Asian American Reproductive Justice Oral History Project
Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College
Northampton, MA

LISA IKEMOTO

Interviewed by

JUHEE KWON

July 8, 2013
Davis, California

This interview was made possible
with generous support from the Royce Fellowship

Narrator

Lisa C. Ikemoto (b. 1961) is currently a Professor of Law at the University of California Davis School of Law. Ikemoto received her J.D. from the UC Davis School of Law in 1987 and her B.A. from UCLA. She teaches bioethics, public health law, healthcare law, reproductive rights law and policy. Her research examines reproductive and genetic technology use, health care disparities, and public health law through a critical race/feminist lens. Prior to UC Davis, Ikemoto taught at Loyola Law School and Indiana University School of Law. Ikemoto has served on the board of Legal Services for Indiana, California Women's Law Center, Asian Pacific Islander for Reproductive Health (APIRH), Reproductive Health Technologies, Pro Choice Advocates for Responsible Research, and the Advisory Board of National Law Students for Reproductive Justice. She was involved in the founding conference for National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF) and attended the 2005 Reproductive Justice for All at Smith College.

Interviewer

Juhee Kwon (b. 1991) is an undergraduate at Brown University, studying Biology and Ethnic Studies.

Abstract

Lisa Ikemoto details the extent of her involvement with reproductive justice community organizations such as APIRH and NAPAWF, especially within her role as a board member and scholar. In the interview, she also reflects on her participation in various reproductive justice conferences. Ikemoto discusses her research and academic work at length, covering topics such as sperm/egg markets, genetic screening, "Gaybies," and reproductive tourism.

Restrictions

None

Format

Interview recorded as MP3 file using Olympus Digital Voice Recorder VN-702PC. Two files: (a) 8 min 1 sec and (b) 57 min 7 sec.

Transcript

Transcribed and edited for clarity by Juhee Kwon. Reviewed and approved by Lisa Ikemoto.

Asian American Reproductive Justice Oral History Project
Sophia Smith Collection
Smith College
Northampton, MA

Transcript of interview conducted July 8, 2013, with:

LISA C. IKEMOTO
Davis, California

by: JUHEE KWON

KWON: So I'm going to record a quick intro.

IKEMOTO: Okay. There's a good chance I won't remember much.

(Both laugh)

KWON: That's okay. So this is Juhee Kwon. Today is July 8, 2013, and I'm interviewing Professor Lisa Ikemoto at her office at the University of California Davis School of Law. This interview's a part of the Asian American Reproductive Justice Oral History, and I just wanted to get started possibly with a quick intro and then also a brief introduction of the current work you do.

IKEMOTO: Okay. Sounds good. . . So what are we starting with? (laughs)

KWON: Your intro, and then the current work you're doing here at the School of Law.

IKEMOTO: I'm on the faculty at UC [University of California] Davis School of Law, and my work focuses on biotechnology uses, mostly reproductive and genetic technology uses, primarily through a critical race, feminist lens and also using cultural studies. So I probably fit in the categories—the academic disciplines—of bioethics and science and technology studies.

KWON: Do you teach classes related to those, too? 1:15

IKEMOTO: Yeah. I teach the bioethics and health law curriculum here at the law school, so I teach bioethics, public health law, healthcare law, reproductive rights law and policy. And then I also teach a bar course on marital property, which is not related to anything else (laughs).

KWON: So how did you get involved in Asian American reproductive justice then?

IKEMOTO: Um, how did I do that? . . . I started my academic career right out of law school with—immediately because I was interested in reproductive technology use and reproductive justice issues. So I guess because I've always used a racial lens and used critical race theory—and I came at a time when critical race theory was emerging as kind of a challenge to the traditional doctrinal approach in legal scholarship and practice. And because I came at a time when the primary paradigm for race was black and white, it was a good time and an important time for thinking—breaking open that black white paradigm. Because I'm Asian American, because I'm from California, and I've lived primarily with Asian and Latino and White communities, I guess it seemed natural to bring in those perspectives or to try to.

KWON: Did you get personally involved with the organizations like APIRH [Asian Pacific Islanders for Reproductive Health]? How did you get involved with those organizations? 2:52

IKEMOTO: Yeah. So my career started in the East Coast and Midwest, and then I was working primarily in a Black White social context, although with as many as—to the extent that I could have contact with Asian American communities. But when I moved back to LA—so that was in ninety—I moved to San Francisco in '92 and LA in '93 or '94. And I was just so happy to be back in a multiracial, multicultural context (laughs).

KWON: Me, too.

IKEMOTO: I just jumped into it. Yeah, you know the feeling, right? So I became involved in Asian American bar activities and other community activities.

So I'm trying to remember. I met Yin [Ling Leung]. Yin approached me and introduced herself to me when I was in the Bay Area. She was ED [Executive Director] of APIRH at that time and then—I think she just came up and introduced herself and was very open and inviting. And then maybe when I moved back to LA, I was approached to join the board of APIRH. . . Maybe it wasn't right away. Maybe it was after that. I just can't remember. It must have been after that.

KWON: Yeah. Okay. 4:26

IKEMOTO: Yeah, but I met Yin pretty early on. Then shortly after I moved to LA—so that was in '93. I took a faculty position in Los Angeles. The women started getting together, initiated—at least from my perspective—by Peggy Saika in the Bay Area and Cyndi Choi, who was then in LA, to have a gathering of progressive Asian American women in the U.S.

KWON: In the entire—

IKEMOTO: So that was the basis—that was beginning of the formation of NAPAWF [National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum].

KWON: Oh, right. So did you attend the first NAPAWF conference? 5:02

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and we chose LA for the first gathering, so I was on the organizing committee. There was a big network of people working on it. It was great because as soon as I moved to LA, I got to start meeting people and connecting with people, largely based in California, because we were doing logistics, but also all over the U.S. And they had been inspired because Peggy and others who went to Beijing [for the 1995 UN Women's Conference] said, How come we have to go to China to meet the progressive women in LA—to meet the progressive women in the U.S.? Why don't we do this in the U.S.? So they really started it, and I was happy to be in the right place at the right time.

KWON: Oh, that's really interesting.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and I think I joined the board of APIRH a little bit later. So I think that was in '97.

KWON: Mhmm. So since then—

IKEMOTO: But I had met some of the key people—

KWON: Right, right. Like Peggy Saika and Yin.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and Yin and Sora Park and some others.

KWON: Okay. Have you been able to integrate that into your academic work here as well? Because I know you—it says you work National Law Students for Reproductive Justice [LSRJ]. There's a group here at Davis? 6:12

IKEMOTO: Yeah, so I've always, throughout my career, tried to connect my academic work with community work. I've done it largely by being a board member or advisor, and I try to work both with a local organization and with a national organization, and those have shifted over the years, just sort of depending on where the opportunities were and where I was. So when I was in Indiana, I was on the board of Legal Services of Indiana and working with the critical race theory people nationally and with some other academic organizations. When I moved to Los Angeles, the opportunities changed, just because the social political context is very different in California than it is in Indiana. So I was on the board of California Women's Law Center. A little bit later, I joined the board of APIRH. Currently, I'm not on a community organization board because—well, I'm on the advisory committee for the national LSRJ. I just cycled

off of Reproductive Health Technologies Project board as of the end of 2012. But because I'm going on sabbatical, I'm saying no to everything right now. I spent my last sabbatical with APIRH, which is great but—

(Phone rings) Hello? Speaking.

END OF FILE 1

FILE 2

IKEMOTO: Did that answer your question? I've lost track of what the question was.

KWON: Yeah, yeah, yeah. How you work with different community organizations.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. So in part, it's hopefully my effort to contribute some time and energy to on-the-ground work, but it also keeps my own work grounded. I pick up issues [and] try to bring in the types of resources and skills that they don't have the time to do themselves. That's sort of how I see it.

KWON: When I talk to a lot of different community organizers, they were saying, "Oh, we need more academics in the field because all of us are on the ground, and there's no actual academic material being produced." Because when I looked for literature and things like that, there's a lot on Black women, Latina women, but there's nothing on Asian American women. 0:36

IKEMOTO: Hardly any on Asian American women. I know. At one point, Yin and I had this dream that we were going to create a history—like an RJ [reproductive justice] history of Asian American women. But there's no documentation.

KWON: Exactly.

IKEMOTO: There is for African American women, because there've long been historians who've been working in that field, and we thought—we looked for data on abortions and all kinds of issues, and we can't find anything. So we'd have to go out and find the people, interview the people—

KWON: Which is what I'm doing.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, exactly. We need people like you.

KWON: Yeah. I looked for it too, because I wanted to—

IKEMOTO: Did you find anything?

KWON: No. I found Lora Jo Foo's book [*Asian American Women*], and then I found *Undivided Rights*, and that was it. And then I found you, and there were a couple articles and then that was it. 1:41

IKEMOTO: Yeah. There's hardly anything out there and I thought, God, I would love to be able to go out and interview people, but I don't have—from a law—if you're not an anthropologist or a sociologist, it's really hard to do that. So I could start now, but I wouldn't be able to get around to collecting

enough material until I retire. (laughs) Then it can be my retirement project. I mean you need somebody who's been trained to do it.

KWON: Yeah, but it's good. I think it's good that I'm interviewing people who are actually doing the work right now because it's more live and it's more fresh, and so their memories are a little better.

IKEMOTO: For a while I had a fantasy of tracking down the doctors who were providing services—because there was a doctor in LA, who—there was a woman doctor who practiced in LA She delivered my aunt, she delivered one of my students, but she was working primarily in South Central. So she must have delivering babies and performing abortions for primarily women of color for decades. For decades. Because she started—she was one of the first women, Asian women doctors. Her life must have been fascinating, and she must have known what was going on. But by the time I figured out who she was, she was like in her nineties, and I was no longer in LA.

3:15

KWON: Yeah, and the history just kind of disappears.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. Maybe somebody got it, I don't know.

KWON: Hopefully with this project, we'll hopefully—because it's in the archives someone will look for it.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, it's great that you're doing this.

KWON: I also wanted to move onto your experience with the RJ for All Conference in Smith College. If you could tell me what the conference was about, what it was like, and who was there. I know it was a while ago.

IKEMOTO: It seemed like everybody was there or nearly everybody was there. So in that sense, it was this wonderful gathering. Because it was people—it was activists, and it was scholars. So there were a lot of synergies there, a lot of excitement. It was one of the first, I think, conferences using the reproductive justice framework; it wasn't the *only* one. And I think it was really telling that the RJ framework came from the movement and not academia, and it gave academics a chance to appreciate that, so I think that was really good. But it was a really good mix of people. Not absolutely everybody could make it, but it was a real mix of issues. It wasn't just abortion. It was also disability rights—a little bit, probably not enough—and the queer activists were there, so sexual orientation, sexual identity, those issues were on the table. And it was one of the few times where I've been to a reproductive rights, reproductive health type of setting where those things came together. It wasn't more narrowly focused, and the goal

was to open up those spaces rather than say, "This is what we can do in two days."

KWON: So what was the final product of the conference? 5:32

IKEMOTO: I know they tried to document it as much as possible. My guess is that there wasn't *a* final product, but it did—one example was that one of the panels I was on, we decided to use that as a starting point, and so we produced a set of articles that was published in *Signs*, and so it allowed us to continue—there were couple—there was at least one meeting following that, which I wasn't able to attend in person. But it sort of—so it was a basis of a new set of relationships at least, and I think that's been true for other people as well. Yeah.

KWON: Who were the other Asian American women that were there?

IKEMOTO: Yin was there. So that's an example. She's someone who's long been doing work on the ground, and she was there and that was really important. I'm trying to—who else was there . . . for Asian American women? (pause) Well, Wendy Mink was one of the organizers.

KWON: Oh, who's that? 6:46

IKEMOTO: She's at Smith [College]. She was one of the core faculty members who put it together. Gwendolyn Mink.

KWON: Okay. I don't know her.

IKEMOTO: She does really great work. Her primarily work's in welfare, but she does great race gender analysis of welfare. She was, in a sense, one of the hosts who helped pull it together. She was key in that process, and she's also—she was selfless in the way she did it. She didn't put herself front and center, and so maybe that's why you don't know her name (laughs), but she was key to that coming together at that conference. So she's Asian American. I'm trying to think. It's so funny, because it was probably much less about race—I mean, it—because there was a racial analysis there, but because it was so open—(pauses) I know Dorothy Roberts was there. She's not Asian American, I'm just trying to remember all the faces I saw. I can't remember.

KWON: It was just a lot of people?

IKEMOTO: Yeah. Was it Marlene [Gerber Fried]? Marlene was there. (pauses) I don't remember. I just remember lots of people were there. Eveline [Shen] wasn't there. I remember I called her from there. Planned Parenthood was there. That was amazing, because to have one of the major national

women's organizations that had been, for so long, white and law-focused. They're embracing the—or at least, saying they were embracing the reproductive justice framework was really important. But the Asian American women, I can't identify specifically. Yeah. It's all pretty fuzzy.

KWON: I can just dig through the archives when I'm at Smith. 8:50

IKEMOTO: Yeah. Yeah. I guess you can remind me who was there. Yeah, I don't remember a lot of specifics about it.

KWON: Were there any other seminal gatherings or any key events that you remember? You said there were some other reproductive justice conferences?

IKEMOTO: In terms of academic conferences?

KWON: Yeah, sure.

IKEMOTO: Let's see. You know, the Color of Justice Conference. That was at Santa Cruz.

KWON: Okay. Do you remember when that was?

IKEMOTO: Let me look it up. I think they have an archive, too. If not, I might have materials from that. (Types on computer)

KWON: Was that a law conference? 9:36

IKEMOTO: No. Let me see—(Typing on computer. Searches "Color of Justice Conference") This was so long ago.

KWON: Was it the nineties?

IKEMOTO: Oh, it was Color of Violence—is it Color of Justice or Color of Violence? Maybe it was this one. (Clicks on link to INCITE website)

KWON: Oh, the INCITE Conference?

IKEMOTO: (Looking at INCITE Conference website) Okay. Maybe this was it. That looks familiar.

KWON: Yeah, that was a pretty big conference. 10:26

IKEMOTO: What was the date? I think this was it. (Pauses while reading website) I think this is the one I'm thinking of. That one was—so it wasn't solely focused on reproductive justice, but there was definitely a reproductive

justice thread there. I just can't remember when it was. But that was another one.

What else? A lot of the stuff that—well, LSRJ, when they switched from Law Students for Reproductive Choice to Law Students for Reproductive Justice, I think that was an important shift, and they've hosted some, I think, important events. One at Berkeley Law. And their trainings are good. Other big events. I think it's just so interesting now because reproductive justice has become so frequently used now that it's lost some of its political meaning.

12:00

KWON: Yeah. That's what happens when it gets into the system.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. I mean even—there was a really interesting—they got an NSF [National Science Foundation] funded workshop, and it was hosted by Jennifer Fishman, Laura Mamo, and . . . I'm losing the third person. Oh! I can't think . . . Janet Shim. Do you know them?

KWON: . . . No.

IKEMOTO: So they're in Sociology, but they hosted this in San Francisco. It was like a workshop, and *that* was focused on reproductive justice. It was much more limited. We could all meet in one room. But we met for two days with pretty intense discussions.

KWON: Was it scholars?

IKEMOTO: That was . . . was it all scholars? I'm trying to think of who was there. All the people I can think of were primarily scholars. Some people doing a mix of both. (pauses) I think it was primarily scholars. But that was a really—oh, what they did was they merge—they had RJ and EJ [environmental justice].

KWON: Mhmm. Oh, that's always good.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and it was really interesting to see the different uses of the word "justice" in different understandings, and the different evolutions and paths that those two framings have followed. So I think that was a useful discussion, at least within the academic world. They had a lot of the key people there.

13:39

KWON: Yeah. This is just a personal question that I was interested in, but why do you think it's so important to have a law students—or why do you think so many law students are interested in reproductive justice, [so much] that there's a national organization around it?

IKEMOTO: Oh, yeah. I think a lot of—well, that's a good question. Let's see. Maybe it shows the ways in which critical theory and feminist critical theory have influenced both undergraduate education and legal education, but probably also the way that community work is done. Students come in with an awareness and are at least open to learning that you can only do so much with law. And so they want a way of thinking about issues that gets them beyond the limitations of legalistic approaches, and RJ can do that.

KWON: Is the organization mostly made up of women, or are there a lot of male allies?

IKEMOTO: LSRJ?

KWON: Yeah.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, I think it's—well, the staffing is primarily women. I think the most of the members in the different law schools are women. It's not limited to women, but their primary goal has been to get courses in the law school's curriculum and to provide sites within the law school for students and faculty to work on the issues, to be trained to address the issues, and then participate in the broader movement in various ways.

KWON: Yeah. Do they go out—after they graduate law school and when they practice law, is RJ something they [continue engaging in]— 15:39

IKEMOTO: Yeah, some of them do. Probably because—so some of them are getting fellowships. (Points to a picture above her desk) Christine right here is one of my former students, and she was head of LSRJ when she was here. She got an LSRJ fellowship. I think she did one of their summer training programs and then got an LSRJ fellowship that placed her at NAPAWF in D.C. So that's what she was doing now. So she's doing RJ stuff, post graduation, and I think she wants to continue doing that. There aren't tons of jobs—

KWON: It's a really narrow field.

IKEMOTO: —in reproductive justice, but I think [students are] much better equipped and much more likely to find those jobs, if they're getting the courses and finding the support system while they're in law school.

KWON: That's really cool. Yeah, I'm trying to figure out what I want to do after college. Yeah, that might be something I would be interested in. 16:37

IKEMOTO: Oh, yeah. It's a great group of people.

KWON: Well, also since you're so familiar with law—I haven't been able to ask as many people, but do you know of any key legislation or policies that I should probably include in the timeline?

IKEMOTO: Well, there's this whole ramping up in abortion regulation right now. I get an email about that every single day.

KWON: (laughs) I know. I have no idea what's going on in this country! We're always on the defensive, right? I don't know what's going on.

IKEMOTO: Oh my gosh. It's crazy. It's crazy. Yeah, so the just the ramping up in abortion regulation, and it is—

KWON: Why do you think that's happened? 17:18

IKEMOTO: I guess—I don't know (laughs). Everybody's talking about the polarization, not just between the official political parties but the cultural political polarization. It's interesting because I think the agenda's not just about fetal politics anymore; it's really about the status of women. It's much more directly aimed at women's decision-making powers. It's trying to narrow down the scope of women's decision-making powers, but it's also very closely linked to a broader agenda. So the same—the attacks on women's rights and women's status is linked to the attacks on same sex marriage—so I don't think that's a coincidence that those two fights are taking place simultaneously. But I don't have you know the perfect answer to what's going on.

And the interesting thing is that at the same time that there's all this effort to contract choice with respect to abortion, assisted reproductive technology [ART] use is almost wholly unregulated. So this notion that free choice is perfectly appropriate in that sphere. So we're using a free-market approach to those kinds of technologies.

KWON: Well, there's definitely a class difference between the two, right?

IKEMOTO: Oh, yeah.

KWON: So the users of technologies, they're not [so-called] "bad mothers who need abortion" or who are making the—"the unfit" to make those choices.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, it's primarily—not exclusively—it's primarily white. It's primarily privileged, you have to have—

KWON: A lot of money. 19:16

IKEMOTO: Credit and cash to use those technologies. There are powerful industries behind them because it's a multibillion-dollar in the U.S., and now it's

global, so—yeah, and it's pro-natalist. One of the things now is to—in California, there's a bill—I think it's close to enactment—to authorize payment for eggs for research purposes. We already have an unregulated market for paying women to provide eggs for fertility purposes, but there's been regulation of payment to provide eggs for research purposes. But now they're trying to authorize payment for eggs for research purposes, so it'll expand the market there. The expansion of a market approach on the one hand—

KWON: It's only going to get bigger then.

IKEMOTO: Maybe. Maybe not. But there's no immediate brakes on it. So . . .

KWON: Wow. Yeah, I'm not very familiar with the legislation or the policies on reproductive technologies.

IKEMOTO: Well, the other thing that's going on is that there's still—I mean, there was just a story in the paper yesterday about the forced sterilizations taking place in—or the—

KWON: The prisons. I clipped it.

IKEMOTO: The involuntary sterilizations taking place in—

KWON: Yeah, I clipped the entire thing. I was like, "This looks like an article that I was reading from the eighties or the seventies." Yeah.

IKEMOTO: Exactly. Exactly. Because there's a group of people working to try to get redress for those who were subject to the forced sterilizations in California as part of eugenic sterilization, but now there's this whole 'nother group of people.

KWON: Oh my gosh. 21:16

IKEMOTO: It hasn't stopped.

KWON: Yeah. I think it's interesting because—I don't know if this is true, but a lot of the discussion is shifting from race to crime or immigration status, and it's hiding the race factor because race is some taboo thing we're not allowed to directly discriminate people on, but it's okay to discriminate people on immigration status or criminal history. People kind of erase the fact that it's connected directly to race.

IKEMOTO: Well, immigration restrictions have long been understood as a way of population control—by race. That's been true since the early 20th century, and that's part of what the debate is about now with respect to

immigration reform. So it's not just specifically about, technology uses, but also things like marriage and immigration are related as well, yeah.

KWON: Because it's all about the nuclear family, like the technology and the immigration and birth control and abortion. It's all about—that's really interesting. 22:18

IKEMOTO: And I think it's important to remember it's also about gender roles. The fight's still on about gender roles. I know it seems like it shouldn't be but it still is.

KWON: Oh my gosh.

IKEMOTO: Yeah.

KWON: Okay, so those are the policies that are [being enacted] right now, but what about some key policies or legislations in the past, in the eighties and nineties? Are you familiar with any [legislations from then] or [have] things that stick out?

IKEMOTO: Oh, from the eighties and nineties?

KWON: Mhmm

IKEMOTO: Well, eighties and nineties the things that surfaced were prosecution of pregnant women for drug use and still, the way pregnant women are treated, especially criminalization, is still—that trend has continued. Now it's criminalization of women for anything causes fetal injury or death. So it's expanded in some senses. Let's see. That was a lot of it. The reproductive technology uses were really booming then.

KWON: When was, when was the Hyde Law? The amendment? 23:31

IKEMOTO: That started in—Hyde Amendment was a reaction to *Roe vs. Wade* so that came up in the late 1970s.

KWON: 1970s.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and it's changed over time. What's changed is its list of exceptions, and then it's also multiplied so there are different Hyde laws. So it applies to members of the military. It applies to other sources of federal funding as well, because the Hyde Amendment itself only applies to Medicaid funding. But now there are sort of Hyde-like laws that apply to other federal funded forms of healthcare.

KWON: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Are you also familiar with PRENDA [Prenatal Discrimination Act]?

IKEMOTO: Oh, yeah.

KWON: Could you talk a little bit about that and sex selection and Asian American women?

IKEMOTO: Yeah. That stuff's getting really nutty. Yeah, so it's all in the name of—I mean, they say it's about protecting women and protecting women of color, specifically.

KWON: Isn't that an interesting rhetoric?

IKEMOTO: Yeah (sighs). Yeah, it's just crazy. So it's all in the name of protecting women, but it's regulation of women in another form, really. They couched it in the form of racial anti-discrimination, which is clever. Yeah, so between that and the [anti-abortion] billboards. You get all these different—there's this women protectionist movement, so we need to restrict abortion in order to protect women against themselves. Reva Siegel's done some of the best work on that, and then yeah, now they're using the anti-race discrimination framework, so it's—I think the focus on the fetus has shifted to these other rationales or narratives about what the regulation's for.

KWON: Has the PRENDA law passed in some states? 25:39

IKEMOTO: The last time—the last one I heard about was in Arizona, and I think it was defeated. Oh! Another person you should talk to: Sujatha [Jesudason].

KWON: Oh, yes.

IKEMOTO: Did you talk to her?

KWON: No, I have her scheduled in two weeks.

IKEMOTO: So she has a really—she's really knowledgeable on this issue.

KWON: Yeah. She used to work with Generations Ahead.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, yeah, yeah. And she's still doing great work.

KWON: Yeah. I think she's at UCSF [University California, San Francisco] for CoreAlign. 19:16

IKEMOTO: Yeah, but Generations Ahead put together a really good analysis of sex selection, anti—the supposed race selection laws. Yeah, she's the person to talk to about that.

KWON: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I mean, your commentary's helpful, too.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, so I think the other important front is—well, Sujatha is also going be good on this—there's only emerging now an ability to talk between the disability rights and reproductive rights people, because they're going to be in conflict on some issues. From a disability rights perspective, there's a lot of concern about choosing abortion because of Down Syndrome or any other disability. So it's really important to acknowledge those conflicts and try to work together to the extent possible. That's only—that's very recent, and it's just starting to happen and may not have gotten very far.

KWON: Oh, wow. What do you see as the possible compromises that they could come up with? 27:32

IKEMOTO: I probably haven't thought enough about this one (pauses). I think at least the conversation can start about acknowledging that there are different understandings of choice on the table. So my concern about pro-choice at any cost is that it's morphed into a free market choice, that it's no longer a sort of a thoughtful, autonomy-based choice anymore, and I think that puts communities like persons with disabilities at greater risk. So I think we have to start by acknowledging that. But I don't know, yeah. I don't know.

KWON: So it's like a potential future conflict—

IKEMOTO: Yeah, I think it's where—how do we start the conversation is hard enough.

KWON: Do you know if there were any convenings of RJ and disability rights activists?

IKEMOTO: Yeah, well, Sujatha's done some of that work. So Generations Ahead did some of that work, and then Center for Genetics and Society held a series of three meetings. I missed it this year because this is the first year without it. The Tarrytown Meetings, and they're—the last two meetings, there were conversations about [RJ and disability rights] that I think were very good and searching—and honest. Difficult, but open and willing in spirit.

KWON: So that's one potential future conflict that you foresee for RJ? 29:30

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and maybe I don't even want to frame it as a conflict, but I think it's an important area of work that RJ needs to taken on.

KWON: What else do you think that—what other issues do you think will come up for the RJ movement?

IKEMOTO: Umm. The next few years . . . Well, the technology issues are moving really fast.

KWON: What's the current status of ART?

IKEMOTO: Let's see. So a lot—some of it's taking place in genetic testing, because it's moving to really early stages of the pregnancy, and so.

KWON: Like how early?

IKEMOTO: First trimester. Early in the first trimester. Yeah, you can now do genetic testing. And presumably you'll get more and more information.

KWON: How exactly does that work?

IKEMOTO: Well, because now they can do rather an amniocentesis, which you usually do at eighteen to twenty weeks, so during the second trimester. There's nothing wrong with doing it earlier, but you're getting more information, and there's no thoughtful analysis as far as I know about how to use that information and the amount of information you'll be able to get will increase over time. So people are facing choices that they don't—they may not be prepared for and don't know how to think about; I don't think I would. They're just presented as choices for people to have. So that's an issue.

KWON: So when you say genetic testing, it means like, "Your son or daughter is a carrier of X, Y, Z disease, and they have a percentage of developing kidney failure."

IKEMOTO: Developing breast cancer when they're fifty or—and so it's the kinds of—they're risks as opposed to conditions that the child will be born with. So we're expanding the ways of tailoring people.

KWON: So when they offer genetic testing, they say, Okay, here's the risk for your child. Then what are the options? Do you want to abort your child? Is that the option they're providing? 31:54

IKEMOTO: Yeah. Yeah, if it's prenatal. We also you know you can screen gametes to some extent. You can screen embryos, in vitro embryos, but most of the testing takes place during pregnancy. On the one hand, you're providing more and more opportunities to get information about the genetic content of an embryo or a fetus, and on the other hand, we have this massive

attempt to regulate pregnancy, so you can't do anything with the information. Part of it's what's going on in genetics. Part of it's what's going on in the ART market. I don't—there's probably not enough attention being paid to contraceptives. There's a lot of research being done in contraceptives in the world of contraceptives, so new forms of contraception will come onto the market.

KWON: Can you give us a sneak-peek of what's coming?

IKEMOTO: (laughs) No, I'm not a science person in that sense, but it's only come on the table because of the fight about the Affordable Care Act and whether or not that should be an essential health benefit, part of the health package that employers regularly cover. But it looks like now that's going to be a fight. It *has* been a fight for the past couple of years. Contraceptives seems like old hat, but it's coming back. So that's back on the table.

KWON: And before you were talking a little bit about globalization of the market for reproductive technologies.

IKEMOTO: Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Because the reproductive technologies and the genetic—I assume the genetic testing stuff is, well, to some extent it is—you can go to different jurisdiction to obtain access to any of these technology uses. The U.S., and California in particular, is both a major destination spot—so a lot of people come here to use these technologies, in large part because they're freely—they're as available as the market makes them here. We have few regulations that restrict access to them. And then a lot of people from the U.S., because those technologies are expensive here, they go to other countries, and so people are traveling from and to countries all over the world.

KWON: What are some of those destinations for U.S. people, who are seeking out cheaper alternatives? 34:27

IKEMOTO: It shifts. It depends on—because the market's shifting. So Mexico's a destination. I think Argentina's positioning itself to become one, because I think they just passed a surrogacy law. South America's opening up. Latin America's opening up. In Europe, Spain and Eastern Europe are really big. There's a lot in Asia. Japan's very restrictive, so people from Japan going out. Part of it depends on who restricts it, where the technology is feasible, what the cost factors are.

KWON: Because it seems like it needs to balance, because you need a certain level of development that you have the technology to do it—

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and you have to have the experts.

KWON: But you can't be so developed that it's expensive.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. Exactly. So it's just—people are moving all over the place. South Africa's a destination. And people go to different countries for specific things. India's received a lot of attention for its surrogacy market.

KWON: Right. I've seen those pictures of Indian women just sitting in a row. It's very weird and *Brave New World*.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, exactly. But a lot of people in the—come to the U.S. for surrogacy as well.

KWON: Oh, okay.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. I think people go to—if you're White, you go to Eastern Europe, Spain. People from all over come to the U.S., because we have diversity here. So if you're looking for a "particular color" baby, then you shop on that basis. But you can take your embryos with you and undergo in vitro fertilization or surrogacy somewhere else. Yeah.

KWON: So instead of traditional [surrogacy], it'd be gestational surrogacy. 36:26

IKEMOTO: Yeah, yeah, yeah. So it's really crazy.

KWON: Yeah. Are there any racial or—I mean, I'm sure there's class conflicts—but isn't it weird to have a white couple come in to an Indian woman and have her have a white child? Isn't that kind of—

IKEMOTO: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. But it's also the privilege of the people from England, say, going to India, where the amount that the woman can make being surrogate is greater than the amount of money she can make doing anything else, if she lacks a lot of formal education and if she wants to support her kids and her family, then that's the best economic opportunity. So they're in a sense taking advantage of the limited opportunities for women in that country to get cheaper surrogacy.

KWON: Yeah, but—because I've heard the opposite argument that people justify their actions saying, "Oh, it's her choice to do it, and she's earning money."

IKEMOTO: "I'm helping them out"

KWON: Exactly. It's an independent woman making her own money, and she can put it in her own bank account—

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and I think, I think that's true as a matter of fact.

KWON: It is.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. And there's some I've heard—some people say—well, they come to the U.S., because we're better at the technology, but the price tag attached to it signifies that it's also better in quality. So some people are actually willing to pay more, because they think it connotes a better outcome or something.

KWON: How many of the people in our world are using these technologies? 38:09

IKEMOTO: I don't know. I don't know. I know the U.S. measures for the industry, which look at the revenues generated. It's a multi-billion dollar [industry] within the U.S., but the numbers, I don't know. The numbers globally, I don't know. There's a European organization, which tracks some technology use. There's some studies in Canada, which have tracked it, and there is—you can get some data in the U.S. through the CDC, Centers for Disease Control. But then you still have to make some inferences and jumps about it. But it's still increasing.

KWON: Oh, wow. Because I haven't met a test tube baby friend yet [in] my generation.

IKEMOTO: Oh, really?

KWON: Yeah. At least I haven't, or they've never disclosed it to me.

IKEMOTO: Maybe that's the difference.

KWON: But I know we're talking about it all the time. These issues come up, and "Oh, this neighbor had a child via in vitro fertilization," and they would talk about it, but I just haven't met a kid my age yet who's done that. So maybe it's a little younger—maybe it's a different generation.

IKEMOTO: Maybe. It also might be—it's a lot of people now don't tell their kids. So it might be that the—and my guess is that it was more true 20 years ago than it is now. So it might be that you are sitting next to a test tube baby, but you don't know. But the use of it's increased over the years, so it's much more likely now that—of the kids being born now, that some form of technology was used than it was 20 years ago. But 20 years ago, that was late nineties, so . . . right? Early to mid-nineties.

KWON: Yeah, because I was born in '91 so—

IKEMOTO: Oh my god.

KWON: Early nineties.

IKEMOTO: At least you were born in the 20th century. So it was definitely being used then. Surrogacy, the servicing—gestational surrogacy, there was a clear market for that. In vitro fertilization, definitely. There was an egg market then, although it's much much bigger now. There was definitely a sperm market. Yeah.

KWON: I want to talk a bit about the egg and sperm market, too. Because even in the *Brown Daily Herald*, which is our newspaper, there's articles that says "SAT 2100"— 40:49

IKEMOTO: How much are they offering?

KWON: They were offering eight thousand to ten thousand [dollars] for Ivy League students, fit, Asian, woman. And I was looking at it, and I'm like, "I could make ten thousand dollars."

IKEMOTO: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. There's a premium on Asian eggs, because there's relatively few donors and people are coming from overseas.

KWON: Oh. So it's Asian couples looking for Asian eggs.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, primarily. As far as I know, as far as I know. That's it, and people from other countries as well as in the U.S. So there's high demand, and the prices go up with demand for eggs.

KWON: And that's a little weird.

IKEMOTO: It is weird. It is weird because it's trait pricing. The industry rhetoric is that no, we're paying for time and energy contributed to this, but the pricing is based on traits of the donors.

KWON: Because they give like a list of requirements. They're like clean medical history and this and that. It's just a little weird, because they're looking for Asian women—Asian eggs. 41:58

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and there's separate eggs for like Jewish eggs, everything you could think of as well. If you wanted to do something fun on the way back on the train, get on—or google California Cryobank, because that's one of the biggest sperm banks in the world.

KWON: Crail bank?

IKEMOTO: Cryobank. California Cryobank.

KWON: How do you spell the second word?

IKEMOTO: C-R-Y-O-B-A-N-K.

KWON: Okay.

IKEMOTO: So it's a sperm bank. Their marketing will astonish you.

KWON: Is it profiles of people with pictures? 42:42

IKEMOTO: Yeah, yeah. You can also do celebrity look-alike donors.

KWON: Why is that necessary?!

IKEMOTO: (laughs) I . . . I don't know.

KWON: It's so weird.

IKEMOTO: It is. That's how crazy it is.

KWON: Is there a gender difference between sperm donors and egg donors?

IKEMOTO: Yeah, so Rene Almeling has done a great work on this. She's a sociologist at Yale. She's interviewed both the banks and also people who've done it—and there's also—there's Jennifer Haylett is a grad student here [in the Department of Sociology at UC Davis], and she's done really interesting work. Jennifer's done work showing that as you go there's an elaborate screening process for most sperm and egg banks, and the screening process serves to get them information to decide who's going to be appropriate, but it also is a socialization process for those who are providing them. So in a sense they're helping you figure out how to think about what you're doing if you're becoming an egg donor or a sperm donor. So sperm donors—this is Rene Almeling's work—characterize their work as—or characterize sperm donation as "work," as like a job. That's what guys do, they go to work (laughs). But egg donors are much more likely to frame it in altruistic terms. They're helping somebody. It's a "gift." It's a gift of life or a gift of family. Even though they're receiving a lot more money than sperm donors and theoretically, they're going through a lot more risk and time and work than [men] are. But it's gendered.

KWON: Wow.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, the way it's presented to the public and the way it's presented to those who are participating in it is very gendered.

KWON: I actually did—my paper was on that. It was about framing surrogacy as a choice, so not egg donation, surrogacy for traditional surrogates and then gestational surrogate. And how it used to be that privileged white women would do it for their sisters or their neighbors, and they would do it for free but then receive monetary compensation after the fact, as a thank you. And then now it's still framed as a choice, these women still do it as a choice, and then ignoring the class and the racial impacts that the gestational surrogates go through. Yeah, so it's interesting and freaky.

IKEMOTO: And I heard the—there's been a lot of news coverage about the surrogacy agencies are targeting military wives.

KWON: Oh, I've heard that too.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. And I haven't seen anything about the numbers, but it makes sense because if you're going be in a place for a year, what kind of career could you build? You could register for school, but then you're going to have to transfer so—and if you've got kids, then you can stay at home.

45:35

KWON: Right, and then just the money itself.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, and you're contributing to the family's income, so they're health—they tend to be healthy, young.

KWON: Do you think that market's going to only further expand?

IKEMOTO: As far as I know, there doesn't seem to be any great push to stop surrogacy. And I think it's being—so many celebrities are so open about it, in a sense, they've helped make it acceptable.

KWON: Oh. You mean that they're *using* surrogates?

IKEMOTO: Yeah. Yeah.

KWON: Do you think it will ever get to the point where the fear that a lot of people have is that you know rich people will use other women to just have babies so that it doesn't affect their figure or they don't have to go through the pain—

IKEMOTO: I don't know. I know people were talking about that in the 1980s, you know, what this was going to do was—you could—it's a subcontracting model, right?

KWON: Yeah.

IKEMOTO: You could contract that out. I don't know. Because there's also a glamorization of pregnancy, too. Kind of a valorization of women who've gone through birth, and then you know in the celebrity world, not only gone through birth but gotten their figures back too.

KWON: (laughs) Beyoncé. 46:51

IKEMOTO: Yeah, exactly. So I don't know. I think together what they form is this idea that this push for women as mothers, and maybe there's different kinds of mothers now, but that's still being held up as the most important role [for women to fulfill].

KWON: And then jumping back to the Asian American women, what's the utilization of ART for the Asian American community?

IKEMOTO: Oh. Well, as egg donors, and I assume for sperm donors too, although I haven't checked that. You can check—when you go through the sperm banks, you can narrow down your search by race and ethnicity. Asian's definitely on there. So I assume they're recruiting for Asian sperm donors, but egg donors even more so, because you see those targeted ads, and then—yeah I'm not—I assume that, and I'm assuming this, I haven't seen any data, because you can't really get the data, that if you think about who can afford this, then at least a certain segment of the Asian American population has enough wealth to use these technologies and fit the profile of those who might want to. And I certainly know on an anecdotal basis people who have, but I don't know of any—

KWON: numbers?

IKEMOTO: Yeah, I don't have numbers or trends.

KWON: That's interesting. Why do they not collect any data on it? Is it just a privacy issue or the companies keep their data?

IKEMOTO: Yeah. The CDC requires that fertility clinics report what they call success rates, and by that they mean, lives births. So they have to report the number of IVF cycles, whether or not surrogacy was used, source of the eggs. But they don't have to report any demographic information. Yeah.

KWON: Oh, okay. So race and everything's left out. 49:10

IKEMOTO: Right, right.

KWON: Because that would be an interesting—

IKEMOTO: Yeah, sure would.

KWON: thing to look at.

IKEMOTO: The only other way to go about it would be to look to see who the agencies are marketing to. And they have become—they started to become more multiracial, and there are niches. Yeah, there are niches.

KWON: Because I know in Dorothy Robert's book [*Killing the Black Body*], she goes through the fertility clinics—and she wrote it in '99 so it was awhile ago—but she says that all the fertility clinics' images and front pages of their homepages are white babies with blue eyes.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, yeah, and I think to a large extent that's still true, but I—my guess—well, the ones I've seen there are some, and I think they're sort of niche clinics. So there are some that are aiming at the so-called "Gaybies," so they're set up for gay and lesbian couples, and some are set up for multiracial families or more diverse communities than that. But the mainstream is still—it's white babies on the front web page.

KWON: Yeah, it was a little creepy. I was looking through different websites, and I'm from the Midwest, so I was looking through local Minnesota fertility clinics.

IKEMOTO: Oh, yeah.

KWON: (simultaneously) All white—

IKEMOTO: (simultaneously) All white.

KWON: families with all white babies. Yeah.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, so I think if you go to LA, New York— 50:34

KWON: Bigger cities.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. San Francisco, then you're going to find those niche markets. And globally, you'll find them as well.

KWON: What about—what did you call them? Gay—

IKEMOTO: Gaybies. That was what term that was being used for a while for clinics that were going for that market.

KWON: Yeah. They mix those names—"gay" with like everything: Gaysian, Gaybies. But with the recently supreme court ruling, do you think that market's also going expand for gay and lesbian couples?

IKEMOTO: Yeah, I mean gay and lesbian couples have been having couples without marriage, but I think the marriage will help validate that use, and it might make—it might help pry open the doors of some of the clinics. Because some clinics have been saying, No.

KWON: Don't some countries also have restrictions?

IKEMOTO: Yeah, yeah, and that might change. So in a sense, it might validate gay family formation. So maybe it'll expand it, but I think it'll also, like I said, hopefully help reduce some of the exclusion from some of the clinics. We'll see.

KWON: I mean, personally from within my family, my family would not be okay with me being a surrogate mother or donating eggs. Is there an Asian cultural thing, too? I know I've seen some articles on stuff like that, but I don't know.

51:56

IKEMOTO: Yeah. I don't know. For one thing, it depends on—it probably depends on which Asian culture you're talking about. So it's really hard, because we're so—

KWON: diverse.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, diverse just within the category of Asian. I think it's really hard to say. I think probably to the extent that now such a huge percentage of Asian Americans are first or second generation, and just in that sense, may be less willing to accept the idea of being a surrogate being an egg donor, that might be true. Otherwise, I don't know, because even the religious diversity within the communities is—

KWON: It's pretty one end to the other.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, yeah, yeah. It's all over the place. So I don't know. A reporter asked me that—was it last year or the year before, because *LA Times* did a story—ooh, it's 4:07PM—on the Asian egg market.

KWON: Maybe I'll look that article up.

IKEMOTO: Yeah, they just did this human-interest piece, because they had noticed the ads or something like that, too.

53:34

KWON: Yeah, they're a little creepy.

IKEMOTO: I bet. We want your eggs. So what feels creepy about it?

KWON: I guess the fact that it's an Asian woman.

IKEMOTO: That it's so specific?

KWON: Yeah, that it's in a school newspaper was a little weird too. So it's next to student articles and local pizza places, and then it says, "Seeking Asian Female Eggs." And I'm like, "What is this?! This is so disturbing." Yeah, the fact that it was targeted towards Asian women because—

IKEMOTO: And that's noticeable.

KWON: Yeah, yeah, yeah. And on top of—and then I'm super race hypersensitive, and so I'm like, "Is this analogous to classified ads looking for Asian women as you know submissive partners? What is this for? I don't understand."

IKEMOTO: Because what they want is your race, right? They want a racial identity.

KWON: It's always at the top. It's Asian Female, and then they list the SAT scores they want and all the other things like that. It's like, Oh wow. I could do this but seems just a little weird. Yeah. Just a little weird.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. I bet. I bet. Yeah, I ask my students. I go, "Where do you see the most ads?" and they say Craigslist. So I guess they're all over Craigslist.

KWON: For eggs?

IKEMOTO: Yeah. Yeah.

KWON: That's interesting. My friends always show me the article, and they're like, "Hey Juhee, make ten thousand dollars," and they joke about it.

IKEMOTO: Still creepy?

KWON: Yeah, it's still a little creepy. Do you think that's like the future? Where do you think everything's headed? 55:05

IKEMOTO: I don't—oh, that's a good question. Where I think everything is headed. Well, I don't even want to—so to me it would be pessimistic to think that we're going in that direction, where everything is totally free market, anything goes. Because my version of the market is that all these social categories will govern the market. That it's—market's not a neutral place, and in a sense it will exacerbate all the racial and gender selections that we already have. So I don't want to be that pessimistic and think that that's where it's going. (pauses) I don't know.

I guess the most promising parts of it to me have been in family formation by gay and lesbian couples. The use of ARTs there, because in that sense, the use of ARTs has had a liberatory effect. I think it's important to think about how do you use these technologies in a way that enhances relationships and communities at the same time? I guess that's sort of the counter to the market for me.

56:48

KWON: The bright side.

IKEMOTO: But I don't know which one's going win. It'll probably just evolve into something completely different. Some new technology will come up.

KWON: Yeah. You can check back like ten years from now.

IKEMOTO: Yeah. It'll turn out like completely wrong.

KWON: Yeah, well, that's all the questions I have, so—

IKEMOTO: Okay. Good.

KWON: Yeah, if we could just—I actually brought a camera, so if we could take a photo and then—

IKEMOTO: Oh, god. I should've worn something else.

KWON: Oh, it's okay. Let me just—

END INTERVIEW

APIRH History – ~~Larger Political History~~ Reproductive Rights

Types of events: those within . . .

Women's movement
Racial discourse
Welfare
Immigration
Labor
"Family"

Ideological threads

Autonomy – bodily integrity, decisional autonomy
Equality
Social Justice
Motherhood
Marriage-based patriarchal family
Controlling female sexuality
Social Eugenics
Fetal Personhood
National identity
Family values
Free trade

Types of organizations within reproductive rights, women's movement:

Single issue/abortion rights: NARAL (1969), Reproductive Health Techn. Project (1987); National Network of Abortion Funds (1992); ACCESS

Women's rights: NOW
- Reproductive health: R2N2 (1978-84); NBWHP (1983); NLHO
- Women's health movement: Nat'l Women's Health Network (1975)
- Family planning: Planned Parenthood

Eugenic/Population control: Zero Population Growth

Conservative moral majoritarian: Christian Coalition
- Problem pregnancy industry: Birthright (1968)
- Conservative feminism
- Direct Action: Operation Rescue (1988)

Types of strategies used by these organizations

Law, policy, state & federal level advocacy

Public education

Networks

Services

Organizing
- direct intervention
- campaign
- social change

Timeline - Reproductive Rights

1960s pro-choice movement begins as a loose coalition of women's rights, single-issue abortion, and population activists and orgs.

Women rights movement becomes invigorated

Women's health movement forms and creates basis for reproductive rights framework

1966: NOW formed

1969: NARAL founded; Jane founded

1973 Roe v. Wade (right of privacy; legalized abortion)

>> balance of power shifts to anti-choice; pro-choice movement forced into reactive stance; groundwork laid for single-issue framing.

- Pro-choice movement relies heavily on the Supreme Court to strike down anti-abortion legislation, until 1977

- NOW shifts away from abortion, to focus on passage of ERA

1975: National Women's Health Network founded (reproductive rights framework)

1976 Hyde Amendment enacted (banned Medicaid funding of abortions, except where life of the mother would be endangered)

- SC upholds this law in 1980 – Harris v. McRae

1977: Maher v. Roe, Beal v. Doe (states need not fund non-therapeutic abortions); Poelker v. Doe (public hospitals can refuse to provide elective abortions).

Late 1970s:

Growth of a "reproductive rights" component of the pro-choice movement that favored direct-action tactics and attempted to promote a broad definition of reproductive "choice."

- CARASA (Ctte for Abortion Rts and Against Steril. Abuse) forms in reaction to Hyde Amendment and 1977 SC decisions)

- R2N2 begins as a project of a Chicago-based socialist organization – this org understood right wing attacks on abortion rights "as part of a general onslaught by conservatives and right-wing forces on social gains made in the last decade by women, minorities and the labor movement;" used direct action strategies

But the major movement became increasingly narrow in response to the single-issue countermovement. Major movement orgs became increasingly formalized, employing tactics that were largely institutionalized. But also mobilized an impressive number of grass-roots activists around the single-issue framework.

Social movement sector/civil rights protest movement has largely waned. Abortion rights orgs needed to develop stronger organizational structures for compensate for the demise of other social movements, notably the women's liberation and population movements, which had previously provided grass-roots suppport for the abortion movement.

After 1977, major movement orgs add focus on political arena (electoral politics and legislature)

1979: Moral Majority founded

- allowed expansion of anti-choice power

1980: Reagan elected as U.S. President

1979-1982: Human Life Bills proposed in Congress

- narrow single-issue approach becomes even more pronounced

- although some women's movement orgs did try to maintain a mult-issue stance; in 1978, NOW called for an enlarged focus on reproductive rights, included rights to contraception and childcare.

1983: National Black Women's Health Project founded

City of Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health (struck down most state and local restrictions on abortions).

1987: Reproductive Health Technologies Project founded

Randall Terry leads first "rescue"

1988: Operation Rescue formally established

>> escalation of anti-abortion violence aimed at clinics

mid/late 1980's
Repro health/freedom begins to make a comeback.
- Fordun, cases -> steril.
- right created the maternal-fetal conflict -> implicating
- multi-culturalism
- race + gender analyses

Bowen v. Kendrick (upholds Adolescent Family Life Act, which denies funding to programs that "advocate, promote,, or encourage abortions).

1989: Webster v. Reproductive Health Services (upholds Mo. Law which includes preamble stating that life begins at conception and imposes other restrictions on abortion; 1 vote away from overturing Roe v. Wade).

1989-1992: over 700 anti-abortion bills introduced in state legislatures

1990: Hodgson v. Minnesota (upholds state law which imposes parental notification + waiting period of 48 hours after notification on minors; judicial bypass)

1991: Rust v. Sullivan (5-4 decision to uphold federal gag rule prohibiting physicians and other employees of abortion-providing facilities from counseling pregnant women about abortion or engaging in activities that encourage, promote, or advocate abortion as a method of family planning)

1992: President Clinton lifts gag rule

National Network of Abortion Funds founded

Planned Parenthood v. Casey (5-4 vote to "retain and reaffirm" women's right to abortion but also upholds Pennsylvania restrictions)

1993: NBWHP leads fight against Hyde Amendment

Hyde Amendment amended to include coverage for abortions in cases of rape and incest

1994: Republican majority attained in Congress; Contract on America

Medical Students for Choice founded

1996: Congress passes partial birth abortion bill; Clinton vetoes