



PROJECT MUSE®

How Not to Pimp Out Reproductive Justice: Adventures in Education, Activism, and Accountability

Carol Mason

Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies, Volume 34, Number 3, 2013,
pp. 226-241 (Article)

Published by University of Nebraska Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/fro/summary/v034/34.3.mason.html>

How Not to Pimp Out Reproductive Justice

*Adventures in Education,
Activism, and Accountability*

CAROL MASON

“So, who was your favorite speaker today?” I was asking one of the ten Oklahoma students I had arranged to join me at Hampshire College’s annual Civil Liberties and Public Policy (CLPP) conference on Abortion Rights and Reproductive Freedom. It was 2010. The year before I’d brought only four young women up from Oklahoma.

“Loretta Ross.”

“Cool.” I had long admired the work and words of Loretta Ross, founder of SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Health Collective. She had been the first speaker I brought to the campus of Oklahoma State University, where I was the only faculty hired to teach women’s studies. I wondered what, in particular, the student had seen in Ross. “Why?”

“Because she said ‘If I catch you pimping out reproductive justice I will hunt you down.’” The audacity of Ross’s hyperbole thrilled the student, who went on to tell me how some people use the phrase without really understanding it. Documented now by scholars culling activist declarations, the definition of reproductive justice entails a racial and class critique of the pro-choice paradigm, a broadening of the feminist movement to encompass more social justice issues, and a rededication to radical politics that demands an intersectional analysis of oppression.¹ Reproductive justice began with women-of-color activists and scholars criticizing a too-narrow focus on abortion as an individualist right supposedly secured by lobbying. The student I was talking with, however, was starting to see how the phrase *reproductive justice* was becoming more style than substance.

These are my reflections on how to stay true to the political and intellectual integrity of an idea called reproductive justice. It is the story of how we feminists in Oklahoma started a gathering now known as the Take Root conference, a reproductive justice event serving the conservative South Central region of America. Now in its third year, “Take Root: Red State Perspectives

on Reproductive Justice” was modeled after the Civil Liberties and Public Policy annual abortion rights conference at Hampshire College (CLPP), inspired by multi-issue organizing and public education exemplified by National Advocates for Pregnant Women (NAPW), and currently is hosted by the University of Oklahoma. But it began at Oklahoma State University (OSU) a couple of years ago amid a renaissance of feminist organizing in response to an incredibly toxic confluence of antiwomen conditions and reprehensible legislative proposals.

THE NEED AND THE FEAR

As detailed elsewhere, the need for a broad contextualization of reproductive issues is especially important in today’s Oklahoma.² The state’s abnormally high rates of domestic violence and teen pregnancy, its dubious distinction of being the top incarcerator (per capita) of women in the world, its abysmal lack of funds for education (ranked forty-ninth in per-pupil spending), its leading role in pioneering new types of antiabortion legislation, and its pride in being the reddest state in the nation (determined by having no county with a majority vote for Obama in 2008) culminate in a perfect conservative storm that oppresses young women.³ The state’s past includes its Indian Territory history as the stopping point of the Trail of Tears, its innovations in terrorizing black people during the Greenwood riots of 1921, and its hosting of internment camps during World War II. The state’s political heritage of leftist populism and socialism was subsumed with an apparent vengeance following the Dust Bowl, replaced by multinational corporatism and an anticommunist fervor that pervades today.

The repressed historical memory of progressive labor politics barely surfaces in class when a student asks what a Wobbly is, because he thinks his grandfather talked about that once. The not-so-repressed McCarthyism is evident in the fact that employers for the state—including Oklahoma State University, where I worked—required their employees to sign a loyalty oath.⁴ The effects of domestic violence, drug use, and incarceration come across in the veiled excuses or frank explanations that students make for why they didn’t complete an assignment. The effects of state-mandated abstinence-only education manifest in remarkable “slut-shaming” on campus and in tales of absurd high school sex education. One such tale involved watching images of advanced stages of STDs as disincentive to have sex. Another student reported how her teacher removed a goldfish from its bowl of water to demonstrate how girls who have sex are suffocating outside of God’s love. Oklahoma’s political heritage is a fascinating mix in which to teach gender and women’s

studies, especially when one of your areas of expertise is reproductive politics and another is right-wing movements. Fascinating, yes. Also: a little scary.

Arriving in Oklahoma in 2006, I didn't have a burning desire to make reproductive issues a main focus of my teaching or activism. I was ensconced in the writing of my second book, which addressed the rise of the right in America but took me far afield from the contemporary antiabortion politics that was the focus of my first book. I offered a Race and Reproduction class as a matter of routine and was intrigued by the fact that there was an inverse reaction to the readings. Previously, my students in Nevada had read Dorothy Roberts's *Killing the Black Body* with much interest and credence; they were less impressed by Andrea Smith's *Conquest*.⁵ In Oklahoma it was switched: students "got" Smith's cultural analysis of the sexual politics oppressing Native American women and outright challenged Roberts's legal analysis of Black women's reproductive woes, especially when it came to discussing the punitive treatment of women giving birth to babies testing positive for drugs. In a state where mass incarceration of women seems to be the response to a public health crisis of high rates of drug addiction, students sadly viewed punishment rather than treatment as an appropriate reaction.⁶

With incredible support from my boss, department head Carol Moder, I arranged to bring Loretta Ross to campus one semester and Lynn Paltrow, a legal scholar and the executive director of NAPW, during another semester. I watched and listened closely to my students as they struggled with the ideas presented in books and by these speakers. When one student confided, "I didn't know anybody else thought like me until I took your class," it came across as something profound. I was realizing the serious need for reproductive justice in Oklahoma.

Around the same time I became involved with the case of *Oklahoma vs. Hernandez*, in which an Oklahoma City mother of five was charged with homicide for suffering a stillbirth that was attributed to her use of methamphetamine while pregnant.⁷ It was an influential case: to equate stillbirth with homicide had significant political and public health ramifications.⁸ It contributed to a gendered moral panic around methamphetamine use in the Midwest.⁹ NAPW was supporting the defense and representing leading medical organizations that opposed the prosecution as counterproductive to maternal, fetal, and child health because they recognized the lack of evidence-based research linking methamphetamine use with stillbirths. Lynn Paltrow asked me, as an NAPW board member, to help organize two public education events for the community and the media, which needed access to expert information about the scientific research on the effects of prenatal exposure to particular drugs.¹⁰ Without medical knowledge on the subject Hernandez was seen as a

monster. Given the charges, the state they were filed in, and this demonizing climate, Hernandez pled guilty in consultation with her direct counsel, who hoped this was a way to obtain a sentence less severe than the twenty-five years in prison that could be imposed.

I attended the sentencing hearing, which I felt was so egregious in its humiliation of Hernandez that I considered getting arrested for contempt of court.¹¹ Her attorney directed her to read, through incontrollable tears and sobs, a list of every “lie” she had ever told. This “confession” lasted more than twenty minutes and entailed innocuous transgressions involving food such as giving liver to the dog instead of eating it herself and, later in life, passing off store-bought goods as homemade. Having previously served as a juror for a murder trial, I was not a total stranger to courtroom procedures and drama. While I understood there was legal strategy at work in the Oklahoma courtroom and the defense was attempting to soften up the judge, I nevertheless felt that Hernandez’s directed self-abnegation was bizarre and inhumane. Moreover, responses to it—how some people in the courtroom reacted, what they said and didn’t say—seemed not just complicit, but sadistically so.

Ultimately, after having served three years in jail while awaiting trial and another year after the sentencing, Hernandez was released from prison and placed temporarily in a private rehab facility.¹² Despite this redemptive ending to the case the courtroom experience was an indelible reminder of vehement attitudes. Sometimes I worried that the vehemence I saw pronounced in the courtroom was related to certain attitudes on campus that could be channeled in my direction for doing precisely what I was hired to do: teach feminism. Simultaneously, however, I was inspired by NAPW’s successes in public education that led to changing attitudes about Hernandez. NAPW’s forum, cosponsored by the Oklahoma Attorney General, Planned Parenthood of Central Oklahoma, and ten other local stakeholders, convinced more people that “the ‘crack baby’ scare of the 1980s and, more recently, fears of ‘meth babies’ were based on ‘insufficient and inaccurate information’ that caused society to overreact and split families.”¹³ Over two years local media and attorneys shifted away from representing Hernandez as a baby-killing “meth mom.” Evidence-based research was key.

THE ORGANIZING PRINCIPLE

Students enrolled in my spring semester Race and Reproduction class were especially excited by the material. So I worked with my university, an anonymous donor, and Hampshire College to take four of them to the college’s annual conference on reproductive justice, known as CLPP, in 2009. The most

memorable exchange from that trip was with one of my students who commented ponderously about the western Massachusetts landscape. Looking around, she said, “There are a lot of trees here.” Professorially, I ventured into a teachable moment and suggested that this geography could be the setting for *The Scarlet Letter*, which we had read in class. “Hester’s scaffold could be over there,” I said, gesturing through the misty April rain. My student’s response—“That’d be really cold”—and how seriously she said it made me realize how much *place* matters. She was processing Hawthorne’s novel in a way she wouldn’t have if she hadn’t seen this landscape and felt its chill. That first group of four students, traveling far from Oklahoma, was processing a lot.

Indeed, they seemed so intimidated or overwhelmed by CLPP that they kept to themselves, opting to stay in their hotel room to video-record their own reactions, instead of attending sessions on the last day of the conference. During the summer, however, without any involvement or suggestion on my part, they created a blog they called Oklahomans for Reproductive Justice (OK4RJ). They explained it to me as way to make available hard-to-find facts about reproductive health services, including abortion, to people around the state. When school resumed in the fall, they organized some events in Stillwater and invited students from the University of Oklahoma (OU) to join them.

In 2010, with a grant from the Tulsa Community Foundation, I took ten Oklahoma students to CLPP, some from OU and some from Oklahoma State. At CLPP the Oklahoma students felt deep affinities and deep divisions. They seemed to feel that their own values were validated by hearing analyses that advocated social justice. But none of the panels reflected their experiences as young people who do not have the luxury of blatantly opposing conservatives because they live and work with conservatives. Their families, neighbors, perhaps roommates, and some professors are conservatives. Having lived and worked in metropolitan, liberal settings as well as smaller, more rural and conservative settings, I too recognized at CLPP a privileged lack of understanding of what it takes to organize for reproductive justice in “red states.” Conversations with my NAPW colleagues—Lynn Paltrow, the executive director; Jeanne Flavin, a Kansas-born sociologist; and Kathleen Wallace, a newly minted JD from Oklahoma City University School of Law—ensued. We pondered why it seemed that those conservative “red states” were virtually ignored by organizations that are known for reaching out to young women. Conversations with my OSU colleagues—department head Carol Moder and institutional diversity staffer Jen Macken in particular—ensued, too. Could we, with our ridiculously limited resources, pull off some smaller version of the CLPP conference meant to address the particular concerns and experiences of *our* students?

I spent the summer of 2010 fruitlessly seeking grants from foundations

and having strained discussions with the university's development officers. Requests for funds for the project made with NAPW were also rejected. With moral support of the gender and women's studies (GWS) core faculty, the coordinator of women's affairs, and the associate dean, who agreed to let me allocate nearly the entire yearly program budget for a regional workshop with a focus on reproductive issues, I started considering logistics. My tenure home, the Department of English, provided infrastructural support, without which nothing could happen.¹⁴

We had about \$7,000. As part of its commitment to building grassroots support for reproductive justice in red states, NAPW funded three of the students who founded OK4RJ to work at NAPW headquarters in New York as special summer interns. Two of those students came back to play important roles in the workshop in Stillwater. Meanwhile, I forged connections at CLPP and the University of Kansas to obtain a \$2,000 Critical Exchange grant from Imagining America, a consortium of universities promoting artists and scholars in public life. CLPP provided a terrific emcee for the event by sponsoring a Hampshire College alumna, Akira Céspedes Pérez, who was teaching in Tulsa. The entire budget for the workshop of a hundred participants from Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Nebraska was just over \$9,000, from which we paid out-of-state guest speakers \$500 to cover plane fare. Student groups (Oklahoma State's chapter of NOW and its GLBTQ organization, SODA) applied for small funds to sponsor a couple of the well-known scholars. It occurred to me while I was promoting the workshop at the National Women's Studies Association conference that I could charge a registration fee, and we set it at a nonmandatory \$30 to help offset the cost of catering. This was not a revenue-generating venture.¹⁵

For financial as well as political climate reasons, we could not do in Oklahoma what they could in Massachusetts. Inspired by the students who started Oklahomans for Reproductive Justice, I wanted *more than anything else* to help more students learn that their lived experiences could be the basis of inquiry and could lead to *meaningful research* with impact. So instead of calling it something like "The Red-Dirt Reproductive Justice Conference," which is how we sometimes referred to it, I decided to name the workshop "Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Reproductive and Sexual Health." I meant to signal that there were serious scholarly issues afoot and bona fide pedagogy at work.

I navigated several axes of coalition. In planning the workshop, I wanted to include local activist and advocacy groups, but many of them were ensconced in second-wave pro-choice thinking, which was terrifically important for lobbying against many heinous antiabortion proposals locomotively

rolling through the legislature.¹⁶ But when it came to thinking beyond abortion, single-issue organizing was not so helpful. At various times we were told (sometimes explicitly, sometimes indirectly) that it was “distracting” to consider queers, immigrants, and the history of sterilization in Claremore Indian Hospital. For some to risk altering the pro-choice party line was to risk losing credibility as a unified force.

On the flipside of my desire to include local advocacy groups, I wanted to include national activist-scholars and organizations, but many of them had no idea what living in Oklahoma was like for me or for the students. East Coast assumptions and expectations clashed with local practice. Oklahoma was seen as exotically backward. Time and time again people could not discern or did not care to distinguish between Oklahoma State University in Stillwater and University of Oklahoma in Norman, two very different places and very different institutions. Sheer geography confounded people accustomed to mass transit and relatively short distances between destinations. An organizer from Boston wanted to talk about my efforts in this “rural” “Bible belt” state, and I drove seventy-five miles to meet with her in the fine *city* of Tulsa only to learn that she had misremembered the date. She asked if we could meet at 4 PM the next day.

Caught between these two types of concerns, I experienced a kind of whiplash. One minute I was explaining to some why attendance at the workshop wouldn't be required for all students enrolled in GWS classes, why I was publicizing so little, and why I was emphasizing academics (boring) instead of activism (lively). The next minute, it seemed, I was reassuring others that, yes, I was tenured; no, I wasn't going to lose my job; no, there had been no threats; and yes, there would be security at the event.

I structured the workshop with students' voices framing the day. Students who had attended CLPP convened en masse three times over the summer and fall semesters to consider how they wanted to contribute to the day. These were not all “A” students, and they were a fairly diverse lot in terms of age, class, race, physical ability, and sexuality. But their trip to CLPP had given them common ground. OSU's coordinator of women's and GLBTQ affairs, Jen Macken, and I worked with them on two projects of their own design: an analysis of crisis pregnancy centers in Oklahoma and an analysis of the abstinence-only sex education they all had experienced as kids growing up in the state. The process of this research was an uneven one, with some students losing interest and others forging ahead with gusto. Two students who had gone to CLPP dropped out of the research projects, while others who hadn't traveled with us joined in. So there was much change, and Jen and I didn't know how it would go.

But during the day of the workshop students' presentations were galvanizing. They set a tone of solidarity and engagement that was sustained throughout the day.¹⁷ Learning what students had lived through with abstinence-only sex education, with family histories of sterilization, and with manipulative claims issued by crisis pregnancy centers illustrated why a reproductive justice framework was so important. Indeed, the students taught and inspired us every bit as much as the students learned from the seasoned experts. Students seemed surprised and emboldened by the genuine interest they received from their peers, their professors, and the guest speakers. It was a two-way learning street, and because most of the faculty and speakers had not grown up in Oklahoma, students were taking us to school. The event exceeded all our expectations.

Reflectively, we realized that the structure of the day helped to facilitate that collaborative workshop atmosphere. No one was headlined. Students were coproducers of knowledge. Issues of race, class, religion, and sexuality were integrated in the discussion of most of the panels. Moreover, panels were specifically designed to thwart a tendency to hear "reproductive" anything and think only "abortion." The panels were: Sex Ed Lessons; Religious Freedom, Reproductive Health, and Sexuality; Birthing Rights and New Eugenics; Criminalizing Reproductive and Sexual Health; Misconceptions; and Advocacy Report.¹⁸ In addition I wrote the following note and included it in the program:

In 1994, women of color activists coined the phrase "reproductive justice." It is an approach to women's advocacy that seeks a merging of the reproductive rights movement and social justice movements. It promotes casting a wide net when discussing the perils and promises of pregnancy. Many see reproductive justice as a corrective to the narrow focus on abortion that dominated electoral politics and feminist work since the 1970s.

Today we explore reproductive justice as a mode of interdisciplinary analysis that examines injustices suffered by people because society judges them according to their perceived ability and desire to reproduce and rear children. Reproductive justice thus broadens the possibility for intellectual collaboration and for coalition-building among scholars and organizations devoted to public health and education, respectful dialogue, and democracy.

Reproductive justice wasn't just a name. It was an organizing principle. We brought together different factions of a multigenerational movement with scholars and students from different disciplines and states. We began a criti-

cally important conversation that had the potential to coalesce better those who see reproductive and sexual rights as a crucial part of multiracial and economically ethical democracy.

THE CROSSROADS

The workshop revealed and made a critical intervention in a philosophical rift. Some attendants espoused the more inclusive framework of reproductive justice while others espoused a more traditional pro-choice framing of reproductive issues. Because *reproductive justice* takes into account matters of race, class, and colonization in ways that a pro-choice stance does not, it is more in tune with current interdisciplinary scholarship that traces how certain methods of birth control and particular health care policies have been implemented in ways that disadvantage and target communities of color. Among the responses to the post-workshop survey we conducted was evidence that some who retained a pro-choice framework were resistant to the messages about how different forms of sterilization abuse have plagued communities of color historically and how eugenic ideas continue to circulate and influence community-based programs.

Specifically, one response to the post-workshop survey we conducted complained about the “quality” of the student presentations. The writer of these comments was troubled by the fact that students were discussing “genocide” and “eugenics”—which she equated with using “inflammatory rhetoric.” This raised my hackles because the student who had used those ideas had taken my class; had read Andrea Smith’s *Conquest*; and was talking about her own research into a family story about her uncle, who had been institutionalized and probably, she concluded after researching the institution and the laws of the era, sterilized. She presented her search and the obstacles she faced as evidence of the silencing of such history. But the person who complained about “inflammatory rhetoric” appeared to feel the student’s presentation was only speculative. She had, I suspect, only heard words—*genocide*, *eugenics*, *sterilization*—that she was used to hearing from current right-wing attacks that purport abortion as a eugenic program franchised through Planned Parenthood.¹⁹

As someone who had spent two years working in a Planned Parenthood office that was evacuated due to the occasional bomb threat, and who had spent many years researching in detail the “pro-life” murder of seven people, I recognized what she was saying. Moreover, I had written precisely about the bogus ways antiabortion campaigns play the race card, firmly believing those campaigns to be intellectually vapid, politically reprehensible, and emotion-

ally manipulative. But I also knew the history of American eugenics, and I saw that my student's inquiry into her uncle's situation was part of that largely untold history. The report my student gave represented scholarly impulses derived from a personal need to know. The person who thought the student was spouting inflammatory rhetoric represented an advocate's priority to defend her cause and—frankly, in the broader scheme of things—her life. It was a crossroads where the desire to discover and the desire to preserve intersected.

TEACHING THE CONFLICTS (AND LIVING THEM, TOO)

Dare one teach the history of eugenics, or research its impact on one's family, or present one's thoughts on it publicly, when the right is using the same words and alluding to the same history in an attempt to demolish reproductive health care?

Absolutely. Here's how.

In class I engage the pedagogy I was taught as a graduate student, and I teach the conflicts.²⁰ I show the students different perspectives and have them consider the situation. By this I mean something other than bogus attempts at neutrality, objectivity, all-sided inclusivity, or relativism. In the context of political campaigns about Planned Parenthood and the demonization of Margaret Sanger in particular, I have found it fruitful to compare Dorothy Roberts's and Andrea Smith's discussions of her.

In *Killing the Black Body* Roberts asks forthrightly, "was Margaret Sanger a racist?"²¹ Posing the question this way allows me to walk students through the idea of what a racist is and what racism is. We consider the distinction between a bigot with intentional hatred and racism as a matter of institutional discourse and power. We examine the history of Sanger's turn away from socialist feminism to eugenics, and we consider carefully where Roberts ends her discussion on the matter: "I agree that Sanger's views were distinct from those of her eugenicist colleagues. Sanger nevertheless promoted two of the most perverse tenets of eugenic thinking: that social problems are caused by reproduction of the socially disadvantaged and that their childbearing should therefore be deterred."²² Despite Sanger's intentions some of the policies and ideas that she perpetuated resulted in historical patterns of disadvantages for people of color and those deemed feeble-minded.

Then we turn to *Conquest*, where Smith focuses on those historical patterns, claiming that Planned Parenthood perpetuates them today. Smith writes that Sanger "collaborated with eugenics organizations during her career, and linked the need for birth control to the need to reduce the number of those in the 'lower classes.' Today Planned Parenthood is heavily invested

in the population establishment, and continues to support population control policies in the Global South,” despite providing “valuable family planning resources to women around the world.”²³ We consider how this claim is similar to and different from Roberts’s discussion. Moreover, we consider how Roberts and Smith pose the question of racism and Planned Parenthood in different ways, with the former author initially questioning Sanger’s motivations and the latter concentrating on the organization’s policies. After these considerations no longer is the question “was Margaret Sanger a racist.” That question is transformed into a far more nuanced exploration of how institutional racism evolves, sometimes despite the best of intentions.

Then we examine one artifact from the many antiabortion campaigns that purport that abortion is a genocidal conspiracy. Current examples are the faux documentaries *Maafa 21* and *180* and the Justice for All display, first titled the Genocide Awareness Project, which tours college campuses.²⁴ Each of these projects argues that abortion is a holocaust or a genocide and equates “the unborn” with Jews who were killed by Hitler’s elaborate system of concentration camps, gas chambers, and executions, or with African Americans who historically have withstood lynchings, sterilization abuse, and enslavement. Can the students see a distinction between (a) the fear-mongering antiabortion campaigns that portray Sanger’s involvement in the eugenics movement as a smoking gun that supposedly proves all birth control and abortion provision are a racist system of extermination and (b) Roberts’s and Smith’s political analyses of the actual “tenets of eugenic thinking” that Sanger’s work promoted and how those tenets influence population control policies today? You bet they can. They understand that the antiabortion campaigns are purporting to expose a historical figure as an intentionally nefarious conspirator, and this is nothing like what Roberts or Smith is doing in her work. Students see the misinformation and the salaciousness of abortion-as-genocide or abortion-as-holocaust campaigns and, by contrast, the integrity of the feminist scholarship.

But how does that knowledgeable distinction play out beyond the classroom? Little did I know that someone seated in the front row during our 2011 workshop at Oklahoma State was taking flip video of our presenters. Inspired by Andrea Smith, a student digitally recorded her as she spoke about reproductive justice. To no surprise on my part, she mentioned forthrightly that she believed Planned Parenthood was racist. As a scholar and teacher I saw this completely in the context of Smith’s larger body of work and in the larger context of feminist scholarship that seeks to tell (as my student reporting on Oklahoma sterilization policies had) untold histories of eugenics in America

in an effort to *expand* reproductive justice, not restrict it. When the video was, unbeknownst to me, uploaded to YouTube, I got an email from the Planned Parenthood office in Oklahoma City. I tried to explain the difference between an honest exchange of ideas in an academic setting and a smear campaign. I wanted them to see a distinction, as my students do, between (a) the principled feminist inquiry into the impact, regardless of intention, of old eugenic laws or current population control policies and (b) the denigration attempted when abortion opponents purport that abortion provision is a conspiracy to curb the reproduction of people of color. My exchange with the Oklahoma City folks did not go well. I imagined, regretfully, that they felt they were getting attacked from all sides.

How do you stay true to the idea of reproductive justice? Not without conflicts. This is a movement, after all, and none of us has all the answers. We teacher-scholars are accountable to the activists and professional advocates as much as the activists and professional advocates must be accountable for their policies and discourses that we teacher-scholars analyze. Questions of complicity and accountability are inevitable and complex, requiring an intersectional analysis of place as well as race, class, gender, citizenship, sexuality, physicality, and nationality. Pimping out reproductive justice requires a callous or oblivious disregard of such questions. Not pimping it out means living the conflicts and loving the struggle.

Today Oklahomans for Reproductive Justice has evolved into an amazing online forum, students on Oklahoma university campuses organize spirited protests of the Justice for All displays that purport abortion is genocide, and the Take Root conference is doing just that: digging in.²⁵ Some erstwhile students who presented at the originating 2011 workshop at Oklahoma State are now attending law school and graduate school, and some are working in activist organizations. All of them know the power of speaking out about reproductive justice in the middle of the reddest state of America.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges Lindsey Bartgis, Sandra Criswell, Jen Macken, Carol Moder, Lynn Paltrow, Debbye Scroggins, Andrea Smith, and Mytheli Sreenivas for clarifications and feedback on drafts of this essay.

NOTES

1. Kimala Price, "What Is Reproductive Justice? How Women of Color Activists Are Redefining the Pro-Choice Paradigm," *Meridians* 10, no. 2 (2010): 42–65.

2. Jeanne Flavin and Carol Mason, "Beyond Carrots and Sticks: Effective Public Education and Feminist Research in Conservative States," *Scholar and Feminist Online* 9, nos. 1–2 (2011): barnard.edu/sfonline/reprotech/flavin_mason_01.htm.

3. Julie Delcour, "49th is Not OK," *Tulsa World*, June 3, 2012. See also Bob Darcy and Jennifer F. Paustenbaugh, *Oklahoma Women's Almanac* (Stillwater OK: OPSA Press, 2006). In terms of pioneering antiabortion legislation see Tracy Weitz, "Oklahoma Gets Top Pro-life Honors for Abortion Laws," <http://blog.ansirh.org/2011/01/oklahoma-abortion-laws-and-ultrasound/> (accessed Mar. 25, 2013).

4. See the loyalty oath listed as part of new employee payroll forms for Oklahoma State University: <http://hr.okstate.edu/hr/new-hire-info> (accessed Mar. 25, 2013).

5. Dorothy Roberts, *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty* (New York: Pantheon, 1997); Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge: South End Press, 2005).

6. In Oklahoma the rate of admission for methamphetamine addiction treatment alone jumped from 15.5 in 1992 to 118.8 in 2002. See Timothy Lineberry and J. Michael Bostwick, "Methamphetamine Abuse: A Perfect Storm of Complications," *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* 81, no. 1 (2006): 77–84. Punishing pregnant women for drug use instead of treating such high rates of addiction as a public health problem is a response that is not Oklahoma's alone, as NAPW research shows. See Lynn M. Paltrow and Jeanne Flavin, "Arrests of and Forced Interventions on Pregnant Women in the United States, 1973–2005: Implications for Women's Legal Status and Public Health," *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 38, no. 2 (Apr. 2013): 299–343; and Lynn M. Paltrow, "Roe v. Wade and the New Jane Crow: Reproductive Rights in the Age of Mass Incarceration," *American Journal of Public Health* 103, no. 1 (Jan. 2013): 17–21.

7. Five months after suffering a stillbirth in 2004, Hernandez was charged with first-degree murder because of an autopsy that discovered meth. Although the method used to determine the toxicity of the stillbirth was seen as scientifically inappropriate and likely to yield false results, the medical examiner was never called to testify. Hernandez was also charged with second-degree murder based on violating Oklahoma's child neglect statute. After waiting trial for three years in the Oklahoma County Jail with no bail and no visitation rights from her children, Hernandez accepted a plea agreement to second-degree murder in Sept. 2007. See Motion to Quash Information Based upon Insufficient Evidence in the District Court in and for Oklahoma County, State of Oklahoma, State of Oklahoma vs. Theresa Lee Hernandez, CF-2004-4801 (Sept. 2007). See also F. E. Barnhart, J. R. Fogacci, and D. W. Reed, "Methamphetamine—a Study of Postmortem Redistribution," *Journal of Analytical Toxicology* 23, no. 1 (1999): 69–70. The author gratefully acknowledges assistance from Kathleen Wallace for these details.

8. National Women's Law Center, "Amicus Brief," <http://www.nwlc.org/resource>

/amicus-brief-state-oklahoma-v-theresa-lee-hernandez; National Advocates for Pregnant Women, "Amicus Brief in Support of the Motion to Dismiss the Information in *State v. Hernandez*," http://advocatesforpregnantwomen.org/main/publications/brief_bank/hernandez_public_health_amicus_brief.php; Motion to Quash Information . . . , *State of Oklahoma vs. Theresa Lee Hernandez* (all URLs accessed Mar. 25, 2013).

9. Travis Linnemann, "Mad Men, Meth Moms, Moral Panic: Gendering Meth Crimes in the Midwest," *Critical Criminology* 18 (2010): 95–110; Jeanne Flavin, *Our Bodies, Our Crimes: The Policing of Women's Reproduction in America* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 95.

10. The two forums were: "Women, Pregnancy and Drug Use: Medical Facts, Practical Responses and the Well-Being of Children and Families," Nov. 14, 2007, Presbyterian Health Foundation Conference Center, Oklahoma City, and "Experts Discuss Responses that Work: A Continued Conversation on Pregnancy, Parenting, and Drug Use," Nov. 10, 2008, Integris Baptist Medical Center, Oklahoma City. An example of the expert opinions offered at both forums is Barry M. Lester, "Prenatal Drug Exposure and Child Outcome: Time for Policy to Catch Up with Research," slides available at http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Children_at_Risk/Presentations.htm (accessed Mar. 25, 2013).

11. The defense team for Theresa Hernandez included Oklahoma City attorneys James T. Rowan and Joanne Bryant Horn and Milwaukee attorneys Robin Shellow and Jim Dixon. See *State of Oklahoma vs. Theresa Hernandez*, Transcript of Proceedings held on the 21st day of December, 2007 before the honorable Virgil C. Black, District Judge, Formal Sentencing, reported by Susan Conner, CSR. 40–41.

12. "Mom in Stillborn Case Released from Prison," *NewsOK.com*, Nov. 19, 2008, <http://newsok.com/multimedia/video/2670008001>.

13. Jeff Raymond, "Effects of Drugs Challenged," *NewsOK.com*, Nov. 15, 2007, <http://newsok.com/effect-of-drugs-challenged/article/3169297>

14. Core faculty of the Gender and Women's Studies Department were Carol Moder, Brenda Phillips, John Kinder, Lu Bailey, Lesley Rimmel, Lisa Lewis, Jennifer Borland, and Carol Mason. English Department staff who provided support included Robert Estes and JuDean Scott.

15. The workshop was made possible with support and assistance from the Tulsa Community Foundation; Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life; National Advocates for Pregnant Women; Civil Liberties and Public Policy, Hampshire College; OSU Student Government Association/MAC; OSU Department of English, Carol Moder, head; Jan Cohen-Cruz, Syracuse University; Elizabeth Max, professor emerita, English Education, OSU; Sallie McCorkle, professor of art, OSU; Patricia Bell, professor of sociology, OSU; Jen Macken MS, coordinator of women's and GLBTQ af-

fairs, OSU; student workers Diya Paul and Kate Reynolds; officers of NOW-OSU, SODA, and the Women's Resource Center Student Alliance, especially Amanda Renk, Amber Lockner, Dennis Rudasill, and Paige Shane McFarlane; Kathleen Wallace, JD; Ann Cudd, University of Kansas; Mia Kim Sullivan and Myrna Breitbart, Hampshire College; Tom Wikle, associate dean, OSU College of Arts and Sciences; Peter Sherwood, dean, OSU College of Arts and Sciences; Rachel Elliott, MFA; Ben Hagan; Jinnings Bur-russ; and Sarah Ramsay.

16. James C. McKinley Jr. "Strict Abortion Measures Enacted in Oklahoma," *New York Times*, Apr. 27, 2010.

17. Student presenters were Lindsey Bartgis, Mallory Carlberg, Sandra Criswell, Danielle Jones, Amanda Renk, Kate Reynolds, Dennis Rudasill, Ana Scott, and Deb-bye Scroggins.

18. Speakers were Paul Ashby, MTh, MDiv, Dmin., senior minister at Fellowship Congregational Church, Tulsa; Julie Burkhart, founder and executive director of Trust Women PAC; Tamyá Cox, JD, program director and legislative counsel at ACLU of Oklahoma; Jeanne Flavin, PhD, associate professor of sociology at Fordham Uni-versity; Scott Jones, PhD, senior minister of the First Central Congregational UCC in Omaha; Lynn M. Paltrow, JD, founder and executive director of National Advocates for Pregnant Women; Akira Céspedes Pérez of the Civil Liberties and Public Policy Program at Hampshire College and Teach for America in Tulsa; Miriam Zoila Perez, founder of RadicalDoula.com; Barbara Santee, PhD; Martha Skeeters, PhD, associ-ate professor of women's and gender studies at the University of Oklahoma; Andrea Smith, PhD, associate professor of media and cultural studies at the University of Cali-fornia, Riverside; Tracy Weitz, PhD, MPA, director of the Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health Program of the Bixby Center for Global Reproductive Health, University of California, San Francisco.

19. Kathryn Joyce, "Abortion as Black Genocide: An Old Scare Tactic Re-emerges," *Public Eye*, Apr. 29, 2010. <http://www.politicalresearch.org/abortion-as-black-genocide-an-old-scare-tactic-re-emerges/>.

20. Gerald Graff, *Beyond the Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts Can Revital-ize American Education* (New York: Norton, 1992).

21. Roberts, *Killing the Black Body*, 79.

22. Roberts, *Killing the Black Body*, 81.

23. Smith, *Conquest*, 102.

24. Carol Mason, "What to Do When They Say Holocaust," *On The Issues* (Winter 2012): http://www.ontheissuesmagazine.com/2012winter/2012winter_Mason.php. See also Carol Mason, *Killing for Life: The Apocalyptic Narrative of Pro-life Politics* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2002).

25. Oklahomans for Reproductive Justice is available at <http://ok4rj.org/>. Reg-istration for the Take Root conference is accessible at <http://take-root.org/>, and the

conference's Facebook page is at <http://www.facebook.com/takerootconference> (accessed Mar. 25, 2013). For discussion of protests against antiabortion campaigns on campus see Mason, "What to Do When They Say Holocaust"; Matt Bruenig, letter to the editor, *Oklahoma Daily*, Nov. 4, 2010, <http://oudaily.com/news/2010/nov/04/column-clueless-people-will-remain-clueless/>; and posts on OK4RJ's blog: <http://ok4rj.org/2011/10/how-i-stopped-worrying-and-learned-to-hate-jfa/> (accessed Mar. 25, 2013).