

Introduction

(Re)thinking Queer Kinship and Reproduction

A kin-ship is a strange little vessel. She is small yet sea-worthy and abides by a comforting yet troubling set of codes that determines who gets in and who stays out of the boat. Like most ships, she lists. She lists between a company of kin that can sit down to breakfast with one mother or two fathers and their brood of loved but unrelated ones, and one that holds fast to blood that draws a line at the family table; between a block that parties and a party that blocks; between unruly affinity occupying all streets and the systematised sameness that holds office.
(Weaver 2013, 43)

WHAT MAKES FAMILY and reproduction queer? As the epigraph by Lois Weaver suggests, kinship can be understood as a vessel that is carried by and lists between many great forces, very few of them predetermined. Indeed, over the past decades, the ideas of family, kinship, and lineage as rooted in, and based on, heterosexual marriage, bloodlines, and even love, ideas that have been seen as self-evident and natural throughout modernity, have increasingly been called into question. Assisted reproductive technologies (ART) such as IVF, gamete- and embryo donation and gestational surrogacy, have developed and spread throughout the world, calling the very "naturalness" of heterosexual reproduction as the basis for family into question, and pointing to the possibility of, as Rosi Braidotti has put it, "reproduction without sexuality – babies without sex" for all humans (1994, 19; see also Haraway 1997). Alongside this development, laws that recognize and enable same-sex family-making, along with a growing discourse on alternative family structures within both queer and heterosexual communities, have destabilized, reshaped,

and recreated the meaning and representation of kinship across many, but far from all, European nation states. What, then, is a family and who is related to whom at the beginning of the 21st century? And above all, how is *queer* kinship and belonging created, reproduced, and represented at the intersection of assisted reproduction and new family law?

This special issue of *lambda nordica* emerged from the workshop *Re-producing Kinship, Queering Reproduction: Familial Bonds in the Age of Assisted Reproductive Technologies* that we, the editors of this issue, together with Antu Sorainen organized in Stockholm in 2013,¹ in order to explore a number of questions that arise at the intersection of these two emerging phenomena. Even if these questions are far from new to the international fields of feminist and queer science studies, this was the first workshop to comprehensively address these topics and questions organized in Sweden. It brought together Nordic and Baltic researchers with experts in the field from other parts of Europe, for an event with the aim of establishing expert networks, formulating new research projects, and producing new knowledge. Scholars from a range of disciplines and countries discussed issues such as: Which new forms of reproduction and kinship relations are made possible at the intersection of "queer kinship" and ART – and which hegemonic forms of kinship might be reproduced? Which new patterns of social inclusion and exclusion (based on e.g. gender, sexuality, age, class, ability, religion, citizenship status, race, and ethnicity) can we identify in the wake of ART and recent changes in family law? How do these changes materialize in the everyday lives of LGBTQ citizens? Which families are considered legitimate in the context of reproductive medicine? What is the significance of "reproductive ageing," declines in fertility and rising age of parents in the context of queer families? Which specific difficulties do lesbian, gay, and queer people encounter when they seek infertility treatment? What is the significance of "reproductive choice" (e.g. choice of donor) in the context of queer kinship and ART? This introduction will neither do justice to the many intellectually inspiring and politically urgent discussions held at the workshop, nor give a full outline of the rich field to which this issue speaks. Rather in what follows, we will

briefly outline how this special issue has emerged from and speaks to our own research paths and briefly introduce the articles in this volume.

Queer(y)ing Queer Kinship and Reproduction

Together with the authors in this special issue, and joining a long line of feminist researchers before us, we argue that while often seemingly self-evident, questions of reproduction and family-making are at the center of a range of heated political agendas. Along with many LGBTQ organizations, we note that in the Nordic region, as well as in other parts of Europe, these are also matters of increasing political urgency. Recent years have witnessed a growing emphasis on traditional "family values" across the EU, including on both sides of the Baltic Sea, reflected among other things, in heightened debates about issues like (same-sex) marriage in the Baltic states, Poland, Finland, and, as Alisa Zhabenko shows, certainly in Russia. The ongoing contestations around who and what count as a family is a sobering reminder that it does not always "get better." Rather, a range of ideas about the future of the nation, about modernity and tradition, not to mention biomedical ethics and elastic definitions of what Sarah Franklin (2000) has called "life itself."

In all their local and national specificities and complexities, individual dreams of family-making and reproduction are often inevitably entangled with changing welfare state health care regimes and their support and/or regulation of same-sex reproduction. At the same time, these dreams are also realized via the growing global phenomenon of so-called fertility tourism (cross-border reproductive care, CBRC), a solution to which – at least the more affluent – citizens that are excluded from fertility treatment in their own home countries can turn. Indeed, it is clear that one queer dimension of queer kinship is its tendency to cross borders of many kinds. For instance, Denmark, and to some extent Finland, has long been a popular destination for lesbians and single women who seek treatment with sperm donation (Adrian 2006; 2010), and India, Ukraine, and the United States are becoming increasingly popular destinations for both heterosexual and gay couples who wish to become parents with the help of a gestational surrogate (Riggs and

Due 2010; Gondouin this issue). The degree to which donors and surrogates are considered part of queer "kinship" and the emotional and economic costs of reproduction remain both politically sore points and scientifically challenging to study. The transnational dimension of queer family-making also includes the degree to which both popular cultural representations of queer families are circulated globally and the various ways that LGBTQ rights organizations collaborate and share demands and strategies transnationally.

Paradoxically, given the wide range of ways in which people now define and make family, we are witnessing a growing insistence on new criteria for parenthood and "chosen families" and at the same time an ever-increasing importance placed on and tools to find one's genetic heritage. Alongside a growing number of families made with anonymous donors is the rise in interest in tracking "donor siblings" and regulating knowledge about one's genetic history. While new reproductive patterns and visions seemingly both challenge and reproduce ideas of gender, parenthood, relatedness, origins, and kinship in ways that remain understudied, there is still a tendency of much LGBTQ centered research to depart from a heteronormative kinship model as "natural" and then to stress the "happiness" and "equality" and even "success" of queer or same-sex parenting and family making. While we certainly do not question the idea that queers make great parents, we agree with Judith Butler who in her famous article, "Is Kinship Always Already Heterosexual?" (2002), critically examines the deep (theoretical) belief that the origin of culture lies in heterosexuality. She argues that once we stop questioning whether it is "natural" for same-sex couples to marry and have children, there are a range of questions of interest to all researchers concerned with gender, sexuality, desire, and power that could be asked. One of them is: "[H]ow do we begin to understand what forms of gender differentiation take place for the child when heterosexuality is not the presumption of Oedipalization?" (Butler 2002, 39)

With Butler, and many other feminist researchers, we are interested in investigating the complex lives and fantasies of kinship, belonging, origins, and intimacy that emerge in and through these new arrange-

ments of reproduction. Relatedly, as queer studies researchers we wonder what happens to the classic code “s/he’s in the family” or the slogan “We are family,” used around the world to signal the political and experiential affinities of LGBTQ movements and communities, when parts of that very community begins to make family with the use of these new technological and legal frameworks? If the double pun in “We are family” points to the idea that people belonging to sexual minorities have a commonality or “likeness” in being nonheterosexual (Walters 2012), and simultaneously to how sexual identity based communities can replace kin when “coming out” results in exclusion from heterosexual families of origin, what happens when you “come out” as parents or desiring children of your own? Differently put: What does *queer* family and kinship mean on a community level and what is the relationship between legally recognized and alternative queer families involving children and the larger idea of the LGBTQ community as family?

By stressing *queer* kinship and how kinship can be queered, we can move beyond a focus on same-sex families and identitarian projects and attend to the complex ways that nuclear family ideals are challenged, resisted, and reworked by complex configurations of people who care for each other and for children. Challenging the distinction between “social” and “biological” kinship, and drawing on Janet Carsten’s (2004) anthropological theories of kinship and Butler’s proposal that kinship is “a set of practices that institutes relationships of various kinds which negotiate the reproduction of life and the demands of death” (2002, 14), we can queer(y) kinship in the Nordic and Baltic region, as well as in other parts of Europe in ways that go beyond adding new empirical knowledge. Significantly, a *relational* approach to these matters assumes that queer identities and kinship are not radically different from, but rather both engage with and challenge existing norms of gender and sexuality (Puar 2007), as well as biology/genetics and love as key cultural symbols of kinship (Hayden 1995). Addressing a key concern for contemporary LGBTQ activism and for contemporary nation and region building, research on these themes also intervenes in queer theoretical debates about assimilation (Warner 1999), futurity (Edelman

2005), and queer liberalism (Eng 2010) and attends to new forms of family and kinship, accounts of subjects and subjectivities, and relations of affect and desire and to how kinship is felt, in part through the racialization of intimacy (Eng 2010). By employing an intersectional theoretical framework for cultural analysis (Collins 1998) we can also consider how studies of (queer) kinship reproduce and challenge particular understandings of gender, sexuality, relatedness, and belonging that also reflect and articulate with larger issues of race, nation, class, age, and ability. If questions of gender, sexuality, and kin relations are central to all areas of politics – indeed, as feminist anthropologists have long demonstrated, reproduction remains invisibly central to all social life (Strathern 1992; Rapp 2001) – the empirical question to be asked is how? To study reproduction and family is to study relations of power, how culture is reproduced and contested, and how the future of nations, regions, and communities are imagined.

Queer Kinship Networks and Grammars

The work with this special issue is part of the (guest) editors' current respective and joint research projects at Södertörn University and of the national, regional, and European networks of kinship studies to which we belong. In a recently started ethnographic research project entitled "Queer(y)ing Kinship in the Baltic region," Ulrika Dahl and her team are studying the cultural, social, and legal conceptualizations and configurations of queer (nonheterosexual) kinship formations and family practices in and between several nations around the Baltic Sea with the overarching objective to make a contribution to the broader fields of kinship and reproduction studies and to an understudied dimension within Baltic and Eastern/Central European Studies. As the first project of its kind to be funded by the Baltic Sea Foundation and extending existing research projects of Joanna Mizielinska and Sorainen, this project focuses on the sexual minorities within Baltic and Eastern European Studies and on family making within and beyond legal recognition. Looking at and across three different national, cultural, and legal contexts: Sweden, Finland, and Poland, and with a planned PhD

project adding an additional theme, the overall project combines ethnographic and textual research on the effects of both new legislation and nonrecognized forms of queer kinship, on same-sex marriage and family making as well as on alternative queer community arrangements of care and inheritance.

Through a research design based in the intellectual kinship between project participants and by combining data from existing and new studies, the project aims to make a substantive contribution to theories of kinship and family as they articulate with studies of ART. Through intersectional analysis, it attends not only to how (queer) kinship reproduce gender and sexuality, but also to how questions of race/nationality, class and migration/citizenship are shaped by, and shape, such formations. By studying the contemporary state(s) of queer kinship in the Baltic region, we gain new insights into fundamental cultural and political questions such as, how do questions of (queer) kinship shape Baltic and European integration and modernization and what are the gendered and sexualized dimensions of political and economic "transitions" and imaginaries of the future? In critical dialogue with international, Anglo-American dominated scholarship, much of which builds on and extends the classic work of Kath Weston (1991), it also hopes to contribute to developing new theoretical models that take into account the specificities of postsocialist and (post)welfare states. By examining contemporary kinship and inheritance legislation, it also contributes to the study of kinship as a target of new politics and policies in the EU. Emphasizing national specificities and cultural encounters both within and between these contexts and by highlighting local and transnational activism and community knowledge, the project questions a liberal narrative about progress that casts the "East" as inevitably "lagging behind" (Koobak 2013) the "West," including in terms of LGBTQ issues. Instead it focuses complexities, nuances, and exchanges in and across these nations' respective legal and cultural frameworks and seeks to provide deepened knowledge of the socio-cultural and political situation of LGBTQ people at the present moment. At its broadest, the project asks: How are kinship and family bonds created, practiced, and

narrated among LGBTQ people, within and beyond the confines of the law? What challenges do these families meet in different national contexts and how are they negotiated? How does queer kinship extend and reconfigure the meaning of kinship and family more broadly and what are the implications of this for Baltic cohesion and collaboration?

Elizabeth Povinelli reminds us that we can hardly call "kinship and affiliation a theory anymore, so thoroughly has it reterritorialized modern social life" (2002, 227). Indeed, the very history of kinship is the history of anthropology, but also of the academy itself, aligned as it has been with national histories of colonialism and state-making, not to mention with academic careers. "With every new argument, the interior complexity of the genealogical grid intensified," Povinelli argues and she points out that for kinship anthropologists, "building careers was one of the means by which the genealogical imaginary was elaborated and spread" (2002, 224). Inspired by Povinelli, Dahl's project is interested both in the topic of queer kinship and in understanding intellectual kinship networks as they are manifested in the (re)citation of both authors and gender norms, the practices of who we invite and collaborate with as in some sense part of this genealogically routed kinship imaginary. In so doing, the point is not to keep these questions in the (racialized) family of whiteness and belonging that constitutes so much of Northern European feminist academia. Rather, it is clear that much is at stake for queers and other others in our racist and nationalist times and they call for asking critical questions. As Povinelli notes, the more reflection on, and critique of, the genealogical grid we have developed, particularly around defining its essential properties, the more the grid itself has receded into the background. Even if the grid has been reworked to encompass new possibilities for making relatedness, discussions about queer family-making practice within liberal democratic states today seem heavily invested in reproducing a certain kind of sameness.

Jenny Gunnarsson Payne's current research investigates reproductive technologies, especially in relation to reproductive rights, citizenship, and kinship. Much of her research has cohered around the so-called

"fragmentation of motherhood" that has emerged in the wake of in vitro fertilization (IVF), and the possibility to reproduce life – "make babies" – outside of the human body. Significantly, not least in relation to queer kinship, the new possibilities that IVF affords breaks with an ancient Roman legal dictum, namely the principle *mater semper certa est*, in short meaning that motherhood, unlike fatherhood, is "always known" by way of pregnancy and birth. After IVF, however, and particularly in the wake of the current increase in gestational surrogacy arrangements in many places all over the world, this principle no longer holds. Motherhood has become "fragmented," in the sense that today we can not only differ between "social" and "biological" mothers, but can find many situations in which it is relevant to ask what we even mean by these terms. Indeed, as Franklin writes in her essay, what we mean by "biological" has changed over time. Importantly, the consequences of this increasing complexification of biological motherhood, go far beyond matters concerning the status of the mother, and has opened up for a plethora of new family forms and kinship bonds, which are of crucial importance for the ways in which it is today possible to conceptualize and practice queer kinship. First of all, this has major implications for how we can think and practice also *biological* kinship.

In an attempt to begin conceptualizing these implications, Gunnarsson Payne has in her recent research on transnational egg donation and gestational surrogacy identified three existing, what she calls, "grammars of biological kinship" that coexist in contemporary European societies: *the kinship grammar of blood*, *the kinship grammar of genetics*, and *the kinship grammar of epigenetics*. In short, a "kinship grammar" can be described as both the vocabulary and the "rules of articulation" for the relationships between included elements (Gunnarsson Payne 2015a; 2015b; see also Wittgenstein 2001; Norval 2007). In a forthcoming article in the feminist journal *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Gunnarsson Payne argues, following the work of Franklin and Susan McKinnon, that kinship grammars are "generative"; they generate "material, relational, and cultural worlds." In this sense they are not only constitutive of such realities, but also determines which worlds are pos-

sible and for whom (Franklin and McKinnon 2001, 15). Put differently, "[s]uch kinship grammars are mobilized and rearticulated differently in different contexts to form and re-form relatedness between people through processes of connection and disconnection, and processes of inclusion and exclusion." Kinship grammars determines "what 'counts' as kinship; it provides us with the rules for who 'counts' as kin" (Gunnarsson Payne 2015a). However, while certain kinship grammars do indeed persist over time, and are reproduced in more or less all domains of human coexistence, this does not mean that they remain stagnant. As these rules are "followed" or "applied," they are also continuously transformed in different ways; new kinship grammars emerge, for example in the form of "hybrid grammars" or more rarely as radically novel ways of thinking and practicing kinship. Importantly, such changes are inextricably interlaced with social, political, and scientific processes.

The three aforementioned grammars of biological kinship describe how people understand and practice kinship and relatedness in relation to "biology" in different ways.

The "kinship grammar of blood" refers to age-old ideas and practices concerning the ways in which "shared blood" (as in "blood ties" and "blood lines"), binds individuals and groups together within and across generations. Today, the notion of "blood" as a kinning substance is most often used metaphorically (as in "blood is thicker than water"), but this grammar has also been shown in research on egg donation to be "applied" by many women who are pregnant by way of egg donation to understand how they are "becoming related" to the fetus that they are carrying (Konrad 2005, Gunnarsson Payne 2015b; see also Franklin 2013). The "kinship grammar of genetics" is the most prevalent way to understand biological kinship in the contemporary Western world; indeed, the terms "biological" and "genetic" are often (but not always) used interchangeably in descriptions of kinship relations. This grammar saturates a discourse about the relationship between donorhood and fatherhood, imbues a story about finding donor siblings, and, of course, also that of the cultural and medical significance attributed to inheritance. Lastly, the "kinship grammar of epigenetics" refers to newer biological

theories about how gene expression is influenced in different ways by environmental factors, such as nutrition, stress, toxins, etc. Even though the kinship grammar of epigenetics is still rather marginal in comparison the kinship grammar of blood and the kinship grammar of genetics, it is noteworthy that it has recently been articulated by egg donation patients to describe themselves as *biological*, albeit not genetic, mothers of their donor conceived children (Gunnarsson Payne 2015b), as well as in a recent surrogacy court case in an attempt to determine who was to count as the biological – and thereby legitimate – mother (i.e. the woman contributing with the egg, or the woman carrying the child to term) (Gunnarsson Payne 2015a).

These three forms of kinship grammar, we contend, take particular kinds of expressions in relation to *queer* as in nonnormative kinship formations. For instance, as the articles by both Zhabenko and Venetia Kantsa and Aspa Chalkidou in this issue illuminate, (paths to) lesbian motherhood is heavily shaped by changing family laws in different countries and those changes in law draw on kinship grammars whereby different rights and recognitions are given to different forms of parenthood. On the one hand, same-sex marriage extends the heteronormative model whereby the spouse of a birth giving mother is given parental rights, but only insofar as the donor, known or unknown, have given up his "genetic" rights. At the same time, the power of the genetic grammar exceeds the law and continues to be culturally powerful for origin stories of many children. For children conceived via surrogacy and raised by gay male parents, there appears to be a break with a tradition of blood, and yet the genetic and epigenetic grammars are often invoked in securing ties. What we might call a kinship grammar of friendship, in this issue discussed by Sorainen and Dahl in different ways, seemingly breaks with an idea of blood, genes, and epigenetics, but culturally never entirely. Indeed, when reproduction in the form of children emerges in the picture, it seems rather challenging to move beyond legally.

This Issue

This issue presents articles by anthropologists, sociologists, and media scholars who in various ways speak to some of the questions we have sketched above. Above all, they present new and interesting empirical data from case studies in Finland, Russia, Greece, and Sweden. All critically engage and extend the so far largely Anglo-American dominated field and thus offer some unique empirical findings that we hope will be of interest to the growing field of queer kinship and reproduction studies. In the first article, "Queer Personal Lives, Inheritance Perspectives and Small Places," Sorainen builds on a larger research project that investigates will-writing and inheritance practices in sexually marginalized groups in Finland. As Sorainen's work illuminates, will-writing and inheritance are crucial topics for queer kinship studies insofar as most inheritance legislation departs from a cultural model of marriage and heteronormative generational succession that does not always fit the lives and kinship configurations of queer people. Drawing on two life stories of lesbians living in rural Finland, Anttu Sorainen also crucially brings the relevance of *place*, in this case the choice of rural living, into the discussion about queer kinship networks, and reminds us that queer livelihoods and successions take a range of shapes. In particular, the article illustrates how understandings of inheritance become important for queers whose work and need as caretakers and carereceivers is often neglected by heteronormative society and who as a group are often economically invisible to the state. Sorainen further shows that inheritance, or the future perspective of it, can affect queer choices in many ways and in the case of the stories she analyzes, it made bio-kin a big part of their life stories and choices, but it also allowed for unconventional or progressive alternatives. At the same time, the article shows how by studying queer personal lives we can gain an insight into the effects of cultural memory and the social possibilities for alternative relationalities, which by extension reveals a site for powerful queer critique.

The second article, "Reproductive Choices of Lesbian-Headed Families in Russia: From the Last-Soviet Period to Contemporary Times," by sociologist Alisa Zhabenko presents unique data on the reproduc-

tive choices of three distinct generational cohorts of lesbians in Russia, from Soviet times until today. Placing the lives of her informants into a larger historical and political context, from Soviet to post-Soviet times, Zhabenko's work challenges easy assumptions about how "it gets better." Rather, she shows the complex navigations of gender, sexuality, and religious and family ideals that lesbians have had to navigate in order to conceive and raise children. Zhabenko also reflects on the challenges involved in researching a topic that under the current laws in Russia puts both her informants and herself at considerable risk. She also shows that legal recognition or not, lesbians have and continue to raise families and access reproductive technologies in Russia.

In the article "Doing Family 'In the Space Between the Laws': Notes on Lesbian Motherhood in Greece," anthropologists Venetia Kantsa and Aspa Chalkidou take up contemporary issues concerning lesbian parenthood achieved by assisted reproduction in the Greek context. Similarly to Russia, Greece law does not recognize nonheterosexual partnerships, which leaves lesbian mothers to create their families and practice parenting "in the interspace of the law." The authors show, amongst other things, how certain forms of lesbian motherhood are made possible by using the legal and medical possibilities for single women to opt for insemination or IVF with donated sperm. This possibility is afforded by cultural notions of motherhood and femininity, and more specifically, by the idea that "women are natural-born mothers." At the same time, this idea does *not* extend to co-mothers, who, as a result of the absence of any legal recognition are left to articulate their parental status outside of any hegemonic heteronormative notions of "the family." Based on their extensive empirical research, Kantsa and Chalkidou investigate how lesbians become parents in this context of legal exclusion, and which meanings medically assisted parenthood and kinship acquire among these parents.

In the final article, entitled "Gay Fathers, Surrogate Mothers, and the Question of the Human: A Postcolonial Feminist Analysis of Emotions in *Barn till varje pris?*," Johanna Gondouin investigates the media representations of a gay male couple's quest to start a family with the help

of an Indian gestational surrogate, Geeta. As Gondouin demonstrates, the documentary genre offers an opportunity to explore, empirically and theoretically, the role that representations of emotions such as love and vulnerability play in normalizing transnational surrogacy as a legitimate option for forming male same-sex families. A crucial finding in her text is that not only are these emotions crucial throughout the documentary, but they are also asymmetrically distributed between the intended parents and the surrogate mother. While the couple is portrayed as driven by love, the surrogate mother's financial incentives are put at the forefront. Drawing on postcolonial and feminist debates on surrogacy, she argues that the normalization of this specific type of queer kinship bonds in this television series is formed through "the exclusion of the racialized female Other." As such, Gondouin's article points to the importance of critically interrogating dominant and often emotionally laden media representations of "the (straight *or* queer) nuclear family" and to investigating if these implicitly or explicitly might build on the exclusion of other "reproductive parties." This, in turn, raises important questions concerning reproductive rights and power asymmetries on a global scale, as well as intersections of privilege and marginalization in current queer reproductive and kinship practices.

Lastly the issue includes two essays that open up further lines of inquiry. In the first, entitled "Not Gay as in Happy, but Queer as in Fuck You: Notes on Love and Failure in Queer(ing) Kinship," Ulrika Dahl revisits the question of (romantic) love as the foundation of queer kinship and ponders how the "failure" of love might be studied ethically and theoretically. The second essay, "Queer Biology?" under the section *We're here*, is offered by Cambridge professor of sociology and pioneering scholar in feminist studies of science and reproduction, Sarah Franklin. Writing on the theme of queer biology, Franklin takes a retrospective look at her own work and at how not only the meaning of reproduction and technology, but also the meaning of "biology" has changed in the field of science and technology studies over the past twenty years. Among other things, Franklin argues that the particular understandings of biology at work in kinship discourse, as well as on matters of

gender and sexuality, and the distinction that is often made between the cultural biological and the natural biological is itself an invention that has gained particular salience in the latter half of the 20th century. We certainly agree with Franklin who proposes that studies of queer kinships are particularly interesting for tracking the queerness of biology and above all the relative value assigned to it. Put together we hope that this selection of papers from contributors to our workshop can be a contribution to the growing field of queer studies of kinship, family, and reproduction in Europe.

ULRIKA DAHL and
JENNY GUNNARSSON PAYNE

ULRIKA DAHL is a cultural anthropologist and associate professor of gender studies at Södertörn University, where her work has primarily centered on queer studies and critical femininity studies. Among her publications are *Skamgrepp: Femme-inistiska essäer* (2014), and *Femmes of Power: Exploding Queer Femininities* (with Del LaGrace Volcano, 2008), as well as articles in *Gender, Place and Culture*, *NORA*, *Tidskrift för genusvetenskap*, and a range of anthologies. Currently she is studying queer kinship figurations and practices in Sweden. Ulrika is also one of the senior editors of *lambda nordica*.

JENNY GUNNARSSON PAYNE is associate professor of European Ethnology at Södertörn University. Her current research investigates issues concerning the social and political consequences of assisted reproductive technologies, paying particular attention to the ways in which these technologies are linked to issues concerning kinship, citizenship, and reproductive rights. Her published work can be read in academic journals such as *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, and *Journal of Citizenship Studies*, but also in a number of edited volumes in English and Swedish.

REFERENCES

- Adrian, Stine. 2006. "Nye skabelsesberetninger om æg, sæd og embryoner: Et etnografisk studie af anvendelsen af assisteret befrugtning på sædbanker og fertilitetsklinikker." PhD diss.; Linköping University.
- . 2010. "Sperm Stories: Policies and Practices of Sperm Banking in Denmark and Sweden." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 17.1:393–411.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 1994. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Butler, Judith. 2002. "Is Kinship Always Already Heterosexual?" *differences* 13.1: 14–44.
- Carsten, Janet. 2004. *After Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998. "It's All in the Family: Intersections of Gender, Race, and Nation." *Hypatia* 13.3:62–82.
- Edelman, Lee. 2005. *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Eng, David. 2010. *The Feeling of Kinship: Queer Liberalism and the Racialization of Intimacy*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Franklin, Sarah. 2000. "Life Itself: Global Nature and the Genetic Imaginary." In *Global Nature, Global Culture*, edited by Sarah Franklin, Celia Lury and Jackie Stacey, 188–227. London: Sage.
- . 2013. *Biological Relatives: IVF, Stem Cells, and the Future of Kinship*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Franklin, Sarah, and Susan McKinnon, eds. 2001. *Relative Values: Reconfiguring Kinship Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Gunnarsson Payne, Jenny. 2015a. "Grammars of Kinship: Biological Motherhood and Assisted Reproduction in the Age of Epigenetics." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* (forthcoming in 2015).
- . 2015b. "Mattering Kinship: Inheritance, Biology and Egg Donation, Between Genetics and Epigenetics." In *Critical Kinship*, edited by Charlotte Kroløkke and Stine Adrian. Palgrave Macmillan (forthcoming in 2015).
- Haraway, Donna. 1997. "The Virtual Speculum in the New World Order." *Feminist Review* 55:22–72.
- Hayden, Corinne. 1995. "Gender, Genetics and Generation: Reformulating Biology in Lesbian Kinship." *Cultural Anthropology* 10.1:41–63.
- Konrad, Monica. 2005. *Nameless Relations: Anonymity, Melanesia, and Reproductive Gift Exchange Between British Ova Donors and Recipients*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Koobak, Redi. 2013. *Whirling Stories: Postsocialist Feminist Imaginaries and the Visual Arts*. Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press.
- Norval, Aletta. 2007. *Aversive Democracy: Inheritance and Originality in the Democratic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Puar, Jasbir. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth. 2002. "Notes on Gridlock: Genealogy, Intimacy, Sexuality." *Public Culture* 14.1:215–38.
- Rapp, Reyna. 2001. "Gender, Body, Biomedicine: How Some Feminist Concerns Dragged Reproduction to the Center of Social Theory." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 15.4:466–77.
- Riggs, Damien, and Clemence Due. 2010. "Gay Men, Race Privilege and Surrogacy in India." *Outskirts Online Journal* 22. <http://www.outskirts.arts.uwa.edu.au/volumes/volume-22/riggs> (accessed 2015-02-20).
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1992. *Reproducing the Future: Essays on Anthropology, Kinship, and the Reproductive Technologies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Walters, Suzanna Danuta. 2012. "The Kids Are All Right But the Lesbians Aren't: Queer Kinship in US culture." *Sexualities* 15.8:917–33.
- Warner, Michael. 1999. *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Weaver, Lois. 2013. "Kinship." *Contemporary Theatre Review* 23.1:43–4.
- Weston, Kath. 1991. *Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2001. *Philosophical Investigations*. The German text with a revised translation [1953]. Oxford: Blackwell.

NOTE

1. We thank the Amundson's fond and the Royal Swedish Academy of Science for their generous support of this workshop.