

## Anthropology and Sociology (ANSO)

Academic year 2019 - 2020

## Anthropological Perspectives on Reproductive Politics in the 21st Century

**ANSO099- Autumn- 6 ECTS**  
[Schedule & Room](#)

### Course Description

The course examines why human reproduction becomes a subject of intense gender discrimination and local, state control. The course is grounded in contemporary anthropological and sociological debates. It critically examines dimensions as wide ranging as conception, childbirth, infertility, abortion and population control to demographic security. The course interrogates how the 20th century gender bias in global population and reproductive politics continues to reverberate in the 21st century. Previous Medical Anthropology courses are recommended but not prerequisites, as we expect students from a diversity of backgrounds to foster interdisciplinary learning.

### > PROFESSOR

Aditya Bharadwaj  
[aditya.bharadwaj@graduateinstitute.ch](mailto:aditya.bharadwaj@graduateinstitute.ch)

[Office hours](#)

---

### > ASSISTANT

Dalia Zein  
[dalia.zein@graduateinstitute.ch](mailto:dalia.zein@graduateinstitute.ch)

[Office hours](#)

---

## Syllabus

### Grading

Assessment for the course is based:

15% Attendance and class participation

20% Class presentation

65% Final written assignment of 4000-4500 words, this word count includes footnotes/endnotes but excludes bibliography.

Guidance on writing the assignment is provided.

The assignment must be submitted by **Friday 20 December 2019**.

## Guidelines for the writing assignment

Students are encouraged to write on a topic of their choosing. This should be discussed in advance with the course convener. You are encouraged to make a brief class presentation on the chosen topic.

**Please note** that references underneath are recommended readings. However, this is not an exhaustive list and further materials will be suggested in class. You are also encouraged to undertake topic specific searches in the library catalogue and e- journals such as: *Reproductive Health Matters*, *Medical Anthropology*, *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, and *Social Science and Medicine*.

### The written assignment should include all of the following elements:

1. Formulation of a topic or problem. □
2. Explanation of how the topic is linked to a broader problem, relevant to the problem/topic. □
3. Breakdown of the problem/ topic in sub-problems/ parts. □
4. Analytical review of the appropriate literature showing how others have approached □ this problem. Review literature along the lines/ dimensions you have identified in #3. □
5. Comment/ state position on each subpart of your analytical review. □
6. Conclusion: summarize findings and state their importance/ consequences. How □ does your analysis contribute to understanding the issue at stake? Which future research directions do they point at? Try and formulate and state your own theoretical argument/ position in the conclusion. □

Your written assignment will be marked according to the following criteria:

1. **Relevance:** The relevance of the question chosen and the extent to which the assignment addresses the question set □
2. **Material Used:** The substance of the assignment, that is, the selection and use of relevant material gained from a variety of sources. Evidence of reading as well as empirical facts and illustrations. □
3. **Argument:** The extent to which the assignment sets out a clearly structured discussion and analysis of the issues raised. Evidence of clear and independent thinking (i.e., signs that you can weigh up evidence, think through and assess arguments for yourself). □
4. **Scholarship:** Basic literacy, fluency and quality of presentation as well as scholarly attribution of references and use of notes.

\*\*\*

#### 1. Monday, 23 September 2019:

➤ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 |

Course Introduction and Overview

#### 2. Monday, 30 September 2019:

➤ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 |

**Stratified Reproduction: The Global Politics of Reproduction**

Power relations across societies have empowering and disempowering effects on different segments of populations and categories of citizens. Social stratification along the lines of gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation and nationality creates differing opportunities for reproductive decision-making. The lecture will show how stratified reproduction involves adjudication of how, who, when and under what conditions people are allowed to reproduce. □

### Readings □

1. Gill, Jungyun. 2016. *Unequal Motherhoods and the Adoption of Asian Children: Birth, Foster, and Adoptive Mothers*. Lexington Books
  2. Ginsburg, F.D. and Rapp, R. (1995) Introduction: Conceiving the New World Order. In Ginsburg, F.D. and Rapp, R (ed) *Conceiving the New World Order*. Berkeley: University of California Press. □
  3. Colen, S. (1995) "Like Mother to Them": Stratified Reproduction and West Indian Childcare Workers and Employers in New York. In Ginsburg, F.D. and Rapp, R (ed) *Conceiving the New World Order*. Berkeley: University of California Press. □
  4. Hardon, A. (2006) Contesting Contraceptive Innovation: Reinventing the Script. *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 62 , 614–627 □
  5. Martens, China; Gumbs, Alexis Pauline; Williams Mai'A. 2016. *Revolutionary Mothering: Love on the Front Lines*. PM Press.
  6. McCormack, K. 2005. Stratified Reproduction and Poor Women's Resistance, 5, pp - 660-679.
  7. Richie, B.E. 1999. The Social Construction of the "Immoral" Black Mother: Social Policy, Community Policing, and Effects on Youth Violence. In Clarke, A and Olesen, V.L. *Revisioning Women, Health, and Healing: Feminist, Cultural, and Technoscience Perspectives*. New York: Routledge. □
3. **Monday, 07 October 2019:**  
➤ □ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 |

### Contested Reproduction: Birth in Medical Settings

Birth, long considered and debated as 'natural,' has become one of the most socially contested sites. Medical interventions in 'managing childbirth' has prompted critical (re)assessment of the growing medicalisation of the birthing process and the consequent disempowerment of women as 'birthing subjects'. This lecture examines how childbirth has oscillated between the medical and domestic settings in the Euro-American countries in direct response to women's movement and greater demands for autonomy and control by women in shaping their birthing experience.

### References

1. Craven, C. 2010. *Pushing for Midwives: Homebirth Mothers and the Reproductive Rights Movement*. Temple Press.
2. Craven, C. 2005. 'Claiming Respectable American Motherhood: Homebirth Mothers, Medical Officials, and the State', *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 19(2): 194- 215
3. Davis-Floyd, R. E., (1994) The Technocratic Body: American Childbirth as Cultural Expression, *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 38, No. 8, 1125-1140. □
4. Davis-Floyd, R. E., (1990) The Role of Obstetrical Rituals in the Resolution of Cultural □ Anomaly, *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 175 -189. □
5. Davis-Floyd, R.E. 2017. *Ways of Knowing about Birth: Mothers, Midwives, Medicine, and Birth Activism*. Waveland Press.
6. Martin, E., (1987) *The Woman in the Body: A Cultural Analysis of Reproduction*, Boston: □ Beacon Press. Introduction and Chapter 4 □ □

7. Robbie E. Davis-Floyd and Carolyn F. Sargent eds., (1997) *Childbirth and authoritative knowledge: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Berkeley: University of California Press. □
8. Donnison, J. (1977) *Midwives and Medical Men: History of Inter-Professional Rivalries and Women's Rights*. London: Heineman. □
9. Viisainen K. (2001) Negotiating control and meaning: home birth as a self constructed choice in Finland. *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 52, 1109–21. □
10. Fox, B and Worts, D. 1999. Revisiting the Critique of Medicalised Childbirth: A Contribution to the Sociology of Birth, *Gender & Society* Vol. 13, 326 □

**4. Monday, 14 October 2019:**

➤ □ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 | F

**Birthing Mothers: Home, Hearth and Health**

The experience of childbirth in the developing south significantly departs from the Euro American experience of home and institutionalized births. A severe lack or absence of medical management of birth is a leading cause of high and preventable maternal and infant mortality around the globe. While international policy initiatives and local state sponsored development thinking have 'birthed' safe motherhood programmes, vast majority of birthing mothers remain inextricably tied to home and hearth or entangled in the local and global medicalizing impulses. The lecture interrogates the urgent need to humanize and render accessible safe childbirth practices in the developing world. In so doing the lecture shows how culture, power, class and gender routinely shape the reproductive lives of women in resource poor settings.

**References**

1. Cosminsky, Sheila. 2016. *Midwives and Mothers: The Medicalization of Childbirth on a Guatemalan Plantation*. University of Texas Press.
2. Galvez, A. 2011. *Patient Citizens, Immigrant Mothers: Mexican Women, Public Prenatal Care, and the Birth Weight Paradox*. Rutgers University Press.
3. Ghoshal, Rakhi. 2014. Death of a Dai. *EPW*, Vol. 49, Issue no. 42, Death of a Dai
4. Hannig, A. 2014. Spiritual Border Crossings: Childbirth, Postpartum Seclusion, and Religious Alterity in Amhara, Ethiopia. *Africa* 84. (2): 294-313
5. Hollen, Cecilia Van. 2003. *Birth on the Threshold: Childbirth and Modernity in South India*. University of California Press.
6. Jeffery, Roger, and Patricia Jeffery. 1988. *Labour Pains and Labour Power: Women and Childbearing in India*. London: Zed Books.
7. Nayak, Akhaya Kumar and Nath, Shivani. 2018. There is an Urgent Need to Humanise Childbirth in India. *EPW*. Vol. 53, Issue No. 2, 13 Jan.
8. Pinto, Sarah. 2011. *Where There Is No Midwife: Birth and Loss in Rural India*. Berghahn Books.
9. Ram, Kalpana and Jolly, Margaret. 1998. *Maternities and Modernities: Colonial and Postcolonial Experiences in Asia and the Pacific*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Ram, Kalpana. 2013. *Fertile Disorder: Spirit Possession and Its Provocation of the Modern*. University of Hawaii Press.

**5. Monday, 21 October 2019:**

➤ □ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 |

**Reproduction Gone Awry: Infertility, Childlessness and Other Social Disruptions around the Globe**

Infertility or involuntary childlessness is a deeply painful and stigmatising experience in the lives of countless women and men around the globe. This lecture explores why this is so. The

lecture asks why infertility is a “private secret stigma” in some societies and cause for “public ostracism” in some others? We will also understand what happens when reproduction goes awry and how reproductive disruption gets framed as responsible for a multitude of socio-cultural disruptions.

## References

1. Bharadwaj, Aditya. 2016. *Conceptions: Infertility and Procreative Technologies in India*. Berghahn Books
2. Greil, A L. (1991a) A secret stigma: The analogy between infertility and chronic illness and disability. *Advances in Medical Sociology* Vol. 2, 17-38. □
3. Greil, A L (1991b) *Not Yet Pregnant: Infertile Couples in Contemporary America*. New Brunswick, NY: Rutgers University Press. Introduction □
4. Inhorn, Marcia C., and Frank van Balen eds. (2001) *Infertility Around the Globe: New Thinking on Childlessness, Gender, and Reproductive Technologies*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Introduction, Chapter 15, 16 □
5. Feldman, S, P. (1994). Plundered Kitchens and Empty Wombs: Fear of Infertility in the Cameroonian Grassfields, *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 39, No. 4, 463-474. □
6. Bharadwaj, A (2003) Why Adoption is not an Option in India: The Visibility of Infertility, the Secrecy of Donor Insemination, and other Cultural Complexities, *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 56, 1867-1880. □
7. Riessman, C. K (2000) Stigma and everyday resistance practices: Childless women in south India. *Gender and Society* Vol. 14, No. 1, 111-135. □
8. Franklin, S. (1997). *Embodied Progress: A Cultural Account of Assisted Conception*. London: Routledge. Chapter 2 □
9. Sandelowski, M. (1990). Failures of Volition: Female Agency and Infertility in Historical Perspective, *Signs*, Vol. 15, 29-40. □
10. Whiteford, L. M and Gonzalez, L. (1995). Stigma: The Hidden Burden of Infertility, *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 40, No. 1, 27-36. □

## 6. Monday, 28 October 2019:

➤ □ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 |

### Assisted Reproduction: Science, Technology and Cross-Cultural Conceptions

Ever since the birth of Louise Brown, world’s first test-tube baby in 1978, in-vitro-fertilisation (IVF), or assisted reproductive technologies have become a global phenomenon. In this lecture we will explore how ‘induction of conception’ is achieved through application of science and technology in various global locales. We will also learn how the medicalisation of infertility has led to renewed social, ethical and political problems in defining and understanding questions about life, kinship, marriage, sexuality and governance of ‘artificially induced life’. We will explore the global contours of the burgeoning rise in the demand for assisted reproduction, it’s commercialization, global transactions in reproductive materials - like human eggs, sperm and embryos - and medical tourism involving a global search for cheaper IVF and surrogate wombs to gestate human embryos.

## References

1. Becker, G. (2000) *The Elusive Embryo: How Men and Women Approach New Reproductive Technologies*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapter 1 □
2. Culley, Lorraine; Hudson, Nicky; Rooij, Floor van. 2013. *Marginalized Reproduction: Ethnicity, Infertility and Reproductive Technologies*. Routledge
3. Martin E. (1991). The Egg and the Sperm, *Signs*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 485-501. □

4. Thompson, C. M. (2000). Fertile ground: Feminists theorize infertility. In *Infertility Around the Globe: New Thinking on Childlessness, Gender, and Reproductive Technologies*, eds. M. C. Inhorn and F. van Balen. Berkeley: University of California Press. □
  5. Ragoné, H. (1994). *Surrogate Motherhood: Conception in the Heart*, Boulder: Westview Press. □
  6. Franklin, S and Ragoné, H eds. (1998). *Reproducing Reproduction: Kinship, Power and Technological Innovation*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. □
  7. Cussins, C., (1996). Ontological Choreography: Agency through Objectification in Infertility Clinics, *Social Studies of Science*, Vol. 26, 575-610. □
  8. Pande, A. (2009). Not an 'Angel', not a 'Whore'" Surrogates as 'Dirty' Workers in India. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*.Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 141-173. □
  9. Davis-Floyd, R. E and Dumit, J eds. (1998) *Cyborg Babies: From Techno-Sex to Techno-Tots*, London: Routledge. Introduction □
  10. Inhorn, M. C. (2003). *Local Babies, Global Science: Gender, Religion, and In Vitro Fertilization in Egypt*. New York: Routledge Introduction □
  11. Edwards, J et al. eds. (1999). *Technologies of Procreation: Kinship in the Age of Assisted Conception*, (2nd ed.). London: Routledge. □
7. **Monday, 04 November 2019:**  
 ➤ □ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 |

### **The 'Other' Mother: The Emergence of Transnational Gestational Surrogacy**

The developing South has emerged as the global commercial hub of transnational gestational surrogacy. The lecture unpacks the notion of being supplementary and surrogate in the domain of assisted conception. The predicament of supplementary women, imagined as surrogates in media and policy domains, and the role of globally dispersed states enabling the 'the other mother' to become a commercial service provider and a fictive kinship misnomer are some of the themes analyzed in this lecture.

### **References**

1. Bharadwaj, Aditya. 2016. *Conceptions: Infertility and Procreative Technologies in India*. Berghahn Books (Chapter 6).
2. Cohen, Erik. 2015. Surrogacy as International Buisness and National Disgrace of Thailand. *Asian Anthropology*, Vol. 14, Issue. 2, pp-115-132.
3. Dow, K. 2015. 'A Nine-Month Head-Start': The Maternal Bond and Surrogacy. *Ethnos* (Early online).
4. Dow, K. (2012). "You're Gonna Get What You Pay for": Gay Parents and Transnational Surrogacy. *Anthropology News*, 53(4)
5. Harrison, Laura. 2016. *Brown Bodies, White Babies: The Politics of Cross-Racial Surrogacy*. New York University Press.
6. Pande, Amrita. 2014. *Wombs in Labor – Transnational Commercial Surrogacy in India*. Columbia University Press.
7. Rao, Mohan. 2012. Why All Non-Altristic Surrogacy Should Be Banned. *EPW*, Vol. 47, Issue no. 21.
8. Rudrappa, S. 2015. *Discounted Life: The Price of Global Surrogacy in India*. New York University Press
9. Teman, E. 2010. *Birthing a Mother: The Surrogate Body and the Pregnant Self*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press
10. Vora, Kalindi. 2013. Potential, Risk, and Return in Transnational Indian Gestational Surrogacy. *Current Anthropology* 54.S7: S97–S106

## 8. Monday, 11 November 2019:

➤ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 |

### **Men and Reproduction: Masculinities, Fatherhood and**

Men and masculinities have taken centre stage in international and national reproductive, population and development policies. The lecture examines critical issues in men's reproductive health concerns and needs. In so doing the lecture weaves together fatherhood, sexuality and masculinity to examine how men ought to emerge as equal partners in reproductive health care planning and delivery practices.

#### **References**

1. Blell, Mwenza. 2017. British Pakistani Muslim Masculinity, (In) fertility, and the Clinical Encounter, *Medical Anthropology*, DOI: 10.1080/01459740.2017.1364736 link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01459740.2017.1364736>
2. Connell, R.W. 2005. *Masculinities*. University of California Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.
3. Daniels, Cynthia R. 2008. *Exposing Men: The Science and Politics of Male Reproduction*. Oxford University Press.
4. Dudgeon, Matthew R and Inhorn, Marcia C. 2003. Gender, Masculinity, and Reproduction: Anthropological Perspectives. *International Journal of Men's Health*, Vol. 2, Issue. 1.
5. Dudgeon, Matthew R and Inhorn, Marcia C. 2004. Men's influences on women's reproductive health: medical anthropological perspectives. *Social Science and Medicine*, Volume 59, Issue 7, pp-1379-1395.
6. Greene, M. E. and Biddlecom, A. E. (2000), Absent and Problematic Men: Demographic Accounts of Male Reproductive Roles. *Population and Development Review*, 26: 81–115.
7. Gutmann, Matthew C. 2007. *Fixing Men: Sex, Birth Control, and AIDS in Mexico*. University of California Press.
8. Inhorn, Marcia C; Tjornhoj-Thomsen, Tine; Goldberg, Helene (eds.). 2009. *Reconceiving the Second Sex: Men, Masculinity, and Reproduction*. Berghahn Books
9. Inhorn, Marcia and Chavkin, Wendy. 2014. *Globalized Fatherhood*. Berghahn Books.
10. Inhorn, Marcia. 2012. *The New Arab Man – Emergent Masculinities, Technologies, and Islam in the Middle East*. Princeton University Press.

## 9. Monday, 18 November 2019:

➤ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 | F

### **Birth of the Pill: Contraception and Contradiction**

The birth of the pill redefined fertility control. The lecture shows how the notion of 'control' can be understood as: (a) an ability to rein in fertility and defining one's reproductive destiny (b) an ironic detachment of human sexuality from the burden of reproduction. The lecture will also examine ways in which 'the pill' entangles gender, sexuality, local governance and global policy together with pharmaceutical and corporate interests. As a mediator between reproduction and sexuality, the pill is analysed as an object of agential expression and structural control.

#### **References**

1. Diczfalusy, E. 1997. *The Contraceptive Revolution: An Era of Scientific and Social Development*. CRC Press.
2. Eig, Jonathan. 2014. *The Birth of the Pill*. Pan Macmillan
3. Hardon, Anita (2005). *Contesting contraceptive Innovation – Reinventing the script*”. *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol 62. pp 614-627.
4. Laveaga, Gabriela Soto. 2009. *Jungle Laboratories: Mexican Peasants, National Projects, and the Making of the Pill*. Duke University Press.
5. Loe, Meika. 2004. *The Rise of Viagra: How the Little Blue Pill Changed Sex in America*. New York University Press.
6. Oudshoorn, Nelly Everdina. 2003. *The Male Pill: A Biography of a Technology in the Making*. Duke University Press.
7. Pomales, Tony O. 2013. *Men's Narratives of Vasectomy: Rearticulating Masculinity and Contraceptive Responsibility in San José, Costa Rica*. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, Volume 27, Issue. 1, pp-23-42.
8. Sheron, Nayantara. 2011. *Reading the i-Pill Advertisement: The Pleasures and Pressures of Contemporary Contraceptive Advertising in India*. In Gajjala, Radhika and Chopra, Rohit (ed.). *Global Media, Culture and Identity: Theory, Cases and Approaches*. Routledge.
9. Sheoran, Nayantara. 2015. *'Stratified Contraception': Emergency Contraceptive Pills and Women's Differential Experiences in Contemporary India*. *Medical Anthropology*, Vol. 34, Issue. 3.
10. Smithsonian.com. *The Science Behind the "Abortion Pill."* Read more: <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/health-medicine/science-behind-abortion-pill-180963762/#S8f1fuSptu0MzCiT.99> or <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/health-medicine/science-behind-abortion-pill-180963762/>
11. Wentzell, Emily A. 2013. *Maturing Masculinities: Aging, Chronic Illness, and Viagra in Mexico*. Duke University Press.

#### 10. Monday, 25 November 2019:

➤ □ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 | f

#### **Reproductive Rights and Procreative Wrongs: MTP/Abortion Around the Globe**

The medical termination of pregnancy (MTP) is mired in a landscape of reproductive rights and procreative wrongs. The lecture outlines the fraught trajectory of abortion debates and its double edged existence around the globe. From feminist politics and right to choose activism to evangelical resistance and criminalization of abortion under certain political dispensations, through to the brutal foetal sex selective abortions as patriarchal procreative ideology, MTP sharply separates 'rights' from 'wrongs'. The lecture aims to explore possible routes out such an impasse.

#### **References**

1. Andaya, E and Mishtal, J. 2017. *The Erosion of Rights to Abortion Care in the United States: A Call for a Renewed Anthropological Engagement with the Politics of Abortion*. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 31(1):40-59.
2. Cecil, R. (ed) *The Anthropology of Pregnancy Loss: Comparative Studies in Miscarriage, Stillbirth and Neonatal Death* Oxford; Herndon, VA: Berg
3. Best, A. 2005. *Abortion Rights along the Irish-English Border and the Liminality of Women's Experiences*. *Dialectical Anthropology* 29: 423-437
4. De Zordo, Silvia; Mishtal, Jonna; Anton, Lorena (eds.). 2016. *A Fragmented Landscape: Abortion Governance and Protest Logics in Europe*. Berghahn Books
5. Ginsburg, F. 1991. *'The "Word-Made" flesh: the disembodiment of Gender in the Abortion Debate'*, in Ginsburg, F. and Tsing, A. (eds), *Uncertain Terms: Negotiating Gender in American Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.

6. Htun, Mala. 2003. *Sex and the State: Abortion, Divorce, and the Family under Latin American Dictatorships and Democracies*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Kligman, Gail. 1998. *The Politics of Duplicity – Controlling Reproduction in Ceausescu's Romania*. University of California Press.
8. Norgren, Tiana. 2001. *Abortion before Birth Control – The Politics of Reproduction in Postwar Japan*. Princeton University Press.
9. Patel, Tulsi. 2006. *Sex - Selective Abortion in India: Gender, Society and New Reproductive Technologies*. Sage.
10. Whittaker, Andrea. 2012. *Abortion in Asia: Local Dilemmas, Global Politics*. Berghahn Books.

#### 11. Wednesday, 02 December 2019:

➤ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 |

#### **Reproducing the Future: State and Reproductive Health Matters**

States around the globe have developed a concerted and vested interest in their citizen's reproductive potential. In controlling or encouraging reproduction the manifest policies of the State get directly mapped on to the reproductive bodies of the citizenry and becomes an important way to 'imagine' the future of the nation itself. Through the course of this lecture we will learn what kinds of reproductive futures are valued and what kinds despised, neglected or controlled by the State.

#### **References**

1. Browner, Carolyn H and Sargent, Carolyn F. 2011. *Reproduction, Globalization, and the State: New Theoretical and Ethnographic Perspectives*. Duke University Press.
2. Carolyn Sargent and Dennis Cordell. (2003) Polygamy, Disrupted Reproduction, and the State: Malian Migrants in Paris, France. *Social Science & Medicine* Vol. 56, 1961–1972 □
3. Haney, L. (1996) Homeboys, Babies, Men in Suits: The State and the Reproduction of Male Dominance. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 61, No. 5, October, 759-778 □
4. Jeffery, P and Jeffery, R. (2002). A Population Out of Control? Myths About Muslim Fertility in Contemporary India. *World Development*. Vol. 30. No. 10. pp-1805-1822 □
5. Jeffery, R and P. Jeffery, P. (2008) 'Money itself discriminates': Obstetric Emergencies in the Time of Liberalization. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.) 42, 1 (2008): 59–91 □
6. Judit Sandor. (2002). Reproduction, self, and state - Part III: States and Boundaries. *Social Research*. Vol. 69, No. 1, Spring □  
([http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2267/is\\_1\\_69/ai\\_88584142/](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2267/is_1_69/ai_88584142/)) □
7. King, L. (2008) France Needs Children: Pronatalism, Nationalism and Women's Equity, *Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 39, Issue 1, 33 – 52.
8. Morgan, Lynn and Roberts, Elizabeth F.S. 2012. Reproductive Governance in Latin America. *Anthropology and Medicine*, Vol. 19, Issue. 2, pp-241-254.
9. Thomas, Lynn. 2003. *Politics of the Womb: Women, Reproduction, and the State in Kenya*, University of California Press.
10. Turner, Bryan S. 2006. Citizenship, reproduction and the state: international marriage and human rights. *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 12, Issue. 1, pp-45-54.
11. Wong, R. Y, (1997). Dispersing the Public and the Private: Gender and the State in the Birth Planning Policy of China. *Gender and Society*. Vol. 11. No. 4. pp-509-525 □

#### 12. Monday, 09 December 2019:

➤ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S2) ANSO099 | F

#### **Birth of Reproductive Control: Population and “Planning”**

The population planning is intimately linked to the twentieth century development discourse. While the post Cairo declaration has precipitated a shift away from aggressive population control policies around the globe, the fallout of these policies still reverberate and shape reproductive control enmeshed in powerful institutions like the state and biomedicine. The lecture interrogates population planning, policy and control to ask what kind of biopolitics is at play?

## References

11. Brunson, Jan. 2016. *Planning Families in Nepal: Global and Local Projects of Reproduction*. Rutgers University Press.
12. Coliver, Sandra. 1995. *The Right to Know: Human Rights and Access to Reproductive Health Information*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
13. Connelly, M. (2006). Population Control in India: Prologue to the Emergency Period. *Population and Development Review*. Vol. 32, No. 4, pp-629-667.
14. De Zordo, Silvia and Marchesi, Milena. 2014. *Reproduction and Biopolitics: Ethnographies of Governance, "Irrationality" and Resistance*. Routledge.
15. Greenhalgh, Susan and Winckler, Edwin A. 2005. *Governing China's Population: From Leninist to Neoliberal Biopolitics*. Stanford University Press.
16. Gutmann, M.C. 2005. Scoring Men: Vasectomies and the Totemic Illusion of Male Sexuality in Oaxaca. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry* 29: 79-101
17. Ladd-Taylor, Molly. 2018. *Fixing the Poor – Eugenic Sterilization and Child Welfare in the Twentieth Century*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
18. Maynard-Tucker, Gisele. 2014. *Rural Women's Sexuality, Reproductive Health, and Illiteracy: A Critical Perspective on Development*. Lexington Books
19. Panu, Mihnea. 2009. *Contextualizing Family Planning: Truth, Subject, and the Other in the U.S. Government*. Palgrave Macmillan.
20. Simon-Kumar, Rachel. 2006. *Marketing Reproduction: Political Rhetoric and Gender Policy in India*. Zubaan.
21. Takeshita, Chikako. 2011. *The Global Biopolitics of the IUD: How Science Constructs Contraceptive Users and Women's Bodies*. MIT Press.

### 13. Monday, 16 December 2019:

➤ □ 10:15 to 12:00pm (S3) ANSO099 | F

## Demographic Security: Developing, Securing and Reproducing the Nation

Demographic security policies are rapidly replacing population policies around the globe. The fear of declining population is impacting both law and policy. The lecture assesses the potential impact of such neo pronatalism on women's reproductive rights and health. Apocalyptic fears of dying nations and withering gene pool to perceived threats from unchecked fertility of minority groups or imagined dangers stalking and overwhelming national identity because of unchecked immigration through to angst of utter failure and economic ruin on account of plummeting numbers, continue to rescript state policies and attitudes towards reproduction. The lecture shows how by turning reproduction into a national security issue, nation states can rapidly displace the conflated burden of nationalism and pronatalism on women's bodies.

## References

1. Andaya, Elise. 2014. *Conceiving Cuba: Reproduction, Women, and the State in the Post-Soviet Era*. Rutgers University Press.

2. Botev, N., 'Could pronatalist policies discourage childbearing?' *Population and Development Review*, 2015, 41 (2): 301-314.
3. Buchanan, Ann and Rotkirch, Anna (ed.).2013. *Fertility Rates and Population Decline: No Time for Children?* Palgrave Macmillan.
4. Castles, F.G., 'The world turned upside down: below replacement fertility, changing preferences and family-friendly public policy in 21 OECD countries', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2003, 13 (3): 209–227.
5. Coleman, D.A. and R. Rowthorn. 2011. 'Who's afraid of population decline? A critical examination of its consequences', *Population and Development Review*, Supplement to Vol. 37, Special Issue on the Demographic Transition and its Consequences: 217–248.
6. Foucault, Michel. 1978. "Security, Territory, Population". Lectures at the College de France 1977/1978. Edited by Michel Senellart. Palgrave Macmillan. 552 pp.
7. Kramer, Steven Philip. 2014. *The other Population Crisis – What Governments Can Do about Falling Birth Rates*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
8. Krause, Elizabeth L. 2004. *A Crisis of Births: Population Politics and Family-Making in Italy*. Wadsworth Publishing.
9. Malnar Dario and Malnar Ana. Demographic Security Trends in South Eastern Europe. *Croatian International Relations Review*, 01 August 2015, Vol.21(73), pp.57-87
10. Maffi, Irene. 2012. *Women, Health and the State in the Middle East: The Politics and Culture of Childbirth in Jordan*. Tauris Academic Studies
11. Straughan, Paulin; Chan, Angelique; Jones, gavin (ed.) 2008. *Ultra-Low Fertility in Pacific Asia: Trends, Causes and Policy Issues*. Routledge,
12. Yuval-Davis, N. 1996. "Women and the biological reproduction of "the nation". In *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 19, pp. 17-24.