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[**STRATEGIC CHANGES IN REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES POLICY**](http://nauka.knmu.edu.ua/sierep/main.php?action=razdel&rname=11.&eid=50&subact=edit&editv=142878)

Medicine started out as an aspect of early philosophy. A close integration of medical expertise and medical ethics existed. Nowadays this is, in fact, the central source of tension and disagreement in pretty much all debates in the field of medical ethics. On the one hand we have a system of medical technology and medical research which constantly pushes the boundaries of what doctors are capable of doing. Indeed, our medical capabilities today are so advanced. The organic unity of fetus and mother can no longer be assumed now that human eggs and embryos can be moved from body to body or out of and back into the same female body. Genetic engineering may be used to determine what type of child a couple will have. Does that mean we actually should make such choices?

The further medicine develops the more extreme the possible good and evil can become. We all have a stake in what doctors do, and this means that we should all participate in the debate - not only over the advancing medical technology, but also over the proper responsibilities that they have. It is difficult to agree with doctors who claim that “the only obstacle to the solution to the problem of infertility in Ukraine is a high monetary value of assisted reproductive technologies” [www.surrogate-mother.ru]. The politics of choice might be changing in response to newly emerging reproductive technologies and might a pro-choice sensibility inform our understanding of morphological freedoms promised by genetic, prosthetic, and cognitive modification.

In the early period of the contemporary women’s movement, reproductive technology was seen as particularly progressive because it opened up the potential for finally severing the link between sexuality and reproduction. Genetic research, bio-technology and infertility treatment are now making dramatic advances. The organic unity of fetus and mother can no longer be assumed. Now human eggs and embryos can be moved from body to body or out of and back into the same female body.

In Ukraine, the major proponents of the possibilities of reproductive technologies are the scientists and medical practitioners developing the techniques as well as women who have benefited from them. Leading infertility doctors (E. Y. Grechanina and others) argue that embryo research promises the possibility of eliminating some of the most crippling forms of hereditary disease and most importantly, gives hope to previously childless couples. However, the use of human embryos in scientific research is becoming a source of controversy. Government is under pressure to impose regulation and define the limits of what is permissible. In this situation there is a very divisive area for feminists. On the one hand, it is necessary to overcome the patriarchal national traditions, which determines the negative connotation with feminism and new reproductive technologies in Ukraine. On the other hand, there is a problem of the gender stereotypes in the medicine. This will require the efforts of feminist groups for the strategic changes in women’s participation in reproductive technologies policy.