

home for a wage or in "workfare" while raising small children, white women are often encouraged to give up wage labor and be stay-at-home moms. Gender norms about labor roles portray an ideal of white motherhood that drastically contrasts with the way black motherhood is interpreted, and different forms of coercion apply to enforce these norms. Examination of these roles, the norms that govern them, and the institutions and arrangements that enforce them is a central task for feminism.

Foucault's description of disciplinary power as productive rather than repressive can help develop feminist perspectives on how resistance can be mounted against heteropatriarchy. When we imagine power as primarily repressive, we often imagine that to make change the main thing is to go to those who "have power" and are at the top of the hierarchy, and take over their roles and/or convince them to pass new rules and laws forbidding the prior behavior. So, for example, we might prioritize passing laws to make sex discrimination, rape, domestic violence, sexual orientation discrimination, and gender identity discrimination illegal. These actions, according to a view of power as repressive, should work to make the operations of heteropatriarchy stop. Interestingly, many of these things have happened in the United States. Yet sexual violence and intimate-partner violence remain endemic; the wage gap has not been eliminated; people still work in highly gendered labor roles (such as 90 percent of secretaries are women) that correlate to pay inequity; parenting roles remain highly gendered and parenting labor remains inequitably divided; and, in general, rigid gender norms remain vibrantly alive and violently enforced. Some would even argue that the passage of such laws exacerbates heteropatriarchal conditions because it serves as a mask for these conditions, creating an illusion of equality and of the government as the protector and guarantor of equality, meanwhile apparatuses of racialized-gendered violence, such as the child-welfare, criminal punishment, and immigration enforcement systems, expand. By reconceptualizing how power works and attending to different forms of power, we can account for the seeming contradictions of systems where control occurs in multiple intersecting ways, including through processes of norm creation and enforcement that help us all see, experience and reproduce ourselves and the world according to racialized gender hierarchies.

BIOPOLITICS AND THE NORM

Discipline was not the only model of power that Foucault described. Foucault also analyzes what he calls "biopolitics," and an understanding of biopolitics and its relationships to discipline is important for understanding the significance of the concepts of norms and normalization to feminist theories and activism. While Foucault's model of disciplinary power helps elucidate the ways that norms and processes of normalization in terms of gender, sexuality, and race operate in systems of heteropatriarchy, Foucault also offers a statistical sense of norm that operates at the level of population. Foucault uses the term "biopolitics" to describe normalization at the level of populations. Whereas the

objective of disciplinary power is to invest in and shape individuals' subjectivities, bodies, behaviors, and interactions, biopolitical power shapes at the general level of population composition. Foucault points to the emergence of state-based statistical gathering practices and the emergence of demographic sciences as evidence of the emergence of biopolitics.

Foucault also points to the ways that processes of normalization are central to biopolitical projects. For Foucault, the consolidation of a population also involves identifying and eliminating the "weak" elements in that population. Weak here designates anything that seems to interfere with or threaten the growth of the population, especially figured in terms of a national population and its relationship to the economy of the state (Clough and Willse 2011). Foucault uses the term "state racism" to describe the process of identifying and cutting out weak elements. This "cutting out" occurs both indirectly through social abandonment, and more directly through mass killing. While Foucault emphasizes that the racism he uses implies the "human race" and he is not thinking only of racialized categories of life, analysis of the racial state and racial capitalism, following David Theo Goldberg (2001) and Cedric Robinson (2000), among others, reminds us that racial subordination is central to the project of nation-state making, and hence to a biopolitics of the population as well.

Biopolitics as a racial project of homogenization that requires killing off weak elements means that eugenic projects, far from an aberration of modern society, are central to any modern state. To understand this claim, we can look to how Foucault writes that the norm travels between the realms of disciplinary and biopolitical power:

In more general terms, we can say that there is one element that will circulate between the disciplinary and the regulatory, which will also be applied to the body and population alike, which will make it possible to control both the disciplinary order of the body and the aleatory events that occur in the biopolitical multiplicity. The element that circulates between the two is the norm. The norm is something that can be applied both to a body one wishes to discipline and a population one wishes to regularize.

(Foucault 2003, 253)

Foucault also argues that sexuality serves as a kind of hinge between individuals and the population, suggesting that this may explain why sexuality achieves such an important and contested status in modern societies. Rey Chow has amended Foucault's history of sexuality, arguing that it might be better framed as a description of the "ascendancy of whiteness." In so doing, Chow draws out the centrality of processes racialization submerged in Foucault's account and highlighted by critical feminist interventions. With this in mind, we can understand the emergence of the women's birth control movement in the United States in the early twentieth century in relation to race population control strategies. Following both emancipation and new waves of immigration, fears of a "race suicide" circulated among white elites in the United States (Haraway 1984/85, 57). Margaret Sanger's campaign to provide women with information and means for birth

control was not simply a feminist project. Rather, it was meant to provide tools for poor white women and women of color to curb what was seen as their hyperreproductivity, a reproductivity that threatened to outnumber the children borne of the proper elements of US society, middle-class and wealthy white women. Here, then, we see the collusion of norms of behavior, including new norms of "empowerment," to use a modern phrase, in women taking control of their bodies by using birth control with statistical norms of the racial and class composition of the US society. These are exactly the subtle forms of state racism Foucault argues characterize the modern state, a kind of positive eugenics of growing the right kind of population by cutting out in advance the wrong kinds. Here we see processes of norming at the level of individual discipline and the normalization of population forms and patterns. Feminists have used terms like "population control" and "ethnic cleansing" to talk about this kind of normalization of the population, where the growth of certain elements is encouraged while attempts are made to reduce the prevalence of subpopulations that are considered undesirable.

Less subtle versions of this have persisted as well, as evidenced in the history of forced sterilization of indigenous, black, and Puerto Rican women in US health clinics. Sterilization has been a regular practice in US prisons as well, emphasizing again feminists' insistence that directly violent forms of domination and control have accompanied the emergence of disciplinary regimes of self governance. Bringing a biopolitical analysis forward helps keep the violence of modern normalization in view.

APPLYING AN ANALYSIS OF NORMS AND NORMALIZATION WHEN STRATEGIZING CHANGE: CASE STUDY ON HETEROPATRIARCHY AND SAME-SEX MARRIAGE ADVOCACY

Foucault's emphasis on norms, categorization, and processes of normalization are vital insights for feminist resistance strategies. Foucault's work draws attention to some significant traps that people and groups resisting heteropatriarchy can fall into if we employ an oversimplified understanding of power. When power is conceived of as repressive, the imagined solution is often to redeem what is repressed and have that despised identity or category become accepted, tolerated, or even supported. To follow Foucault's famous example of homosexual identity, from the perspective of the repressive model of power, it would make sense to attempt to move homosexuality out of being labeled criminal and deviant and toward being understood as a normal and acceptable variation with sexual practice and identity. Indeed, this has been one strategy of gay rights reformers in the United States—to get sodomy decriminalized, to remove the bar to military

service for gays and lesbians, and to advocate for sexual orientation non-discrimination laws and for same-sex relationships to be recognized as the same as heterosexual relationships by allowing same-sex couples to marry. These reforms seek to change laws understood to repress homosexuality, and to instead establish in law that gay and lesbian people and their relationships must be treated the same as heterosexual people and relationships. Such reforms purport to achieve equality by having the authority of law (where power is understood to reside) come down on the side of “gays are the same” rather than “gays are different and bad.” This model seeks to punish discriminators and eliminate legal distinctions.

When processes of normalization are considered, change seekers can assess whether a particular approach will have the transformative impact they hope. Gayle Rubin’s famous 1984 essay “Thinking Sex” helps illustrate how the project of becoming accepted, or being declared the same as heterosexuals, is at odds with feminist approaches to dismantling sexual hierarchies created by heteropatriarchal regimes of normalization. Rubin describes how systems that hierarchically rank sexual practices change as part of maintaining their operations of control. Sexuality is divided into those practices that are considered normal and natural—what she calls the “charmed circle”—and those that are considered bad and abnormal—the “outer limits.” Practices sometimes cross from the outer limits to the charmed circle. Unmarried couples living together, or, perhaps, homosexuality when it is monogamous and married, have moved in mainstream US culture from being highly stigmatized to being considered acceptable (see Figure 27.1).


These shifts, however, do not eliminate the ranking of sexual behaviors. In other words, the shifts do not challenge the existence of a charmed circle and outer limits—they do not disrupt a system in which people are coerced and shamed into engaging in certain practices and not others. Freedom and equality are not achieved when a practice crosses over to being acceptable. Instead, such shifts strengthen the line between what is considered good, healthy, and normal and what remains bad, unhealthy, stigmatized, and criminalized. The line moves to accommodate a few more people, of whom society suddenly comes to approve, adjusting the system and keeping it in place. The legal marriage system—along with its corollary criminal punishment system, with its laws against lewd behavior, solicitation, indecency, and the like—enforces the line between which sexual practices and behaviors are acceptable and rewarded, and which are contemptible and even punishable (Extein 2013; Pittman 2013; Center for HIV Law and Policy 2013).

The trouble with the strategy to “get the law to say gay is the same” is that it promotes equality within the oppressive frame of heteropatriarchy. Rather than questioning the terms and categories through which sex, love, and romance are disciplined and controlled, this approach embraces such terms and categories and reproduces them. Critique of romance and marriage as cultural institutions central to the subjection of women, the creation of harmful gender roles, and cultivation of sexual violence is part of the bedrock of feminist thought. As feminists have attacked the institution of marriage, they have both attacked the romantic myths that accompany it and hold it up, and drawn attention to the structural violence in the way that marriage as a legal institution is used to distribute such basic needs as healthcare and immigration status.

The charmed circle:

Good, Normal, Natural, Blessed Sexuality

Heterosexual
 Married
 Monogamous
 Procreative
 Non-commercial
 In pairs
 In a relationship
 Same generation
 In private
 No pornography
 Bodies only
 Vanilla

**The outer limits:**
Bad, Abnormal,
Unnatural, Damned
Sexuality

Homosexual
 Unmarried
 Promiscuous
 Non-procreative
 Commercial
 Alone or in groups
 Casual
 Cross-generational
 In public
 Pornography
 With manufactured objects
 Sadoomasochistic

FIGURE 27.1 The sex hierarchy: the charmed circle versus the outer limits.

Source: Rubin (1984).

As part of seeking entrance into marriage, gay rights advocates have taken up messaging that is deeply invested in these same myths and reproduces them. Same-sex marriage advocacy has included talking points about how children benefit from having married parents, about how expressing love through marriage is important to human dignity, about how married love is the most important relationship people can have, about how the marital family is the proper place for care to happen. Feminists have fought to

remove stigma from unmarried childbirth, to expose marriage as a form of social control rather than a voluntary bond based in love, to expose marriage as a key site of sexual and gender violence and labor exploitation, to break stereotypes that declare women "selfish" if they are not willing or able to endlessly provide care labor in the marital family, and to expose how marriage is a site where women are forced into unpaid care labor while governments and employers reap the benefits of the workforce being reproduced by this uncompensated work. Roles and categories that feminists have critiqued and worked to denaturalize, such as "good wife," "romantic couple," and "legitimate family," have been embraced by same-sex marriage advocacy. Rather than being concerned with the harmful norm enforcement entailed in the maintenance of these categories, these advocacy efforts have sought to prove that gay and lesbian people can also occupy these roles and carefully follow the norms they require.

Feminist scholars and activists have imagined a break from the norms of romance and the marital family, but same-sex marriage advocacy has introduced a new celebration of the traditional trappings of the institution of marriage, complete with blood diamonds, white gowns and destination weddings in colonized locales. Feminists have dared to imagine a world in which sexuality and reproduction was not tied to the couple form or the marital family, in which the moral enforcement of sexuality through the figures of "slut," "mistress," "adulterer," and "faithful spouse" might fall away, in which people would not spend their lives believing that being unmarried is a personal failure, or remain in harmful marriages because of emotional and economic coercion. Further, they have dared to imagine a world in which immigration status, healthcare, and other life necessities are not conditioned on entering into the state-approved family form. Such imaginings and proposals challenge the disciplinary norms of marriage and the romance myth, and are deeply at odds with a project that identifies liberation not by questioning norms and exposing their operations to dismantle them, but by being considered normal.

In addition to analyzing the limits of same-sex marriage advocacy from the perspective of disciplinary norms, feminist scholars and activists have also articulated how such advocacy abandons feminist analysis of the ways that marriage is used to manage populations. Specifically, feminist analysis has exposed how marriage is an apparatus of racialized-gendered population control—a key tool of anti-black racism, xenophobia, and colonialism that ensure that black people, native people, immigrants, and other racialized people are controlled, subjected to significant state violence, displaced, and disposed of.

Since the founding of the United States, regulating family formation has been key to anti-black racism and violence (Spillers 1987; Hartman 1997; Willse and Spade 2013). Slaves were not allowed to marry. Denying the family ties of slaves was essential to slavery—ensuring that children would be born enslaved and maintaining black people as property rather than persons. Sexual violence against black women was central to the system of racial chattel slavery. After emancipation, the US government scrambled to control black people, coercing marriage among newly freed black people and criminalizing them for adultery as one pathway of recapturing them into the convict lease

system. After *Brown v. Board of Education*, which challenged formal, legal segregation, illegitimacy laws became a favored way to exclude black children from programs and services (Mayeri 2011).

The idea that married families and their children are superior was and remains a key tool of anti-black racism. Black families have consistently been portrayed as pathological and criminal in academic research and social policy based on marriage rates, most famously in the Moynihan Report (US Department of Labor: Office of Policy Planning and Research 1965). Anti-poor and anti-black discourse and policymaking frame poverty as a result of the lack of marriage in black populations. President Bill Clinton's 1996 dismantling of welfare programs, which disproportionately harmed black families, was justified by an explicit discourse that said that poverty results from unmarried parenthood (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act 1996). Under both President George W. Bush and President Barack Obama, "healthy marriage promotion" initiatives have been used to encourage low-income women to marry, including at times offering cash incentives (Silag 2003; Olson 2005). Demonizing, managing, and controlling black people by applying racist and sexist marital family norms to justify both brutal interventions and "benign neglect" has a long history in the United States, and remains standard fare.

Enforcement of gender and family formation norms has also been central to the processes of colonization of North America by European settlers. Colonizers often portray invasion as rescuing colonized populations from their backward gender and family systems. Forcing indigenous people to comply with European norms of gender, sexuality and family structure and punishing them for not doing so has been a key tool of US settler colonialism in North America. Marriage has been an important tool of land theft and ethnic cleansing aimed at disappearing indigenous people in many ways. The US encouraged westward settlement by promising male settlers 160 acres to move west, plus an extra 160 if they married and brought a wife (Matthew n.d.). At the same time, the United States criminalized traditional indigenous communal living styles, burning longhouses where indigenous people lived communally, eliminating communal land-holding methods, and enforcing male individual ownership. Management of gender and family systems was and is essential to displacement and settlement processes. Enforcing gender norms in boarding schools as part of a "civilizing mission," and removing children from native communities through a variety of programs that persist today are key tools of ethnic cleansing and settlement in the United States (Morgensen 2010; Smith 2005; Rifkin 2011).

The racialized-gendered ethnic cleansing that produced and produces the United States, of course, requires not only the displacement and erasure of indigenous people but also racialized-gendered population control at the borders. Since its origins, US immigration law has put in place mechanisms for regulating those migrants it does allow in, always under threat of deportation, and labeling other migrants "undesirable" to make them both more exploitable and easier to purge. Keeping out poor people, people with stigmatized health issues, and people of color has been urgent an national priority. Marriage has been one of the key valves of that control. The Page Act of 1875, the

first restrictive federal immigration law in the United States, sought to keep out Asian women, hoping to prevent Asian laborers in the United States from reproducing, but allowed the immigration of Asian merchants' wives (Abrams 2005). Marriage continues to be a deeply unjust tool of immigration control in the United States, with marital family ties being one of the few pathways to immigration. One impact of this system is that it keeps people trapped in violent and harmful sexual and family relationships because their immigration status depends on it (Dutton, Orloff, and Haas 2000).

Given these analyses of marriage as a key tool of normalization at the population level, feminists have questioned the wisdom of same-sex marriage advocacy which, rather than challenging the ways that marriage regulates access to property, healthcare, and immigration status to maintain white supremacist and colonial arrangements, embraces marriage and an institution and seeks to slightly reform it so that those who may benefit from it within gay and lesbian populations can get their piece of the action. Marriage operates as a tool of population regulation, cultivating the life of the desired population, and producing conditions of vulnerability, ranging from lack of access to healthcare to imprisonment and deportation, for those marked as disposable or threatening.

NORMS AND NORMALIZATION IN FEMINIST RESISTANCE FORMATIONS

Analysis of norms and normalization processes allow feminists opportunities to evaluate the impact of heteropatriarchy across several scales—our individual psyches, our immediate interactions with other individuals, our experiences of coercive institutions, and the broad management of populations by multiple, overlapping structures and methods of governance. In addition to helping feminists assess these conditions and evaluate various resistance strategies to see how they might participate in or dismantle various norms, an analysis of norms and normalization also draws our attention to our own methods of organizing ourselves. Biopolitics and state racism, and the processes of normalization they require, are not limited to governments. Any group that imagines a good way of life and the kinds of people who would live that life and be the ideal subjects of that life is creating and enforcing norms. Various social movements, including the nationalist anticolonial and antiracist movements of the 1960s and 1970s in the United States, often imagined a revolutionary subject that was, by default, male, and often reproduced heteropatriarchal gender and family formation norms in discourses about restoring power and ownership to those subjects (Combahee River Collective 1980; Yuval-Davis 1997; Kaplan et al. 1999; Anzaldúa 1987; Grewal and Kaplan 1994; Moraga 1983; Mohanty 1988). In the mid-sixties, women in the civil rights and student movements made key interventions when they spoke out against being relegated to “second sex” status by men in the movement (Evans 1979). Black feminists and other feminists of color have analyzed how white feminism and white women's movements

have imagined white women as the subjects of feminism, have centered their needs and struggles as the issues feminism is concerned with, falsely universalizing white women's experience as "women's experience" in ways that collaborate with and reproduce white supremacy (Moraga and Anzuldúa 1981; Sandoval 2000). These analyses of the production and enforcement of racialized gender norms within resistance movements draw attention to both disciplinary and biopolitical processes of normalization as well as to their intersections.

At the disciplinary level, these analyses ask activists to consider the ways that we create social movement culture. What are our meetings and social spaces like? Who speaks and whose perspectives are privileged? What behaviors move people into leadership roles or get people kicked out? What norms about valued bodies, gender expressions, ways of having sex or forming families are enforced in the movement culture and how are they enforced? In contemporary movement spaces, we can see the impacts of these feminist inquiries. Contemporary social movement organizations frequently utilize "anti-oppression" curricula with members to address harmful dynamics within groups. Increasingly, feminist and queer organizing meetings begin with individuals identifying what pronouns they prefer to be referred by and what accessibility needs they have for the meeting. These innovations are the results of trans people and people with disabilities advocating for analyses of how these spaces reproduce ableist and transphobic norms and what might be done in the immediate context of a meeting to begin to shift these dynamics.

At the level of population, feminist activists have asked and continue to ask difficult questions about how to build processes into our work that address the tendency of groups to create internal enemies, people who can be expelled, denied, or forgotten in the name of the health or well-being of the life being cultivated. The systems of distribution that we seek to replace, whose exclusions and expulsions feminist scholars and activists have documented carefully, must not be replaced with systems that, though using perhaps altered norms, still sort the population into those who will live and those who must die. Tools developed particularly in women of color feminist scholarship and organizing contexts that address this are critiques of institutionalization, critiques of hierarchy and a value for horizontal structures, consensus decisionmaking, and ongoing processes of self-reflection (see Nepon, Redfield, and Spade 2013; INCITE! 2007). These tools aim to disrupt forms of governance that establish norms and ignore or exclude those for whom the norms produce harm. These tools operate on an assumption that even the most well-intentioned individuals and groups will enforce harmful norms that make some people vulnerable, and that the processes of coming to understand, denaturalize and "unlearn" such norms is an ongoing one that requires ongoing vigilance and adaptation, facilitated by consistently working to critically reflect on processes of normalization. These tools represent lessons learned from the pitfalls of often rigid, norm-enforcing ideologies enforced within social movements.

Feminist prison-abolition work represents a vibrant location where feminist scholars and activists are deeply engaging an analysis of state racism and developing innovative social movement infrastructure. Scholars and activists have traced how the

rise of the antiviolence movement in the US corresponded with a historical prison boom (INCITE! 2006; Ritchie 2012; Munshi 2010). White feminist antiviolence activists, in particular, embraced approaches to domestic and sexual violence that centered criminalization (Bumiller 2008). Women of color, immigrant, and indigenous feminists critiqued this turn, arguing that increased policing further endangered their communities and failed to get to the root causes of sexual and gender violence, and that feminist analysis of gender violence was being coopted to justify devastating racially targeted prison expansion (Crenshaw 1991; Smith 2005). Meanwhile, the prison-abolition movement in the United States has been growing, asserting a deeply transformative claim that prisons do not resolve violence, but *are* violence, and that imprisonment cannot be reformed to become just, safe or fair but instead must be abolished (Stanley et. al. 2012; Davis 1998). This claim significantly challenges the criminalization-centered approach to gender and sexual violence, which purports to resolve such violence by using the state's most coercive powers to neutralize harmdoers and convince potential harmdoers not to engage in violence. Feminist prison abolitionists argue that the institutional logics of state violence, in particular carceral control, were adopted by antiviolence movement organizations when they began to collaborate with state strategies of increased prosecution and enhanced criminal penalties, at least in part because the federal government made funding available to domestic violence agencies willing to focus on prosecution strategies. Feminist abolitionists assert an opposing view about resolving violence, one centered in prevention, healing, resolution, and root causes (Creative Interventions 2012; Generation Five 2007; INCITE! and Critical Resistance 2001).

Particularly importantly, they contend that violence should be resolved without processes centered in shaming, labeling and exiling people. These processes are analyzed by such scholars and activists using wisdom from the disability justice movement, prisoners' rights movement and antiracist movements, among others, about how such processes relentlessly enforce racialized gender norms and disproportionately target vulnerable populations with state violence. They refute that such processes produce safety, and instead presume the existence of large apparatuses of caging and punishment to be inherently racist in Foucault's sense—designed to produce, label and bring on the death of those cast by harmful systems of meaning and control as "threats." These feminist abolitionists look for the root causes of gender and sexual violence not in bad individuals who need to be exiled but in the larger processes of normalization that produce uneven distributions of life chances, including the punishment system itself. Further, they imagine that people doing harm are not dangerous outsiders to be contained or extinguished (as imagined by the criminal punishment system) but are the people we already know, often intimately. They argue that we need not throw anyone away. Instead, feminist antiviolence work can be focused on preventing harm by addressing the root causes of violence and the reasons someone has engaged in violence if it has already happened, figuring out what s/he needs to never do it again, and addressing the reasons a survivor of violence was vulnerable and what s/he needs to be safe from experiencing this harm again.

This reimagining of the core work of the antiviolenence movement is significant for feminist engagement with norms and normalization in several ways. First, it engages a critique of the feminist processes that produce internal enemies and justify exiling them for the safety of the population. Second, it imagines and experiments with alternative approaches while centering an awareness of the tendency to produce killable populations and a detailed analysis of the institutional modes and normalization processes that sort the population into those whose lives will be cultivated and those who are disposable. Third, while it asserts a bold vision of an alternative society that does not exile "dangerous others," it takes seriously the reality that norms and normalization are functions of human socialization and interdependency, and seeks to engage ongoing reflection and processes of democratization to address the harms produced by that tendency rather than imagining that it can be ultimately resolved. Feminist prison abolition work, for that reason, represents a site of engaged feminist critique of processes of norms and normalization that is deploying lessons learned in prior feminist experiments.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, K. 2005. "Polygamy, Prostitution, and the Federalization of Immigration Law." *Columbia Law Review* 105 (3): 641-716.
- Anzaldúa, G. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Arkles, G. 2009. "Safety and Solidarity across Gender Lines: Rethinking Segregation of Transgender People in Detention." *Temple Political and Civil Rights Journal* 18 (2): 515-560.
- Associated Press. 2013. "Swedish Cinemas Take Aim at Gender Bias with Bechdel Test Rating." *The Guardian*, November 6. Accessed May 3, 2014. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/nov/06/swedish-cinemas-bechdel-test-films-gender-bias>.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. 2011. *The Second Sex*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Bird, P. Y. n.d. "Wild Indians: Native Perspectives on Hiawatha Asylum for Insane Indians." Accessed May 3, 2014. <http://www.power2u.org/downloads/NativePerspectivesPeminaYellowBird.pdf>.
- Bumiller, K. 2008. *In an Abusive State: How Neoliberalism Appropriated the Feminist Movement against Sexual Violence*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2012. "Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2011-12." Accessed May 3, 2014. <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/svpjri1112.pdf>.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge and Chapman & Hall.
- Butler, J. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 1997. *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Center for HIV Law and Policy. 2013. "State HIV Laws." The Center for HIV Law and Policy website. Accessed May 4, 2014. <http://www.hivlawandpolicy.org/state-hiv-laws>.
- Chow, R. 2002. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Clough, P. T., and C. Willse. 2011. *Beyond Biopolitics: Essays on the Governance of Life and Death*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Combahee River Collective. 1980. "Combahee River Collective Statement." In *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*, edited by B. Smith, 264–274. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Creative Interventions. 2012. "Creative Interventions Toolkit." Accessed May 6, 2014. <http://www.creative-interventions.org/tools/toolkit/>.
- Crenshaw, K. W. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–1299.
- Davis, A. 1998. "Racialized Punishment and Prison Abolition." In *The Angela Y. Davis Reader*, edited by J. James, 264–274. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Dutton, M., L. Orloff, and G. A. Haas. 2000. "Characteristics of Help-Seeking Behaviors, Resources, and Services Needs of Battered Immigrant Latinas: Legal and Policy Implications." *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law and Policy* 7 (2) (Summer): 245–305.
- Ernst, Rose, Linda Nguyen, and Kamilah C. Taylor. 2013. "Citizen Control: Race at the Welfare Office." *Social Science Quarterly* 94 (5): 1283–1307.
- Evans, S. 1979. *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation*. New York: Random House.
- Extein, A. 2013. "Why Queers Should Care about Sex Offenders." *Huffington Post*. June 8. Accessed May 4, 2014. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/andrew-extein-msw/why-queers-should-care-about-sex-offenders_b_3386970.html.
- Foucault, M. 1990. *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1, *An Introduction*. Translated by R. Hurley. New York: Random House.
- Foucault, M. 2003. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975–1976*. Translated by D. Macey. New York: Picador.
- Generation Five. 2007. *Toward Transformative Justice: A Liberatory Approach to Child Sexual Abuse and other forms of Intimate and Community Violence*. Generation Five online. Accessed May 6, 2014. http://www.generationfive.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/G5_Toward_Transformative_Justice-Documents.pdf.
- Goldberg, D. T. 2001. *The Racial State*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Grewal, I., and C. Kaplan, eds. 1994. *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Haraway, D. 1984/85. "Teddy Bear Patriarchy: Taxidermy in the Garden of Eden, New York City, 1908–1936." *Social Text* 11 (Winter): 20–64. doi:10.2307/466593.
- Haritaworn, J. 2013. "Beyond 'Hate': Queer Metonymies of Crime, Pathology and Anti-Violence." *Jindal Global Law Review* 4 (2): 44–78.
- Hartman, S. V. 1997. *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Idaho Department of Corrections. 2009. "Procedure Control No. 325.02.01.001: Prison Rape Elimination." Accessed May 3, 2014. http://www.wcl.american.edu/endsilence/documents/prea_doc_idaho.pdf.
- INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, ed. 2006. *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, ed. 2007. *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence and Critical Resistance. 2001. Statement on Gender Violence and the Prison Industrial Complex. [incite-national.org](http://www.incite-national.org), and criticalresistance.org. Accessed May 6, 2014. http://www.incite-national.org/sites/default/files/incite_files/resource_docs/5848_incite-cr-statement.pdf.

- Jackson, V. 2002. "In Our Own Voice: African-American Stories of Oppression, Survival and Recovery in Mental Health Systems." *International Journal of Narrative Therapy & Community Work* 2. Accessed May 3, 2014. <http://www.power2u.org/downloads/InOurOwnVoiceVanessaJackson.pdf>.
- Kanani, N. 2011. "Race and Madness: Locating the Experiences of Racialized People with Psychiatric Histories in Canada and the United States." *Critical Disability Discourse* 3. Accessed May 3, 2014. <http://pi.library.yorku.ca/ojs/index.php/cdd/article/viewFile/31564/31232>.
- Kaplan, C., N. Alcaron, and M. Moallem, eds. 1999. *Between Woman and Nation: Nationalisms, Transnational Feminisms, and the State*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- LeFrancois, B. A., G. Reaume, and R. J. Menzies. 2013. *Mad Matters: A Critical Reader in Canadian Mad Studies*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Matthew, S. n.d. "Northwest Homesteader: A Curriculum Project for Washington Schools." Center for the Study of the Pacific Northwest. University of Washington. Accessed March 25, 2014. Available at http://content.lib.washington.edu/curriculumpackets/Northwest_Homesteader.pdf.
- Mayeri, S. 2011. "What's Wrong with Illegitimacy? A Brief History." Address at American University Washington College of Law: The New Illegitimacy Conference. March 15. Transcript on file with author.
- Metzl, J. M. 2009. *Protest Psychosis: How Schizophrenia Became a Black Disease*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mink, G. 1990. "The Lady and the Tramp: Gender, Race, and the Origins of the American Welfare State." In *Women, the State, and Welfare*, edited by L. Gordon, 92-122. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Mogul, J. L., A. J. Ritchie, and K. Whitlock. 2011. *Queer (In)Justice: The Criminalization of LGBT People in the United States*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mohanty, C. T. 1988. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourse." *Feminist Review* 30: 61-88. doi:10.1057/fr.1988.42.
- Moraga, C. 1983. *Loving in the War Years: Lo Que Nunca Paso por Sus Labios*. Boston: South End Press.
- Moraga, C., and G. Anzuldúa, eds. 1981. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. New York: Kitchen Table/Women of Color Press.
- Morgensen, S. L. 2010. "Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16 (1-2): 105-131. doi:10.1215/10642684-2009-015.
- Munshi, S. 2010. "Negotiations of Safety within Logics of Security: Section 287(g) and Domestic Violence against Immigrant Women." Paper presented at the Association of Asian American Studies Annual Conference. April 7-11.
- Nepon, E., E. Redfield, and D. Spade. 2013. "From the Bottom Up: Strategies and Practices for Membership Based Organizations." Sylvia Rivera Law Project. Accessed May 6, 2014. <http://srlp.org/from-the-bottom-up-strategies-and-practices-for-membership-based-organizations/>.
- Neubeck, K. J., and N. A. Cazenave. 2001. *Welfare Racism: Playing the Race Card against America's Poor*. New York: Routledge.
- Olson, S. 2005. "Marriage Promotion, Reproductive Injustice, and the War against Poor Women of Color." *Dollars & Sense* 257. Accessed May 4, 2014. <http://www.dollarsandsense.org/archives/2005/0105olson.html>.

- Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act 1996. <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-104hr3734enr/pdf/BILLS-104hr3734enr.pdf>.
- Pittman, N. 2013. "Raised on the Registry: The Irreparable Harm of Placing Children on Sex Offender Registries in the US." *Human Rights Watch*. Accessed May 4, 2014. <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2013/05/01/raised-registry>.
- Rifkin, M. 2011. *When Did Indians Become Straight: Kinship, the History of Sexuality and Native Sovereignty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ritchie, B. E. 2012. *Arrested Justice: Black Women, Violence, and America's Prison Nation*. New York: New York University Press.
- Roberts, D. 2002. *Shattered Bonds: The Color of Child Welfare*. New York: Civitas Books.
- Robinson, C. 2000. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rubin, G. 1984. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality." In *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, edited by C. S. Vance. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Sandoval, C. 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Scholinsky, D. 1998. *Last Time I Wore a Dress*. New York: Riverhead.
- Silag, G. 2003. "To Have, to Hold, to Receive Public Assistance: TANF and Marriage Promotion Policies." *Journal for Gender, Race and Justice* 7 (2): 413-438.
- Smith, A. 2005. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Spade, D. 2003. "Resisting Medicine/Remodeling Gender." *Berkeley Women's Law Journal* 18 (1): 15-37.
- Spade, D. and Willse, C. "Marriage Will Never Set Us Free." <http://www.organizingupgrade.com/index.php/modules-menu/beyond-capitalism/item/1002-marriage-will-never-set-us-free>. Portions of pages 562-564 of this chapter are taken from this previously published article.
- Sparks, H. 2003. "Queens Teens and Model Mothers: Race, Gender and the Discourse of Welfare Reform." In *Race and the Politics of Welfare Reform*, edited by S. F. Schram, J. Soss, and R. Fording, 188-189. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Special Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council. 2011. "Interim Report of the Special Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment." United Nations General Assembly. Accessed May 3, 2014. <http://solitaryconfinement.org/uploads/SpecRapTortureAug2011.pdf>.
- Spillers, H. 1987. "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book." *Diacritics* 17 (2): 64-81.
- Spivak, G. S. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by C. Nelson and L. Grossberg. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Stanley, E. A., D. Spade, A. J. Ritchie, J. L. Mogul, and K. Whitlock. 2012. "Queering Prison Abolition, Now?" *American Quarterly* 64 (1): 115-127. doi:10.1353/aq.2012.0003.
- Stoler, A. L. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stoler, A. L. 2002. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- US Department of Labor. Office of Policy Planning and Research. 1965. *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*. Accessed May 4, 2014. <http://www.dol.gov/dol/aboutdol/history/webid-meynihan.htm>.

- Wilchins, R. A. 1997. *Read My Lips: Sexual Subversion and the End of Gender*. Riverdale, NY: Magnus Books.
- Willse, C., and D. Spade. 2013. "Marriage Will Never Set Us Free." Organizing Upgrade online. Accessed March 25, 2014. <http://www.organizingupgrade.com/index.php/modules-menu/beyond-capitalism/item/1002-marriage-will-never-set-us-free>.
- Wilson, I., C. Griffin, and B. Wren. 2002. "The Validity of the Diagnosis of Gender Identity Disorder Child and Adolescent Criteria." *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 7 (3): 335-351. doi:10.1177/1359104502007003003.
- Yuval-Davis, N. 1997. *Gender and Nation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.