

H O M E L A N D M A T E R N I T Y

**US SECURITY
CULTURE
AND THE NEW
REPRODUCTIVE
REGIME**



NATALIE FIXMER - ORAIZ

Homeland Maternity

US Security Culture and the
New Reproductive Regime

NATALIE FIXMER-ORAIZ



**UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS PRESS**

Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield

© 2019 by Natalie Fixmer-Oraiz
All rights reserved
Library of Congress Control Number: 2018057607

ISBN 9780252042355 (hardcover)
ISBN 9780252084140 (paperback)

Publication of this book was supported by funding from
University of Iowa's Office of the Vice President for
Research and Economic Development.

Cover photo by Stevi Michner

Contents

Preface vii

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction: Homeland Maternity, the New
Reproductive Regime 1

1. Securing Motherhood on the Home Front 31
2. Risky Reproduction and the Politics of Octomom 59
3. Post-Prevention? Conceptualizing
Emergency Contraception 85
4. Crisis Pregnancy and the Colonization of the Clinic 111

Conclusion: Just Pregnancy, Just Parenting in the
Age of Homeland Maternity 141

Notes 161

Bibliography 209

Index 245

Preface

“Your body is a battleground.” For the three years I worked as a community organizer for Planned Parenthood in the US South, the iconic art of Barbara Kruger—visually arresting in its split symmetry and color contrast across a woman’s steady gaze—greeted me every morning as I opened my laptop. It felt real. I was in my early twenties, funneling my deepest rage and passion into statewide organizing for the 2004 March for Women’s Lives against a steady stream of assaults on reproductive rights and dignity.

It is fair to say that this book began then. It has traveled with me, too—deepening alongside shifts in my career, spanning two pregnancies, the journey into parenthood, and vexed negotiations of reproductive technologies in the context of queer family formation. It is fueled by the endless urgency of queer, feminist, and antiracist struggle that eventually propelled my return to academic research and teaching, in search of answers that might help build a better world, beginning with our collective capacity to imagine and speak its possibility.

Much has changed for the worse. We face stunning hostility to sexual and reproductive self-determination, some of it painful in its familiarity and some the likes of which we haven’t seen since the Comstock Era. In 2018, two of the three federal branches of US government are controlled by vocal opponents of reproductive, social, and economic justice. Mike Pence governed one of the most dangerous states in the nation for those pregnant and parenting before taking up residence in the Naval Observatory. And attacks on health care continue

unabashed and unabated at the state level, with 431 anti-choice bills proposed in the first three months of 2017 alone.

Nevertheless, we persist. I am buoyed by the historic 2017 Women's March, in which an estimated 3.5 to 4.5 million people in the United States—roughly one in a hundred—took to the streets on the day following Donald Trump's inauguration, in solidarity with 250,000+ marchers worldwide. I am inspired by grassroots activists and organizations that insist on maternal dignity and reproductive justice in novel and affirming ways—for example, in the Mama's Bail Out Day campaign launched in 2017 by Southerners on New Ground, Color of Change, Black Lives Matter, and other allied organizations. I celebrate the growing number of bills proposed in state assemblies that aim to enhance reproductive health and dignity, even as the number of anti-choice bills continues to outpace them. And I admit a small, quiet solace in returning to the history of radical struggle for reproductive justice in my research, knowing that our work here and now travels farther and faster in its wake.

Much of this book was written before the Trump administration, and I imagine that the struggles detailed here will endure long after this particular nightmare ends. It is written in the spirit of resistance and resilience, that we might understand how our communicative habits shape—or distort—the possibilities of justice, and that we might find ways to bend those habits toward a vision of reproductive justice that includes us all.

Introduction

Homeland Maternity, the New Reproductive Regime

In 2014, Tamara Loertscher was charged by the State of Wisconsin with posing a “substantial risk” to her fourteen-week fetus.¹ Unemployed and unable to afford her thyroid medication, the twenty-nine-year-old former nursing aide eventually sought care for hypothyroidism and depression when she suspected she was pregnant. Providing a full account of her medical history to her doctor, Loertscher disclosed that she had self-medicated for her condition with methamphetamine and marijuana prior to discovering her pregnancy. She expressed her strong desire to have a healthy pregnancy and baby, and was voluntarily admitted to the hospital’s unit for behavioral health. During her brief stay, a social worker reported Loertscher to county officials for illicit drug use in violation of the state’s Unborn Child Protection Act.² Subsequently held at the hospital against her will and denied legal counsel, Loertscher arrived at an initial hearing to discover that the state had appointed an attorney to represent her fetus. The court ordered Loertscher to be placed in an inpatient drug treatment facility indefinitely. When she refused to comply, Loertscher was incarcerated in a county jail for eighteen days. In state custody she was denied prenatal care, threatened with a Taser, and placed in solitary confinement for thirty-six hours for refusing a pregnancy test.³ Her eventual release was predicated on, among other things, regular drug tests at Loertscher’s expense—all of which were negative. The state of Wisconsin considers her a child abuser, which bars employment in her field of nursing and prevents her from volunteering someday in her child’s school.⁴

Several weeks prior to giving birth to a healthy baby in early 2015, Loertscher filed a lawsuit against the State of Wisconsin, initiating a legal battle that is winding through the federal courts as this book goes to press.⁵

Wisconsin is not anomalous but rather at the forefront of a disturbing trend. Loertscher joins Rinat Dray, Marlise Muñoz, Purvi Patel, and countless other women across the country recently deprived of fundamental human rights in the name of fetal health and protection. As the concept of “risk” is used to position women against fetuses, women have been arrested and detained for refusing a Caesarean, attempting a home birth, falling down a flight of stairs, disclosing addiction, and attempting suicide.⁶ State actions against pregnant women—including incarceration, involuntary commitment, and forced medical interventions—are on the rise in the United States and are disproportionately imposed on low-income women, immigrant women, and women of color.⁷ While a district court decided in Loertscher’s favor, the state appealed the decision and in July 2017 the US Supreme Court weighed in briefly to stay an injunction—in short, permitting the State of Wisconsin to continue to prosecute pregnant women like Loertscher under its Unborn Child Protection Act.⁸ Loertscher’s story points to a frightening pattern of state intervention that compels women to eliminate all manner of prenatal risk, inflicting severe punishment—and, ironically, new risks—when they falter in the impossible task of ensuring a perfect uterine environment for their pregnancies.

At the same time that pregnant women are increasingly criminalized, the requirements of motherhood are intensified. In 2016, former Homeland Security advisor and mother of three Juliette Kayyem issued a clarion call to US mothers in *Security Mom: An Unclassified Guide to Protecting Our Homeland and Your Home*. Urging mothers to embrace the passé moniker with a new twist, Kayyem asserts that a “security mom’ can and should mean a woman who plans and prepares as she raises her children in a world where anything can happen.” Her inspiration came by way of an e-mail from a cousin who, in soliciting advice on precautionary parenting in a post-9/11 world, “clarified what [Kayyem] had always suspected—there is something missing from our nation’s security efforts.” The glaring omission, for Kayyem, was the fundamental connection between the homeland and the home: “The safety of our nation is dependent on skills that we [mothers] already practice to keep ourselves and our children safer at home, in our communities. And those of us who work in homeland security failed to disclose this one basic fact: You are a security expert, too.”⁹ Blending memoir and self-help, Kayyem urges a rethinking of homeland security, in which the security of the state was articulated to quotidian maternal sensibilities. Her book is described as “smart, manageable guidelines for keeping your family

safe in an unpredictable world. From stocking up on coloring books to stashing duplicate copies of valuable papers out of state, Juliette's wisdom does more than just prepare us to survive in an age of mayhem—it empowers us to thrive.”¹⁰ In *Security Mom*, mothering is of explicit value to domestic affairs—central, in fact, to the security of the nation itself.

The criminalization of Loertscher and Kayyem's call to rethink motherhood and security are not unrelated. Consider the following parallels. First, in each instance, pregnant and parenting women are made relentlessly responsible for circumstances beyond their control. Loertscher is part of a startling trend in which the state punishes women for failure to eliminate prenatal risk; Kayyem's manifesto renders maternal vigilance central to the safety of children—and entire communities—in a world fraught with insecurities. Second, motherhood subsumes the claim to personhood as any concept of individual human rights is made ancillary to those of the fetus or child. Despite Loertscher's clear and urgent need for health care services, the State of Wisconsin positioned her as a threat to her unborn child and supplied criminal interrogation, arrest, and detention instead. According to Kayyem, being a security mom is an all-consuming endeavor, exacting exceptional diligence, labor, and wholesale devotion to family. Finally, in each instance pregnancy and motherhood are intimately entwined with the nation, its recent investments and dominant logics. Both stories turn on discursive features (e.g., “risk” and “security”) of homeland security culture—a term that I use to signal both an early twenty-first-century state formation as well as a felt exigence in a post-9/11 United States that has filtered into routine ways of relating to one another and to the world. Loertscher's story signals the intense, if also unevenly distributed, policing of pregnancy by the state under the banner of fetal risk; Kayyem's book recasts motherhood—and presumably wealthy, white, heteronuclear motherhood—explicitly in the service of national goals and desires. Thus, each of these stories is differently, but also profoundly, shaped by what I refer to as *homeland maternity*. I designate this term in order to theorize a significant force within US reproductive regimes of the early twenty-first century—namely, the relationship between motherhood and nation within homeland security culture.

In naming homeland maternity, I argue that motherhood and nation are deeply enmeshed and mutually constitutive. Each of the chapters that follow centers a site of analysis wherein discursive alignments of motherhood and nation are present and persistent—a site where homeland security culture shapes reproductive politics just as motherhood and reproduction are imagined to bolster the project of building and securing the nation. Homeland maternity, thus, joins two bodies of literature: feminist studies of maternal and reproduc-

tive politics and critical scholarship on homeland security culture. Regarding the former, homeland maternity extends existing feminist scholarship on the politics of motherhood and reproduction. Grounding recent public struggles within a broader cultural terrain, the concept of homeland maternity clarifies connections between national security and the strict regulation of sexuality, reproduction, and family formation in the early twenty-first century. Homeland maternity specifies how *national security is tethered to securing the domestic and reproductive body*. The recent history of reproductive politics is deeply inflected by the dominant discourses of homeland security culture—from public debates over the availability of birth control and the uptick in crisis pregnancy centers to the privileging of fetal personhood and subsequent deprivations of pregnant individuals' rights and liberties. Critically tending to these discourses—to related rhetorics of security, risk, emergency, and crisis—*Homeland Maternity: US Security Culture and the New Reproductive Regime* traces how homeland security culture shapes the tumultuous terrain of contemporary reproductive politics, with an eye toward the possibilities of reproductive justice.

This book also specifies a new arena of attention for scholarship dedicated to mapping the form and function of homeland security culture across a range of public policies, practices, and politics.¹¹ Historically speaking, the project of securing the nation has long exceeded explicit political efforts and investments, such as foreign diplomacy, immigration policy, and the use of military force. The project of security enlists domesticity as requisite to the future of the nation, which has often meant governing reproduction through the differential surveillance and control of women's bodies and behaviors.¹² Thus, the cultural alignment of motherhood and nation is evident at several key historical moments in the United States from the colonial era to postwar containment culture and into the present.¹³ Homeland maternity stands as the most recent iteration of this persistent trend, reviving familiar tropes and normativities as it accommodates postfeminist ideologies, deepening neoliberalism, and the surveillance state.

Naming homeland maternity provides a critical point of departure for intervening in the conditions that fuel contemporary forms of reproductive injustice. Homeland maternity draws attention to motherhood and reproduction as thoroughly implicated in homeland security culture and, reciprocally, clarifies how the logic of homeland security culture shapes contemporary US reproductive politics. Homeland maternity provides a vocabulary through which we might better understand how, why, and under what circumstances pregnancy is figured as patriotic—whether in fertility campaigns aimed at young profes-

sional women or in the high-profile celebration of US military wives serving as commercial surrogates for infertile couples at home and abroad.¹⁴ Homeland maternity includes, for example, the quiet colonization of comprehensive reproductive health clinics by crisis pregnancy centers, the revival of traditional beliefs about gender and motherhood that “take feminism into account,”¹⁵ and the elevated status of the fetus that renders pregnant women vulnerable to forced interventions, arrests, and detention. It signals a context in which the concept of fetal personhood regularly eclipses claims to reproductive or maternal rights, in which pregnancy itself is increasingly medicalized and managed by experts, a culture in which risk in any form—but particularly that related to the future of the nation and its citizenry—is to be avoided at all costs. In short, this book is an attempt to account for the recent history of US reproductive politics—stubbornly inflected by, but also active in shaping, collective life in post-9/11 homeland security culture.

I begin with a history, detailing motherhood and nation as deeply enmeshed and mutually constitutive, in order to understand homeland maternity more thoroughly in light of its antecedents. Then, drawing the past into the present, I turn to theorizing homeland security culture itself as a primary context for more recent reproductive and maternal politics. My concluding remarks center critical frameworks and offer an outline of chapters.

Histories of Motherhood and Nation

Alignments between motherhood and nation are not new. Reproduction has long been a site for negotiating cultural anxieties, most often at the expense of women. As historian Rickie Solinger reminds us, “Official discussions about reproductive politics have rarely been women-centered. More often than not, debate and discussion about reproductive politics—*where the power to manage women’s reproductive capacity should reside*—have been part of discussions about *how to solve certain large social problems facing the country*” (original emphasis).¹⁶ A wealth of feminist scholarship has documented the relationship between pregnancy and power in US history; some of this scholarship highlights the centrality of reproductive politics to nation, particularly in moments of national crisis and heightened patriotism. Tracing a genealogy of relationships between motherhood and nation allows me to ground homeland maternity within relevant histories of gender, race, coloniality, national identity, and belonging. Stories like those of Loertscher and Kayyem thus become legible—less anomalous than synecdochic, symptoms of long-standing patterns of cultural practice and belief.

Reproduction, Motherhood, and Racializing the Nation

The strict regulation of reproduction proved central to early state formation and colonialism, codifying white supremacy at the founding of the new US republic. Early laws legitimized white, propertied forms of intimacy—for example, banning interracial marriage between white women and black men as early as the seventeenth century and prohibiting slaves from marrying altogether. For wealthy white women, motherhood was imagined as the primary vehicle for patriotism, citizenship, and civic virtue. In her germinal study of republican motherhood, historian Linda K. Kerber explores the historical persistence of motherhood as the primary justification for women’s political participation, noting its roots in the late eighteenth century: “In the years of the early Republic a consensus developed around the idea that a mother, committed to the service of her family and to the state, might serve a political purpose . . . through the raising of a patriotic child.”¹⁷ Drawing on popular ideologies, including the “cult of true womanhood,”¹⁸ the white, upper-class family was figured as central to nurturing the nation, and white women of means were urged to birth sons who would inherit the fledgling republic. In other words, rather than participate directly in democracy, wealthy white women of the Revolutionary era were to perform citizenship through domesticity. Although the rearing of wealthy white children typically exploited the labor of enslaved black women as primary-care providers, white women were nonetheless constituted as the bearers of moral guidance and virtue, rendered responsible for cultivating their sons’ investments in civic participation and state leadership. This understanding of republican motherhood lends nuance and specificity to one dimension of a multifaceted historical phenomenon—that is, the negotiation and management of women’s reproductive and childrearing capacities as a national resource.

Republican motherhood stands in stark contrast to the maternal histories of indigenous women, black women, and poor white women in conditions of servitude in the United States.¹⁹ Systemic reproductive abuses of women are similarly embedded within the project of nation building, inextricably tied to broader systems of racial domination and the colonization of the Americas. In the context of US slavery, for example, while republican motherhood was marshaled to establish white wealth across generations, enslaved women were denied legal recognition as mothers, their children born into bondage and designated by law as a slaveholder’s property. Early colonial laws established the legal status of a child, either bonded or free, as contingent on the status of the mother. Thus, biracial children born to enslaved women became the property of the slaveholder; biracial children born to white women contributed to a grow-

ing population of free people of color, thus fueling the establishment of anti-miscegenation laws and strict enforcement of white women's fidelity within marriage.²⁰ Relatedly, propertied white men's rape of black and indigenous women was essential to perpetuating slavery and reinforcing white supremacy, as historian Rickie Solinger notes: "the reproductive capacity of enslaved and native women was the resource whites relied on to produce an enslaved labor force, to produce and transmit property and wealth across generations, to consolidate white control over land in North America, and to produce a class of human beings who, in their ineligibility for citizenship, underwrote the exclusivity and value of white citizenship."²¹ Denying legal recognition of motherhood or kinship codified slaves as property without claim to family, ancestry, or national belonging.²² Women resisted by refusing compliance—fighting off rape, committing to partners of their choosing, creating extended networks of kin, shielding enslaved children from white slaveholders' brutalities, providing forbidden forms of care under the cloak of night, and attempting self-induced abortions. Even so, this violent occupation of women's bodies and reproduction under slavery was a key component in racializing the nation.²³

The use of reproductive and sexual violence as weapons of racial domination characterizes a broad pattern of reproductive injustice in the United States. Documenting myriad brutalities inflicted on indigenous populations, Andrea Smith demonstrates how the colonization of the Americas relied on violent assertions of white patriarchal control. Early narratives detailing the gruesome rape and dismemberment of Native women are woven throughout European settlers' records of war against indigenous peoples, attesting to the centrality of sexual violence to colonization and genocide.²⁴ In another example, beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, Native boarding schools were established in communities across the United States in order to, in the words of Carlisle Indian School founder Richard Pratt, "kill the Indian and save the man."²⁵ Boarding schools destroyed Native communities and cultures. Over a hundred thousand indigenous children were removed from their families—they were forced to speak English, trained for menial labor based on strict gender binaries, and subject to horrific physical and sexual abuse by pro-assimilationist missionaries.²⁶ These and other more recent examples, from sterilization abuse to medical experimentation, demonstrate how attacks on Native women's bodies and efforts to exert control over Native reproduction and family formation persist as powerful weapons of white supremacy, patriarchy, and genocide.²⁷

Immigration is another key site for policing the borders and bodies of national belonging. From the Alien and Sedition Acts of the late eighteenth century through the Trump administration's attempts to ban travel and migration from

Muslim-majority nations, culturally legible claims to US entry and citizenship have long been shaped by the perceived threat of the political, ethnic, and religious Other; these fears have been negotiated in part through the strict regulation of immigrant women's bodies and behaviors.²⁸ Historically, US immigration policies have privileged "selective" immigration and family reunification, targeting for exclusion those imagined as threatening to white, hetero-patriarchal norms. For example, early selective immigration laws barred most immigration from Asian nations but specifically targeted Asian women, curtailing the possibility of family formation for Asian men who were subject to antimiscegenation laws, and providing a precedent for early twentieth-century policies that excluded all Asian immigration with the exception of Filipinos, who were then under US rule.²⁹ In concert with nativist panics regarding "race suicide" and declining white birth rates in the late nineteenth century, pregnant immigrant women faced increasing barriers to entry and family reunification laws were unevenly applied to preclude immigrants of color from citizenship while working to codify European families as "white" and to affirm "white families . . . [as] desirable and consonant with the interests in the nation."³⁰

Restrictive immigration policies and practices were intensified in the early twentieth century, fueled by isolationist cultural sentiment and increasing support for eugenics and scientific racism. Post-World War I restrictions included literacy tests and quotas; as a result, over 85 percent of immigration was effectively designated for Northern and Western Europeans.³¹ For immigrant women allowed entry or conditional entry to the United States, sexuality was tightly regulated in accordance with heteronormative domesticity. Lesbians were refused at the border; immigration authorities rigorously inspected the homes where single women were to reside, conducted marriages for engaged women on the dock prior to entry, and frequently deported poor immigrant women on the grounds of pregnancy.³² In short, the strict exclusion of pregnant women, lesbians, and immigrant women of color, in combination with antimiscegenation laws, inhibited family formation outside of dominant, white heteronuclear norms. In this way, immigration policies and practices reveal clear historical investments in regulating sexuality, reproduction, and family formation as central to the project of nation building.

As these histories demonstrate, the concept of nation has, since its inception, relied on regulating maternal and reproductive labor. It is a pattern traceable into and throughout the twentieth century. For example, while the early birth control movement argued on behalf of voluntary motherhood and originated within radical activisms of the Progressive Era, these alliances were quickly dissolved as birth control campaigns found mainstream support and expression

in eugenics.³³ In this collaboration, Angela Davis explains, the birth control movement was “robbed of its progressive potential, advocating for people of color not the individual right to *birth control*, but rather the racist strategy of *population control*” (original emphasis).³⁴ State-funded family planning programs as early as the 1930s targeted low-wealth communities and communities of color, who otherwise struggled for access to quality health care and public services. These government programs made birth control readily available and actively promoted its use.³⁵ Similarly, in the postwar era, “overpopulation” roused significant panic and debate. While situated squarely in the midst of the US “baby boom,” public concern did not center on the domestic demographic experiencing the sharpest increase in birth rates—white middle-class women.³⁶ Instead, public anxieties focused on the birth rates of women of color and low-wealth women, both in the United States and the Global South. These anxieties coincided with a loosening of US immigration restrictions designed to curry international favor during the Cold War, as well as hard-won expansions of welfare provisions that enabled low-wage workers to leave exploitative conditions and afforded greater access to state services.³⁷ No longer a cheap source of labor, low-wealth communities, immigrant communities, and communities of color were soon considered “surplus” and targeted for state population control policies, including federally funded sterilization.³⁸

The history of sterilization in the mid- to late-twentieth century clarifies the differential politics of motherhood and reproduction in no uncertain terms. At its height in the 1970s, sterilization was the fastest growing birth control method in the country. But while white women of means had difficulty locating a doctor willing to perform this procedure and were often required to obtain their husbands’ consent, other women were particularly vulnerable to sterilization abuse—specifically, black, Puerto Rican, and indigenous women, as well as women on welfare, who were threatened with refusal of services if they did not consent.³⁹ A 1973 lawsuit revealed the extent of sterilization abuse in the US South, where an estimated 100,000 to 150,000 low-wealth women, almost half of them African American, were sterilized annually under federal programs. Sterilization abuse frequently occurred as women sought routine medical attention and were subsequently sterilized by the attending physician without warning or consent, a practice so widespread that it was commonly referred to as a “Mississippi appendectomy.”⁴⁰ Sterilization abuse was not limited to marginalized communities in the US South, however. By 1968, over one third of women of reproductive age in Puerto Rico were sterilized through an aggressive campaign waged by private agencies and the US and Puerto Rican governments; another federally funded campaign in the 1970s sterilized over a

quarter of Native American women, and in some cases eliminated entire tribes.⁴¹ In short, the reproductive abuse of women and communities of color has long been central in maintaining white supremacy in global and domestic settings.

The postwar experiences and expectations of middle-class white women were markedly different. Far from being subjected to forced sterilization or targeted by state family planning services, white women's domesticity and motherhood were valorized and encouraged across a variety of contexts. Tracing the sentiments of republican motherhood into post-World War II containment culture, Elaine Tyler May documents the revival in the cult of domesticity that infused white suburban motherhood with national purpose, noting its celebration of early marriage, contained heterosexuality, and traditional gender roles as uniquely American and anticommunist. Thus, private life was not a retreat from public affairs but rather codified as an embodied commitment to it: "Procreation in the cold war era took on almost mythic proportions," May writes. "Through children, men and women . . . demonstrated their loyalty to national goals by having as many children as they could."⁴² While men were implicated in the national impulse toward the nuclear family, the postwar reproductive consensus was particularly salient for white women, as motherhood and domesticity were elevated once more and idealized in a postwar suburban form. In an era of nuclear threat and cultural containment, maternity was figured, yet again, as pivotal to securing the home front.

The habits and requirements of containment culture signal patterns that are explored for their contemporary resonance throughout this book. Take, for example, the national panic induced by sex outside of straightness and marriage, from the McCarthy-era lavender scare and the forced surrender of "illegitimate" white children to suburban white couples, to the recent history of heated public debates over same-sex marriage, sex education, and the stigmatization of teen sexuality and pregnancy in popular culture. In another parallel, post-World War II containment culture transformed white Hollywood sex symbols into domestic goddesses and contented mothers. A similar pattern emerges in contemporary celebrity maternity, perhaps most clearly evidenced in Angelina Jolie's reinvention from bisexual-badgirl-bombshell to ideal citizen and global mother.⁴³ And, as if to anticipate Kayyem's call, the so-called opt-out revolution of the early twenty-first century profiled the exodus of professional white women from prestigious jobs and careers for a domestic agenda, a trend that recalls the midcentury suburbia of Betty Friedan's feminine mystique.⁴⁴ Postwar containment culture is thus a powerful precedent for homeland maternity in its resurrection of traditional gender roles, emphasis on gender normativity and white women's domesticity, as well as its reification of the white suburban

nuclear family as a strategy of security and mode of governance. Each of these examples underscores how homeland maternity functions as an historically specific yet patterned articulation between motherhood and nation.

Contemporary Motherhood and Homeland Security Culture

The discursive alignment of motherhood and nation is yet to be explicitly named and theorized as a coherent system of regulation in twenty-first century contexts. In so doing, homeland maternity extends three critical insights advanced by scholars of contemporary maternal and reproductive politics. First, recent scholarship on motherhood theorizes its all-encompassing and uncompromising character, but is less attentive to how these expectations of motherhood underwrite the nation and national belonging. Referred to as “intensive mothering,” the “mommy mystique,” or what Susan Douglas and Meredith Michaels term “the new momism,” contemporary motherhood recasts traditional gender politics in new relational terrain, that which is “not about subservience to men . . . [but rather] about subservience to children.”⁴⁵ Domesticated, intensive mothering is an ideology predicated on individual perfection and personal responsibility for the health and well-being of children. Reanimating nostalgic notions of wealthy white “virtuous” motherhood—and significantly, I argue, in service of national imaginaries—these responsibilities are assigned to women, guided by experts, and relentless in locating children at the center of women’s lives.

Intensive mothering borrows on mainstream feminism in its interpellation of women, as Lynn O’Brien Hallstein argues: “rather than *compete* with feminism, the new momism began to *integrate* feminist ideas and the rhetoric of choice explicitly” (original emphasis).⁴⁶ Motherhood itself, for example, is articulated through the logic of “choice,” increasingly stripped of its political import and strictly relocated to the realm of the personal. Thus, as women “opt in” to motherhood, they are made solely responsible for managing the choice to parent, fueling the conditions for what Judith Warner refers to as the “perfect madness” of contemporary motherhood: “The mess of the Mommy Mystique—the belief that we can and should control every aspect of our children’s lives, that our lives are the sum total of our personal choices, that our limitations stem from choosing poorly and that our problems are chiefly private, rather than public, in nature—is *not* an individual problem. . . . It is a social malady . . . a way of privatizing problems that are social in scope and rendering them, in the absence of real solutions, amenable to one’s private powers of control.”⁴⁷ Notably, the mommy mystique recalls Betty Friedan’s classic second-wave feminist text, highlighting parallels between motherhood in contemporary and containment culture with one significant exception—ideologies of contemporary

motherhood are decidedly postfeminist. They adopt the language of mainstream feminism (i.e., “choice” and “empowerment”) in the service of an agenda that depoliticizes women’s lives and struggles. Deeply rooted in the new economic order, postfeminism signals a world in which feminism has been “taken into account,”⁴⁸ a world in which feminism is done, over, and no longer necessary. It appropriates the language of feminism as it undermines feminism’s radical impulse toward structural transformation—in personalizing and individualizing, postfeminism reduces the political to the personal once more. Not only is this a world in which individual solutions reign supreme, but it is also one in which structural conditions such as lack of childcare or livable wages are positioned as personal problems, the result of poor decision making or individual character flaws. In short, postfeminism makes women exclusively responsible for ongoing structural inequities, and does so, insidiously, under the banner of feminism itself.⁴⁹ Postfeminist mothering has been rightly critiqued for its tidy coherence with late capitalism,⁵⁰ but it has been less interrogated for reviving mythic maternities consonant with nationalist nostalgia for “the way we never were,”⁵¹ a task that this book takes up.

Second, scholars have traced the role of risk in shaping the experiences and expectations of contemporary motherhood. For example, Julie A. Wilson and Emily Chivers Yochim explore how working- and middle-class mothers support their families in an era of privatized risk through “mamapreneurial” endeavors, striving to manage economic instability through digital and home-based labor.⁵² Risk also filters into the everyday demands of care for children. Integrating risk into the ideology of intensive mothering, Joan Wolf defines “total motherhood” as that which: “reveals the vexations of a risk culture: the fixation on planning and the ongoing drive to control the future through the proper selection and application of scientific knowledge; the individualization and privatization of responsibility for lifestyles, particularly in matters of health; overlapping reverence and disdain both for science and technology and for all things natural; the inescapable moral dimension of risk analysis; and the reflexive construction of self-identity.”⁵³ Total motherhood relies on personal responsibility and self-sufficiency in the care, nurturance, protection, and cultivated successes of children; it expects that mothers anticipate and mitigate all potential harm by developing a range of professional expertise, from child nutrition and psychology to consumer products safety. As Loertscher’s case against the State of Wisconsin demonstrates, total motherhood is a moral code that begins at least by conception, but perhaps even earlier, in what Miranda Waggoner refers to as the “zero trimester.”⁵⁴ Recent scholarly attention to risk in the context of mothering provides a point of departure for considering how

reproductive and maternal politics are not only inflected by risk but reshaped by the homeland security state and its attendant cultural logics. In *Homeland Maternity*, I argue for an expansion of this line of inquiry by situating risk alongside other discursive constructs central to homeland security culture—namely security, emergency, and crisis.

Third, homeland maternity broadens the scope and implications of critical motherhood studies by attending to various maternal identities and reproductive struggles. Intensive mothering feeds acute and exacting demands, but it also functions powerfully to codify the trope of the “bad” mother as its constitutive outside. Put another way, ideologies of intensive mothering sculpt a different world for those pregnant and parenting outside of wealth, whiteness, US citizenship, or heteronuclear family formation. With a few notable exceptions, as Raka Shome astutely observes, wealthy “white heterosexual . . . mothers engage in mothering through an *affirming* relation with the nation-state. In contrast, mothers of color—especially working-class or poor mothers of color—have historically, and even today in most Anglo-dominant nations, engaged in mothering *against* the dominant norms of the nation-state” (original emphasis).⁵⁵ Intensive mothering propels this dynamic—as “good” motherhood is recast as all-encompassing and self-sufficient, the steady erosion of the welfare state is justified in turn. The effects are vicious and cyclical—the moralizing insistence on personal responsibility compounds the stigma attached to those who fall short of feeding, clothing, educating, and nurturing their children according to impossible ideals. Moreover, the ideology of intensive mothering renders the criminalization of “other” mothers possible. This is a world in which alarming trends take hold—one in which marginalized mothers are detained for crimes they are not convicted of and incarcerated for defending themselves against abusive partners.⁵⁶ One in which mothers are demonized for seeking state assistance and under constant threat of foster care removal even though minimum-wage employment offers neither rest nor mobility for the working poor. One in which pregnant women—like Loertscher—are incarcerated for disclosing to health care providers their addiction.⁵⁷ Thus, the ideology of intensive mothering is a dependent formation that relies on the pathology and criminality assigned to “other” mothers—to those who dare to parent while poor or undocumented or ill or addicted. These binary constructions of motherhood—good and bad, celebrated and criminalized, necessitating promotion or punishment—are accorded greater weight and velocity in moments of collective crisis as the figure of the child (or even that of the fetus) stands in for the future of the nation.

In theorizing homeland maternity, I argue for the immediacy of nation in understanding trends that celebrate and censure mothers and that shape US

reproductive politics in the early twenty-first century. Motherhood is a key site in the production and maintenance of homeland security culture—it is a site that tends to fracture along lines of race, class, sexuality, age, marital, and immigration status. Indeed, homeland security culture possesses a resonance that adheres not only to security checks at airports and the defense of borders, but is similarly vested in reproduction and domesticity. Extending a long history of securing the nation through reproductive control, and particularly in moments of crisis, homeland maternity as a conceptual framework enables the interrogation of the conditions under which women are able (or unable) to assert control over their reproductive, maternal, and relational lives. And as a heuristic, homeland maternity also suggests the possibilities of invention, intervention, and redress. Its full theorizing necessitates, however, a robust understanding of homeland security culture itself.

Interrogating Homeland Security Culture

“Homeland security” simultaneously hails and exceeds the formal architecture of the state. It is typically understood vis-à-vis the former, as a referent to seismic shifts that include a restructuring of intelligence operations, preemptive foreign policy, and the proliferation of citizen surveillance and policing in the name of an opaque and endless so-called War on Terror. I use the phrase “homeland security state” to refer to these and other transformations in official modes of government. But homeland security is not limited to the state. It is centrally concerned with the nation as an imagined community.⁵⁸ In other words, homeland security functions ideologically, as a set of affective resonances attached to national identity and belonging that authorizes the state in its current form. Investigating it necessitates tending critically to both the power of sovereign governing apparatuses and the politics of everyday life. Thus, I use the phrase “homeland security culture” to refer broadly to the state in concert with the felt quality of life in post-9/11 US culture—including the rise in neoconservatism, postfeminist gender politics, as well as heightened nationalism, nativism, and US exceptionalism.

Theorizing homeland security culture is less a claim about the “effects” of 9/11 than it is an attempt to account for how the events of 9/11 provided a catalyst for reanimating familiar notions of security, nation, and citizenship.⁵⁹ “Homeland security” draws on Cold War conceptualizations of national security, substituting terrorism for communism as the single most imminent threat to US safety and global dominance.⁶⁰ Post-9/11 Cold War continuities include a governing apparatus reliant on agencies originally designed to combat communism (in-

cluding the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency), as well as reinscriptions of citizenship and national identity that hinge on neo-conservative nostalgia, indiscriminate patriotism, and a silencing of dissent.⁶¹ In short, the residue of postwar containment culture inflects the architecture of the state as well as everyday life in the early twenty-first century, even as homeland security culture is distinct in its shift toward preemption.

Preemption functions powerfully as paradigm in homeland security culture. Privileging “the power of imagination over the power of fact—suspicions over evidence,” preemption relies on radical speculation to visualize the contours of all possible worlds.⁶² It is neither primarily invested in accuracy (prediction) nor in probability (risk), exceeding the bounds of precision and estimation with its emphasis on capacious imagination. Scholars have traced how the logic of preemption undergirds the homeland security state at a variety of sites. For example, preemption swiftly displaced deterrence as the reigning doctrine of post-9/11 military and intelligence operations—from state justifications for the invasion of Iraq to the findings of the 9/11 Commission, which faulted intelligence agencies for a “failure of imagination” and lauded “agencies that had ‘speculated’ about . . . suicide hijackings.”⁶³ Coining the term *premediation*, media scholar Richard Grusin argues that preemption sculpts a post-9/11 US media regime tasked with readying for all possible futures: “[its] fundamental purpose is to preclude that no matter what tomorrow might bring, it will always already have been premediated.”⁶⁴ Thus, premediation names the requisite media logics that render anticipatory state action inevitable. In the homeland security state, radical speculation supplants scientific assessments of probability and possibility—forging a world in which present action hinges on riotous imagination, and in anticipation of our worst nightmares.

The logic of preemption is often couched as risk, however, even as preemption exceeds risk in centering imagination as the locus of anti-terror policy in domestic and international arenas.⁶⁵ Put another way, risk is frequently the rhetorical vehicle for authorizing preemption in homeland security culture. It is a powerful one. Risk functions discursively to cordon off undesirable outcomes, naming some practices excessive or unconscionable, and others optional; it defines normativities, polices boundaries, and shapes pedestrian practices, attitudes, and beliefs. Risk has received extensive scholarly attention—it is theorized as a centerpiece of contemporary life, a form of “manufactured uncertainty” distinguished from danger or disaster by its unique temporality and assumption of human agency.⁶⁶ Marked not by realness but by the potential to “becom[e] real,”⁶⁷ risk is orientated toward unknowable futures; it positions humans as response-able agents and warrants decisive action in the present.

As Ulrich Beck writes, risk “is existent *and* non-existent, present *and* absent, doubtful *and* suspect. In the end it can be assumed to be ubiquitous and thus grounds a politics of prevention . . . assuming that the threat which does not (yet) exist really exists” (original emphasis).⁶⁸ As risk is imagined as the primary condition that sculpts our world, then preemption offers its requisite mode of management—constituting the primary logic through which we calculate and avoid, manage and deter, predict and prevent in a world replete with rapid transformation.

The 9/11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, D.C., mark a moment of intensification in the politics of risk and a point of departure for preemption as paradigm. As the vulnerability of the United States was made visible on a global stage, risk was rendered a defining feature of twenty-first-century US life and marshaled to bolster a politics of prevention no matter the cost. The centrality of risk to homeland security culture signals a world of proliferating possibilities and related uncertainties, distinct insofar as they are of our own making and thus subject to preemptive management through emerging modes of expertise and governance. In short, preemption is deeply reliant on the logic and rhetoric of risk, even as it exceeds the repertoire of risk to authorize any number of ruthless actions under the banner of homeland security. Notably, the insistence on preemption includes attempts to govern those pregnant and parenting through the culture of intensive mothering (evidenced by Kayyem) or through state violence against pregnant people (as in the case of Loertscher). Understanding the full significance and implications of these stories, however, requires first an elaboration of homeland security as a state apparatus and cultural politics.

Homeland Security and the State

The preemptive paradigm fuels the rapid expansion of two defining features of the homeland security state: surveillance and policing.⁶⁹ As feminist and critical race scholars have detailed, state surveillance and policing are not new. They constitute the very foundation of the settler state—violently circumscribing the lives of those most vulnerable, including black and brown communities, women, racialized immigrants, and poor people.⁷⁰ The 9/11 attacks catalyzed the intensification of surveillance and policing, however, through unprecedented technological capacity and state investment. The exponential growth of the security industry—topping \$350 billion in 2012 in the United States alone—undergirds the rapid development of surveillance technologies, the outsourcing of security to private citizens and industries, and mounting violations of constitutional rights and privacy in the United States.⁷¹ Moving from margin to center in the

homeland security state, surveillance and policing are distinguished by their ubiquity, extensive infrastructure, and the urgency of the War on Terror. In this context, chronic forms of state violence against marginalized communities are compounded while white, middle-class citizens are rendered increasingly (if also differently) vulnerable to the homeland security state. Significantly, surveillance and policing are two sides of the same coin—one cultivates self-discipline and lateral observation; the other ensures strict sovereign enforcement when neoliberal governmentality fails to induce compliance.

Post-9/11 surveillance pivots on deepening neoliberal governmentality, concentrating power through its dispersion. This is evidenced, for example, by extensive citizen surveillance programs that range from the National Security Agency's warrantless wiretapping to the Department of Homeland Security's 2010 "If You See Something, Say Something" campaign to promote local reporting of "suspicious" activity to local authorities.⁷² Foucauldian theories of governmentality account for such apparatuses, which are distanced from formal political institutions but aim to exert authority, govern through freedom, and "conduct conduct" nevertheless.⁷³ Power operates insidiously through a "loose assemblage of agents, calculations, techniques, images and commodities" that enlists individual actors and governs through related rationalities of individual choice and responsibility.⁷⁴ As Nikolas Rose and Peter Miller note, "personal autonomy is not the antithesis of political power, but a key term in its exercise, the more so because most individuals are not merely the subjects of power but play a part in its operations."⁷⁵ Governmentality turns our attention from centralized, sovereign structures to more dispersed locales, as myriad forms of authority are enlisted alongside a disciplined citizenry to manage responsibilities once considered public, from health and welfare to the security of the nation. Extensive citizen surveillance is thus recursive: trafficking in fear, docility, and allegiance to the state, surveillance itself is rendered mundane and inevitable.

Moreover, the homeland security state relentlessly positions risk and security as personal responsibilities. These responsibilities are contingent on an autonomous, enterprising, and disciplined citizen-subject to mitigate and manage the complexities of an uncertain world. Thus, in a key inversion of the welfare state, citizens absorb the work of domestic security in everyday life, as James Hay and Mark Andrejevic note: "In the era of Homeland Security, constant re-training and self-education in techniques for securing the self, the home, and the homeland become yet another set of required skills for the multi-tasking citizen-subject. An ethic of self-care is invoked in contrast to disparaged forms of dependency on the state and its institutions."⁷⁶ Linking national belonging to the integration of security and defense into everyday life, recent

scholarship demonstrates how homeland security has become quotidian, from airport checkpoints and campaigns to secure the home, to interactive websites such as Ready.gov that encourage citizens to engage the war on terror through information gathering and preparedness.⁷⁷ This logic shifts responsibility from the public to the private sphere, casting the political as personal and mobilizing privacy “not just as a sphere for submission to expert guidance, but as the locus of responsibility and action.”⁷⁸ From genetic counselors to financial risk advisors and home security experts, proliferating modes of expertise dedicated to the reduction of risk compel an “empowered” citizenry to seek guidance in securing everyday life, leaving James Hay to assert “Homeland Security as the new Social Security.”⁷⁹

The function of governmentality is usefully understood alongside transformations in contemporary biopolitics, particularly when considering reproduction and motherhood in the homeland security state.⁸⁰ Biopower has indeed shifted alongside capitalism; it is less reliant on exerting sovereign control over the health of the population than it is on what Nikolas Rose terms “ethopolitical” modes of governance.⁸¹ In lieu of centering on disease or pathology, ethopolitics are concerned with the enhancement and optimization of life on a molecular level and at its earliest stages. Enlisting reprogenetic technologies,⁸² ethopolitics focus on our increasing capacity to determine, shape, and intervene in human life at virtually any and all of its stages, from fetal gene therapies to biotechnical enhancement and optimization.⁸³ A constellation of forces—including the preemptive paradigm and postfeminist “choice” politics—collide to craft an ethopolitical imperative that demands informed, responsible decision making in consultation with new forms of expertise that include bioethicists, fertility counselors, and genetic engineers.⁸⁴ In a trend eerily reminiscent of republican motherhood, patients are saddled with the expectation to “exercise biological prudence, for their own sake, that of their families, that of their own lineage, and that of their nation as a whole.”⁸⁵ This brave new world responsabilizes the self as it details the role of experts in governing “life itself” through freedom, blurring the boundaries between choice and determination, coercion and consent.

Pregnant and parenting individuals are particularly subject to interpellation within this biopolitical terrain. Take, for example, the intense medicalization of pregnancy. As prenatal life is increasingly imagined as a site of optimization, as innovations in reproductive and genetic technologies broaden the potential to determine the shape and the cadence of life on all scales, pregnancy gets tangled in a web of constraints masquerading as reproductive self-determination, often at the expense of social justice and even human diversity.⁸⁶ Reprogenetics—a term that highlights the steady integration of genetic testing and counseling

into standard prenatal care—has rightly drawn sharp feminist critique for its eugenic tendencies, for its ushering in of what Dorothy Roberts refers to as a “new reproductive dystopia” wherein women are compelled to manage genetic risk as a condition of responsible citizenship as the state sheds support for children and families writ large and for children with disabilities specifically.⁸⁷ Moreover, the language of mainstream feminism is appropriated to forward this agenda, recasting concepts such as “autonomy” and “choice” so as to render extensive medical counsel and intervention inevitable.⁸⁸ Far from expanding reproductive freedom, as Silja Samerski astutely observes, “the professional imputation of this new autonomy makes women powerless while holding them responsible.”⁸⁹ Samerski’s astute remarks are written in the context of her study of genetic counseling but are applicable to myriad modes of governmentality that shape maternal health and politics in the context of homeland security.⁹⁰

This shift toward surveillance and governmentality, however, does not signal an abandonment of sovereign rule—far from it. Overt state action, including violence, remains central to the homeland security state when other forms of authority fail—when governing through freedom does not or cannot serve the interests of the state. This is clearly evidenced in the examples I offer at the opening of this book, but of course pregnant and parenting women are not the sole targets of policing and state violence. The rise of the homeland security state has wrought an alarming uptick in draconian forms of policing and a normalization of the “state of emergency” that suspends the rule of law in favor of the exception.⁹¹ Frightening trends in post-9/11 policing exemplify this point. From Wall Street to Ferguson to Standing Rock, law enforcement officials have donned riot gear, acquired military-grade weaponry, and driven armored vehicles into assemblies of unarmed protesters. Reports have detailed numerous instances of brutal state violence against protestors (as well as journalists and legal observers): baseless arrests, unmerciful beatings, denial of medical care, sexual assault, and the use of chemical agents, stun grenades, pepper balls, rubber bullets, sound cannons, flex cuffs, and other so-called less lethal weapons to terrorize protestors.⁹² In addition to inflicting immediate and serious harm, these weapons can result in permanent—even fatal—injuries such as neuropathy, hearing loss, and brain damage.

Poor communities, immigrant communities, and communities of color have long faced state and state-sanctioned brutalities in a system designed to protect whiteness, citizenship, and wealth. What distinguishes policing in the context of homeland security, however, is its rapid escalation, militarization, and mainstreaming. A federal program, initiated through the post-Cold War National Defense Authorization Act, authorized the transfer of military weapons

and gear to civilian law enforcement to bolster efforts in the War on Drugs.⁹³ The implications are difficult to understate. This program funneled high-tech military equipment—including firearms, aircraft, and tactical vehicles—into local police departments, often into the hands of officers ill-equipped to use them. A new subset of the security industry flourished, targeting domestic law enforcement as an untapped but lucrative client for services and technologies. Industry conventions like Urban Shield, funded in part by the US Department of Homeland Security, continue to draw local law enforcement to showcase the latest in surveillance technologies and weaponry. Federal “antiterror grants” totaled over \$34 billion in the decade following 9/11, ensuring a steady stream of funding for the amassing of weaponry and riot gear by state and local police.⁹⁴ The federal weapons program eventually garnered greater public scrutiny in the wake of Black Lives Matter, but even measured attempts by the Obama administration to curtail the scope of weapons transfer drew sharp criticism.⁹⁵

The consequences of militarized policing have been devastating. Various reports detail egregious human rights abuses as well as the steady erosion of public trust.⁹⁶ Permanent injuries to Occupiers, Black Lives Matter activists, and #NoDAPL water protectors have been traced to weaponry from two major security contractors, as well as to Cold War-era arsenals.⁹⁷ The crude display of military might—state officials in full riot gear, tanks rolling into residential communities, midnight raids on peaceful encampments, chemical agents shot point-blank into the faces of nonviolent protestors—renders policing itself hypervisible, a turn fueled by the circulation of images of state violence through social networking platforms. In this strident exhibition of domestic arms, the nation is figured as a war zone. Political dissent is read against the grain of patriotism, and protestors are shamed and silenced by a politics of civility.⁹⁸ As everyday citizens, residents, and communities are recast as enemy combatants in the eyes of the homeland security state, policing as state occupation and suppression becomes the *modus operandi*. Each of these trends is deeply disconcerting when considered in isolation. In concert, the homeland security state is clarified as that which imagines its largest threat to be democracy itself.

The logic of preemption undergirds and sustains these trends. Moreover, just as preemption authorizes exceptional state violence against organized communities within the United States, so too does it promulgate a host of abusive practices in immigration and foreign policy. Examples include preventive detention, preemptive war, extraordinary rendition and torture, and, most recently, the unconscionable separation of undocumented children from their parents at the United States–Mexico border as an alleged strategy of deterrence, a story sparking national outrage as this book goes to press. My purpose here is not to

detail these trends in their entirety, but rather to note them as evidence of the power and ubiquity of preemption—a doctrine that fuels the proliferation of surveillance and policing in both domestic and international arenas, and dwells at the heart of the homeland security state.

Homeland maternity thus privileges the reliance on neoliberal governmentality as a defining characteristic of the homeland security state, while noting the sovereign architecture necessary to ensure its normalizing grasp. The incarceration of Tamara Loertscher offers an example of violent state intervention under the banner of risk; in another, we might consider the unprecedented professional disciplining of Dr. Michael Kamrava, stripped of his medical license in 2011 by the Medical Board of California due largely to his role in Nadya Suleman's conception of octuplets (see chapter 3). My focus on governmentality does not exempt the sovereign state, its traditional functions and modes of enacting authority. But Kamrava and Loertscher mark an extreme—formal interventions deemed necessary when women, at odds or in concert with experts or authority figures, refuse to govern themselves. At the heart of this project is a desire to trace the more subtle discursive logics that render such state action possible, reasonable, or even pedestrian. This task not only requires attention to homeland security as it pivots on preemptive state action, but it also directs our concern to culture and the politics of everyday life in the new millennium.

Everyday Life in Homeland Security Culture

Homeland security culture both signals and exceeds the state, referencing a post-9/11 sociopolitical order that censors dissent, circumscribes civil liberties, relies on exclusion, and pairs draconian policing at home with flagrant lawlessness abroad.⁹⁹ Homeland security culture refers to a vision of nation and national belonging that celebrates nativism, nationalism, indiscriminate patriotism, and an adherence to resurging conservatism and normative “family values.”¹⁰⁰ It is a defining characteristic of early twenty-first-century US public culture—evident in the architecture of the state and other cultural institutions, integrated into popular film and television, woven into the fabric of everyday life, and a powerful force shaping the recent history of reproductive and maternal politics in the United States.¹⁰¹

The rhetorical shift from Cold War-era “national security” to post-9/11 “homeland security” is significant. The appropriation of the term “homeland” itself broke with more familiar patriotic patois—prior to 9/11, no US president had referred to the nation as “homeland,” even in moments of national crisis.¹⁰² As Amy Kaplan notes, the “homeland” is tied to mythic beliefs in “native origins . . . ancient ancestry, and notions of racial and ethnic homogeneity.”¹⁰³

Imagining the nation as a homeland under siege in the early twenty-first century possesses a powerful double function. It fuels an anxious sense of porous boundaries and borders alongside racialized notions of belonging. References to the “homeland” have long signaled “diasporic nostalgia and desires,” and, as Nicholas De Genova writes, “discursively re-figures US citizens as ineffably alienated from their own ‘native’ entitlement to the comfort of unproblematic belonging.”¹⁰⁴ The vernacular privileging of “homeland” incites US nationalism and nostalgia apace with a felt sense of “radical insecurity,”¹⁰⁵ shoring up neoconservative ideological commitments and political priorities—including those related to domesticity—in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

The homeland is thus an abrupt departure from familiar idioms of nation. And yet, homeland security culture possesses a powerful precedent in Cold War-era containment culture.¹⁰⁶ Much like communism in the Cold War era, terrorism could come from anyone anywhere at any time. Affectively marked by this heightened sense of endless insecurity,¹⁰⁷ homeland security culture is, as Jennifer Gillan explains, “both a makeover of, and a return to, 1950s style Containment Culture that divides the world into two camps, fetishizes national security, and establishes uncritical support [to the nation] as a value unto itself, and makes ‘personal behavior part of a global strategy.’”¹⁰⁸ In the absence of any clear sense making or explanatory apparatus for the terrorist attacks, “it was the cold war that echoed most loudly across the post-9/11 landscape.”¹⁰⁹ Familiar terminologies were deployed in characterizing the attacks—live reports on the World Trade Center drew an immediate parallel to the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the site “became ‘ground zero’—a term long associated with nuclear targets,”¹¹⁰ and, in an ill-fated attempt to merge the World War II Axis powers and Reagan’s Evil Empire through metaphor, President George W. Bush called for public support against an “axis of evil.” The Cold War metaphor reverberated far beyond the immediacy of the attacks, shaping homeland security culture through a revival of containment culture practices and attitudes—for example, in touting consumption as patriotic, reanimating traditional gender roles, idealizing traditional family values, silencing political dissent, threatening free speech and civil liberties, and targeting people of African, South Asian, Southeast Asian, and Southwest Asian descent in antiterrorist efforts.¹¹¹

Significantly for the purposes of this project, homeland security culture is shaped by postfeminism even as its gender politics often include overt anti-feminism.¹¹² As Susan Faludi deftly demonstrates in her study of the cultural response to 9/11, the terrorist attacks were collectively imagined as an emasculation of the nation; its antidote swiftly asserted through a renaissance of virile manhood.¹¹³ Indeed, emulating a persistent pattern of containment culture

resuscitation and its attendant forms of gender discipline, the rise of homeland security culture fueled a neofifties gender melodrama that reinvigorated masculinist heroism and its feminine counterpart, domesticity and dependence. Media focused on “security moms” stockpiling food and obsessing over their children’s safety, while single professional women were reportedly lonely and aiming to opt out of careers and into marriage.¹¹⁴ Independent women were publicly chastised while pregnant widows and the “manly men’ at ground zero” were lauded extensively as brave and selfless patriots; taken together, these patterns form a consistent whole: “What mattered was restoring the illusion of a mythic America where women needed men’s protection and men succeeded in providing it. What mattered was vanquishing the myth’s dark twin, the humiliating ‘terror-dream’ that 9/11 had forced to the surface of national consciousness.”¹¹⁵ Save the grieving mothers and widows of 9/11 afforded copious publicity, women were expected to disappear from leadership and public life within the immediate post-9/11 US landscape.

These gender politics, as Faludi notes, did not bode well for feminism. Feminist journalists such as Susan Sontag and Katha Pollitt bore the brunt of public censure and allegations of treason—far beyond that of their male peers—for daring to suggest reflexivity in the wake of the attacks.¹¹⁶ Contemporary feminist concerns were dismissed as superfluous at best, but more frequently demonized for leading the nation astray and heightening national insecurity; the allegations were twofold: “women’s liberation had ‘feminized’ our men and, in so doing, left the nation vulnerable to attack.”¹¹⁷ Conservative women were immediately put to work in service of this agenda, from Karen Hughes and Ann Coulter to self-proclaimed “dissident feminist” Camille Paglia, each equating feminism with terrorism—for example, in framing reproductive rights as incompatible with the post-9/11 reevaluation of life, reprimanding so-called career women for their lack of domestic aspiration, and maligning feminist challenges to patriarchal norms while asserting a revival in traditional masculinity as the antidote to national insecurity. The widows of 9/11 were culturally lauded as long as they remained chaste and in grief; those radicalized by the terrorist attacks, those widows who demanded answers and demonstrated some success in getting them, were reviled. And the very notion of security was retooled toward antifeminist ends—“hijacked,” as Carol Stable and Carrie Rentschler note, “as an alibi for a series of economic policies, political decisions, and military actions that have had the effect of making many women throughout the world infinitely less secure.”¹¹⁸ In short, the only “feminism” allowed to flourish in the wake of 9/11 was decidedly postfeminist—not only a feminism stripped of its radical politics, but one retooled in the interests of patriarchy, capitalism, and US imperialism.

Clarifying this resuscitation of containment culture gender regimes, which are made pliable and more insidious through the reigning logic of postfeminism, is pivotal to understanding homeland security culture writ large, and homeland maternity specifically. From Pat Robertson's blaming of gays, lesbians, and abortion rights supporters for 9/11 to the use of the terrorist attacks to mobilize donations for pro-life causes, the threat of women in control of their own sexuality, reproduction, and motherhood was discursively aligned with terrorist threats to the nation. While these sentiments may seem extreme, I argue that they function as a kind of canary in the coal mine—signaling relationships between motherhood and nation, between reproduction and homeland security, that play out meaningfully in a variety of more subtle, but no less dangerous, contexts. The reigning logic of homeland security culture—reliant on rhetorics of security, risk, emergency, and crisis—possesses a powerful velocity and salience that not only shapes public justifications for citizen surveillance, torture, and the fortification of national borders, but that also constrains sexual and reproductive agency. *Homeland Maternity* explores to what extent, and under what conditions, motherhood and reproduction are aligned with the interests of homeland security; it illuminates how motherhood and nation are inextricably interwoven, perhaps differently, but no less now than ever before.

Locating Homeland Maternity: On Method and an Outline of Chapters

My analysis is guided by an ethic of reproductive justice and by my training as a feminist rhetorical critic. Reproductive justice has been widely embraced as a necessary corrective to the inadequacies of reproductive choice.¹¹⁹ As a mobilizing concept and rhetorical claim, “choice” has been rightly and thoroughly critiqued for centering women of means and privilege, for its inability to secure reproductive freedom and dignity for all women.¹²⁰ As opposed to rights or justice, choice is imagined as superfluous, elite, and rendered subject to the judgment of others. It is often subsumed by individualism and facilitates the privatization of matters that are fundamentally political in scope—for example, mothers on welfare are regularly accused of poor decision making, and this emphasis on “bad choices” deflects attention from the structural dimensions of poverty such as persistent gendered inequities and economic injustice. Put simply, reproduction and motherhood—and indeed, feminism itself—have been reduced to choice at their own peril. The crude equation of feminism with individual choice—*any* choice—robs feminist politics of their ongoing salience, force, and transformative potential through critique. What began decades ago

as an earnest and resonant claim to self-determination—jurisdiction over one’s body, fertility, sexuality—has been depoliticized through myopic obsessions with personal preference, mobilized in service of the new economic order, and subsequently articulated in defense of a range of practices that may or may not serve a vision of social justice or feminist politics. In short, “choice” has diminished the political to the personal once more.

As an organizing tool and critical paradigm, reproductive justice is rooted in the struggles of women of color, both in the United States and in the Global South. The term itself was coined by twelve African American women in 1994 on the heels of the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo.¹²¹ Inspired by their collaborations with feminists of color from around the globe, these twelve women discussed their frustrations with the pro-choice framework and sought a means to articulate reproductive rights as part of a broader human rights and social justice agenda.¹²² As Loretta J. Ross explains, reproductive justice offers “a theory, strategy and practice for organizing against . . . multiple, interlocking reproductive violences . . . by placing Indigenous women and women of color at the center of [its] lens.”¹²³ Thus, reproductive justice advocates center their work on the belief that every human “has the right to have a child, not have a child, and parent the children”¹²⁴ they have, illuminating one of the primary distinctions between reproductive justice and pro-choice advocacy. Pro-choice movements have historically focused almost exclusively on the right to decide *not* to bear children—a reflection of the ways in which whiteness, heteronormativity, and class privilege inform mainstream feminist advocacy and the experience of compulsory motherhood. The histories of women marginalized by and within heteronuclear white supremacist culture are decidedly dissimilar to compulsory motherhood, and in fact reveal the opposite—sustained, institutionalized efforts to curtail or prohibit fertility and motherhood. Reproductive justice takes this as its starting point, and interrogates contemporary issues with a cultivated sensitivity to these histories and experiences.

Reproductive justice is a framework increasingly conversant with the struggles of trans and nonbinary communities. The desire to birth and/or parent children in dignity is not one limited to cisgender women, and the language I use in this book attempts to grapple with the complex realities that shape diverse experiences with pregnancy and parenting. In some cases, the policing of pregnancy is explicitly about the policing of *all* cisgender women of reproductive age—regardless of their ability or desire to carry, birth, or parent children. In this way, there is a specificity to the cisgender misogyny embedded in homeland maternity—and a reason to name it as such. Accordingly, when in reference

to narratives, historical practices, or other instances particular to cisgender women, my language reflects these conditions and points more specifically to considerations of cis sexism and misogyny in the politics of pregnancy and reproduction. Still, the policing and surveillance of reproduction ensnares people from across the gender spectrum, at times providing much common ground in the struggle for reproductive justice among those who identify as trans, nonbinary, or cisgender. Thus, I also use broader, more inclusive language in particular moments throughout this book to reflect how trans and nonbinary individuals are similarly subject to these, and other unique, hostilities. Following the lead of Loretta Ross and Rickie Solinger, I aspire imperfectly toward language both inclusive and specific, oscillating between “women” and “mothers” and “pregnant and/or parenting individuals” according to context.¹²⁵ This nexus of reproductive and gender justice is rich with possibility, calling for ongoing scholarship and critical attention.

As a rhetorical critic, I gather and read a range of artifacts that bear meaningfully on figurations of motherhood and reproduction in homeland security culture. My archive includes newspaper articles, public campaigns, advertisements, popular film and television, legal documents, and advocacy efforts by professional associations and nongovernmental organizations. In so doing, I build on a vibrant tradition of rhetorical scholarship that embraces criticism “in the artistic mode.”¹²⁶ It is a tradition that understands illumination as its first impulse, a tradition that invests in the critical process as fundamentally creative, generative, and world making.¹²⁷ While the sites of inquiry in the chapters that follow may seem divergent at first glance, I aim to articulate connections among fragments of culture in order to map continuities and consistencies; to locate, in Raymond Williams’s terminology, “a felt sense of the quality of life at a particular place and time.”¹²⁸ The selected case studies are spatially and temporally bracketed in distinct ways; rather than assume discrete beginnings and ends, however, the aim of this project is to trace striking consistencies across time and space as powerful, interanimating cultural formations.¹²⁹ Without laying claim to causality or intentionality, in *Homeland Maternity* I assemble and interrogate a rich archive of public discourse, with a cultivated sensitivity to how particular rhetorical acts and utterances are made salient in broader cultural contexts.

Each instance of homeland maternity explored in the following chapters focuses on a controversy or cultural phenomenon in recent US history (1) centered on reproduction and motherhood, (2) wherein the rationalities of homeland security culture shaped public thinking through rhetorics of security, risk, emergency, and crisis, (3) in ways that served a vision of nation, and (4) garnered significant attention—dominating news headlines for months (even

years), reverberating through media, popular culture, state assemblies, and/or Congress, and generating a wealth of public interest and debate. That is to say, each chapter centers on a site where the discursive alignment of motherhood and nation is present and persistent, where the logic of homeland security culture shapes reproductive politics and, significantly, where motherhood and reproduction are figured as central to homeland security within dominant discourse. Although I focus some attention on instances where clear and egregious violations of human rights have occurred, the longer case studies foreground moments of homeland maternity that are more subtle, illustrating the quotidian contexts that undergird alignments between motherhood and nation and fuel the conditions necessary to police motherhood and reproduction in the ways that we currently—and increasingly—do. In other words, I attend to those discourses that normalize, even render necessary, more extreme forms of surveillance and policing of those pregnant and parenting in everyday US contexts. These sites are not meant to be exhaustive, but function rather as representative anecdotes that illustrate well the defining features of homeland maternity and its implications.

As history would suggest, homeland maternity enlists wealthy, white domesticity in the project of security. In chapter 1, “Securing Motherhood on the Home Front,” I examine the post-9/11 surge in pronatalism that aligned white, professional women’s fertility with national security. Two cultural sites are of particular interest in this case study. First, I interrogate the “opt-out revolution” of the early twenty-first century that profiled an exodus of professional women from elite careers in favor of full-time domesticity, a trend reminiscent of postwar white suburbia but refigured in the context of postfeminist culture. Second, I study the proliferation of fertility campaigns that targeted young professional women in the latter part of the decade, offering lifestyle directives and encouraging the use of assisted reproductive technologies to secure the possibility of pregnancy later in life. I argue that these pronatalist campaigns are usefully understood in concert, clarifying the discursive valorization of domesticity and motherhood for women of means as a critical dimension of homeland security culture.

But not all mothers are equally celebrated. Homeland maternity directs attention to how the fertility of particular women is relentlessly promoted, even as others are punished for reproductivity that is read against the grain of the nation. The second chapter, “Risky Reproduction and the Politics of Octomom,” explores the case of Nadya Suleman (more widely known as Octomom) and the cultural politics of “risk” in reproduction. I examine public discourses surrounding the birth of the Suleman octuplets, tracing related rhetorics of pathology and risk

that marked Suleman as a threat to be contained while masking dominant logics of race, class, and family formation through the ethos of medical expertise. In this chapter I explore how the rhetoric of risk governs women differentially, policing the borders of maternity and asserting the primacy of medical authority in maintaining these borders. Furthermore, as risk is rhetorically evoked to position women against their pregnancies, I argue that this fundamentally shifts the gaze of the clinic—decentering women, elevating the fetus, and fueling the discursive conditions necessary for the deprivation of pregnant women’s rights and liberties. Thus, Suleman’s story is situated alongside frightening trends toward state criminalization and punishment of pregnant women across the country, as evidenced recently in the state of Wisconsin’s cruel treatment of Tamara Loertscher.

Attempts to govern motherhood and fertility according to dominant ideologies are also intimately entangled with the politics of purity and youth sexuality. The third chapter, “Post-Prevention? Conceptualizing Emergency Contraception,” analyzes public debates surrounding the availability of emergency contraception (EC) over the counter. From 2001 to 2006, as FDA officials wrestled with the parameters of EC availability, the perceived significance and implications of a novel form of pregnancy prevention—specifically, a means of preventing pregnancy *after* unprotected sex—fueled cultural panics regarding sexual purity and young people’s sexual and reproductive decision making. I argue that EC was discursively managed through rhetorics of “emergency” that drew on the ethos of science, emphasized normative family planning and sexual restraint, and disciplined women differentially according to longstanding (classed, racialized) hierarchies of maternal worth. In so doing, I note how advocacy for EC accessibility relied on antiabortion cultural sentiment and the intrinsic value of sexual “purity.” Eventually placed behind the counter and subject to pharmacist refusal clauses and recipient age requirements, I explore how the reclassification of EC unevenly relocates and intensifies surveillance of women’s sexual and reproductive lives within homeland security culture.

In the final chapter, I investigate how rhetorics of crisis in the context of homeland maternity have reshaped contemporary reproductive politics. In “Crisis Pregnancy and the Colonization of the Clinic,” I critically account for the significance of crisis teen pregnancy narratives in homeland security culture (e.g., *Juno*, *16 and Pregnant*, *Glee*, and *Teen Mom*) alongside the colonization of comprehensive women’s health clinics by the evangelical crisis pregnancy center movement. First, I consider how crisis teen pregnancy narratives resuscitate containment culture normativities with a postfeminist twist. In dominant entertainment media, the containment culture disappearance of pregnant white

teenagers is adapted to contemporary contexts as crisis pregnancy narratives offer teens neoliberal risk tutorials—tools for self-governance that emphasize postfeminist empowerment through prematernal and maternal prudence and responsibility. Rhetorics of “crisis” pregnancy resonate beyond television and film, however. I thus attend also to the rhetorics of crisis mobilized by federally funded evangelical crisis pregnancy centers, clarifying how they are implicated in the public defunding and closure of abortion clinics across the country. This is, to be sure, clear and sobering evidence of the steady uptick in the policing and coercion of women’s reproductive lives in recent US security culture.

Taking recent immigration policies related to pregnancy and motherhood as a point of departure, the conclusion considers the implications of homeland maternity and examines potential modes of resistance to it, including strategies of co-optation, subversion, and other modes of rhetorical invention and reinvention. This final chapter is written in the spirit of exploration and provocation. It highlights and develops emerging channels of challenge and transformation, edging us toward the promise of reproductive justice beginning with the very words we speak.

Motherhood in the context of homeland security culture is a site of intense contestation—at once a powerful form of currency and a target of unprecedented assault. As reproductive bodies are imagined to threaten national security, either through supposed excess or deficiency, a culture of homeland maternity intensifies the requirements of pregnancy and parenting as it works to discipline those who refuse to adhere. Securing the nation has long entailed the surveillance and control of reproduction and motherhood. What follows is an investigation of this pattern in its most recent instantiation, committed to the belief that we can—and must—make other worlds possible.