The International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics continues to grow. In the years since its founding in 1992 at the Inaugural Congress of the International Association of Bioethics, FAB has attracted 371 individual members in 28 countries. FAB has successfully established itself worldwide as the leading organization devoted to developing approaches to bioethics that encompass the standpoints and experiences of women and other marginalized social groups, and it is largely due to FAB members’ efforts that the field of feminist bioethics not only exists, but flourishes.

As your new co-coordinators, we want to share with you our early plans for FAB in 2003-2005:

- A major theme in feminist thought is that theory should not be divorced from practice. Accordingly, we wish to propose that FAB expand its mission to include such practical matters as: advising local, regional, and national governments on health policy; teaching hospital administrators to take feminist concerns into account; altering laws and policies that systematically disadvantage women and other oppressed groups; and changing the conditions that perpetuate oppression within health care systems. To that end, we propose to develop a questionnaire to be sent to our members, so that we can gather information about who has access to the policy-making process, or is a hospital administrator, or possesses some other kind of political power that can be put to practical feminist use. This can be extended across national boundaries to provide a set of resources and contacts on a range of issues in feminist bioethics globally. Once we know who is in a position to do what, we hope to marshal the many theoretical and material resources within FAB to bring about positive change.

- We would like to use the FAB website and email list more effectively to stimulate debate and intellectual networking. The recent events surrounding Deborah Diniz’s dismissal from the Catholic University of Brasilia are a good reminder of the need for constant vigilance. We would also like to make greater use of the FAB advisory board to raise and discuss issues relevant to FAB members and FAB’s mission.

- We will encourage more FAB-identified sessions at conferences. At this year’s meeting of the Australian Bioethics Association confer-
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ence, for example, considerable interest was generated by the FAB session involving Rachel Ankeny, Katherine Hall, Viola Schubert-Lehnhardt and Gail Tulloch. Sessions by FAB members at the American Society of Bioethics and Humanities have also been well received. Explicitly labeling sessions by FAB members as FAB-identified serves to promote interest in FAB and in feminist bioethics.

- As part of a commitment to supporting broader diversity in debate within feminist bioethics, we want to investigate the possibility of funding a FAB scholarship or stipend for postgraduate study for disadvantaged students over and above the current use of the Audre Lorde fund. This would involve approaching various funding agencies that give money for educational purposes and seeking specific funding support from members for this purpose. An alternative way of meeting this goal, which arises from discussion at the FAB meeting in Brazil, is to seek funds to help translate work by FAB members into English or from English into other languages, to allow for greater sharing of understanding and scholarship.

- We will continue the tradition of supporting edited collections of FAB members’ works. In addition to the call for papers for the collection, Feminist Bioethics, Human Rights and the Developing World: Integrating Global and Local Perspectives, which Rosie Tong, Anne Donchin, and Sue Dodds will edit, we will work towards developing a proposal for a collection following the 2004 FAB conference in Sydney.

- We would like to see greater FAB representation on the IAB Board, and greater FAB membership of IAB, as this would contribute to the process of “mainstreaming” feminist bioethics. Sue Sherwin and Florencia Luna have worked very hard to have FAB views heard within the IAB and we should try to expand the voice of FAB within the IAB.

- Plans are afoot to convene the next FAB Congress in Sydney in 2004. FAB members Rachel Ankeny and Paul McNeill are on the organising committee for the IAB conference and they have begun discussions about the Congress with Sue Dodds. Among other matters that will receive our attention is that of finding travel funds for FAB members who could not otherwise afford to come to Sydney.

We are delighted to be coordinating FAB at this exciting time in its history, and we look forward to continuing the work that has been done so very well by our distinguished predecessors.

Hilde Lindemann Nelson
Susan Dodds

Watch for the Upcoming FAB Anthology!

Feminist Bioethics, Human Rights and the Developing World: Integrating Global and Local Perspectives. Edited by Rosemarie Tong, Anne Donchin and Susan Dodds.

Forthcoming from Rowman and Littlefield, 2004

Copies will be available through your bookstore or directly from the Philosophical Documentation Center.
HIV, AIDS and the provision of anti-retroviral drugs dominate the discussions about bioethics in South Africa. On the public policy level, there is government’s internationally-publicised recalcitrance to provide antiretroviral therapy (ART) as part of the public health service, with some provinces that were not under ANC rule piloting distribution sites. Linked to this, an NGO called the Treatment Action Campaign, or TAC (who were the applicants in the Constitutional Court case that forced government to provide ART to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV) has embarked upon a campaign of civil disobedience to encourage government to roll out ART to the general public. (Further details about TAC and its roll-out plan are available at their highly useful website: http://www.tac.org.za/).

While these public policy debates rage on, private and charitable attempts to provide antiretroviral therapy are thwarted, witnessed most recently by another delay in the distribution of money donated to South Africa by the Global Fund for the provision of ART to some South Africans.

In the field of health research ethics in South Africa, ART is once again on the agenda, this time in the context of HIV vaccine trials and a debate as to whether or not trial participants who become HIV infected should receive ART. A conference was held (co-incidentally the day after the release of the disappointing Vaxgen results), to (in part) set national policy for the “standard of care” that is to be offered to vaccine trial participants. The results of this conference will be published in a booklet (Guidelines on Ethics for HIV Preventive Vaccine Research), produced by the Medical Research Council (MRC), the fifth in its series on research ethics. The production of this booklet was co-ordinated for the MRC by a dedicated ethics research and training group, the HIV/AIDS Vaccine Ethics Group (HAVEG), funded by the South African AIDS Vaccine Initiative (SAAVI - www.saavi.org.za)

It is arguable that the debates about the provision of anti-retrovirals would never arise if there were unlimited healthcare resources. It is thus on a linked theme that the South African Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (SASOG) recently had a pre-congress workshop on the ethics of rationing. Sadly, however, it seemed that delegates were more interested in the legal implications of rationing (and the knock-on effect of an increase in insurance premiums for healthcare providers) than the ethical debates per se. However, the frequent conflation of law and morality seems to be a common problem for professional ethics generally.

2002 was also an important year for the teaching of health research ethics in South Africa, with the awarding of two substantial Fogarty grants to facilitate such programmes. The Universities of Pretoria and Natal, Pietermaritzburg offer one jointly (see http://shsph.up.ac.za/sareti/sareti.htm); the University of Cape Town offers the other (see http://www.scidev.net/dossiers/ethics/saproject.html).

Melissa Stobie, University of Natal, South Africa
Paulette Dieterlen’s paper examined issues of justice and access to health care in Mexico, emphasizing the serious difficulties that developing countries face when making decisions about the allocation of scarce public resources. Keeping the Mexican context in mind, she discussed the concept of health that should be used in forming public policies and the criteria that should guide the distribution of medical resources. She argued for Norman Daniels’s narrow definition of health as “the absence of disease” and disease as “deviation from the natural functional organization of a typical member of the species.” For Dieterlen, the main reason in favor of this definition is that it would make it easier to target those who are the worst off. As regards the criteria for the distribution of resources, she favored developing the notions of “basic needs” and “urgency” as a guide to public policy, recommending the decentralization of health care services and targeting policies. I am not convinced by Daniels’ claims about the advantages of his approach in avoiding the problem of assigning “health” and “disease” a strong normative character, but I find Dieterlen’s proposal of starting with a narrow notion of health adequate for setting priorities for public policy in conditions of severe scarcity of resources.

Although the paper by Debora Diniz explored the challenges faced by feminist bioethics in the context of Brazil, many of her concerns could be extended to other Latin American societies. According to Diniz, the field of bioethics has been developed and controlled by physicians, lawyers, and theologians, with minor participation by social scientists and philosophers. As a consequence, bioethics tends not to be conceived as a critical enterprise, but rather as a technique for resolving moral dilemmas. Diniz rejects assigning bioethicists the role of moral authorities and proposes a more reflective and questioning activity. As regards the field of feminist bioethics in Brazil, she holds that it has not been properly recognized as an academic subject, in part due to the fact that feminist research is distributed among different schools and courses. Another difficulty she mentions is the scarcity of feminist bioethics publications in Portuguese. In order to face these challenges, she recommends setting a research, teaching and political intervention agenda oriented towards feminist goals.

Raising important concerns about international justice, Florencia Luna’s paper discussed recent proposals for revising the ethical guidelines for biomedical research involving human subjects which introduce a “double standard” concerning the obligations towards and treatment of research subjects – that is, guidelines according to which the type of care that research subjects would be provided would depend on the economic situation of the country where research takes place, so that research subjects in poorer countries will be offered less care than participants in similar research trials in richer countries. Luna criticized the arguments offered in support of this de facto double standard, which appeal to a number of positive consequences: more research, faster results, new drugs and treatments which could be available for members of poorer societies. She correctly questioned the empirical evidence for these predictions and pointed out the risk of causing serious harm to research subjects without guarantees that they will be provided with proven or effective treatment, even when such treatment already exists. For a stronger criticism of these proposals, Luna explored the claim that there are obligations towards research subjects, appealing to two models or ways of conceptualizing research subjects, either as “contractors” or as “victims.” The use of such models in the bioethics literature is meant to capture our intuitions about what the relevant moral considerations at stake in a particular case are. Luna pointed out some limitations of each of these models, suggesting the need to combine the recommendations of securing informed consent and of designing special protections for vulnerable subjects.

Finally, Arleen Salles’s paper examined the role that considerations of culture and ethnic background should play in the physician-patient relationship, focusing on the situation of Hispanic/Latino patients in the U.S. Salles provided a sensible discussion of current arguments in favor of encouraging health-care professionals to develop attitudes of cultural sensitivity and to acquire more knowledge about the culture-based values and attitudes of their patients. She argued that, before recommending that physicians pay attention to alleged cultural trends, certain risks should be taken into account. One is the risk of stereotyping: of promoting a simplified view of what Hispanic/Latino patients’ preferences and values are. Moreover, there is the risk of physicians relying on these stereotypes to replace the necessary process of communication with patients. Salles suggested that one promising strategy might be to develop alternative understandings of culture and ethnicity, which could be relational and flexible and could therefore avoid rigid essentialisms. In my view, knowledge about the existence of cultural attitudes towards health care is a powerful antidote to the tendency to expect all patients to fit the same pattern and to find the same type of treatments acceptable. Also, it could be useful for health care professionals to know in advance what type of questions ask patients. Rather than replacing communication with patients, this kind of knowledge may help health care professionals select the type of information that needs to be discussed in more detail with patients.

María Victoria Costa, Argentina
In October 2002, and with great anticipation, I traveled to Brasilia, Brazil to take part in the Fourth International Conference on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics Network. The conference, held in conjunction with the Sixth World Congress of Bioethics, was entitled “Gender, Power, and (In)justice.” Co-organizers Debora Diniz and Susan Sherwin did a fabulous job organizing this event, which was held at the Academia de Tênis. Several FAB members gave insightful, interesting talks on topics ranging from the relationship between bioethics and power, the importance of voice, language, and gender, and the need to link feminist bioethics to the global human rights movement. Papers were given in Portuguese, English, and Spanish, with simultaneous translation. The conference began with Rosemarie Tong’s paper “Feminist Perspectives and Global Bioethics: The Search for a Common Moral Language,” read by Tong’s University of North Carolina (Charlotte) colleague, Carol Quinn, who read on her behalf. Tong was unable to attend the conference because of illness. Despite this, the FAB conference audience benefited greatly from Tong’s insights, which I highlight below.

The conference was a terrific success due in large part to Diniz’s wonderful hospitality. Conference attendees were surrounded by Brazilian culture, music, dance, food, and crafts. But this was a very serious as well as festive occasion, given the importance of the conference theme, but also because FAB members were sensitive to, and supportive of, Diniz, who was recently fired from the Catholic University of Brasilia for debating (by invitation) the morality of abortion. One of the highlights of the conference was the honoring of Diniz, winner of the Manuel Velasco Suarez International Bioethics Award, with a Distinguished Leadership Award. Also honored for their outstanding service roles were FAB founders Anne Donchin and Becky Holmes.

The conference centered on the importance for feminist bioethicists (and especially Western feminist bioethicists) to pay attention to the exploitative conditions so prevalent in the developing world, and a need to reflectively consider the values and practices of developing regions, all the while recognizing the universal rights of all people. To this end, many papers highlighted the importance of integrating a global human rights perspective into feminist bioethical discourse (and especially care discourse), the importance of empowering “voiceless voices,” and of bringing in local as well as global perspectives. Another important topic was on the importance of recognizing the imbalance of power between Western feminist bioethicists and voices in the developing world. There was a call for more self-critical, self-examination of Western feminist practices and the need for connecting across differences and forming solidarities. Some of these papers are being collected and edited by Tong, Sherwin, and Susan Dodds in an upcoming anthology tentatively entitled “Feminist Bioethics, Human Rights and the Developing World: Integrating Global and Local Perspectives.”

The conference began with the presentation of Tong’s insightful paper “Feminist Perspectives and Global Bioethics.” In this paper, Tong looks at the possibility of a feminist human rights language. Emphasizing the importance of unity-diversity, Tong highlights the works of Sherwin, Susan Moller Okin, and Ruth Macklin, which recognize that, although women experience gender inequality differently, depending on where they live, they experience sex-based inequality for essentially the same reasons and with the same consequences. Tong looks at the need to use human rights discourse to improve women’s lives. According to Tong, feminists have been suspicious of rights language because, at least in the United States, such language is viewed as male language, which stresses justice, fairness, and rights, but is increasingly adversarial and conflictual in nature. This male language is contrasted with female’s style of moral reasoning, which focuses on human connections, community, and care. But, Tong argues, humans rights talk is profoundly feminist talk. Feminists need to learn how to speak the language of human rights, importantly because it is the moral language of the international arena, in which we call to justice those who engage in violent, abusive, and unjust acts. Argues Tong, given the level of abuse to which many women are subjected across the globe, feminists would be well served by this language. Overall the conference was a rewarding, educational, eye-opening experience, beneficial to all present. The next FAB conference will be in Sydney, Australia, in 2004.

Carol Quinn, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

E. Pelkner enters new ground with her work in double regard. On the one hand, she analyzes statements on the part of the Protestant (in some places also the Catholic) Church toward genetic and reproductive medicine and the picture of a woman standing beside it. On the other hand, she opens to the German-speaking public American feminist thought, which she then critically carries further.

In the first section of the book she goes into the theoretical and material bases of her work. She describes the general base of feminist ethics and the positions concerning reproductive medicine and then presents it with special contributions from the theological view. Next, the fundamental ethical dilemmas of these new medical-technical possibilities are explained.

The second section is an excursion into the history (for the U.S.A. and Germany) of the first participation of theological authors in bioethics to the present day. What began as a strong presence became almost dominating only, in recent times, to fall into almost complete retreat. Pelkner’s corresponding critical evaluation of the theological portion on the solution to these questions follows.

The next section occupies itself with what today is designated as “feminist coined bioethics,” illustrated here by the positions of the theologians Karen Lebacqz, Margaret Farley, Dorry de Bejer, and the Canadian philosopher Susan Sherwin. She discusses criticism of IVF, the modern women’s movement and the idea of a too easily understood liberty gain for women through reproduction. The concluding fourth part contains a summary.

It has been a long time since I read such an energizing bioethics book: I am delighted to review it. For me it could become “the book of the year.”

Viola Schubert-Lehnhardt, Germany

(Translation into the English language by Karin S. Fester)


Through a lively narration, Gaia Marsico gives us not only a critical instrument to understand the reasons, sense and opportunity of a different, feminist bioethics, she introduces us to women’s polyphonic contribution to ethics tout-a-court.

The twentieth century has been the stage of a deep ethical, social and political change that still is underway. Women have been among the promoters and makers of such change; together with other excluded or discriminated groups, women have raised their voices to demand a concrete and inclusive justice, real conditions for choosing, the requirement of new processes of information, communication and management of science.

Clinical practice and biomedical research are paradigmatic places of the supposed democratisation of social practices. In this context, bioethics can be considered one of its most creative fruits, although not devoid of controversy. Patients’ emancipation and research subjects’ participation, which expresses the right to make herself heard about her own body and on the different possible scenarios of health, have been
demanding the construction of a renewed moral horizon and pluralistic ethical approach. At the beginning, bioethics has been revealed as a space for discussing this challenge; but, paradoxically, this process has rarely been accompanied by a revision of theoretic instruments and concepts or by the concrete engagement of the human beings involved.

In the last twenty years, theoretical elaboration of the female and feminist experience have highlighted these voids and have searched for concrete answers and alternatives. Gaia Marsico, through her reflection and analysis, guides us nicely into this process, facilitating its understanding.

Her essay is opened by a very clear explication of the necessity to distinguish “female” from “feminist,” as noted by Elisabeth Johnson and Susan Sherwin. “Feminist” marks the plenitude of women’s growth as a precondition for authentic humanity. A feminist perspective openly assumes responsibility for oppressive and discriminative situations, by building upon a story and an experience of discrimination and exclusion to promote and propose inclusive ethical practices, as well as ones respectful of differences. A feminist standpoint unafraid of the multiplicity of voices can give voice to the excluded and will endorse the empowerment of all human beings through a Socratic education and the particular attention to the conditions of choice.

Thus we meet in Gaia’s volume some of the different women’s voices on ethics, from a maternal and care ethics to the feminist theology, from liberalist feminism to an eclectic one, but at the same time, and with great attention, the author skilfully delineates the common horizon of these perspectives, composing a sort of positive eclecticism. These voices are building and offering a new approach to ethical problems, in which the moral and concrete experience is basic, the value of difference assumed, and the requirement of an ethical, social, political concrete empowerment for each individual with her circumstances demanded. This double track of different voices with a common horizon allows us to comprehend gradually how a feminist bioethics is different and necessary. This bioethics has as interlocutors tangible individuals with particular circumstances and problems. It is central for it, as Gaia says, “to look from point of view of the weakest, the homeless, beyond genre and origin, contributing to change the social and health structures, so that every individual acquires an increasingly active role” (Cfr. 74-75).

From this standpoint, the attention to the context that produces or can produce injustice and imposition is great: in particular, it will underscore the role of economic markets as well as the necessity to discuss continuously the sense and the possible limits of science. In the last part of the book, the author, by analyzing some actual bioethical problems such as informed consent, assisted reproduction, and genetic testing with this different glance and language, suggests an open and committed conclusion: this feminist bioethics recognizes the deep link amongst knowledge, context-promoting free choices, and empowerment. Here we face a challenge and a commitment: the men and the women involved in bioethics should work in a Socratic way, considering bioethics as a public ethics. This bioethics could offer a concrete opportunity to be free citizens and patients.

Sara Casati
**Calling All FAB Authors!**

Becky Holmes is compiling another bibliography of books written or edited by FAB members. This will continue the one she prepared for the FAB international conference in London in 2000 (which was also published in the May 2002 Newsletter, Vol. 10 #1).

Please send complete citations for books you’ve written or edited with a publication date of 2000 or later. Citations should include the complete title (and subtitle, if any), full names of all co-authors, the publisher with city and year.

Since many people have dropped their FAB membership, our criterion will be ‘member or former member.’ And in some cases non-members have edited books that include papers by members. Here we say arbitrarily that if any such book includes at least three papers by FAB members, we’ll include it. For example, the book “Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and the Self” edited by MacKenzie and Stoljar was included in the previous biblio.

Because this biblio’s main purpose is to honor FAB members, the books do not have to meet any strict criteria of ‘feminist’ or ‘bioethics.’ If you know about books that really should be called to our attention, but written by non-members, please send me information about them. Maybe you or I can recruit their authors to join FAB! (We hope that by the time this Newsletter appears, a list of members will again be posted on our web site.)

Please send your citations to Becky by e-mail <fholmes@pltpath.umass.edu> or fax <1-413-549-1226> by the end of August so that the biblio can appear in our next issue.

---

**Congratulations to Our Newly Elected Officers!!**

Co-coordinators:  Hilde Nelson (USA) and Susan Dodds (Australia)

Advisory Board (elected members)

Gwen Anderson (USA)
Viola Schubert-Lehnhardt (Germany)
Rachel Ankeny (Australia)
Susan Sherwin (Canada)
Debora Diniz (Brazil)
Susana Sommer (Argentina)
Arleen Salles (Argentina and USA)
Rosie Tong (USA)
Laura Shanner (Canada)

For a complete list that includes ex officio members see the FAB Contacts page.

Biographies of the officers are available on the FAB website: www.fabnet.org

---

**New Membership Policy**

As FAB’s membership has grown over the past decade the informality of our voluntary contribution arrangement has become increasingly unmanageable. The administrative workload has grown enormously, contributions have fallen off and, as our international membership has grown, the inability to accept contributions in foreign currencies has become an increasing problem. So after exploring alternative arrangements, the FAB Board recommended that we contract with the Philosophy Documentation Center to provide membership services for us. This recommendation was ratified by the membership at FAB’s conference in Brazil. We anticipate that this new structure will spread more equitably the expense of maintaining FAB and advancing our mission. Mandatory dues have been structured on a sliding scale based on income. Dues payment will be waived in hardship cases. If you have not yet sent in your membership form for the calendar year 2003 please use the form included in this issue of the Newsletter. Prompt payment will save FAB the expense of a repeated mailing making more funds available for scholarships and programming. Note that you can now pay your dues and make additional (tax exempt) contributions to the Audre Lorde Fund by credit card.
2003–2004 FAB Advisory Board Members

Gwen Anderson
Medical Genetics Program
Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula
PO. Box H.H.
Monterey, CA 93942, USA
Tel: 1-851-622-2713
Fax: 1-851-622-2793
gwen.anderson@chomp.org

Rachel Ankeny
Unit for History and Philosophy of Science
F07 Carslaw Building
The University of Sydney
NSW 2006, Australia
Tel: 61-2-9351-1428
Fax: 61-2-9351-1412
r.ankeny@scifac.usyd.edu.au

Debora Diniz
SQSW 104 F 605
Brasilia DF 70660-406
Brazil
Tel: 55-61-344-7889
Fax: 55-61-343-1994
debdinizr@zaz.com.br

Arleen L.E. Salles
Department of Philosophy
Montclair State University
4 Meadow Court
Midland Park, NJ 07432, USA
Tel: 1-201-251-9863
Fax: 1-201-251-9864
arleensalles@at.net

Viola Schubert-Lehnhardt
Albert Einstein Strasse 14
Halle 06122, Germany
Tel: 49-345-552-7035
Fax: 49-345-552-7035
kd.Schubert@verwaltung.uni-halle.de

Laura Shanner
John Dossetor Health Ethics Center
2220 114th Street, #622
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Tel: 1-780-492-6676
Fax: 1-780-492-0673
laura.shanner@ualberta.ca

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

June

The Adaptable Human Body: Transhumanism and Bioethics in the 21st Century, June 27-29, 2003, Yale University, New Haven, CT USA. Sponsored by the World Transhumanist Association, this conference will focus on the bioethics and policy questions of using technology to transcend limitations of the human body. For more information please see: http://www.transhumanism.org/tv/2003usa/index.htm or contact: Dr. James Hughes, Public Policy Studies, Trinity College, 71 Vernon St., Hartford CT 06106.

July

Bioethics for Tough Times: Professional Challenges in Medicine & Nursing, July 11 - 12, 2003, Loyola University, Maywood, IL, USA. Sponsors: The Neiswanger Institute for Bioethics & Health Policy of the Stritch School of Medicine, The Center for Ethics of the Niehoff School of Nursing, LUC’s Center for Ethics and Social Justice and The Chicago Clinical Ethics Programs (CCEP). This two-day conference is for physicians, nurses, related health-care professionals, and anyone who is interested in the ethical challenges facing the health-care professions in redefining and recommitting to professionalism in health care., contact: Tammie Morris, Conference Coordinator Phone: 708-327-9219, Fax: 708-327-9209. e-mail: bioethics@lumc.edu or tmorris3@lumc.edu. For More Information visit: www.meddean.luc.edu/ssom/depts/bioethics/news/index.htm


August

Mortal Beings/Immortal Dreams: Dancing Around the Fountain of Youth: The 11th Annual Summer Seminar of the Center for Literature, Medicine, and the Health Care Professions, August 2-7, 2003, Hiram College, Hiram Ohio, USA. What forces and values are driving the anti-aging movement? What are the ethical, social, economic, environmental, and health care issues related to this movement? What does literature tell us about characters who live for centuries or about those who extend lives indefinitely through technology? Seminar Coordinators: Carol Donley, Martin Kohn. E-mail Contact: Carol Donley or 330-569-5380 or visit our website for further details and registration form http://home.hiram.edu/www/litmed/

XVIIIth European Conference “Genetics and Health Care,” August 25-28, 2003, The Netherlands. Sponsored by The European Society for Philosophy of Medicine and Health Care, the ELSAGEN bioethics project, and the Centre for Ethics at the University of Iceland. The focus is on philosophical, ethical and legal issues in relation to biomolecular technologies and genetics in particular. Contact: Professor Henk ten Have, ESPMH Secretariat, Department of Ethics, Philosophy and History of Medicine, 232 University Medical Centre Nijmegen, PO Box 9101, 6500 HB Nijmegen, The Netherlands, d.verhaar@efg.umcn.nl or h.tenhave@efg.umcm.nl

October

Association for Feminist Ethics and Social Theory, October 16-19, 2003, Clearwater Beach, Florida, USA. Contact: Lisa Tessman, Philosophy, Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY 13902-6000, e-mail: ltessman@binghamton.edu. For more information, visit the website at: www.afeast.org/

November

The Program in Palliative Care Education and Practice, November 11-18, 2003, Boston, MA, USA. Sponsored by the Center for Palliative Care and the Department of Continuing Education, Harvard Medical School. The HMS Program in Palliative Care Education and Practice offers intensive learning experiences for physicians and nurse-educators who wish to become expert in the clinical practice and teaching of comprehensive, interdisciplinary palliative care, as well as to gain expertise in leading and managing improvements in palliative care education and practice at their own institutions. For more information, visit the website at http://www.hms.harvard.edu/cdi/pallcare or e-mail: Pallcare@partners.org or call Wendy Katz at 617-724-9509.
Launched in 1992 at the Inaugural Congress of the International Association of Bioethics, FAB now has over 350 members in 28 countries. Our aims and scope include development of a more inclusive theory of bioethics encompassing the standpoints and experiences of women and other marginalized social groups, re-examination of the principles and legitimizing functions of the prevailing discourse and creation of new strategies and methodologies. Benefits of membership include eligibility for conference travel grants, opportunity to present papers at FAB conferences, receipt of our semi-annual newsletter and support of activities that advance our mission. We also maintain a listserv, member database, and website. **Dues may be paid by check drawn on a U.S. bank or by the following credit cards:** VISA, MasterCard or Discover. Dues in excess of $10 per year are tax deductible where law allows.

(Note: If you made a contribution to FAB after September 1, 2002 that corresponds to your income level as specified below, your 2003 dues are considered paid. Please indicate that when returning this form).

To join FAB or renew your membership, please complete and return this form to:

**Philosophy Documentation Center**
PO Box # 7147  •  Charlottesville, VA 22906-7147 USA
or fax this form to: 434 220-3301 (please include credit card information.)
Members whose information is current may renew by phone: in the U.S. and Canada call (800) 444-2419. Outside North America call +434 220-3300

Please print clearly

Name
Position
Address
City
State/Province/Postal Code  Country

Academic or Activist Field
Phone (include country code)

Fax
E-mail

Signature
Date Posted

To pay by credit card please complete the following information as it appears on your card:

Signature _____________________________  Card type _____  Card no._____________________  Exp.date_____

Please circle up to **three** areas of interest, or two plus a third of your own choosing. Insert a third in the space following “Other”. Only **three** can be included in the FAB database.

- ACT-activism
- DIS-disability
- ENV-environment
- EOL-end of life
- FAM-family/children
- GEN-genetics issues/
- GLO-global issues
- HCP-health professions
- HIV/AIDS/HIV
- MEN-mental health
- POL-policy/law
- REP-reproduction
- RES-research/science
- SEX-sexuality
- THE-theory/methodology
- WMH-women’s health

Other:_____________

**ANNUAL DUES:** Based on annual income level in US$ equivalents:

- Over $50,000  $25
- $50,000-$35,000:  $20
- $35,000-20,000:  $10
- Under $20,000:  $10

* [ ] I enclose my dues of $_____ plus $_____ additional scholarship donation for a total of $_______

* [ ]  Please send an e-mail receipt.
* [ ]  A receipt is not needed.

* [ ]  I am not able to contribute this year and request a dues waiver.

Because FAB functions as a network for those sharing similar interests, it is our policy to list members names, institutional affiliation, e-mail addresses and interest categories on our website. However, if you do **not** wish to be so **listed**, please check here.

---
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Get Involved in FAB

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

To Contribute to the Newsletter
We welcome contributions of all sorts: articles, announcements of upcoming events, information about articles or books you have published or find useful, reviews of books. Book reviews are organized by Alison Brookes. Any other contribution should be forwarded to Maggie Little (both addresses on Contact page). It's particularly helpful if you can send them in electronically. Deadline for submissions to the next newsletter is September 15, 2003.