

**The Gift of Life:**  
**How Surrogacy Undermines Dignity, Marriage, and Family**

Michelle Kaufman

National Catholic Certification Program in Health Care Ethics

April 22, 2022

## Introduction

It is said that the family is the building block of society.<sup>1</sup> It is the place where children grow to love and serve others and develop knowledge of who they are so they can realize their potential and flourish. Strong families, where virtue is encouraged and nurtured, gift society with citizens invested in contributing to the common good.

In the instruction *Donum Vitae*, the Catholic Church declares that,

the vitality and stability of society require that children come into the world within a family and that the family be firmly based on marriage. The tradition of the Church and anthropological reflection recognize in marriage and in its indissoluble unity the only setting worthy of truly responsible procreation.<sup>2</sup>

Marriage between one man and one woman is central to the flourishing of the children they beget as the fruit of their one-flesh union. Therefore, families, and the children welcomed into them, are a great good for society.

Yet, the family is under attack from ideologies that proclaim a distorted vision of the human person, dignity, rights, and marriage. Many practices that purport to assist in building the family up actually restructure the meaning of familial relationships and offer new models of family life, undermining the solid foundation of the natural family. Anthony Fisher notes that as time progresses, “the marriage-based natural family, so long recognised as the basic cell of society, will no longer be normative, and to privilege it in any way is increasingly regarded as discriminatory.”<sup>3</sup> This rejection of the natural family, coupled with the embracing of alternative family-like structures, offends the sanctity of marriage and the dignity of the human person.

Surrogacy is one such practice that undermines the family in society. Increasingly popular, surrogacy presents many moral dilemmas. Although its proponents declare that the method is an excellent way to “grow a family,” it does so at a great cost.<sup>4</sup>

In this paper, I will argue that surrogacy is immoral because it severs the generation of human life from the marital act and dehumanizes the child conceived, undermining the family in society.

Far from mirroring the welcoming of children in the marital act, surrogacy utilizes illicit reproductive technologies to engender human embryos at the request of “intending parents.”<sup>5</sup> These new human lives are placed in the surrogate mother’s womb to gestate until birth, completely independent of any marital relationship or act. The arrangement may be altruistic or undertaken with the view of commercial gain. When the baby is born, the surrogate mother hands over the child to the person(s) who contracted her services, severing herself from the child she has nurtured in her womb.

The surrogacy process emphasizes how children engendered in this way are not welcomed as a gift, begotten in an act of total self-giving between spouses, but are reduced to objects of desire, made, using whatever means necessary, to satisfy the desires and dreams of adults. Thus, the child created in a sterile laboratory, and with multiple actors in their coming into being, is dehumanized, reduced to an object to be used.

Marriage and the natural family are further undermined as same-sex couples employ reproductive technologies, donor gametes, and surrogate mothers to form a caricature of family life. In these situations, the child conceived is more clearly seen to be dehumanized, viewed as a product desired and produced, for it is impossible, in the natural order, for two people of the same sex to beget a child.

Marriage between one man and one woman is the only place where children can be engendered in a way that respects their rights which flow from their inherent dignity as a human person created in the image and likeness of God.

### **The marital union upholds the dignity of the human person**

Central to any discussion concerning the engendering of new life is the dignity of the human person. Regardless of the circumstances surrounding his or her conception, every human being brought into existence has inherent dignity. All children should be loved, nurtured, and protected without reserve. They should be treated with respect from the very first moment of their existence, as ought to be afforded to every human person at every stage of life. This demand for respect, regardless of origins, is so critical that the Church reaffirmed its importance in *Donum Vitae*:

Thus the fruit of human generation, from the first moment of its existence, that is to say from the moment the zygote has formed, demands the unconditional respect that is morally due to the human being in his bodily and spiritual totality. The human being is to be respected and treated as a person from the moment of conception; and therefore from that same moment his rights as a person must be recognized, among which in the first place is the inviolable right of every innocent human being to life.”<sup>6</sup>

But does this mean that because children are good, adults have a right to them, and may obtain them by any means necessary?

### *Cooperating with God*

The engendering of human life is sublimely profound when a married couple cooperates with God. Conception brings into being a unique person with inherent dignity, which flows from being made in the image and likeness of God. Because of this dignity, children have a right to be conceived within an act of love between his or her own mother and father.

John Haas eloquently expresses it this way:

Children should arise from an act of love between a husband and wife, in cooperation with God. No human being can “create” the image of God. That is why we say that human beings ‘procreate’ with God. Engendering children is a cooperative act among husband, wife, and God himself. Children, in the final analysis, should be *begotten not made*.<sup>7</sup> (emphasis mine)

To be begotten is to come into being as a result of the total self-giving of the spouses. When a husband and wife freely give themselves to each other in marriage, they capacitate themselves to enter into the self-surrender of the marriage act, giving themselves totally to each other, becoming one flesh, making themselves capable of being open to receiving the gift of new life.<sup>8</sup>

In his encyclical letter, *Humanae Vitae*, Paul VI states, “by means of the reciprocal personal gift which is proper and exclusive to them, husband and wife tend toward that communion of their beings whereby they help each other toward personal perfection in order to collaborate with God in the begetting and rearing of new lives.”<sup>9</sup> Therefore, the child is welcomed as a “third” into the communion of persons that the husband and wife established when they married and gave of themselves unreservedly.<sup>10</sup> The child, true to his or her dignity, is welcomed as a gift and as an equal with their parents.

#### *Principle of Inseparability*

The two meanings of the conjugal union – the unity of the spouses and procreation - are essential to the marital act. They cannot be separated without damaging “the sense of true mutual love and its ordination to man’s most high vocation to parenthood.”<sup>11</sup> Separation of these ends harms the marital relationship, which is a communion of persons. So important is this total self-giving and receptiveness to a new life that it elevates reproduction to that of procreation.<sup>12</sup> The couple truly work with God in total self-surrender to welcome the gift of new life, having “established each other as absolutely unique and irreplaceable.”<sup>13</sup> Any child

conceived as a result of the fruit of their love comes into being as an equal person to his or her parents because they are begotten rather than made.<sup>14</sup>

However, the unique relationship between husband and wife is violated when means other than the marital act, such as surrogacy, is employed to conceive a child as it violates the principle of inseparability.

This violation is clear when one objectively looks at the surrogacy process. Eggs are harvested from the woman through a surgical intervention after her ovaries are stimulated by drugs. The male (husband or donor) masturbates in order to produce sperm to fertilize the eggs. Masturbation is self-abuse, morally illicit, and violates the unity of any marital bond that exists.<sup>15</sup> The human embryo is engendered in a glass dish in a laboratory, quite apart from the marital act. The main actor in the process is the technician, and the biological parents, who may or may not be, the “intended parents,” become simply the providers of the biological material needed to create the baby. Finally, a satisfactory embryo is implanted in the womb of a woman, who again, may or may not be biologically related to the nascent life that she carries. In surrogacy, the unitive and procreative ends are completely severed from the engendering of new human life.

### **The struggle of infertility and the immorality of using bad means for a good end**

Engendering children only through the marriage act may, for some, lead to great angst, especially for some couples who suffer the heavy cross of infertility. They may ask why it is not licit to use any means available to bring a child into the world when a child is a tremendous good.

The unique relationship between husband and wife is defiled when means other than the marital act are employed to conceive. It is never permissible to “do evil so that good may result from it.”<sup>16</sup> The good end cannot change the morality of the act. It will always be

immoral.<sup>17</sup> The dignity of human beings, made in the image and likeness of God, is at stake. This is true of the “intended parents,” the biological parents, those who donate their gametes and bodies, and of course, the child to be conceived. In the final analysis, each person is treated as an object.

Karol Wojtyla wrote extensively about the importance of not treating people as an object of use – a means to an end – even if that end be good. He explained that everyone, as a matter of justice, has a right to not be treated as an object:

For to be just always means giving others what is rightly due to them. A person’s rightful due is to be treated as an object of love, not as an object for use. In a sense it can be said that love is a requirement of justice, just as using a person as a means to an end would conflict with justice.<sup>18</sup>

When surrogacy is chosen as a means to create a family, children are no longer received as a gift, but they are sought out as something that the couple perceives they have a right to, even if only subtly, and that can be obtained even without their coming together in an act of love. This wrongly ordered attitude embraces a bad means to a good end. It is not just. Neither IVF nor surrogacy – crimes against the dignity of the human person - can ever be considered moral acts.

#### *The Duty of Catholic Health Care Providers to infertile couples*

Providers of Catholic health care play an important role in directing patients who struggle with infertility to morally acceptable treatments. They stand in a unique position to find solutions that recognize and honor the physical, social, and spiritual needs of their patients. It is possible that in some cases, the underlying cause(s) of infertility may be treated and rectified or where the marital act may be assisted, rather than replaced, with morally acceptable methods of fertility treatment.

NaPro Technology, developed by Thomas Hilgers, MD, has had great success in assisting couples in such a way that their dignity, the sanctity of marriage, and the morality of human acts are respected.

In regard to surrogacy, the *Ethical Religious Directives (ERDs)* are very clear that its practice cannot be permitted:

Because of the dignity of the child and of marriage, and because of the uniqueness of the mother-child relationship, participation in contracts or arrangements for surrogate motherhood is not permitted. Moreover, the commercialization of such surrogacy denigrates the dignity of women, especially the poor.<sup>19</sup>

Further, the *Directives* prohibit the use of homologous fertilization (using the gametes of the spouses), or heterologous fertilization (using the gametes of at least one donor), because they, above all, violate the principle of inseparability.<sup>20</sup>

Men and women who suffer from infertility must be treated with the utmost respect and with concern for their situation. However, no evil may be done in order for good to come about. Therefore, in addition to offering ethical fertility treatments, Catholic health care providers should also advocate for adoption and offer recourse to counseling.<sup>21</sup> In this way, the dignity of all involved can be upheld while respecting the sanctity of marriage and life.

### **The dehumanization of the human embryo**

Oftentimes people talk rather flippantly about “making a baby.” But as already discussed, the moral way for a child to be conceived is in the loving marital embrace of their mother and father. “His parents “do” something when they come together in total self-giving.”<sup>22</sup> The child is welcomed into the communion of persons as an equal and in no way is “made” as if an object of use or to satisfy a longing that one believes they are entitled to obtain fulfillment of.

*Donum vitae* explains the violation by saying, “surrogate motherhood represents an objective failure to meet the obligations of maternal love, of conjugal fidelity, and of responsible motherhood... it sets up, to the detriment of families, a division between the physical, psychological and moral elements which constitute those families.”<sup>23</sup>

Reproductive technologies are a vital component of modern-day surrogacy. When children are engendered in this way, replacing the marital act instead of assisting it, the nascent human life is dehumanized and reduced to the status of an object to be used and a product to be produced. This mentality is contrary to their dignity as human beings made in the image and likeness of God.

No one can claim the right to a child, but a child, because of their inherent dignity, can claim the right “to be conceived, carried in the womb, brought into the world and brought up by his own parents.”<sup>24</sup> Anything less than this violates the child’s rights and results in them being dominated by others who have more power than themselves, stripping them of the respect due to a person equal in dignity.

#### *Dehumanized by being treated as a product*

From the very outset of the surrogacy journey, a person or couple is setting out to obtain a baby by whatever means necessary. The child who eventually will be born and handed to them is the end product of a costly manufacturing process.

The process begins with finding a suitable surrogate mother who will gestate the baby, often for a handsome fee. Even in altruistic arrangements, the surrogate may be reimbursed for reasonable costs.<sup>25</sup>

Gametes need to be obtained to fertilize the egg(s). So absurd is the situation that the embryo implanted in the womb of the surrogate mother may bear no biological relationship to her nor to the “intended parents.” The child may never know anything about his or her true

origins, especially when the egg and sperm are anonymously donated. Donors may be well paid or at least reimbursed for their “generosity.”

Something paid for is never a gift freely given and received.

*Dehumanized by being subjected to quality control*

Just as a product manufactured on the assembly line is subject to the scrutiny of its producers, so it is in the case of reproductive technologies and surrogacy.

When all the reproductive material is procured and bills are paid, a technician becomes the principal creator of life in the laboratory. They create the human embryo in vitro or artificially inseminate a surrogate who will also become the egg donor. It is the technician who is given the role of deciding who will be given a chance to live and who will die. “Inherent in IVF,” Haas explains, “is the treatment of children, in their very coming into being, as less than human beings.”<sup>26</sup>

This “less than” and dehumanizing attitude toward human embryos allows for such practices as storing surplus embryos through cryopreservation. Before freezing, the selected embryos go through a process of having an agent applied to them to hinder the production of ice crystals, which, if they were to develop, would cause damage to the embryo.<sup>27</sup> The embryo is then frozen in vials in liquid nitrogen tanks in a state of suspended animation.<sup>28</sup> They are stripped of human dignity, unable to grow and develop, treated as mere biological matter that is no different from a skin cell, with no moral solution to be found.<sup>29</sup>

Embryos that are deemed to be unsatisfactory are easily discarded, just as a defective product is discarded. Genetic testing might reveal the possibility of *disease* or disability, or the division of the cells may not occur as expected. Those that don’t measure up are rejected, either thrown away or donated for research. Human beings treated with dignity are never discarded because they do not measure up to expectations, nor are they experimented on

without consent. However, human beings created in a laboratory are not treated with the dignity they are due as persons.

For those embryos that are afforded the opportunity to continue developing without the indignity of freezing, their safety is not assured. Many surrogacy arrangements include clauses in the contract that require the surrogate mother to abort any apparently defective fetus. If more than one embryo implants in her womb, she may be required to selectively reduce (abort) the number of babies she carries, in accord with the intended parents' wishes.

Throughout the process, the child is dehumanized by being subject to quality control. The utilitarian world view that drives surrogacy means the children are not equal to but inferior to their producers. This attitude is beneath the dignity of a human person, even at the most nascent stages of their life, and it highlights the grave injustice perpetrated on them as they are perceived as products to be made in order to fulfill the desires of the adults who dominate them.

### **Surrogacy undermines the family in society**

It is clear that while purporting to create families, surrogacy and its sister reproductive technology work to undermine the very fabric of the family in society. As the creation of children takes place outside of the marital union breaking the unitive and procreative bonds, it disrespects marriage and the natural family. Marriage between one man and one woman is the cornerstone of family life. Without this moral foundation, the family flounders, and the repercussions are felt throughout society. Subversion can take place subtly, as in the case of when heterosexual married couples participate in the practice of surrogacy, or more overtly, as when those who are not married or engage in a same-sex relationships employ this means to have a child.

*How surrogacy violates the sanctity of marriage: A lesson from Sarah and Abraham*

Surrogacy is not new. The Bible relays the story of Sarah's longing to provide a son for Abraham. In desperation, Sarah asks Abraham to lie with her maid, Hagar, in order that she may have a son for him on Sarah's behalf. Ishmael was born of that union. Despite Sarah having full knowledge and giving her blessing, she still struggled with jealousy, leaving a deep wound in their marriage.<sup>30</sup>

In her article "*Abraham, Sarah, and Surrogacy*," Laura Cristiano, explores the cross of infertility and human nature, applying lessons learned from Sarah and Abraham's experience to the present day. Although the surrogate pregnancy seemed like a reasonable solution, it wasn't long before Sarah's jealousy was raised by Hagar's dislike of her.<sup>29</sup> In her desire to produce a son for Abraham, "Sarah had not anticipated the rivalry and resentment that the pregnancy would provoke in both women," resulting in injuring Sarah and Abraham's union.<sup>31</sup>

Abraham and Sarah were unaware of the consequences of their actions and the long-standing difficulties that would eventuate. The surrogacy arrangement wounded everyone involved, including Hagar and Ishmael, and it caused division in the family.

Cristiano draws a further parallel between Ishmael's treatment and that of embryos created in vitro today, which are not treated with dignity and respect due to a human person. Just as Ishmael "was deprived of the security and happiness that results when one is conceived and reared by a mother and father who are married to each other," these nascent human lives are deprived of being conceived in love as the fruit of their parents' union and are manufactured, frozen or discarded according to need.<sup>32</sup>

Their story issues a strong warning to those who would believe that a modern-day surrogacy arrangement would fare better, not only for the family receiving the child but also for the surrogate mother's family.

*The absurdity of surrogate family relationships*

The same jealousy experienced by Sarah may be replicated in modern-day surrogacy arrangements, especially where a close friend or relative agrees to carry a child. These situations allow familial confusion to arise, blurring the lines about who is "mother" and "father."

In his book *The Doctor and Christian Marriage*, Dr. H.P. Dunn, notes the situation's absurdity. "Cases have been reported in which a woman has 'donated' an ovum to her sterile sister, who went on to be the surrogate mother," he writes. "The baby she produced was therefore her own nephew, her husband's stepson, and the donor's true child as well as her stepson, too."<sup>33</sup>

Jean-Louis Brugués concurs with Dunn, noting that reproductive technology "destroys kinship relations." He explains that "a child could have a biological father and social father who bestows his name, a biological mother (the oocyte donor), a surrogate mother, who lends her uterus, and a social mother."<sup>34</sup> In these arrangements, a catastrophic rupture occurs between familial relationships.

Brugués maintains that these situations highlight that their creation is "the sole fulfilment of the desire of the adults, while relegating to the background the good of the child himself."<sup>35</sup> These instances of familial confusion confirm that children engendered outside of the marital act are 'made' in the way that one may manufacture a product. If the child's interests were truly at heart, then the adults in their life would never allow such confusing atrocities to occur.

### *The problem of same-sex family-like structures*

Surrogacy has further undermined marriage and the natural family by making it possible for same-sex couples to form a caricature of family life. Here, the child conceived is more clearly seen to be a product desired, for it is impossible, in the natural order, for two people of the same sex to beget a child.

More than a decade ago, Sister Renée Mirkes revealed the rise of surrogacy as a means for same-sex couples to have children. As members of the medical community embraced this development for same-sex couples, Sister Mirkes sounded a warning: “If society’s moral infrastructure rests squarely on the foundation of the family, then appraising the moral character of the means by which couples build those families takes on critical individual and social importance.”<sup>36</sup>

Hence, it is important to observe and critique the ever-increasing acceptance of surrogacy in society and its adoption, particularly by same-sex couples.

Western celebrities lead the charge, promoting this distorted and immoral way of producing children and ‘building families’ that requires no mother except for the woman whose womb is rented.<sup>37</sup> Although the desire to engender children is wholly natural and a good, the proper place, as discussed, is within marriage between a man and a woman who, through their commitment to one another, capacitate themselves to enter into the marital act and generate new life. The Church reminds us that there is only one moral way to engender life. *Donum vitae* clearly articulates this truth, saying, “the gift of human life must be actualized in marriage through the specific and exclusive acts of husband and wife, in accordance with the laws inscribed in their persons and in their union.”<sup>38</sup>

Homosexual relationships, even those that purport to be marriages, cannot provide for the children raised within them, nor for society, the moral foundation of the natural family;

they can't because they are attempting to do something they cannot do, both morally, and physically.<sup>39</sup>

Most importantly, the child's rights are infringed upon when adults try to create families with two parents of the same sex. The child is purposely deprived of being brought up by both their mother and father, whose complementary influence is critical for authentic human development.<sup>40</sup>

Aquilino Polaino-Lorento points out that "boys and girls need their father and mother, in order to identify with a person of their same gender." It helps them "to learn respect, affection and complementariness with the person of the opposite gender" and is "indispensable to establish the child's identity."<sup>41</sup>

Whatever impacts on the social and psychological development of the child will threaten the good of society and the family. The increasing recognition of same-sex family-like structures formed through surrogacy will only serve to shake the foundations of the natural family.

### **Conclusion**

The gift of human life is always a great good. No matter how they came into being, all children are precious, unrepeatable, and have inherent dignity that must be respected always and everywhere. However, just because children are good, adults do not have a right to obtain them by any means necessary, most especially when those means are immoral. No one can claim a right to a child.

The sanctity of marriage and the dignity of the human person is upheld when children are begotten within the marital act, rather than made by any means available. When rightly ordered, husband and wife give of themselves totally, making it possible, in their love, to be

open to receiving the gift of new life, receiving another, of equal dignity, into their community of persons.

However, surrogacy, and its sister, illicit reproductive technologies, undermine the solid foundation of the natural family by dehumanizing children, treating them as objects to be used, and easily discarded if defective in any way. Therefore, to resort to surrogacy to build a family is an immoral act that can never be made moral because of its good end.

## End Notes

1. John Paul II, *Familiaris Consortio* (November 22, 1981), n. 46. The concept of the family being the “building block of society,” or the “basic cell of society,” has now become a generally accepted notion both within secular and Catholic circles.
2. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Donum Vitae: Instruction on Respect for Human Life in its Origin and on the Dignity of Procreation; Replies to certain questions of the day* (February 22, 1987), n. 5.2.A.1.
3. Anthony Fisher, *Catholic Bioethics for a New Millennium* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 14.
4. “Fertility Associates offers support and treatment options for LGBTTTQI+ couples and individuals hoping to start a family,” Fertility Associates, accessed April 18, 2022, <https://www.fertilityassociates.co.nz/pathway/lgbttqiplus/>.
5. “Surrogacy,” Repromed, accessed April 18, 2022, <https://www.repromed.co.nz/fertility-treatments/surrogacy/>.
6. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Donum Vitae* (February 22, 1987), n. I, 1.
7. John M. Haas, “Begotten Not Made: A Catholic View of Reproductive Technology,” *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*, 1998, <https://www.usccb.org/committees/pro-life-activities/begotten-not-made-catholic-view-reproductive-technology> (accessed January 26, 2022).
8. William E. May, *Catholic Bioethics and the Gift of Human Life*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 2008), chap. 3, 2A, Kobo.
9. Paul VI, *Humanae Vitae* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1978), n. 8.
10. Father Tad Pacholczyk, “Thinking About Sex and Marital Surrender,” *National Catholic Bioethics Centre: Making Sense of Bioethics*, March, 2007, <https://www.ncbcenter.org/making-sense-of-bioethics-cms/column-021-thinking-about-sex-and-marital-surrender> (accessed April 15, 2022).
11. Paul VI, *Humanae Vitae*, n. 12.
12. May, *Catholic Bioethics and the Gift of Human Life*, 3, 2C.
13. May, *Catholic Bioethics and the Gift of Human Life*, 3, 2A.
14. May, *Catholic Bioethics and the Gift of Human Life*, 3, 2C.
15. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Persona Humana: Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics* (December 29, 1975), n. IX. The text states, “in fact both the Magisterium of the Church - in the course of a constant tradition - and the moral sense of the faithful have declared without hesitation that masturbation is an intrinsically and seriously disordered act.<sup>19</sup> The main reason is that, whatever the motive for acting this way, the deliberate use of the sexual faculty outside normal conjugal relations essentially contradicts the finality of the faculty. For it lacks the sexual relationship called for by the moral order, namely the relationship which realizes “the full sense of mutual self-giving and human procreation in the context of true love.”<sup>20</sup> All deliberate exercise of sexuality must be reserved to this regular relationship.”
16. Catholic Church, *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1994), n. 1756.
17. Rev. Edward J. Hayes et al., *Catholicism & Ethics: A Medical/Moral Handbook* (Norwood, MA, C.R. Publications, 1997), 67.
18. Karol Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility*, trans. H.T. Willetts (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 42.
19. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Care Services*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2018), n. 42, 18.
20. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Ethical and Religious Directives*, 18. The Directives provide two very clear statements regarding the fertilization of human embryos outside of the marital act. ERD # 40 states that “Heterologous fertilization (that is, any technique used to achieve conception by the use of gametes coming from at least one donor other than the spouses) is prohibited because it is contrary to the covenant of marriage, the unity of the spouses, and the dignity proper to parents and the child.” ERD #41 states, “Homologous artificial fertilization (that is, any technique used to achieve conception using the gametes of the two spouses joined in marriage) is prohibited when it separates procreation from the marital act in its unitive significance (e.g., any technique used to achieve extracorporeal conception).”
21. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Ethical and Religious Directives*, 18. The Directives ask that Health Care providers ensure that people suffering from infertility are given hope. ERD #43 specifies that “A Catholic

health care institution that provides treatment for infertility should offer not only technical assistance to infertile couples but also should help couples pursue other solutions (e.g., counseling, adoption).”

22. May, *Catholic Bioethics and the Gift of Human Life*, 3, 2C.

23. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Donum Vitae*, n. A3.

24. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Donum Vitae*, n. A3.

25. Fertility Associates, *Pathway to a Child*, (Auckland: Fertility Associates, July, 2021), 106-107. In New Zealand, only altruistic surrogacy is permitted by law. However, ‘intended parents’ are expected to pay for any health care costs incurred. The fertility clinic will bill the ‘intending parent(s),’ passing on to the surrogate or gamete donor reimbursement by way of travel vouchers and gift cards. For instance, a \$75 petrol voucher will be given to a sperm donor by the state-run fertility clinic “Fertility Plus.” Repromed gives \$50 Prezzy cards to sperm donors each time they visit. Travel expenses are reimbursed by Fertility Associates. However, all the costs of these incentives to donors are passed on to the ‘intending parents’ who pay hefty for the privilege of using donor gametes and wombs.

26. Haas, “Begotten Not Made.”

27. “What happens during embryo cryopreservation?” Embryo Freezing (Cryopreservation), Cleveland Clinic, last reviewed February 17, 2022, <https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/treatments/15464-embryo-freezing-cryopreservation>.

28. May, *Catholic Bioethics and the Gift of Human Life*, chap. 3, 5

29. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Donum Vitae*, n. I, 5. The passage points to the absurdity of the situation, stating: “those embryos which are not transferred into the body of the mother and are called “spare” are exposed to an absurd fate, with no possibility of their being offered safe means of survival which can be licitly pursued.” These children have been conceived and are kept on ice, and there is nothing that can be done morally to help them.

30. See Genesis 15-18, 21 for the story of Abraham and Sarah. RSV.

31. Laura A. Cristiano, “Abraham, Sarah, and Surrogacy: A Scriptural Insight into Church Teaching,” *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* 11, no. 3, (2011), 433-44, [https://www.pdcnet.org/collection/authorizedshow?id=ncbq\\_2011\\_0011\\_0003\\_0433\\_0441&pdfname=ncbq\\_2011\\_0011\\_0003\\_0025\\_0033.pdf&file\\_type=pdf&q=abraham%20sarah%20surrogacy](https://www.pdcnet.org/collection/authorizedshow?id=ncbq_2011_0011_0003_0433_0441&pdfname=ncbq_2011_0011_0003_0025_0033.pdf&file_type=pdf&q=abraham%20sarah%20surrogacy) (accessed January 20, 2022).

32. Cristiano, “Abraham, Sarah, and Surrogacy,” 440.

33. H.P. Dunn, *The Doctor and Christian Marriage* (New York: Alba House, 1992), 125.

34. Jean-Louis Bruguès, “Assisted Procreation and IVF-ET,” in *Lexicon*, ed. Joseph Meaney (Front Royal, VA: Human Life International, 2006), 1-8.

35. Bruguès, “Assisted Procreation,” 1-8.

36. Sister Renée Mirkes, “Anything Goes: Reproductive medicine grows ever more disturbing,” *Catholic World Report*, February 15, 2012, <https://www.catholicworldreport.com/2012/02/15/anything-goes/>.

37. Spencer Bergen, “All the celebrities who welcomed babies via surrogate,” *Page Six*, April 11, 2022, <https://pagesix.com/article/celebrities-who-have-used-surrogates/> (accessed April 20, 2022). Celebrities use their fame to promote surrogacy and laws to make it easier for couples, whether heterosexual or homosexual, to access the process. For example, in New Zealand, former weatherman/TV personality turned politician Tamati Coffey is using his own experience of surrogacy (as a same-sex parent) to change the current law. When ordinary citizens see more uptake of surrogacy by high profile people, they tend to cast aside any doubts about its morality and accept the process as a means to a good end. See more here: Johnny Blades, “Bill seeks streamlined path through surrogacy process,” *RNZ*, March 27, 2022, <https://www.rnz.co.nz/national/programmes/the-house/audio/2018835183/bill-seeks-streamlined-path-through-surrogacy-process> (accessed April 20, 2022).

38. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Donum Vitae*, n. 5.

39. Aquilino Polaino-Lorente, “Homosexual Marriage,” in *Lexicon*, ed. Joseph Meaney (Front Royal, VA: Human Life International, 2006), 445-459. Polaino-Lorente draws the distinction between same-sex relationships and the marital union, calling the former for what it really is (as harsh as it may come across). “The legal and social recognition of “marriages” between homosexuals constitutes a fraudulent simulation of what the human being is in their sexed condition, an imposture of what “marriage” is between persons of the opposite sex. It is a personal and social deception that artificially establishes an anthropological fiction: the impossible psychological identicalness between men and women and, consequently, of the unions that can be made between homosexuals.” Such “marriages,” even though legalized, can never be the same type of union of one man and one woman that is both unitive and procreative.

<sup>40</sup>. Polaino-Lorente, "Homosexual Marriage," 457. Although the discussion is pertaining to the adoption of children by homosexual couples, it seems fitting to apply the points raised to children obtained by people in same-sex relationships (particularly men) through surrogacy arrangements.

<sup>41</sup>. Polaino-Lorente, "Homosexual Marriage," 457.