

37 • Monisha Das Gupta

"BROKEN HEARTS, BROKEN FAMILIES": The Political Use of Families in the Fight Against Deportation (new)

Monisha Das Gupta is professor of ethnic studies and women's studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. Among numerous articles and books in chapters, she published the award-winning *Unruly Immigrants: Rights, Activism, and Transnational South Asian Politics in the United States* (Duke 2006) and has an article forthcoming in *Latino Studies* titled "Mexican Migration to Hawai'i and U.S. Settler Colonialism." The piece that follows was written specifically for inclusion in this collection. It has been adapted from the author's article "'Don't Deport Our Daddies': Gendering State Deportation Practices and Immigrant Organizing." *Gender & Society*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2014, pp. 83–109.

In the course of my involvement in the immigrant rights movement since it was reenergized in 2006, when documented and undocumented migrants poured out on the streets of cities across the United States to protest anti-immigrant federal legislation, I joined an anti-deportation rally in Manhattan at the invitation of Families for Families in the summer of 2009. I was in New York for a few weeks to learn about migrant organizing, and was curious about Families for Freedom (FFF), which had been formed in 2002 in the wake of escalating deportations post-9/11. From its inception, it has been made up entirely of deportees and their loved ones. Those not directly affected by deportation are allies but not members. The organization represents migrants from the Caribbean, Latin America, Asia and Africa. The members have a range of immigration status—some are undocumented, others legal permanent residents (LPRs), and still others asylum seekers. Many of them live in mixed-status families with members who are US citizens.

The rally that day in front of the Federal Plaza, which houses the immigration court, was for a FFF organizer, the then fifty-two-year-old Brooklyn resident, Roxroy Salmon, a Jamaican national and a LPR. He was appearing before an immigration judge for a hearing on his deportation case. Many of us who had gathered that morning held signs that read "Broken Hearts, Broken Families. Stop Deportation Now," "Help Keep Children Safe. Stop Deportation," and "A Family United Is a Happy Family." During the several hours we waited for Roxroy, we sang and chanted about the attentiveness with which Roxroy cared for his mother and his children, three of whom lived with him; we communicated to all those who passed us on that busy street that we were standing up against a state practice that separated children from their parents. Hours later, Roxroy, who had been building the campaign against his deportation for two years, emerged to tell us that the judge had ordered his deportation for two minor drug convictions over twenty years ago.

As I examined FFF's representational strategies, I wondered what would make criminalized men of color, like Roxroy, sympathetic figures. Reading member testimonies on its older website,¹ I found that the emphasis on Roxroy's caregiving in his family was not exceptional. It was a theme that ran through the narratives of and about other men who had been deported or were in deportation proceedings. Was the portrayal of these men as loving and caring fathers a move on their part to represent themselves in the public eye as migrants deserving of reprieve? As a feminist, I wanted to find out how the organization mobilized families, the public appeal to which made me wary because "the family" and family values have been appropriated by the Right to push a conservative white heteropatriarchal agenda to promote sexual, economic, and political control over women, measures that are particularly punitive for poor women.

What set FFF apart from many others, which appealed to normative ideas of the family in fighting deportation, was its unwavering commitment to publicly advocating the rights of criminalized members, most of whom, mirroring the prison population, were men of color. Its entry point—the role of deportation in tearing apart families—helps us piece together how deportation, working hand in hand with mass incarceration, reorganizes kinship arrangements as well as the division of labor within families. The testimonies that were carried on its older website and my interviews with organizers reveal the ways in which the state intrudes in the lives of migrants of color to put not only their economic viability at risk but also their ability to do carework in the private sphere. This type of state violence, feminist theorists of color have reminded us, have historically shaped communities of color, which are not allowed to shield their private lives from state intervention (Cohen).

Migrants, who often share the same inner-city neighborhoods with African Americans and Chicanos, are subject to heavy policing and racial profiling, which have led to the mass incarceration of the minoritized citizenry in the United States. But for noncitizens the consequences of encounters with the

criminal legal system are somewhat different from those suffered by citizens. Under current law, they are barred for their lifetime from returning to the United States regardless of the lives they built and of their intimate ties to US-born spouses, children, and siblings.

The legal grounds for the permanent removal of lawfully present immigrants and undocumented migrants with criminal convictions had been consolidated in 1996. With the passage of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) in 1996, immigration judges lost the discretion they had exercised from 1976 onward to waive the removal of long-term LPRs with criminal records by taking into account the hardship to US-born or LPR family members (Hing 58–64). The IIRIRA expanded the definition of aggravated felony to misdemeanors and low-level offenses for noncitizens. Those with such convictions are subject to mandatory detention and removal. The changes to the law have been applied zealously in the twenty-first century. In this period, several federal programs authorized local police to find out whether arrested noncitizens had immigration (civil) violations. This federal–local law enforcement cooperation enhanced the ability of immigration authorities to identify deportable migrants. In 2014, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement removed 315,943 people and reported that 85 percent of the 102,224 individuals removed from the interior (i.e., not at the border) had criminal convictions (United States). These numbers show that the criminal legal system has become a key partner in the business of deporting migrants who lived in the United States.

The removal of "criminal aliens" as an immigration priority has broad public support fed by racialized discourses about criminality and the need for law and order. The division this discourse creates between "good" migrants, who deserve legalization, and "bad" criminal migrants, who need to be expelled permanently, is so powerful that it has also entrenched itself in immigrant activism. A FFF organizer at the time, Manisha Vaze, pointed out the pervasiveness of this divisive argument in the movement when she observed, "I hear it all over—we

want to keep the family-oriented immigrants, criminals should be analysis of what migration purposes work lies in offering works in the situating the deportation of these migrants

The FFF member convictions, shouldered by the because the punishment and deadbeat emotionally supported expectations applied into law in and reducing whose benefit collection and (Curran and well as those counter the criminal conviction (see Pallares) the immigration loving detention for their from their elderly parents which the or their their ability

How for not describe US citizens and then up, it to spend together a father testimonies the ch

want to keep the hardworking undocumented family-oriented immigrants in this country. But those criminals should be deported. And there is no real analysis of what it means to be a criminal for immigration purposes" (Vaze). The importance of FFF's work lies in offering an analysis of how criminalization works in the lives of migrants of color and in situating the deportation crisis in the daily struggles of these migrants.

The FFF members, many of whom had criminal convictions, faced a difficult task, akin to that shouldered by those who advocate prisoners' rights, because the public perceives them as lawbreakers and deadbeat dads who are unable to financially and emotionally support their families. These racialized expectations about normative fatherhood were codified into law in 1996 as part of restructuring welfare and reducing public assistance for single mothers, whose benefits were tied to stringent child support collection and paternity establishment requirements (Curran and Abrams). The FFF men's accounts as well as those of their partners and children directly counter the stereotypical casting of men who have criminal convictions as uncaring and irresponsible (see Pallares on the emergence of the family as a political subjectivity and site of racial resistance in the immigrant rights movement). They present in loving detail the work they did in caring not only for their biological children but also stepchildren from their partners' previous marriages as well as elderly parents. They eloquently express the ways in which their indefinite separation from their children or their constant fear of deportation interfered with their ability to be good fathers.

Howard, a FFF member deported to Jamaica for not complying with a prior deportation order, described his feelings on being separated from his US citizen wife, who sponsored him for residency, and three children: "Even though I'm not locked up, it feels like prison. I worry about time I used to spend with kids. We spent precious time together. I don't want my kids to grow up without a father" ("Barbara and Howard"). From his wife's testimony, we learn that Howard used to "pick up the children from school; take them to the library,

park and McDonalds." After Howard's deportation, his wife, who worked at a drug store, had difficulty picking up one of their children from school on time because of her work schedule and was told that the school would notify the Office of Children and Family Services for neglect if she were repeatedly late. Like Howard's wife, who remarked, "Life has turned upside down since our husbands were taken away," Carol, whose Guyanese husband was arrested for marijuana possession, expressed her frustration with her new role as a single mother as a result of her husband's nine-month-long incarceration at an immigration detention center. In her testimony, she confessed, "Raising a daughter without any help is a struggle. . . . Natasha got sick last week. . . . No matter how much it hurt, I had to send her to school and go to work as a home health aide" ("Carol and Linden"). Carol's narrative points to an irony that is typical of a society where commodified and paid carework is done by women of color for other, better-off families while struggling to take care of their own. In this racialized and gendered division of labor, families that lose a caregiver to deportation do not have the resources to replace the emotional and physical labor. Jani, an African American woman, in asking for sanctuary for her Haitian husband, Jean, who had a criminal record, recounted the crucial role he played in her life by taking care of their children so that she could attend college and earn her bachelor's degree.

Joe, an asylum seeker from China, in his testimony to the congregants of St. Paul of the Apostle Church, expressed his and his wife's constant anxiety of being separated from their small children. He said, "As parents facing deportation, we feel helpless to protect our own children. . . . We love our children's smiles. We want to see them grow. We want to be in their daily life. . . . I have been working in a restaurant for 10 years. . . . Today I am 28. I am a young father. I want to be a good father. . . . My daughter here—she is the oldest child. She is 2 now. I take her to the playground, even if I am tired. She has a lot of energy. She deserves the best." Both Howard and Joe articulate what they consider to be the qualities of good fatherhood; both emphasize time spent

with their children and focus on everyday tasks of taking care of them and the daily, mundane pleasures of fatherhood. Similarly, when testifying with her nine-year-old son, Joshua, to the United Nations Special Rapporteur, Kathy McArdle, who continues to sit on FFF's board, shared an ordinary but tender domestic moment while recounting the horrors of Calvin's arrest at their home early one morning by eight armed immigration agents. Recalling the interactions Calvin had with their son, she said, "Their greatest joy was probably the tickle fights they used to have, and just quiet moments together that can never be duplicated by phone calls." In the magazine *Colorlines*, an older Joshua is quoted as remembering his father's cooking: "I miss his cooking. I really liked his rice that he used to make. It had coconut milk in it" (Wessler). Calvin, a LPR, had lived in the United States for thirty-three years at the time of his arrest and deportation in 2004.

Janis Rosheuvel, former executive director of FFF, attributes the focus on men's caregiving in their households to the lived experience of these families. Fathers struggling to find work often become the primary caretakers, cooking their children dinner, taking them to the park, and helping them with their homework. FFF, she noted, represents men and women who jointly care for their children and elderly to survive in decaying urban areas while working low-paying jobs without adequate benefits (Rosheuvel). These inner city men of color have few prospects of gainful employment, especially if they have a criminal record or are undocumented. Roxroy, for example, could not financially support his family. Instead, he took on the role of the person who took care of his children, his mother, who suffered from Alzheimer's disease, and his infant grandchild. This work ensured that his eighteen-year-old daughter could attend a local university. His life story, Rosheuvel points out, is not an exception when it comes to members of the organization.

The testimonies from FFF members challenge us to apply the feminist insights about kinship arrangements in communities of color where men's place in their families cannot be read straightforwardly

through the hegemonic scripts about masculinity that is contingent on breadwinning. The emotional content of the testimonies of FFF members sheds light on the reorganization of kinship and the everyday caregiving tasks in migrant and mixed-status families through immigration enforcement. Deportation not only serves to deprive migrants of their livelihood, discipline them for their activism, and target their biological reproduction (Chavez; Buff) but also impacts their ability to care for their family members and households.

In the application of deportation policy, we can discern a set of codes that appeal to morality to devalue the relationships of criminalized migrants to their loved ones. The folding together of law enforcement, national security, and immigration enforcement constantly remind FFF that their members and their loved ones are under attack because they fall outside of nationally and racially marked familial arrangements considered normative. In this context, Rosheuvel's insistence that "Our *family* is valuable; our family deserves justice; our family should have access to relief and justice like any other family" rests on the recognition that deportees' kinship ties are devalued because they do not conform to dominant ideologies that govern the family as an institution (Rosheuvel). The revaluation renders visible the emotional and material labor of migrant men in their households. The stories of domesticity, intimacy, and tenderness under social and economic circumstances that strain heteronormative versions of these affective states counteract the dehumanizing portrayals of these men as dangerous criminals, terrorists, and men who flout the "rule of law," a concept that reifies the state's sovereignty exercised through its right to deport. Deportation practices that mandate lifetime separation of family members themselves create new configurations of nonnormative kinship, desire, and intimacy. These split families may signal a restructuring of heterosexuality by unmooring it from heteronormativity, as feminist scholar Jasbir Puar suggests (146). The long-distance arrangements raise afresh questions about what it means to negotiate heterosexuality as well

as affective and ca
deportation.

Simply put, FF
are not just a stra
respectable, dome
sympathy. They c
deportation beco
the state continu
in the immigra
about the relatio
lation and the r

NOTES

1. The older vers
wayback.archi
for www.fami
personal narra
ing on the Tr

WORKS C

- "Barbara and H
dom.org/fan
2015.
- Buff, Rachel Id
terly, vol. 6
- "Carol and Lin
org/familie
- Chavez, Leo R
Citizens, an
- Cohen, Cathy.
Agenda fo
vol. 1, no.
- Curran, Laura
Fatherhoc
Society, vo

ADDIT

- Detention W
Families for

as affective and caregiving structures in an era of deportation.

Simply put, FFF's narratives of good fathering are not just a strategic choice to cast these men as respectable, domesticated, and deserving of public sympathy. They confront us with the ways in which deportation becomes an instrument through which the state continues to define "the family." However, in the immigrant rights movement, discussions about the relationship between immigration regulation and the regulation of gender and sexuality

are rare outside of feminist and queer spaces. As an immigrant feminist who is involved in the movement, the process of interrogating my skepticism about FFF's mobilization of "families" and attending to FFF's analysis of the intersection between the criminal legal system and immigration enforcement underlines the importance of recognizing that the organization of gender and sexuality lies at the heart of immigration policy and, thus, addressing state control over our intimate lives needs to be central to visions of justice for migrants and their loved ones.

NOTES

1. The older version of the FFF Web page is archived at wayback.archive.org/ and can be accessed by searching for www.familiesforfreedom.org/index.htm. Some of the personal narratives quoted here can be accessed by clicking on the Truth Commission link. The testimonies of

Jean and Jani, Joe and Mei, and Josh and Kathy used here are no longer online, but the stories about Joe and Mei and Josh and Kathy can be accessed at familiesforfreedom.org/families/kathy-josh-calvin and familiesforfreedom.org/families/chen-family.

WORKS CITED

- "Barbara and Howard." *Families for Freedom*, familiesforfreedom.org/families/barbara-howard. Accessed 11 Sept. 2015.
- Buff, Rachel Ida. "The Deportation Terror." *American Quarterly*, vol. 60, no. 3, 2008, pp. 523–51.
- "Carol and Linden." *Families for Freedom*, familiesforfreedom.org/families/carol-linden. Accessed 11 Sept. 2015.
- Chavez, Leo R. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Stanford UP, 2008.
- Cohen, Cathy. "Deviance as Resistance: A New Research Agenda for the Study of Black Politics." *Du Bois Review*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2004, pp. 27–45.
- Curran, Laura, and Laura Abrams. "Making Men into Dads: Fatherhood, the State and Welfare Reform." *Gender & Society*, vol. 14, no. 5, 2000, pp. 662–78.
- Hing, Bill Ong. *Deporting Our Souls: Values, Morality, and Immigration Policy*. Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Paralles, Amalia. *Family Activism: Immigrant Struggles and the Politics of Noncitizenship*. Rutgers UP, 2014.
- Puar, Jasbir. *Terrorist Assemblage: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2007.
- Rosheuvel, Janis. Personal Interview. 2010.
- United States, Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement. *FY 2014 ICE Immigration Removals*. 2014, www.ice.gov/removal-statistics.
- Vaze, Manisha. Personal Interview. 10 July 2009.
- Wessler, Seth. "Double Punishment." *Colorlines*, 9 Oct. 2009, www.colorlines.com/articles/double-punishment.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- Detention Watch Network. www.detentionwatchnetwork.org/.
- Families for Freedom. familiesforfreedom.org/.

43. • Kathy E. Ferguson

BIRTH CONTROL (NEW)

Kathy Ferguson, a professor of political science and women's studies at the University of Hawai'i is currently writing a book on the activism of anarchist women advocating for reproductive and sexual freedom, labor rights, and an end to war. She has received several teaching, research, and service awards from the University of Hawai'i and from the field of political science, most recently for scholarship that directly benefits local communities. An earlier version of this essay first appeared in the blog *The Contemporary Condition* on July 14, 2015.

The second decade of the twenty-first century is witnessing significant political attacks on women's ability to use birth control—the Supreme Court case *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby* (2014), the presidential campaigns of Mitt Romney, Ted Cruz, and Rick Santorum, and a plethora of state-level initiatives from conservative and religious sources: such assaults often elicit disbelief from progressive women. We thought those battles were over. We thought we had won. A Planned Parenthood ad reminds us that it's not the 1950s anymore: "It is unbelievable that in 2014 we are still fighting about women's access to basic health care like birth control." Progressive women often ask, sarcastically, if this is 1915, not 2015, as if the passage of a hundred years were a guarantor of progress.

However, a stronger grasp of the history of the birth control movement suggests otherwise: the anarchists and socialists who fought those battles in the early twentieth century would not, I think, be surprised that the issue is still with us. I imagine that Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, Marie Equi, Ida Rauh, Crystal Eastman, Eugene Debs, Walter Adolphe Roberts, and many, many others working for access to contraception would know better, because they understood birth control as a central tenet of a larger struggle. Rather than looking at opposition to birth control as a lingering remnant of an otherwise settled past, the earlier radicals encourage us to see birth control as inextricably woven into

other ongoing struggles for freedom and community. Rather than assuming progress and being repeatedly surprised at its absence, we could learn from earlier struggles to locate our understanding of birth control in a more radical frame.

The anarchists and socialists who fought for birth control in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries did not think they were winning a definitive war but that they were engaging in a prolonged and messy set of battles in which victories came at significant costs. They understood that if women did not control their own reproduction, someone else would control it, since states, capitalists, churches, and families have serious investments in controlling women's bodies. It wasn't just attitudes that needed to be changed but also institutions. They fought for birth control, not as a private decision between a woman and her doctor but as a potentially revolutionary practice that radically challenged prevailing power arrangements, including that of men over women, capitalists over workers, militaries over soldiers, and churches over parishioners.

The Supreme Court decision in *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby* offers an unwelcome opportunity to think about birth control through an appreciation of its radical past. Many good questions have been asked regarding the *Hobby Lobby* ruling—why do for-profit corporations have religious rights? Why is men's sexuality unproblematic, so that insurance coverage for Viagra and vasectomies is uncontested, while

women's sexualit
straightforward
venting concept
confused? Why
ational sex on t
cerned that me

While recog
ries, I want to
we surprised?
disbelief: "Ho
age?" Critics
backward" an
back the clo
torical timeli
one pushes
view of histo
victories and
open-ended
unfolding c
of efforts to
up the com
of progress
the terms

RECLA

Linda G
study W
cal roots
unknown
the Un
with re
dire. T
birth
ments.
selecti
been
sage c
ing "
birth
into
varic
sarie
thro

women's sexuality is subject to scrutiny? Why are straightforward medical distinctions between preventing conception and aborting a fetus ignored or confused? Why do many conservatives decry recreational sex on the part of women but seem unconcerned that men might have sex for fun?

While recognizing the legitimacy of these queries, I want to raise a different question: Why are we surprised? Why is our indignation tinged with disbelief: "How could this happen in this day and age?" Critics routinely call the decision "hopelessly backward" and accuse critics of wanting to "turn back the clock," as though there were a single historical timeline that carries us forward unless someone pushes us back. This is an utterly inadequate view of history. Instead, we need to locate both our victories and our defeats within multidirectional and open-ended historical processes, not steps in a single unfolding drama. We won't understand the tenacity of efforts to control women's sexuality until we give up the comforting assumption that history is a story of progress, and look more closely at the stakes and the terms of political struggle.

RECLAIMING OUR RADICAL PAST

Linda Gordon rightly points out, in her landmark study *Woman's Body, Woman's Right*, that the radical roots of the struggle for birth control are largely unknown today. The situation faced by women in the United States in the early twentieth century with regard to controlling their reproduction was dire. The main problem was not a lack of known birth control technology, since, as Gordon documents, ancient, effective forms of birth control were selectively available, but in the United States it had been largely forced underground. In 1873 the passage of the Comstock Law, which criminalized sending "obscene" material through the mail, gathered birth control, sexuality, and radical ideas in general into its elastic net of prohibitions. During this time, various barrier and suppository methods, called pessaries, were known and available to wealthy women through their doctors but largely unknown or

unavailable to the poor. Diaphragms and condoms had to be smuggled into the United States from Europe. Politics, rather than technology, made birth control unavailable to most American women, and to change that situation political struggle was required.

From a contemporary point of view, it is startling to realize that many anarchists and socialists placed women's access to birth control at the heart of social revolution. We are accustomed to seeing the medicalized perspective—the claim that reproductive choices are questions of women's health and should be left to women and their doctors—as the feminist position, the position we must defend. Yet, there is another set of feminist voices, radical voices, voices that aimed to free women as well as liberate workers, end war, and transform society. Jamaican writer Walter Adolphe Roberts championed birth control both to enhance women's freedom and to advance the cause of social revolution (Roberts 7). Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman located women's control over their reproduction as a central aspect of workers' struggles and antiwar activism. Emma Goldman's journal *Mother Earth* devoted its April 1916 issue to birth control. Alexander Berkman's journal *The Blast* concentrated on birth control in its February 12, 1916, issue and mentioned it in several others. While they supported Margaret Sanger in her early activism, they objected to Sanger's later strategy, which legitimized the birth control movement by aligning it with (mostly male) doctors. The radicals felt this approach removed birth control from the larger political context while giving power over women (including midwives) to doctors rather than to women themselves. Understanding these arguments can help feminists today learn from our own movement's past and perhaps shape current reproductive struggles as steps toward more radical political change.

Anarchists and socialists who embraced birth control framed it as a revolutionary demand to include sexual and reproductive freedom as necessary aspects of social justice and individual autonomy. Controlling one's own reproduction was part of transforming society. These progressive women and men integrated the liberation of women's sexuality into

their vocal anticapitalist, antiwar mass movements. Just as capitalism sought to control the laboring bodies of workers and militaries sought to control the fighting bodies of soldiers, so did patriarchal families, churches, professions, and governments seek to control the reproductive bodies of women. Restrictions on birth control, they concluded, served the interests of states by producing an endless supply of cannon fodder for imperial wars, the interests of capital by generating a reserve army of labor to keep wages down, and the interests of organized religion by maintaining women's subservience and vulnerability within families and communities. A free society would be a society in which workers control their own labor, soldiers control their own fighting, and women control their own wombs. The radicals watched with dismay as their vision of a transformed society was displaced by the rise of a coalition between feminists, doctors, and the state to privatize contraception as an issue "between a woman and her doctor." Understanding the potentially radical implications of women's reproductive freedom, they also saw that some kinds of birth control reform could reinforce patriarchy rather than challenge it.

Attention to these struggles can reframe contemporary debates over birth control. The *Hobby Lobby* decision and other contraceptive losses for women are not temporary backsliding or inexplicable throwbacks to an earlier era but instead indicate ongoing and predictable unrest over proper standards of sexuality and of women's place. It would not surprise earlier anarchist and socialist feminists that the current Gilded Age, driven by neoliberal values and global corporate priorities, includes a resurgent war on women's reproductive autonomy. These radicals would, however, likely recoil from the pallid notion that birth control is a "women's issue" rather than a central aspect of a larger system of exploitation and control. A fuller grasp of our radical past can help us think of history as a dynamic network of shifting relations, operating at different paces in response to various challenges. The birth control movement then becomes a site of struggle, not an unfolding of a telos of development. We can look for the forgotten

victories and lost possibilities of human freedom recorded there and bring those minoritarian views back into contemporary discussions.

HOW CAN BIRTH CONTROL BE MORE RADICAL?

How might a greater appreciation of birth control's radical past change feminism's present and future? Perhaps it could give us an alternative to being on the defensive: rather than asking for healthcare, we might demand freedom. Rather than seeing doctors as our main partners, we might see unions, antiwar groups, civil rights organizations, environmental groups, alternative spiritual movements, and other radical communities as coalition partners. There is a vibrant history of such coalitions: the early years of the journal *The Birth Control Review* brought together labor leaders like Eugene Debs, antiwar activists such as John Haynes Holmes, and civil rights activists including W. E. B. Dubois to endorse women's access to birth control as a central aspect of freedom for all oppressed people. Today, we could make common cause with others who are similarly disadvantaged by, for example, judicial rulings granting corporations personhood, defining money as speech, and attributing religious identity to for-profit businesses. We might become bolder, not more cautious, in our thinking and acting.

For example, feminists often stress the difference between preventing and terminating pregnancy in order to use opposition to abortion to promote acceptance of birth control. Abortion and contraception are two separate issues, we say. Hobby Lobby's court arguments are invalid because they confuse technologies that prevent fertilization with technologies that remove fertilized eggs, we point out. We invite people who oppose abortion to agree with us about birth control because, if all women had access to birth control, there would be fewer abortions. These are very old arguments: birth control activist Mary Ware Dennett made the exact same claims in her 1926 book advocating the removal of contraception from the category of obscenity (12). Perhaps we

need to stop co
though these
to be workin
While clearly
ent, it is their
control their
and abortion

Also, fem
relationship
to discredit
woman and
we need to
contracept
tion, the p
happened
spectives
women's
high qua
of that fr
primary
before C
oral con
than pro
titude a
demand
we wan
sexual
"plight
sexual
are som
a "pli
wome
over-
for fr
want
nitie

NO

1.

need to stop concentrating on these arguments. Even though these claims are accurate, they don't appear to be working. I suspect they give up too much. While clearly abortion and contraception are different, it is their common value to women who want to control their fertility that makes both birth control and abortion into targets of conservative wrath.

Also, feminists often stress the priority of the relationship "between a woman and her doctor" to discredit other possible relations, say, between a woman and her employer, a woman and her husband, a woman and her Supreme Court justices. Perhaps we need to stop doing that too. Medicalization of contraception has come to be the progressive position, the position we have to defend. But that only happened because more radical, more feminist perspectives were sidelined. Maybe it's time to stress women's freedom—and access to affordable and high quality healthcare would surely be an aspect of that freedom—rather than women's health as our primary goal. When Sandra Fluke bravely testified before Congress in 2012 about the importance of oral contraception for treating health issues other than pregnancy, she was vilified as a slut and a prostitute anyway (Moorhead). So perhaps it's time to demand access to the birth control techniques that we want rather than parsing our desires to downplay sexual freedom. Calling on the courts to consider the "plight" of women who use contraception for non-sexual purposes implicitly suggests that those uses are somehow more legitimate, that women who have a "plight" are more worthy of consideration than women who have a cause. If contraceptives were sold over-the-counter at affordable prices or distributed for free at accessible clinics, then women's reasons for wanting them would be irrelevant and the opportunities to judge women's sexuality might diminish.

Further, feminists sometimes speak of opposition to birth control as psychological, a question of men's fears of women's sexual autonomy. Joan Walsh of Salon.com writes of a deep fear of women's freedom on the Right; Dan Savage writes on *Slog*, "it's sex for pleasure that they hate." I don't disagree with either of these claims, but I want to push them further—opposition to women's reproductive freedom is not primarily a bad attitude or emotional hang-up. The interests of material structures and institutions that distribute resources, organize labor, conduct war, and administer spirituality are fully in play. Birth control keeps coming back as an issue not just because men don't get it but because capitalism, the state, empire, war, and patriarchal religions are still in power, and those institutions have an enormous stake in controlling women's sexuality. Controlling access to physical pleasure, managing demographic change, disciplining labor, and ensuring inheritance, among other outcomes, are at issue.

Finally, feminists need to give up the comforting idea that history is on our side, that progress toward fuller rights and greater equality is written into the order of things, once we dispense with those irrational, wrong-thinking obstructionists. History, I think, isn't on anyone's side; more importantly, there are many histories, many trajectories, and many different futures past. When feminists assure us, as Joan Walsh recently did, that "the right's crippling panic over women's autonomy will eventually doom it to irrelevance," or, as Amanda Marcote commented, "the anti-sex argument is a losing argument," we should question the implicit progress narrative folded into such guarantees. We are neither doomed nor blessed—rather, we have multiple opportunities to struggle for a better world and we should think carefully about their possibilities.

NOTE

1. My thanks to Nicole Sunday Grove, Jairus Grove, and Lori Marso for their help on this essay. An earlier version appeared in *The Contemporary Condition*, 14 July 2014.