical theory that is valuable to more grounded work. This well researched and accessible book is not only important for academics, but also for parents, childcare givers and workers, disability theorists and activists, and medical professionals specializing in obstetrics and pediatrics. Moreover, if we agree with Mullin that pregnancy and childcare are complex and rich forms of reproductive work that deserve recognition, value, and a place in the public discourse, then this book, and more generally the topics it raises, is relevant for all of us.

Lisa Englestein, *Michigan State University*

.....

A review of *Autonomy and Trust in Bioethics*, by Onora O'Neill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. ISBN cloth: 0521815401; paper: 0521894530.

In this series of lectures, Onora O'Neill argues that while bioethicists continue to emphasize respect for individual autonomy, public trust in the areas of medicine, science, and biotechnology continues to erode. Why? She believes there is an inherent tension between the conception of individual autonomy used in bioethics and the concept of trust. In her view, a reliance on principled autonomy would be more adequate for the needs of bioethics and compatible with valuing trust.

According to O'Neill, autonomy, as it is used in bioethics, is primarily associated with independence or the ability to make independent decisions. Also, O'Neill argues that *in practice* this conception of individual autonomy is usually reduced to a demand for informed consent. "What is rather grandly called 'patient autonomy' often amounts simply to a right to choose or refuse treatments on offer, and the corresponding obligations of practitioners not to proceed without patients' consent" (37). While she agrees that informed consent is important, she believes that an emphasis on this conception of autonomy can work against restoring trust.

As the author points out, expressions of individual autonomy can be good or bad (3, 25). This means that increasing individual autonomy does not automatically increase trust. Individual autonomy (as it is currently conceived) emphasizes independence from others whereas trust requires developing relationships with others (24-25).

O'Neill proposes a conception of principled autonomy taken from Kant. She argues that Kant's conception of autonomy is not individual, but is instead a matter of acting on principles and obligations. The principle of autonomy requires that we only act on choices that could be made into universal laws or principles. Thus, principled autonomy is a matter of restraint. O'Neill notes:

Kant's concern is not a *self* that actually legislates for all, but principles that are fit to be laws for all. The stress he places on the term *self-legislation* is on the notion of *legislation*: the advocates of individual autonomy by contrast stress the notion of *self* and have little to say about any conception of (moral) legislation. (85-86, Author's emphasis)

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

She argues that adopting a conception of principled autonomy gives us a foundation of basic ethical requirements. Also, this conception is more compatible with trust because it forbids deception and coercion.¹

The foundation of basic ethical requirements seems to be O'Neill's main concern. As alluded to earlier, she believes that without other ethical constraints, individual autonomy is not an intrinsic good. Yet, I am not convinced that her version of principled autonomy is going to be as helpful as she claims.

First, O'Neill admits that the principles or laws derived using principled autonomy will still need to be interpreted in practice (95). As she puts it, principles underdetermine actions and, thus, must be complemented by exercising practical judgment (124). Even if principled autonomy obligates all health care practitioners to avoid deception and coercion, each individual practitioner must still use her moral judgment to decide what acts count as deception and coercion in any particular instance. How is this any different than what occurs in current practice? All health care practitioners are currently obligated to uphold ethical guidelines that prohibit deception and coercion and currently use their own judgment to interpret those guidelines.²

Second, the different conceptions of autonomy O'Neill introduces appear to apply to different groups or, at least, appear to develop from different contexts or debates. The conception of individual autonomy and requirements for informed consent developed in reaction to medical paternalism and a series of medical abuses. As O'Neill correctly points out, this is often referred to as "*patient autonomy*." The emphasis on independence and choice makes sense if we pay attention to the context in which this conception of autonomy developed. In contrast, O'Neill's discussion of principled autonomy focuses primarily on health care practitioners, insurance companies, and the media. According to O'Neill, principled autonomy turns our attention to obligations; therefore, it makes sense that her discussion shifts to those who are in power or those who are in charge of disseminating information. However, it is unclear how these two discussions related to each other. O'Neill claims, "A primary focus on interaction and relationships, on obligations and rights, does not prevent those committed to principled autonomy from assigning due - but no more than due - weight to individual autonomy" (O'Neill 96). Yet, it remains unclear from her discussion what patients would owe their health care providers based on principled autonomy (or how principled autonomy would apply to patients).

Despite these reservations, I agree with O'Neill that the dominance of the principle of autonomy (as it is currently conceived) is a problem for bioethics. I also agree that shifting our focus from a discussion of rights to a discussion of obligations (which she believes principled autonomy would do) could be a very productive move.

Much of our current emphasis on individual autonomy in bioethics was in reaction to paternalism. In that context, it made sense to emphasize individual rights or the right to choose. Even though I do not believe the problem of how to account for patient power in the health care system has been solved, I do agree there are many issues in bioethics that deserve more attention, for example; access to health care, the rising costs of health care, and potential problems with a health care system that seems bound to consumer demands. A discussion of these issues will likely need to shift to obligations (what we owe each other or what society owes certain groups) rather than a continued focus on individual choices.

In addition to her analysis of autonomy, O'Neill begins a philosophical analysis of trust. She points out that despite general mistrust of institutions many individuals continue to trust specific practitioners. As O'Neill accurately points out, wholesale distrust is impossible; therefore, the question is with whom and how we should place trust (141-142). Her analysis of trust is quite thought provoking. I hope others will continue this discussion and analysis.

In addition, O'Neill discusses various cultural trends that have likely eroded trust such as the "audit agenda" and a sensationalized media. By the "audit agenda," O'Neill refers to a shift in institutional practices that replaces qualitative measures of performance with quantitative ones. Inevitably, the way these institutions work must also change to accommodate these new requirements. Although the quantitative measures are meant to ensure trust, they often increase distrust because they "formalize" trust, rely on external constraints, and obscure the

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

workings of institutions (129-134). O'Neill also looks at how the media has undermined public trust. An emphasis on sensationalism over substance obscures what real issues are at stake and inhibits useful public discussion. She suggests some procedural standards for ethical reporting that would better reflect the original intents of a free press (Chapter 8).

Neither of these issues will be new to most bioethicists. Still, O'Neill is correct to highlight them. As she points out, trust can only be restored if people are able to (in some way) judge information and institutions for themselves. Thus, until we address these issues and others that obscure or unnecessarily complicate information, we will not be able to restore trust.

In conclusion, O'Neill's book will probably be of interest to a number of groups. Her general discussion of specific topics such as reproductive technologies, genetic privacy, and the media would be accessible to anyone interested in those topics. Most of her analysis of autonomy is also very accessible, but will probably be more meaningful to those working in philosophy or to academically trained bioethicists. She purposely uses footnotes sparingly so it is helpful if you have some familiarity with the literature she is discussing. This is especially true in her chapter on principled bioethics when she discusses some debates over Kant. However, I could also see this book being useful for an upper level undergraduate or graduate level bioethics course given the topics covered.

Sonya Charles, *Michigan State University*

Footnotes

¹ Her analysis of why principled autonomy forbids deception and coercion is similar to the classic account Kant gives against lying. In sum, it would be incoherent to deceive because if universalized it would undermine trust which is necessary for deception (98).

² For example, the American Nurses Association Code for Nurses includes "veracity (truth-telling)" as part of showing respect for patients, and the American Hospital Association's Patient Bill of Rights includes a right to obtain "complete current information concerning diagnosis, treatment, and prognosis" (quotes are taken from *Ethics in Nursing*, 3rd edition by Martin Benjamin and Joy Curtis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992, 219, 221 respectively).

A review of *The Perversion of Autonomy: Coercion and Constraints in a Liberal Society*, by Willard Gaylin and Bruce Jennings. Revised and Expanded Edition. Georgetown University Press, 2003.

ISBN: 0878409068; LC: 2002013910.

What is the meaning of freedom if we are fundamentally bound to each other? And what costs are we, as ostensibly free individuals, willing to incur by virtue of our membership in a society that seems to be torn between a slavish devotion to personal autonomy on the one hand, and the need for mutual cooperation and collaborative decision-making on the other?

In the first edition of *The Perversion of Autonomy*, Gaylin and Jennings, employing the tools of political theory, philosophy and psychology, have located the modern liberal society in precisely this struggle. The central question that the authors posed there was whether individual U.S. citizens and society are able to sensibly balance our devotion to freedom and autonomy with the welfare of the larger community. What they suggested is that, alas, we have sacrificed the latter for the former, and in doing so, have in fact begun to undermine the liberal and democratic society we seek to preserve.

In this second edition, Gaylin and Jennings offer us a more compelling and more passionate work. It is more

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

passionate perhaps as a result of the immediacy that the events of September 11, 2001 have given to the autonomy vs. civic responsibility debate, both in the U.S. and globally. It is more compelling as a result of two new, provocative chapters on the crucial issues of forgoing life-sustaining treatment and physician-assisted suicide (PAS). These chapters, which the authors note were written at least in part as a response to the movements to legalize physician-assisted suicide and to defend euthanasia on moral grounds, advance the book's general argument by suggesting that even at the end of one's life -- and perhaps *especially* at the end of one's life -- autonomy fails as both an "overriding" value, as well as a substantive moral guide for our reasons, policies, and actions.

Indeed, the authors argue, it is rather significant that our debates surrounding individuals' rights to forgo life-sustaining treatment appear to have shielded us from the very multifaceted and *human* reality of what it might mean to live a good life and die a good death. In addressing the complex and profound questions of death and dying, they suggest, we find ourselves confronted not merely by the binary question of "Am I being coerced in my choices?" but by a whole host of concerns, including the importance of our "relational space" (250), or our personal, human, and communal relationships with each other. Without acknowledging these concerns, we are subsequently left contemplating a limiting and starkly "formulaic" notion of autonomous freedom of choice rather than allowing for the possibility of actual "self-sovereignty." In the end this deprives us of the opportunity to honor a life with a "dignified" (250) death, and to thus preserve the "integrity of the person in the extended social space surrounding the physical body" (244).

We make a similar mistake, the authors suggest, by arguing for rights in the case of PAS, relying on a dispassionate "liberal neutrality," which holds that neither the government nor the individual ought to get in the way of one's "considered" end-of-life decisions, including those related to PAS. And this neutrality is not merely abstract, for its chief failure lies in what it leaves out, namely, "the surrounding interpersonal context of the dying process" (242). Unsatisfied by this empty liberal formalism, the authors propose two principles: respecting the "relational integrity of the person," and protecting dying individuals from "moral trespass" (242, 245). By way of clarification - and perhaps to emphasize the deeply *moral and spiritual* rather than (liberal) political or somatic foundations of these concepts -- they cite Paul Ramsey's *The Patient as Person*, where Ramsey notes that "the sanctity of human life prevents ultimate trespass upon him even for the sake of treating his bodily life" (279). This "sanctity" includes taking seriously the social connections in an individual's life that give that life meaning. These principles, then, might enable us to move away from viewing death and dying as a triumph of the autonomous individual, asserting his or her abstract rights, and toward accepting the dignity and the *interrelatedness* of our mortality. This acceptance, warranted by "moral common sense" and by our shared humanity, excludes both direct euthanasia and assisted suicide.

In a number of ways, this is a brave book. It is brave because it is bound to upset a number of those who take themselves to be liberal, and because it engages with so many different areas (political theory, medical ethics, legal theory, and so on). The former worry, I think, is only partially warranted, for autonomy (and its related notions), while still arguably central to any discussion involving ethics and politics, has become somewhat of a predictable philosophical refrain, repeated, mantra-like, when we run out of original argument. Thus, while the book's treatment of Mill's harm principle (which calls for absolute liberty in matters that are purely self-regarding, justifying interference only on the basis of harm to others) might be a bit too brief and its claims about emotions and reasons may be a little light on illustrative examples, the fact remains that autonomy (and its correlative abhorrence of all coercion) calls for a fresh critique. That said, the authors' attempt should not only be encouraged, but applauded.

Although the book's multidisciplinary approach might generate concern in the current climate of micro-specialization in academe, in my view it is very welcome. Given that the arguments put forth are direct challenges to some of the most fundamental modern liberal assumptions, it appears as quite sensible, and indeed

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

refreshing, that the authors draw on a variety of sources for their conclusions. If the subject at hand is nothing short of the nature of human good, it certainly deserves a multifaceted, multidimensional treatment. Indeed, those who might critique the book based on its academic "homelessness" might be missing the point.

Finally, a word is warranted about the new chapters in this edition. As I noted earlier, they primarily address medical ethics, broadly construed (really extending into areas of law, sociology, psychology, and so on). These additions to the text are generally successful, both in terms of the rigor of their analysis and the strength of the specific examples that are offered in support of the authors' overall claims. There are, however, several concerns that should be noted. First, a clearer, more precisely drawn connection between the "good" kind of coercion and end-of-life decisions would have been helpful. For instance, how might we address worries about the relationship between coercion and power differentials, especially in the case of the disempowered patient and the often-intimidating medical establishment in whose care she finds herself? How can the inadequacies of "liberal neutrality" be overcome, or at least be challenged, by policies that are coercive in the *right way*, that is, that take seriously the complexity of end-of-life decisions and their role in a *good life* while taking off the table certain options (such as PAS)? While the authors gesture toward "the ethic of interdependence," pointing beyond autonomy and neutrality to a more Aristotelian, inclusive, civic-minded conception of the good, some of their suggestions sound a bit like promissory notes rather than concrete solutions.

Moreover, I wonder if in their discussion of the role of the family (and other relationships) in decisions about life-sustaining medical treatments, Gaylin and Jennings did not go too far in supplanting what they view as an excessive focus on the individual with an equally polarizing claim that calls on us "to rethink the assumptions about the self that allow it to have interests apart from relationships in the first place" (227). While I am rather sympathetic to the notion of looking at the self as, in part, a function of its relations with the world, I am not sure that the authors offer a sufficiently nuanced claim. That is, are we to read them as arguing that we are *nothing but* the products of our relationships? But this does not seem to leave much room for personal responsibility on our part. After all, if the individual as such is insignificant apart from her relationships, then perhaps we might *only* hold groups morally accountable (and morally praiseworthy) instead of the singular person. This possibility, however, is less than satisfactory, and does not appear to fit with many of the other (individual-centered) claims made by the authors.

Ultimately, *The Perversion of Autonomy* is a powerful and significant book. It dares to take on the generally untouchable pieties of contemporary liberal thought -- autonomy and individual freedom -- with rigor, passion, and a determination to make us consider, and re-consider, the positions we might have otherwise regarded as unassailable. While its tone is at times academic and directed at scholars, it is also quite accessible to those members of the general public who are interested in politics, medicine, philosophy and current affairs. And it is this kind of socially inclusive probing, searching, and questioning that ought to be at the heart of any conversation about freedom and the human good. To this vital discourse, *The Perversion of Autonomy* serves as an important contribution.

Anna Gotlib, *Michigan State University*

Awards and Honors

Jocelyn Downie was awarded the Abbyann D. Lynch Medal in Bioethics by the royal Society of Canada for her book, *Dying Justice*.

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

The Hadassah-Brandeis Institute Research Award and The Eleanor P. Jacobson Woman of Valor Award were awarded to Dr. Ruth Halperin-Kaddari and FAB member Eyal Katvan for their work regarding Rosa Ginossar, the first woman lawyer in Pre-State Israel.

Debora Diniz received two awards for "Severina's History," a documentary on abortion in Brazil. These included: Best Film (first prize) at the Rio de Janeiro International Documentary Festival, 2005 and Best Film (third prize) at the Fort Lauderdale International Film Festival in Florida, 2005.

Donna Dickenson will receive the prestigious Dutch Spinozalens award 2006. This is a biannual award (25000 euro) awarded to a famous thinker in the field of ethics and society. Following is an excerpt from the press release dated 02/20/2006:

“Donna Dickenson, a frequent high-profile commentator on ethics, Professor of Medical Ethics and Humanities, and executive Director of the Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities, has become the first female academic to win the international Spinoza Lens award. An expert on medical law and ethics, including issues surrounding the right-to-die debate, abortion and the wholesale patenting of the human genome, Professor Dickenson has had direct influence on public education and health policy.

She has been asked to contribute to many public consultations, including a commissioned paper for the Retained Organs Commission, the body charged with proposing new laws to deal with human tissue after the Alder Hey scandal. At the European level, she has run six major projects, including the Network for European Women's Rights, which brings together organizations from Eastern and Western Europe on the crucial topics of trafficking, reproductive rights, women's political participation and social entitlements. Her publications include some 20 books and 60 articles spanning philosophy, law, politics, feminist theory and literature.

The Spinoza series of awards are well known in the scientific community, with the Spinoza 'Lens' award specifically recognizing commitment to furthering public debate on ethical issues. The prize, named after the famous Dutch philosopher Baruch de Spinoza, who was a strong supporter of reasonableness and tolerance, is awarded to a renowned thinker on ethics. The award will be presented to Professor Dickenson by the Mayor of Amsterdam, Job Cohen, at a ceremony on 28 April in the Amstelkerk, Amstelveld te Amsterdam at 4pm.

"I am very deeply honored to have been named as the fourth recipient of the International Spinoza Lens award and the first woman to receive the prize," says Professor Dickenson. "The first recipient was Edward Said, whose dedication to humanism and democracy in his academic writings combined so notable with his work towards Palestinian-Israeli reconciliation in his private life. While my achievements cannot match his, I hope that my campaigning and writing is irrelevant and that there are no right or wrong answers in ethics, the Spinoza awards give hope to those of us who accept neither premise as true."

The Spinoza award jury states: "Donna Dickenson's work is characterized by commitment, openness and thorough philosophical knowledge. It encompasses philosophy, law, health care ethics, global politics, feminism, historiography, poetry and literature. Time and again, Dickenson strives to express the diversity of human values while respecting the concept of universality. Her criticism of universal notions on what women, patients, the dying or physicians are or ought to be, and what concepts like property, feminism or luck mean, is no reason to

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

abandon them. On the contrary, by assigning them other meanings or interpretations, she aims to give the existing discourses and practices a different turn."

The jury continues: "Dickenson expands the agenda of traditional bioethics and introduces perspectives that are not frequently presented. Her ability to analyze the philosophical theories underlying bioethical and feminist approaches to health care practice reveals great craftsmanship. Her *oeuvre* has yet to be completed, which is something the jury mainly sees as an advantage. The current reality of the problematic the author addresses requires a continual attitude of amazement - the feature *par excellence* of Dickenson's approach and work."

Dr. Rosemarie Tong has been named an East Coast Advisory Board member of the Women's Bioethics Project, which is directed by Kathryn Hinsch in Seattle.

Lisa Eckenwiler has received a fellowship for the Spring 2006: Visiting Fellow, Center for American Progress, 1333 H Street NW, Washington, DC 2005. Her fellowship work focuses on justice, caregiving, and globalization.

Dalhousie News February 17, 2006

Honouring excellence by Charles Crosby

Each year the Official Black History Month Poster features prominent black Canadians who have contributed deeply to the fabric of Canadian society. This year the poster, which is displayed across the country, has an important Dalhousie connection. Among the four Canadians featured are Dr. Joyce Ross, founding Executive Director of the East Preston Day Care Centre who has received an honorary Doctor of Laws from Dal, and Dr. Françoise Baylis, Dalhousie's Canada Research Chair in Bioethics and Philosophy.

Dr. Baylis, a professor in the departments of Bioethics and Philosophy was approached by Rob Small, the artist behind each year's poster as a leading example of an inspiring black Canadian, and says she is honoured to be a part of this important project. "I am very proud to have been selected as one of the four Canadians featured on this poster," she says. "My mom's cousin, Senator Ann Cools, was featured in an earlier edition. This is the first time that one family has had two family members profiled..."

For further information go to: <http://www.dal.ca/news/2006/02/17/blackhistory.html>

Gender Inequities in Health Research Grant

Wendy Rogers, as part of a three-woman team, received funding from the Australian Research Council to investigate Gender Inequities in Health Research: Towards a New Regulatory Framework. The award totaled \$300,000 over three years.

Ads and Announcements

FAB Call for Nominations

In accordance with the FAB policy, the Co-coordinators have appointed Arleen Salles (Chair), Anne Donchin, and Sue Sherwin to serve as the nominating committee. We have been charged with the responsibility of preparing a slate of candidates to stand for election to the positions of Co-coordinators and Advisory Board members at the FAB meeting to be held in August, 2006. Therefore, we now seek nominations for the positions of Co-coordinators (2) as well as members of the Advisory Board (at least 6 and no more than 9). In accordance with FAB policies, we seek nominations for people who are willing to serve for a renewable two year term.

All nominations should include both a nominator and a seconder and a statement that the candidate is willing to serve. Advisory Board members must have belonged to FAB for at least a year. Candidates for Co-coordinator must have belonged to FAB for at least two years and have actively demonstrated their involvement in FAB. It is essential that both Advisory Board members and Co-coordinators have easy and frequent access to e-mail. Diversity and international representation are sought. Information about the roles and responsibilities of Co-coordinators and Advisory Board members may be found at the FAB website (www.fabnet.org).

Please send your nominations no later than April 30th, 2006 to:

*Arleen Salles
Chair of the Nominating Committee
arleenl@optonline.net*

They can also be sent by fax to:

201-251-9864

We hope you will consider standing for these important positions.

We have a new webmistress -

Ruth Groenhout

For years now, the FAB website has been managed by Hilde Lindemann and Alison Crane Reiheld, who have done a tremendous job profiling FAB to the wider community. We are all very grateful for their generous contributions of time and talent. Responsibility for the FAB website will soon be transferred to Ruth Groenhout (Calvin College, Grand Rapids, MI). One of Ruth's early tasks will be to "refresh" the website: www.fabnet.org.

*Anyone with suggestions for ways in which our website can better serve the needs of our members can forward these to Ruth at
rgroenho@calvin.edu*

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

FAB seeks a volunteer...

...to take over as Listserv Moderator. The Moderator provides an institutional base for the listserv and moderates the list. The Moderator is expected to check her email at least once a day so that she can approve messages that have been submitted to the list, weeding out spam and other messages that are not for the subscribers. She also regularly updates the subscriptions to the list.*

**For the technologically uninitiated: The Moderator's home institution sets up the listserv, through one of its IT people. The listserv gets its own email address, and when anyone posts to it, the post comes to the Moderator first for her approval. She hits the "okay" url that's attached to the post, and the server broadcasts it to all the subscribers.*

Membership

As we are all very busy scholars, teachers, and activists, sometimes the mundane things like renewing our FAB membership might get away from us. But it is essential that we stay actively involved in FAB, particularly as we are a membership-based organization.

Please go to the PDC website at <http://www.pdcnet.org/member-fab.html> and renew for 2006. This will give you access to discounted conference registration and eligibility for grant applications, as well as allowing you to show your commitment to FAB in this exciting time of growth and new projects.

Membership dues are on a sliding scale and dues waivers are available on application. For problems with the PDC website, please email order@pdcnet.org. For general enquiries on membership, please contact the FAB membership secretary, Rachel Ankeny (rankeny@science.usyd.edu.au).

Calendar

APRIL 2006

Call for Papers: *Who is a journalist? - April 1, 2006*

Media Ethics Colloquium at the University of St. Thomas

As part of a decade-long series aimed at enhancing scholarship in applied media ethics, the University of St. Thomas will host the 2006 colloquium October 14-17 in Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota. The colloquium - the seventh of the series - will feature 12 fellows working in teams of two to explore the moral dimensions of the question: Who is a journalist? Selected fellows will receive an honorarium and travel expenses. During the colloquium, fellows will present their work to each other and solicit feedback. A group of fellows will also speak at a public symposium at the colloquium's end. Papers that result from the colloquium will be published in the *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* in 2007.

Applications for fellowships should include the following:

- * a brief (500 word) abstract of a paper proposal
- * a curriculum vitae
- * if appropriate, a notation of the desired team member

The deadline for proposals is April 1, 2006. Send paper or electronic submissions to:

Wendy N. Wyatt
2115 Summit Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
Phone inquiries: 651-962-5253
email: wnyatt@stthomas.edu

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

Conference: Roundtable on Latina Feminism - April 6-8, 2006

You are invited to participate in the first annual Roundtable on Latina Feminism. The roundtable will provide a forum for discussion and exchange of ideas related to Latina feminist philosophy as well as Latina feminism in general.

This event is sponsored by John Carroll University, Philosophy Department, the Don Shula Chair in Philosophy and the John Carroll University Office of Multicultural Affairs. The keynote speaker will be Linda Martin-Alcoff, Syracuse University. She will speak on "*Mestiza Identity-Politics*" on April 6th at 7:00pm.

Conference: 33rd Conference on Value Inquiry "Market Values and Moral Values" - April 6-8, 2006
Rockville Centre, New York

Broad participation is sought for the conference which will be held at Molloy College, New York. Papers and proposals for papers, that address the nature of, and relationship between, market values and moral values are welcome. Early submission is strongly encouraged and advised. papers should be between 20-25 minutes reading time.

Papers may be practically or theoretically oriented. Topics may be disciplinary and range over issues within a single field of value inquiry such as normative ethics, applied ethics, aesthetics, political theory, or economics. Papers that address the issues of market values and moral values within business ethics are especially welcome. Topics may be interdisciplinary and range over issues between two or more fields of value inquiry. Topics may even be meta-disciplinary and range over purely conceptual issues concerning market values and moral values.

The Conference on Value Inquiry seeks to bring together those whose work represents differences in interest, outlook, and expertise on questions of value. For further information go to: Value-Net.org

To submit a paper, an abstract, or a proposal contact:

William Kline, Conference Coordinator
33rd Conference on Value Inquiry
Center for Business Ethics
Molloy College
P.O. Box 5002
Rockville Centre, NY 11571 USA
email: wkline@molloy.edu

Due to postal regulations, the P.O. Box number must be included in the mailing address.

Conference: Popular Culture/American Culture Association Conference - April 12-16, 2006
Atlanta Marriott Marquis Hotel Atlanta, Georgia

Call for Papers: Mediated Bodies (September 2006 Conference Maastricht University) April 15, 2006

There is no object of scientific investigation that is as difficult to consider a 'mere' object as the human body. People do not merely 'have' but 'are' their bodies. Accordingly, there is a strong mutual relationship between scientific, especially medical conceptions and practices and the constitution and experience of the body in other cultural domains (i.e. religion, philosophy, art, popular culture, etc.) and in every day life. The visualization of the body's interior is particularly significant as it renders available what is both very nearby and inaccessible in daily experience. The way the body is dealt with, cared for, used, or sensed changes with how its interiority and boundaries are conceived of and vice versa. Therefore, the early modern body might be very different from that of the 21st century and the body in African medical practice might bear little resemblance to the corporeal object of European or American biomedicine. Bodily realities and experiences are produced as much as they are discovered and expressed in the interplay of mediating discourses and practice. Medical visualization technologies are at the heart of this interplay.

The conference centers around the question of how medical visualization technologies interact with other discourses and practices in the mediation of human bodies. This question is explored in 7 successive sessions, each dealing with specific visualizations of bodies and with particular historical or cultural contexts.

A panel for the session - "Mediating Bodily Marginality" is being formed. This session explores how negative cultural attitudes towards socially marginalized individuals lead to the proliferation of normalizing medical procedures targeted to this latter group that in turn further marginalizes those individuals who fail to make use of them. Medical advertisements for cosmetic medical procedures

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

often resort 'before' and 'after' shots of specific patients in order to provide us with visible 'proof' of the efficacy of the surgeries they are trying to promote. More recently, due to advanced medical technologies and the rising popularity of 'reality' television we are increasingly witness to 'during' shots as well, that is, to actual footage from the operating room. These latter images tend to present to the viewer (who is targeted as a possible future consumer of the procedure in question) patients who are free from pain (because anaesthetised) and doctors who appear calmly in charge at every step of the way of very complex procedures. Through the 'miracle' of technology we can see what the patient cannot, namely, the interior of her/his body, the body under the knife. This session is concerned with how the increased visualization of the body can lead paradoxically to the increased invisibility of the underlying social forces that motivate more and more people to undergo elective, normalizing medical procedures, procedures that reinforce increasingly narrow corporeal standards of social acceptability for women and men respectively and whose very availability intensifies discrimination against those who fail to make use of them.

Current panelists include: Rosemarie Garland Thomson (Emory University, Atlanta) and Gail Weiss (The George Washington University) If you are interested in being a part of this panel, please send a 500 word abstract to:

Gail Weiss
gweiss@gwu.edu

The deadline for this submission is April 15th, 2006.

Call for Papers: Acta Bioethica - April 30, 2006

The Bioethics Unit PAHO/WHO directed by Dr. Fernanco Lolas have a journal specialized on Bioethics Issues, called "Acta Bioethica". It counts with international standard. (www.paho.org-www.uchile.cl/bioethica)

The next number of this journal will be focused on Gender and Ethical issues. Consequently, we invite you to submit a paper accordingly, in either English or Spanish. **The deadline is April 30th, 2006.**

If there are any questions, please contact:

Carolina Valdebenito
CIEB - University of Chile
valdebec@chi.ops-oms.org

Call for Papers: "Gender Relations in the Labour Market and the Welfare State" April 30, 2006

The Gender (in)equality in the European labour market Interim Conference of the ESA Research Network *Gender Relations in the Labour Market and the Welfare State* will be organized in three sub-themes addressing some of the main issues concerning new and traditional sources of gender discrimination. The three themes under which abstracts for papers to be submitted are:

- Unemployment, insecurity and flexibility in the European labour market - a gender perspective
- Gender, ethnicity and migration - segregation or inclusion?
- Wage and career advancement: sources of gender discrimination

Proposals for papers dealing with these topics in different European countries, especially if they are empirically based, are therefore welcome. Abstracts (not more than 250 words) should be email to the coordinators by **April 30, 2006.**

For inquiries, please contact any of the coordinators.

Sub-theme 1
Sara Falcão Casaca
sarafc@iseg.utl.pt

Sub-theme 2
Vanessa Beck
vanessa.beck@le.ac.uk

Sub-theme 3
Margareta Kreimer
margareta.kreimer@uni-graz

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

MAY 2006

Conference: Ethics and Africa Conference May 29-31, 2006

Sponsored by the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics at Georgia State University (USA) and the Department of Philosophy, University of Cape Town (Cape Town, South Africa) this conference will be held at the University of Cape Town.

Keynote speakers include:

- Chandran Kukathas: Neal A. Maxwell Professor of Political Theory, Public Policy and Public Service, Department of Political Science, University of Utah, USA
- Thomas Pogge: Professorial Fellow, Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics, Australian National University; Professor of Philosophy, Columbia and Oslo Universities.

This conference will draw together scholars in political theory, ethics, applied ethics, international law, public health, sociology, cultural anthropology, and history, to present work and exchange ideas on ethical issues specifically relevant to the peoples and political context of Africa.

Topic areas include

- The ethics of humanitarian intervention,
- International distributive justice (regarding, for example, resources for treatment of AIDs and other infectious disease),
- Democracy in developing African nations,
- Political legitimacy and political authority in Africa,
- Secession and the rights of African national minorities,
- North-south obligations,
- Polygamy,
- Circumcision and female genital cutting and other African cultural practices
- Just war in the African continental context,
- All other related themes.

The conference will attract the interest of scholars from across the globe, and the research we feature and discuss will be on the cutting edge of work in these timely and important fields. There will be plenary and concurrent sessions with respondents.

For additional information, see the conference website at www.gsu.edu/ethics

JUNE 2006

Call for Papers: The Journal of Interdisciplinary Feminist Thought June 1, 2006

The Journal of Interdisciplinary Feminist Thought invites contributions for its next issue which will be devoted to the theme "Women and Science".

Papers are sought in all disciplines; joint papers and papers co-authored with student researchers are also encouraged. Papers should be 20-25 pages in length, typed, and formatted according to the accepted method for the discipline.

Possible topics include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Feminist approaches to inquiry
- Women as discoverers
- The interconnectedness of research and practice
- Applied ethics: biomedical; genome; environmental; computer; engineering; business; feminist perspectives
- Women and science in the mass media/literature
- Challenges facing women in the sciences
- Biology of women's health and disease
- Effective programs for women in sciences
- Women and the environment/technology/engineering
- Scientific methods and generalist practice

Send three blind copies of all manuscripts to:

Drs Carol Gibbons and Lois Eveleth, Co-editors
C/O O'Hare Academic Center
Salve Regina University
Newport, RI 02840

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

Each copy should be accompanied by a title page with contact information for all authors including:

- Author(s) names
- Institution(s)
- Telephone number(s)
- Email address(es)

Each copy should also include the home and work address for the corresponding author.

The deadline for submission is June 1, 2006. All work should be original and current.

Editors' email addresses:

gibbonsc@salve.edu

or

evelethl@salve.edu

Conference: Australian Association for Professional and Applied Ethics June 12-14, 2006
Sydney, Australia

The 13th annual conference of the Australian Association for Professional and Applied Ethics (AAPAE) will be held at the University of New South Wales, in Sydney, June 12-14, 2006. A notice of the conference is available on the AAPAE website: <http://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/aapae/> Click on "Conferences"

The direct address is: <http://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/aapae/conference06>

Papers are invited in any area of professional and applied ethics. Dedicated streams are planned in the areas of business ethics, healthcare ethics, public sector ethics, environmental ethics, and defense ethics.

We extend a special invitation to our North American colleagues to join us at this conference.

Inquiries can be directed either to the address below or to the conference convener:

Stephen Cohen

s.cohen@unsw.edu.au

Or

Australian Association for Professional and Applied Ethics

c/o School of Philosophy

University of New South Wales

Sydney 2052

Australia

email: aapae@unsw.edu.au

Conference: Close Encounters - the 4th European Biannual Conference of the Society for Science, Literature, and the Arts
June 13-16, 2006
Amsterdam

This conference is organized around 11 thematic streams. The following ones could be of interest to FAB members:

- Stream B: Feminism, Science, Science Fiction
- Stream C: the New Aesthetics (ethical issues, politics of beauty, etc.)
- Stream E: Narratives and Narratives (disability studies, narrative ethics, narrative medicine, etc.)

For a short description, possible topics and calls for co-panelists, go to: <http://www.slsa.nl> and click "Streams" on the menu.

For additional information, contact:

Manuela Rossini

email rossini@slsa.nl

Conference: Legal Ethics: Professional Ethics and Personal Integrity June 23-25, 2006
Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

The keynote speaker for this conference is Gerald J. Postema, Cary C. Boshamer Professor of Philosophy and Professor of Law,

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill on "Iniquity, Integrity, and the Perils of Professionalism".

Papers on the conference theme "Professional Ethics and Personal Integrity" are particularly encouraged, though papers on any topic within legal ethics are welcome. Submissions should be sent to the conference organizer:

Dr. Tim Dare
Department of Philosophy and Faculty of Law
The University of Auckland
PO Box 92018
Auckland,
New Zealand
email: t.dare@auckland.ac.nz
Telephone: (00 64 9) 373 7599 ext 87493
Fax: (00 64 9) 373 7408

The Legal Ethics Conference will overlap with the 2006 Annual Conference of the Australian Society for Legal Philosophy, to be held at the University of Auckland over the same weekend. The theme of the SSLP Conference in 2006 is "The Common Law". Registrants will be able to attend both conferences.

Conference website:
www.auckland.ac.nz/phi/legaethics2006

Bioethics Summer Course in Rome: Technologizing humanity or humanizing technology? bioethics toward the future
June 26-July 7, 2006
Rome, Italy

Session 1: The frontier of techno-ethics (June 26-28)

- Technology - historical, philosophical, and theological aspects
- Medical technologies today
- Cybernetics and Artificial Intelligence
- The informatics age
- Privacy and chip
- Nanotechnology
- Ethics and anthropology of technology - nature vs. culture
- Neuro-ethics and neuromarketing
- Laws governing technology

Session 2: Biotechnologies: Therapy or Utopia? (June 30 - July 4)

- Biotechnology and genetic manipulations
- Reproductive technologies
- Stem cells and cloning
- The search for happiness
- The quest for immortality
- Beyond therapy: treatment or enhancement?
- Christian vision of biotechnology

Session 3: Technology, environment and society (July 5-7)

- Genetically modified organisms (GMOs)
- Xenotransplantation and chimeras
- Environmental impact of technology
- Atomic energy and its alternatives
- Pollution
- Patenting life
- Bioterrorism and Biosecurity
- Risky behaviors - videogames and virtual casino
- Globalization of technology
- UNESCO and technology
- Social doctrine of the Church

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

The course is open to anyone holding a university-level degree. The summer course has three sessions. One may participate in any one or all three. Professors from the School of bioethics and other international experts will discuss the issues in a classroom environment designed to incorporate the reflections and insights of participants. Dr. Edmund Pellegrino, the Chairman of president's Council on Bioethics, has agreed to give a lecture via teleconferencing.

Complete 2-week course: 450 euros; each individual session: 180 euros

For further information and registration please contact:

Pontifical Athenaeum Regina Apostolorum
Via degli Aldobrandeschi, 190, 00163, Rome, Italy
Tel: (+39) 06-66527800, Fax: (+39) 06-66527814
bioethics@upra.org
<http://www.upra.org/articulo.phtml?se=3&id=1652>

JULY 2006

A Summer Institute for Undergraduates: Philosophy in an Inclusive Key July 17-28, 2006

The Association for Feminist Ethics and Social Theory (FEAST) is pleased to announce the Philosophy in an Inclusive Key Summer Institute (PIKSI). The institute is designed to encourage undergraduate students from under-represented groups to consider future study in the field of philosophy. PIKSI will emphasize the on-going project of greater inclusiveness that is transforming the discipline, inviting students to be participants in the conversation.

PIKSI is permanently housed at the Rock Ethics Institute at Pennsylvania State University, State College Pennsylvania and receives additional funding from the APA. The Director and the theme will change on a regular basis. Inaugural theme: Living Philosophy: Experience and Transformation Director: Professor Shannon Sullivan, Philosophy and Women's Studies at Penn State

This year's theme will explore philosophy as a living, dynamic enterprise generated out of both everyday and extraordinary human experience. Abstract philosophical reflection often arises out of the puzzles, problems, aspirations, and anxieties of real life, making philosophy a passionate and meaningful enterprise. Combining standard texts with feminist theory, critical race theory, disability theory, and other nontraditional work, students will investigate how lived experience has helped shape philosophical reflection from its earliest beginnings to today. Through readings, writing assignments, visiting lecturers, and professional development mentoring, students will learn that their own perspectives and experiences can contribute to the ongoing development of philosophy.

Guest Faculty: Lucius Outlaw, Vanderbilt University; Linda Alcoff, Syracuse University

If you know promising undergraduate women or men from underrepresented groups such as African Americans, Chicano/as and Latino/as, Native Americans, Asian Americans, LGBTs, economically disadvantaged communities, and people with disabilities, please consider alerting them to this program and serving as their sponsor. See the web page <http://rockethics.psu.edu/piksi>

Transportation to and from the institute, room and board, and a small stipend will be provided for participants. While we expect that most students will come from four-year colleges, promising students from two-year institutions are also welcome.

For further information also contact PIKSI Board Members:

Eva Fedder Kittay, Chair
Eva.Kittay@sunysb.edu

Or

Barbara Andrew
AndrewB@wpunj.edu

Or

Joan Callahan
buddy@pop.uky.edu

Or

Sarah Miller
scmillr1@memphis.edu

Or

Naomi Scheman
nschema@umn.edu

AUGUST 2006

Call for Papers: "The Power of Masculinities" August 1, 2006

The University of Northern Iowa Journal of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity invites contributions for electronic publication in its "Forum" section on the topic: "The Power of Masculinities". Empirical or theoretical contributions on any aspect of masculinities are welcome.

We are especially interested in the following themes:

- How has the pluralized concept "masculinities" empowered researchers and activists to explore the diversities of masculinities?
- What do the inherent complexities in the constructions and presentations of masculinities tell us about the relationships among gender, power and masculinities?
- What are the connections between masculinities and power? For example, in what ways are masculinities also patriarchies?
- How does scholarship on masculinities empower people to change undesirable aspects of masculinities?

Submissions must be sent electronically and **received by August 1, 2006.**

Those in the Social Sciences should be sent to:

Phyllis Baker
Associate Dean of the College of Social and Behavior Sciences
phyllis.baker@uni.edu

Those in the Humanities and Arts to:

Harry Brod
Professor of Philosophy and Humanities
harry.brod@uni.edu

The editors especially encourage interdisciplinary contributions and work developed in collaboration with graduate and (in exceptional cases) undergraduate students. you may create a piece of art or music (with a short artist's statement defining how your contribution relates to the topic); write a review of a relevant publication (book, video, game, film, performance, etc.); or describe a relevant teaching project.

Each article should be accompanied by an abstract of 100-200 words. Since Universitas is not a print publication it does not have a page limit, but articles should run between fifteen and forty typescript pages.

Creative pieces (music, video, art, etc.) should also be accompanied by an abstract (200-500) words or a longer introductory text (e.g., an "artist's statement") to provide some initial explanation of the submitted material.

Copyright remains with the authors, who may republish their work as long as they provided full citation acknowledging Universitas as the original place of publication.

Conference: FAB Congress August 3-6, 2006 Beijing, China

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics (FAB) announces its 6th International Congress. Focusing on Gender Justice and Women's Rights in Healthcare, the Congress will explore these themes:

- Gender (In)Justice and (In)Equality in Healthcare;
- Development, Globalization, and Women's Healthcare;
- Women's Health Rights as Human Rights;
- Cultural Traditions and Feminist Bioethics;
- Other Theoretical and Practical Issues in Feminist Bioethics.

The FAB International Congress will occur in conjunction with the 8th World Congress of bioethics organized by the International Association of Bioethics (IAB). There will be joint plenary and concurrent IAB/FAB sessions on the 6th of August, the last day of FAB Congress which coincides with the first day of IAB Congress.

For complete details go to: see section on Congress 2006 above

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

Call for Papers: Thinking Experience*XIIth IAPh Symposium Rome, August 31 - September 3, 2006*

The XIIth Symposium of the International Association of Women Philosophers will take place in Rome. It will provide an opportunity to highlight the geopolitical position of Italy - in the very heart of Mediterranean Europe, close to Africa and to the Eastern countries. It will thus transform the idea of Europe in a larger sense - and highlight the particular flavour of Italian feminism. In Italy women's politics and theorizing have not followed the direction "from the movement to the institutions" in the way this has happened in other countries where Women's or Gender Studies departments were established. Italian feminists have recognized the skill, sensitivity, and authority of women's thinking, as it is manifest in their activity in social spaces other than the academy: women in trade unions, associations, public administration, hospitals, media, business. This call for papers is therefore addressed not only to academic philosophers but to "thinking women", to those who are able to demonstrate the meaning of their activities and the thought that informs them, wherever they are.

When feminist discourses become mere cultural theories, they risk turning into abstract and artificial discourses. Thinking becomes an exercise of conceptualisation of, or affiliation with, dominant theories. We have broader expectations for this Symposium. We invite women who work in academic institutions to show how they literally "do" their work of thinking - in teaching, in theorizing, in all the relations and situations they deal with. More generally we welcome the surprises that experience - behaviours, actions and passions - has in store for established theories and systems of thought. Discourses embedded in experience often have transformative potential. We know that feminist words have had political effects and changed many important aspects of society and culture. How was this possible? How can experience have political force? A first answer is provided by the "practice of starting from oneself" (*pratica del partire da sé*) in which words refer to one's own situation and relationships, but are not concerned only with subjective issues. The expression "starting from" has the double sense of providing a starting place, and departing from one's own situation, because words enable communication that goes beyond particular circumstances.

In our times we are in need of embodied and transformative words: of restoring sense, undoing unjust orders of discourse and living, opening up new forms of relations. The political proposal of the Italian version of the IAPh Symposium is to foster the development of "thinking experience" toward innovative political practices and styles of behaviour.

We invite contributions to one of the following fields of experience that present themselves as political challenges in the present-day world:

- *work whether recognized or remunerated as such or not*
- *government, the public activity to which women are nowadays called, and sometimes welcomed, but often handle in unexpected ways*
- *education, a field in which women traditionally are more active than men, which is essential to social growth but often regarded, today, as an unproductive expense*
- *science and technology, these too are fields of political and ethical concern about which women's debates often challenge the 'received view'*
- *art, and all forms of expression that show and develop other orders of living*
- *daily life, the ordinary experiences we often ignore in thinking*
- *history and memory, two fundamental aspects of human life, today often manipulated or ignored*
- *sexuality, the metamorphoses of subjects and desires*
- *rules, laws and relations, an extremely urgent set of issues, especially when politics is reduced to claiming rights*
- *divine, because free spiritual or religious experience can open new ways of coping with these fundamentalist times*

Official languages: Italian, Spanish, French, German, English

Abstracts:

- Language: abstracts should be submitted in at least two of the official languages
- Information: abstracts should include the following information: author(s), mail and e-mail address, section for which the contribution is intended (i.e. work, government, education, etc.)
- Length: 500 - 1500 words
- Deadline: March 31, 2006

Contact persons:

Federica Giardini & Francesca Brezzi: Dip. di filosofia
Università di Roma Tre,
via Ostiense 234,
00146 Roma, Italy
fgiardini@uniroma3.it

Or

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

Annarosa Buttarelli: Dip. di filosofia
Università di Verona
Via S. Francesco 22
37129 Verona, Italy
annarosa.buttarelli@univr.it

All further information will be posted on the conference web site: <http://host.uniroma3.it/dipartimenti/filosofia/Eventi/Eventi.html>

SEPTEMBER 2006

Conference: Third Conference on International Corporate Responsibility September 22-24, 2006
Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

The Carnegie Bosch Institute of Carnegie Mellon University is sponsoring its Third Conference on International Corporate Responsibility, to take place at Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST), 22-24 September 2006. Approximately 25 participants will be invited to present talks at the meeting and contribute papers to a proceedings volume.

Financial support includes three nights accommodation at the HKUST executive education facilities, most meals during the conference, waiver of the conference registration fee, and very limited travel support.

Three-page extended abstracts should be submitted to mboltz@andrew.cmu.edu by 15 April 2006. Conference details may be found at <http://web.tepper.cmu.edu/icr/>

OCTOBER 2006

Conference: Media Ethics Colloquium at the University of St. Thomas October 14-17, 2006

As part of a decade-long series aimed at enhancing scholarship in applied media ethics, the University of St. Thomas will host the 2006 colloquium October 14-17 in Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota. The colloquium - the seventh of the series - will feature 12 fellows working in teams of two to explore the moral dimensions of the question: Who is a journalist? Selected fellows will receive an honorarium and travel expenses. During the colloquium, fellows will present their work to each other and solicit feedback. A group of fellows will also speak at a public symposium at the colloquium's end. Papers that result from the colloquium will be published in the Journal of Mass Media Ethics in 2007.

Applicants may apply as individuals (in which case colloquium organizers will pair them with another applicant? or as part of already formed teams. In the selection process, preference will be given to teams that combine disciplines or that include a junior scholar working with a senior scholar. The guidelines are general and should not be seen as exhaustive or exclusive. Individuals who have previously participated as fellows are invited to apply, although preference may be given to first-time participants.

Applications for fellowships should include the following:

- * a brief (500 word) abstract of a paper proposal
- * a curriculum vitae
- * if appropriate, a notation of the desired team member

The deadline for proposals is April 1, 2006. Send paper or electronic submissions to:

Wendy N. Wyatt
2115 Summit Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
Phone inquiries: 651-962-5253
email: [wnwyatt@stthomas.edu](mailto:wnyatt@stthomas.edu)

Conference: Feminism and War October 20-22, 2006

Call for Proposals:

The Women's Studies Program at Syracuse University invites proposals for papers to be presented at a national conference on the contested and complex relationship between feminism and war. The focus will be on recent U.S. government initiatives that claim

The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter

Volume 14, Issue 1

war in the name of women's liberation, but with a global and transnational context in which other military actions might be considered. We look forward to energetic dialogue from interdisciplinary perspectives on these sub-themes:

- Women's Liberation and U.S. Foreign Policy
- U.S. War and Women in Iraq and Afghanistan
- War and Women in and of the U.S.
- The War and Organizing for Women's Liberation

Confirmed Speakers:

- Zillah Eisenstein, author most recently of *Against Empire: Feminisms, Race and the West* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2004)
- Suheir Hammad, a Palestinian-American poet who has performed on Broadway and whose books include *Born Palestinian, Born Black*
- Shanaz Khan, author of *Muslim Women: Crafting a North American Identity* (University Press of Florida, 2000)
- Anne McClintock, author of *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (Routledge, 1995)
- Jasbir Kaur Puar, author of *Geographies of Globalization* (Duke, 2001) and most recently "Abu Ghraib: Arguing Against Exceptionalism" in *Feminist Studies* and with Amit Rai, "Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots," in *Social Text*, 72
- Julia Sudbury, author most recently of *Global Lockdown: Race, Gender and the Prison-Industrial Complex* (Routledge, 2005)

A special invitation is extended to activists to submit proposals, to increase dialogue between theoretical analysis and grounded experience.

We hope to examine questions such as :

- What are the multiple interpretations of the phrase "women's liberation"?
- How are these multiple interpretations related to the specifics of religion, culture, history, nation within the current U.S. wars?
- What, in fact, is assumed about the category "woman" in the context of these conceptual and actual locations at this moment in time?
- What different philosophical concepts of "freedom for women" might be implicit in the current debate raised by the conduct of U.S. wars?
- What different histories-national, gendered, religious-intersect within this debate about women and freedom?
- What are the liberating and limiting aspects of religion in relation to women in these debates?
- How does the struggle over definitions of women's freedom manifest itself in cultural creations, artifacts, and productions?
- Have women in Iraq and Afghanistan been liberated by the recent Gulf War?

The conference schedule will include plenary sessions, paper presentations, discussion groups, and cultural events.

The Conference Organizing Committee includes Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Minnie Bruce Pratt, Linda Martin Alcoff, Gwen Pough, and Vivian May. We will consider proposals for single papers or panels. Please send a one page abstract for each paper, or send a one page description of each panel proposal with one page abstracts for each paper in the panel to the committee at the address below. Proposals are due **April 15, 2006** through email or regular mail to:

Janet Dodd, Women's Studies Program
208 Bowne Hall
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244
jkdodd@syr.edu

Notifications of acceptance will be made by May 15, 2006.

NOVEMBER 2006

Conference: The Seventh Biennial Conference of the Radical Philosophy Association November 3 - 6, 2006

Conference Theme: We live in a time both dreadful and hopeful: dreadful because the United States, under the control of a powerful neo-conservative minority, has embraced and instituted a global policy of militaristic unilateralism under the pretense of spreading "democracy" and "freedom", hopeful because this very approach has sparked unprecedented global protest and has given rise to powerful networks of resistance.

In response to global injustice we, as radical philosophers, serve as witnesses, stand in solidarity with those who suffer, speak out against oppression, and mourn the deaths that constitute the wake of empire. We resist the cultural, economic, political, and social

*The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics
(FAB)
Newsletter*

Volume 14, Issue 1

hegemony sought and imposed by the United States and by all imperial superpowers. We reclaim democracy - the power of individuals and communities to shape their own lives and visions and futures.

In this the Seventh National Conference of the Radical Philosophy association, we seek to examine both the dread and the hope by thematizing radical visions and practices. We welcome papers that will provide visions both of the present situation and of concrete possibilities for our shared future; we welcome papers that will discuss workable radical social, cultural, political, or pedagogical practices that can be implemented on the community, national, and/or international level.

Please send paper, workshop, poster, and other proposals to:

RPA Program Committee
c/o Anne Pomeroy
Philosophy and Religion
K150 Arts and Humanities
Richard Stockton College
Pomona, NJ 08240
email: anne.pomeroy@stockton.edu