

Nova Law Review

Volume 13, Issue 2

*

1999

Article 2

Foreword

Nadine Taub*

Copyright ©1999 by the authors. *Nova Law Review* is produced by The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress). https://nsuworks.nova.edu/nlr

Foreword

Nadine Taub

Abstract

The birth of the first "test-tube baby," the death of a couple who left frozen embryos, breakthroughs in prenatal and perinatal care, and similar developments since the 1960s have generated widespread public and professional debates over the new reproductive technologies.

Taub: Foreword

Foreword

Nadine Taub*

The birth of the first "test-tube baby," the death of a couple who left frozen embryos, breakthroughs in prenatal and perinatal care, and similar developments since the 1960s have generated widespread public and professional debates over the new reproductive technologies. Until relatively recently, however, women's voices and concerns were conspicuously absent from these debates.

The Project on Reproductive Laws for the 1990s began in 1985 under the aegis of the Women's Rights Litigation Clinic and the Institute for Research on Women, both at Rutgers University with the goal of injecting women — as participants and as a group with interest to be considered — into the debates over reproductive law and policy. Two goals characterized the Project's work: first, to generate discussion, and, where possible, consensus among those committed to reproductive autonomy and gender equality as to the best way to respond to the questions raised by reported advances in reproductive and neonatal technology and new modes of reproduction; and second, to ensure that those shaping reproductive law and policy appreciated the ramifications of these developments for gender equality.

To meet this twofold agenda, the Project convened a working group of 25 academics and activists who shared a common commitment to reproductive choice and gender equality to lay a theoretical foundation for Project proposals. At the same time, with the help of individual drafters, the Project produced model legislation and position papers in six areas: time limits on abortion; prenatal screening; fetus as patient; reproductive hazards in the workplace; interference with reproductive choice; and alternative modes of reproduction. Two publications have resulted from the Project's work: a Briefing Handbook distributed to approximately 2500 policy-makers and advocacy groups in the fall and winter of 1988 and a scholarly book, *Reproductive Laws for the* 1990s, reviewed in this issue.

As Project Director, I am pleased that the Project has been able to

^{*} LL.B. Yale Law School, 1968; Professor of Law and Director of the Women's Rights Litigation Clinic, Rutgers Law School, Newark, New Jersey; Director of the Project on Reproductive Laws for the 1990s.

Nova Law Review

320

contribute to exploring the implications of today's reproductive modes and technologies. But this process of exploration is clearly one that must continue. Thus, I am even more pleased that the editors of the *Nova Law Review* have also joined in that process and that the Introduction written by the Project's working group can introduce this issue.

The press this twofold agandar equality for greet this twofold agandar the Propert compared a withing above of 25 academics and antivate who altered a computer compared mean to reproductive choice and grader estivation herein a function formation for Propert proposale on the sense one, and the effect indefinial dealers the Propert produced model legislation and condition provides in an arrange time transmitter of a sense one, and the sense indefinial dealers the Propert produced model legislation and condition provides a statement time times on aborthout present of extended to allow a new statement to be property in the weakplance transmitter terms at magine choice, and alternative model of reproduction. Two parameters is a productive framerous is the weakplance transmitter terms and winter of 1988 and a scandardy make a fittering bloodook devictioned and winter of 1988 and a scandardy make. Reproductions from the fail and winter of 1988 and a scandardy make a Reproduction from the failer and winter of 1988 and a scandardy make Reproduction from the failer and winter of 1988 and a scandardy make Reproduction for the failer and winter of 1988 and a scandardy make Reproduction from the failer and winter of 1988 and a scandardy make Reproduction for the

https://nsuworks.nova.edu/nlr/vol13/iss2/2

2