

Queer Kinship Revisited

IN THE NEW millennium, the Nordic region, if not the global North, has experienced a queer, as in non-heterosexual baby boom (cf., Andreassen 2018). Following variations of same-sex or gender-neutral marriage and civil partnership being recognised by many states, coupled with advances in assisted reproduction technologies available on a global and stratified market, family law has been expanded to include same-sex parental constellations. Same-sex couples along with solo persons with wombs now have growing access to assisted reproduction via the state. At the same time, forced sterilisation as a requirement for gender affirmation surgery has been lifted, and policy and law makers are busy pondering how to expand heteronormative frameworks to accommodate trans parents whose reproductive biology is not congruent with how the terms mother and father are understood. All this and more means that these days, fertile generations of LGBTQ+ people have reproductive futures and are able to make kin in both nuclear and queer family forms. While we know little of what the future will bring for the planet or for its queer spawn, it is safe to say that kinship as it has been understood in modernity has been profoundly queered, as in reconfigured, and along with it, at least some of the gendered subjects constituted in and by it.

To revisit means to return, take up again, or to reconsider, which implies to bring new perspectives, motivated by wish to change or improve something.¹ The theme of this special issue of *lambda nordica*, is not new,

rather it is centred around a topic addressed in the journal before (Dahl and Gunnarsson Payne 2014). In a way, we reconsider a topic that since the 1990s has been central to LGBTQ studies as a whole, namely the ways that kinship is central to gender and sexual formation (cf., Rubin 1975; Butler 1990; 2002; Freeman 2007), which suggests that perhaps it is always already being revisited. Akin to a desired family addition, “Queer Kinship Revisited” has been long in the making and even if it arrives late, it does bring new perspectives to the fields of critical and queer kinship studies. Here we offer peer-reviewed articles and essays presenting new empirical research on new topics related to queer kinship, reproduction, and family-making, even if its primary objective is not queer improvement but rather to keep the question of what is queer about queer kinship open.

Last time *lambda nordica* explored questions of kinship and reproduction, we had a geopolitical focus on Europe, and articles addressed a range of ways that LGBTQ+ people make kin and become parents in Finland, Russia, Greece, and Sweden. This special issue explored several crucial topics such as gay men’s use of transnational surrogacy, spatiotemporal variations of motherhood, the effects of legal recognition, what it means to practice kinship outside the confines of the law, and the politics of failure and divorce, that since then have certainly not ceased to be important, but rather increased in urgency and complexity. Then as now, research on kinship is however not limited to procreation and parenthood; indeed, Antu Sorainen (2014) discussed how queers negotiate and think about inheritance and will-writing, and how personal life and cultural memory shape ideas of place and practices of intimacy, from friendship to reconfigured kinship, among queers who chose to live in rural areas of the Nordic region. While the possibilities are now seemingly endless, at the same time, the very meaning of family may have become narrower insofar as its definition remains related to reproduction within a two-parent model. This is interesting, given that the number both of multi-parent families by design and of recombinant queer families is steadily rising. Indeed, a survey conducted by Swedish RFSL in 2017 indicates that close to 11 percent of people with children

were more than two parents, and 21 percent stated that in the future they imagine themselves entering into parenthood with more than one adult.² At the same time, various divorce statistics now indicate that there is no real differences between straight and gay in terms of separation, but also that lesbians are more likely to divorce than gay men.³ When it comes to paths to family making via assisted reproduction, the range of possibilities is growing; sperm, ova, embryos and wombs are now all available on the reproductive market, suggesting that conception itself is no longer central to ideas of family and kinship. At the same time, strengthened legal frameworks around children's rights to origin, search for donor siblings and donors, is growing exponentially, with search for gestational surrogates and ova/embryo donors likely to follow. All this suggests that there is a lot that is queer, as in strange, in this phenomenon, as well as a lot of biogenetical thinking that suggests that we remain quite culturally lodged in a story about heterosexual reproduction as the origin of life. This special issue is a contribution to this growing field of research, offering original research articles and essays on a range of topics that deal with queer life in Sweden, Poland, Denmark, the U.K., and Israel. The topics discussed range from future to food, gay fatherhood to polyamory, egg donation to transgender parenting, and of course the pains and pleasures of queering kinship.

A Queer Kinship Research Boom?

Since our last special issue, we have seen a range of changes both in scholarship and politics around queer kinship. Indeed, alongside the queer baby boom in the Nordic region and more broadly in Northern Europe, we have also seen growing research on these matters in the 2010s (Dahl 2014; 2018a; 2018b; 2020; Dahl and Malterud 2015; Hanssen 2015; Malmquist 2015a; 2015b; 2016; Nebeling Petersen and Myong 2015; Nebeling Petersen et al. 2017; Andreassen 2018; Nebeling Petersen 2018). It lies beyond the scope of a short editorial to summarise this rich and promising field in detail; however, we would like to take the opportunity to make a few remarks. First, we note the growing number of studies done across disciplines, ranging from sociology

and psychology, to gender studies and reproductive medicine, including many by students at the MA level. There is a significant strand of research on non-heterosexual reproduction and families that has centred on encounters with heteronormative society, health care, social services, and other state institutions. In Sweden, this is perhaps best reflected in the rigorous work of Anna Malmquist (2015a; 2015b; 2015c; 2016), who also contributes to this special issue, but similar research is being conducted in many national settings.

It has often been suggested in the Nordic region that the key contribution of queer theory is its challenge to heteronormativity (cf., Ambjörnsson 2006). In this respect, solid empirical research that focuses on how same-sex parents negotiate heteronormativity in the form of ideas of familial belonging and understandings of parenthood, as well as in the form of heteronormative state institutions certainly contributes to the field of queer studies. Along with significant research done in the U.K., such as that of Swedish sociologist Petra Nordqvist (2012a; 2012b; 2014; 2017; Nordqvist and Smart 2014), this work also shows the normative dimensions of queer families, insofar as it is clear that non-heterosexual nuclear families also often mobilise normative ideas of kinship and Nordic ideals of equality (Malmquist 2015b). It is noteworthy that thus far, most empirical research has focused on the majoritarian and relatively racially and socioeconomically privileged parts of the population. The focus on “same-sex families” thus often in effect leave out how questions of race and nation enter into procreative dreams (see, Wade 2007; Andreassen 2018; Dahl 2018a; 2018b). In Denmark, research on the (queer) politics of assisted reproduction has been growing for the past several decades (Bryld 2001; Adrian 2010; Kroløkke 2015; Mohr 2015; 2018; Nebeling Petersen et al. 2017; Harrison 2019) and more recently, scholars have also attended to new forms of kinship, such as that around donor siblings (Andreassen 2018), or how kinship is constituted through affective on-line practices of kin-making (Andreassen 2018; Nebeling Petersen forthcoming). It is clear that the main beneficiaries of expanded legal frameworks of access are couples where there is at least one womb. By contrast, gay men’s reproduction and parenthood

remain more marginal, even if scholarship is growing there too, including around advocacy for, critiques against, and concrete experiences of engaging in surrogacy (Gondouin 2012; 2014; Nebeling Petersen and Myong 2015; Nebeling Petersen et al. 2017; Nebeling Petersen 2018; forthcoming; Malmquist and Spånberg this issue). Norwegian scholarship on queer kinship and assisted reproduction does not seem quite as prolific (yet), but a number of interesting studies are emerging on similar topics. In addition, in Finland, the ongoing research of Sorainen (2014; Sorainen et al. 2017) on queer forms of kinship remains promising in its efforts to extend the discussion beyond what is legally recognised. Moving beyond the scope of the Nordic region and the North/West, it is clear that the success story of the Nordic nations is not shared on the other side of the Baltic Sea. A growing body of work in the area of queer kinship studies also concerns Eastern European contexts, and indeed one of the most prolific and empirically rich research projects on queer kinship in recent years has been *Families of Choice in Poland*, lead by Joanna Mizielińska (see for instance, Mizielińska and Stasińska 2018; 2019; this issue). At the moment of writing, we also know that several doctoral dissertations are developing on these topics drawing on material from Estonia, Belarus, Ukraine, Russia, and the Czech Republic.

Queer Kinship across Borders

While the legal frameworks that shape kinship and family making remain national, recent studies have shown that due to restrictions in family law in different nations, fertility travel across borders is common among queer and trans people who wish to become parents (Smietana 2016; 2018; Leibetseder 2018). Indeed, the *global* dimension of assisted reproduction, that is, the ways in which reproductive technologies themselves are global in form is hardly new, and importantly it means that these technologies also have a “specific capacity for decontextualization and recontextualization” (Collier and Ong 2005, 11; see also, Ginsburg and Rapp 1995; Franklin and McKinnon 2001; Knecht et al. 2013, 16–7; Kroløkke 2015; Ryan-Flood and Gunnarsson Payne 2018). Interestingly, when studies are confined to national settings, these dimensions are of-

ten either omitted or taken for granted, even if they also have significant implications both for queer and trans people and for queers' reproduction and kinship (Leibetseder 2018; Leibetseder and Griffin 2018). While the ever-expanding global market of assisted reproduction technologies, available both through increasingly outsourced welfare states and a growing range of private clinics, means that there are a range of paths to reproduction and family making and indeed of reproducing the future (Strathern 1992), a growing number of studies now demonstrate that queer reproduction is intensely stratified along lines of race, gender, age and health, significantly reflected in material, emotional and relational resources (see further, Dahl and Gabb this issue). Indeed, it needs to be clear that it is predominantly resourced LGBTQ people who are able to access these technologies and thereby reproduces futures in a range of ways, both within and across national borders (cf., Smietana et al. 2018) and in the future we hope to see much more work that attends to the stratification of queer reproduction (cf., also Lie and Lykke 2016).

While the past five years have seen increasing rights and recognitions of new family forms and paths to reproduction across many national settings, we are also experiencing growing nationalism and right-wing conservatism, populism, and growing "anti-gender movements" (Paternotte and Kuhar 2017). LGBTQ+ people have gone from being subjects of homophobia to being targets of new forms of religious "heteroactivism" (Browne and Nash forthcoming). This movement invokes freedom of speech rights and religious rights in its defence of heteronormativity as fundamental to society, and argues that successful lobbying by LGBTQ movements has resulted in what they understand as an "ideological agenda" being forced on innocent children and traditional families. It remains to be seen whether homonationalism will save certain queers or if the "family values" (read: the defence of the bourgeois heterosexual nuclear family), central to the conservative and right-wing political agendas sweeping across Europe and the world (Paternotte and Kuhar 2017), will throw us all under the bus.

At this juncture, and especially given the complex and unequal ways in which LGBTQ people can participate in (assisted) reproduction,

many questions remain to be asked and the field remains difficult to delineate. In some ways, perhaps biology was always queer, as Sarah Franklin (2014) noted in the previous special issue. In other ways, perhaps the very use of assisted reproductive technologies has made all reproduction queer as in denaturalised. Yet, if the 1990s argument about queer kinship highlighted how queers who are rejected by families of origins and by hostile societies create new forms of kinship, including chosen kin (Weston 1991; Weeks et al. 2001) and the early 2000s saw a queer rejection of reproductive futurism (Edelman 2004), it is clear that alongside growing legal inclusion and a growing range of assisted reproductive technologies, we now witness an increasing emphasis on normality. As Petra Nordqvist (2012a; 2012b), among others, has shown, white middle-class lesbians in particular draw on specific strategies to “fit in,” largely centred around racial similarity, biogenetic connections between siblings, and practices of naming that point to the cohesion of family, and as Ulrika Dahl (2018a, 2018b) has shown, there is hardly anything monstrous about being queer and a parent at this point. Jenny Björklund (2018a; 2018b; forthcoming) even suggests that if queer kinship has failed to be queer, we may have to look for queerness elsewhere, and she locates a potential for queer resistance in literary representations of (mostly heterosexual) mothers who leave their families.

We see productive potential in the emerging field of critical kinship studies (Kroløkke et al. 2015; Riggs and Peel 2016), as well as in the many questions that remain to be asked. As Charlotte Kroløkke and colleagues (2015) formulate it, critical kinship studies:

designates the contours of methodological and theoretical approaches that (a) conceptualise how kinship is both transformed and preserved through the accelerated mobility of some (but not all) bodies and human substances and (b) engage with the complex ethical consequences arising from kinship formation produced through political, discursive or economic inequalities. (Kroløkke et al. 2015, 2)

In a different volume, with the same title, Damien Riggs and Elizabeth Peel (2016) state:

[C]ritical kinship studies takes as its central focus the need to move beyond a humanist account of kinship, one in which human understandings of kinship and human kinship practices are treated as the only forms of kinship and only ways of being possible. (Riggs and Peel 2016, 11)

One objective they propose is “to examine which humans are central to understandings of human kinship, through which practices such understandings developed, and how boundaries are drawn in terms of what constitutes human kinship” (Riggs and Peel 2016, 12). This suggests that *queering* kinship does not omit the importance of relations nor does it suggest an absence of boundaries around who is kin and who is not (cf., Wahlström Henriksson and Goedecke forthcoming). If we become relatives and related through relationships as well as through technologies (including social and digital media), a central question for (queer) critical kinship studies is how commodification and precarisation shapes dreams and futurities.

Feeling Backwards and Future Forms of Queer Kinship

A final way of *revisiting* queer kinship, we would like to call attention to, is how kinship always conjures up temporalities; both the rewriting of the past and the imagining of futures. Here the renewed interest in queer cultural memory within research, popular culture and activism in recent years offers additional perspectives on queer kinship. This “turn,” we think, is also linked to a larger challenge not only to optimism and progress as the tropes of queer liberalism (Eng 2010) but a critique of a dominant narrative that suggests that from Stonewall and via the AIDS epidemic, LGBTQ rights have increasingly expanded to the point where we now can and should expect recognition and validation from all institutions in society. This narrative is far too often a kind of undercurrent in research on what we might call queer futurities that places its optimistic focus on expanding access to reproductive

technologies and to recognition of parental arrangements. Attending to queer histories and to other forms of intergenerational queer intimacy not only provides us with a different take on kinship itself, it reminds us that such a neoliberal and late capitalist narrative inevitably builds on a kind of queer necropolitics (Puar 2007; Haritaworn et al. 2014;) that is founded on an assumption that all queers are not meant to survive and certainly not reproduce. Indeed, this is a time when there are profound differences between queer subjects; there are those who are being folded (back) into life and being granted reproductive futurities, and there are entire populations who are named as deviant and marked for death, including a range of racialized (queer) populations (cf., Puar 2007; Haritaworn et al. 2014).

In recent years, both activists and scholars have called attention to how LGBTQ history in the West has relied on the omission of poor and marginalised subjects, in particular the centrality of transwomen of colour in the struggle against heteronormativity and heterosexism, and argued that these omissions have been crucial to obtaining the whitewashed image of an LGBTQ community that largely reflects and serves affluent white gender normative “same-sex” couples and their reproductive dreams.

In terms of cultural memory and queer kinship, the FX series *Pose*, which is streamable on HBO, chronicles the days before and during the AIDS epidemic and the rise of Act Up in New York through the lens of ballroom culture, offers some interesting ways to revisit kinship. While certainly not a universal story of that era, we contend that it serves as one potent commentary on what queer kinship has been and continues to mean beyond conceiving and birthing children. Not only does the central story of the series illuminate how poor queer and trans* people of colour continue to live with high risks of kinship loss and homelessness and that many queers face far greater challenges than access to assisted reproduction, marriage and parental recognition, it also serves as a beautiful reminder of how queer and trans* kinship challenges ideas of the patriarchal heterosexual family.

Within ballroom culture as in many contemporary queer communities, “houses” or households do not refer to what you own or who

is your legal kin; they are multigenerational and multigendered, and membership, while certainly “chosen” and beyond what is typically recognised, is also sought and won, lost and changed. In *Pose*, a house simultaneously refers to a domestic arrangement and to an affinity group, for which performance in ballroom culture is the centre of life, meaning that “family” means sharing both material and creative resources. Perhaps not unlike in lesbian families with their own donor-conceived children, in *Pose* it is mothers who head households and who take it upon themselves to offer material and emotional support for their “children,” from whom they also expect love, devotion, recognition, and gratitude. Inspired by their own mothers, for better or worse, the mothers in *Pose* go to great lengths to provide for others what they did not have themselves; appreciation for their queerness and skills to survive. At the same time, for the trans* women of colour who are the main protagonists in this series, the ability to provide material support for their queer children is intensely related to the ability to perform femininity in ways that can be transformed into labour, often of an intimate and sexual kind that is pretty far from what today’s middle-class rights-bearing lesbians are doing, even if it seems that lesbian motherhood does insist on the importance of both intense care work and normative gender presentations (cf., Dahl 2018a).

Blanca and other house mothers in *Pose*, care, defend, encourage, comfort, discipline, and raise their “chosen” children; that is, queers who have frequently been thrown out of their families and who due to racism, capitalism, and homo- and transphobia find themselves at the margins of society, struggling to survive and frequently failing to do so. Funerals are central arenas for displaying queer kinship, and are as frequent as the balls in this era. Here “parenting” then, is not so much about having one’s own children, or passing on one’s genes, or even getting one’s relationships recognised by the state, as it is about making kin and surviving; indeed literally finding ways to “be long” (Freeman 2007) with one another. Motherhood also has little to do with gestation or even with intent, and mothers can be stern and selfish, kind and caring, they can use their spawn to further their own fame or simply build houses to secure their own survival.

While the scenarios presented in this series might seem far from the reality of contemporary (white) queer livelihoods in a corner of the world that is shaped by rainbow rights – and surely the ongoing white fetishisation and appropriation of ball culture and voguing does not extend to a desire to share that particular position – it is not too hard to imagine who the marginalised queers of today are. They are the first-generation citizens who are busy supporting their parents and other family members, organising protests and turning out for each other's achievements, and for whom there is neither time nor resources to go to the chapel or the clinic. They are the refugees and asylum seekers waiting for years to obtain papers and having to “prove” their sexual orientation – only to then be granted the right to stay on the premise that unlike other refugees, they will not be attempting family reunification. They are the transgender, non-binary, and genderqueer youth whose potential parental support is made increasingly fragile by a growing public discourse about “regret.” They are the queers of colour who, when they do make it to the clinic, are frequently told to take whatever sperm is available regardless or not if it “matches” the racial background of the co-parent (cf., Dahl 2018b). They are the countless queers whose attempts with or without costly assistance to become pregnant fail, like so much of the use of assisted reproductive technologies does, and who suffer from reproductive loss. They are the divorced couples, the ones who fight custody battles and the ones who lose touch with their children thanks to an over-reliance on the law over an effort to build robust and lasting relationships. They are the queers who have learned that in order to survive in times of climate crisis and austerity, not to mention extreme right-wing politics, we will need a lot more than access to donated gametes or knowledge about where our genes come from.

We hope to see more research on these forms of close relations, and diffuse and enduring solidarities (Schneider 1980) and what they might teach us about how to make both kin and babies and how to inhabit this endangered planet otherwise.

This Issue

Like the last time *lambda nordica*, discussed this topic, this is a double special issue that has partial origins in a conference. In this case, many contributions began as presentations at the international conference “Close Relations,” organised by the Swedish network for family and kinship studies at Uppsala University in 2018.⁴ Featuring two queer keynotes by David Eng and Rikke Andreassen, the conference had a good (queer) turnout, including many of the authors in this issue.

To stay with the ongoing question of what is queer about kinship, we begin with its conception in theory, and with a contribution by Sara Edenheim that hits at the core of what is at stake in the futurities of queer reproduction. Taking Lee Edelman’s (2004) discussion of the sinthomosexual as her point of departure, Edenheim places the wilful childless woman, rather than the homosexual man, in the position of the sinthomosexual and imaginatively explores what such a position entails and depends on in relation to contemporary understandings of community and emergent climate crisis. In particular, Edenheim offers an analysis of the anti-social turn in relation to feminist understandings of kinship and community.

Gay fatherhood has thus far received much less empirical attention than lesbian motherhood. Anna Malmquist and Alexander Spånberg Ekholm’s article is based on interviews with gay fathers in Sweden about the legal obstacles they face on their paths to fatherhood. Given the emphasis on motherhood to kinship, it is not surprising that legal obstacles were substantial, and the authors found that interviewees had used various strategies to overcome. Being persistent and well-prepared, pretending to be straight or traveling to fertility clinics abroad were among the core principles required to obtain fatherhood. While the interviewees had become fathers in different ways, they all stressed that it had required considerable economic or personal resources to handle the legal obstacles. This we would argue again points to how a legal framework that aims at parental equality in fact, in many ways, reproduces privilege.

Given that the growing normalisation of non-heterosexual families has largely focused on two-parent families and been concerned with

the complex contradictions of ongoing emphasis on biogenetic origins and the need for gendered parental role models, Catrine Andersson and Charlotta Carlström's study of how families with more than two parents are represented in Swedish newspaper and magazine articles between 1992 and 2016 offers insights into what is queer about kinship at this point in time. Their study shows that while these families are portrayed as slightly unusual or new, they are first and foremost described as modern, normal and legitimate. The normalisation of more-than-two-parent families takes place discursively through references to responsible and successful parenthood, and to love and intimacy. In the media narratives, these modern families are also contrasted against the outdated legislation, which only recognises two parents. Andersson and Carlström's study reminds us that in neoliberal times of growing stratification, appropriate parenthood and family making have become less matters of gender, sexuality or number of parents, than about intimate and material resources.

As the field of research on queer families expands, a significant strand continues to investigate the micro sociology of everyday life, the doing of family and kinship. If the queer devil is in the details, Joanna Mizielińska and Agata Stasińska's contribution to this issue suggests that everyday dimensions of queer kinship can be found by studying food sharing practices among families of choice in Poland. In this article, they argue that for their interviewees, having meals together and remembering each other's needs and cravings are ways of communicating love and care, both between partners and in relation to extended family members. Interestingly, here it turns out that queerness is not so much a question of sexual practices or desires, or even about verbal declarations of love, rather there is a kind of silent intimacy in preparing meals for each other and sharing food at the same table.

As a growing tradition of scholarship has now shown, the growing use of assisted reproductive technologies offer many ways to queer the very biogenetic substances previously understood to form kinship. In this issue, Matilde Lykkebo Petersen explores how egg donors in Denmark understand and negotiate issues of kinship and relatedness. Importantly,

egg donation potentially queers kinship insofar as it opens up the possibility of imagining two mothers. Here Lykkebo Petersen shows how egg donors in Denmark draw on different strategies to either connect or disconnect from kinship in order to create what the author calls an “appropriate distance” to the receiving family. Even if egg donation has a subversive potential in relation to normative ways of understanding kinship, Lykkebo Petersen shows that in reality, egg donation practices often reproduce heteronormative ways of conceptualising family and kinship.

In addition to these articles, this issue also offers two autoethnographic essays on issues related to how our understandings of queer kinship are further challenged and imagined by transgender theory and politics. Drawing on theories of necropolitics (Mbembe 2003) and spectrality, Atalia Israeli-Nevo’s autoethnographic investigation of mourning, following the suicide of transwoman and queer activist DanVeg in Israel, examines the affects, mourning practices, and political actions following upon DanVeg’s death. Focusing on chosen family among lovers, friends, and activists, Israeli-Nevo’s beautiful essay reminds us that in many ways, queer kinship are matters of life and death that work both with and against tradition and continue to be a threat against the core of normative kinship.

Artist and transactivist Josephine Baird has not only provided this issue with its stunning image of queer family making, she has also offered a beautiful account of queer kinship. Baird’s autoethnographic essay can be read as a case study of queer family formations at the intersection of gender transitioning, multiple border-crossings and navigations of national legal systems, EU legislations and sociocultural norms around motherhood and parenthood. Going against multiple impossibilities, Baird’s story is a reminder of how seemingly progressive frameworks continue to present trouble for so many queer families and also of how families, parents and children continue to thrive and survive against many odds.

Finally, to close this special issue, under the heading *We’re Here*, *lambda nordica* editor Ulrika Dahl together with queer feminist sociologist of intimate life Jacqui Gabb, offer reflections on current trends in queer kinship studies. Intentionally polemic, Dahl and Gabb aim to

push our discussions further by asking what is queer about queer studies of family and kinship at the turn of the decade. Reflecting both on the conditions of the neoliberal university and how it shapes bodies of flesh and knowledge, on how ideas of geopolitical context are used, the authors also contend that the central dimensions of queer studies, gender and sexuality, remain under theorised in research on “same-sex parenthood.” They also emphasise the need to go beyond the majoritarian population and norms of white middle-class parenting dreams and to consider the queer kinship practices that remain at the margins of an increasingly stratified and unequal world in times of growing austerity.

We know from studies of queer kinship and assisted reproduction that it takes a lot longer than nine months to make a baby and more than a baby to make a family, and clearly, this is also true for making in a special issue on such a topic. As we often say, we have learned to be patient whilst working with this journal, and we have learned that our writers, reviewers, editors, and readers are patient. The good news is that the next issue is nearly completed, which means that readers do not have to wait as long to receive *lambda nordica*’s contribution “Queer Concepts for the 2020s,” packed with new and old tools for making queer analysis of an endangered world and its multiple species of inhabitants.

**ULRIKA DAHL and
JENNY BJÖRKLUND**

REFERENCES

- Adrian, Stine Willum. 2010. “Sperm Stories: Policies and Practices of Sperm Banking in Denmark and Sweden.” *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 17.4:393–411.
- Ambjörnsson, Fanny. 2006. *Vad är queer?* Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.
- Andreassen, Rikke. 2017. “New Kinships, New Family Formations and Negotiations of Intimacy via Social Media Sites.” *Journal of Gender Studies* 26.3:361–71.
- . 2018. *Mediated Kinship: Gender, Race and Sexuality in Donor Families*. London: Routledge.
- Björklund, Jenny. 2018a. “Killing Family Joy: Mothers on the Run in Twenty-First Century Swedish Literature.” *Women’s Studies* 47.8:806–28.

- . 2018b. “Motherhood Gone Wrong: Failure As Resistance in Twenty-First Century Swedish Literature.” *Contemporary Women’s Writing* 12.1:83–100.
- . Forthcoming. *Maternal Abandonment and Queer Resistance in Twenty-First Century Swedish Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Browne, Kath, and Catherine Nash. Forthcoming. *Heteroactivism: Resisting Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Rights and Equalities*. London: Zed.
- Bryld, Mette. 2001. “The Infertility Clinic and the Birth of the Lesbian: The Political Debate on Assisted Reproduction in Denmark.” *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 8.3:299–312.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2002. “Is Kinship Always Already Heterosexual?” *differences* 13.1:14–44.
- Collier, Stephen J., and Aihwa Ong. 2005. “Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics As Anthropological Problems.” In *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics and Ethics As Anthropological Problems*, edited by Aihwa Ong and Stephen J. Collier, 3–21. New York: Blackwell.
- Dahl, Bente, and Kirsti Malterud. 2015. “Neither Father nor Biological Mother: A Qualitative Study about Lesbian Co-Mothers’ Maternity Care Experiences.” *Sexual and Reproductive Healthcare* 6.3:169–73.
- Dahl, Ulrika. 2014. “Not Gay As in Happy, But Queer As in Fuck You: Notes on Love and Failure in Queer(ing) Kinship.” *lambda nordica* 3–4.19:143–68.
- . 2018a. “(The Promise of) Monstrous Kinship?: Queer Reproduction and the Soma-technics of Sexual and Racial Difference.” *Somatechnics* 8.2:195–211.
- . 2018b. “Becoming Fertile in the Land of Organic Milk: Lesbian and Queer Reproductions of Femininity and Motherhood in Sweden.” *Sexualities* 21.7:1021–38.
- . 2020. “Precarious Labourers of Love: Queer Kinship, Reproductive Labour and Biopolitics.” In *Bioprecarity: Body and Intimate Labour*, edited by Gabriele Griffin and Doris Leibetseder, in press. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Dahl, Ulrika, and Jenny Gunnarsson Payne. 2014. “Introduction: (Re)thinking Queer Kinship and Reproduction.” *lambda nordica* 19.3–4:11–27.
- Edelman, Lee. 2004. *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. 2014. “Queer Biology?” *lambda nordica* 19.3–4:173–80.
- Franklin, Sarah, and Susan McKinnon. 2001. *Relative Values: Reconfiguring Kinship Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Freeman, Elizabeth. 2007. “Queer Belongings: Kinship Theory and Queer Theory.” In *A Companion to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Studies*, edited by George E. Haggerty and Molly McGarry, 295–314. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

- Ginsburg, Faye D., and Rayna Rapp. 1995. *Conceiving the New World Order: The Global Politics of Reproduction*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gondoun, Johanna. 2012. "Adoption, Surrogacy and Swedish Exceptionalism." *Critical Race and Whiteness Studies Journal* 8.2:1–20.
- . 2014. "Gay Fathers, Surrogate Mothers, and the Question of the Human: A Postcolonial Feminist Analysis of Emotions in *Barn till varje pris*?" *lambda nordica* 19.3–4:109–39.
- Hanssen, Jorid Krane. 2015. "The Donor Figuration: A Progenitor, Father or Friend?: How Young People in Planned Lesbian Families Negotiate with Their Donor." *Sexualities* 18.3:276–96.
- Haritaworn, Jin, Adi Kuntsman, and Silvia Posocco, eds. 2014. *Queer Necropolitics*. New York: Routledge.
- Harrison, Katherine. 2019. "A Virtual Promise of Happiness: Kinship on the Websites of Danish Fertility Clinics and Sperm Banks." *Feminist Media Studies* 19.8:1096–113.
- Knecht, Michi, Maren Klotz, and Stefan Beck, eds. 2013. *Reproductive Technologies As Global Form: Ethnographies of Knowledge, Practices, and Transnational Encounters*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Kroløkke, Charlotte. 2015. "Have Eggs, Will Travel: The Experiences and Ethics of Global Egg Donation." *Somatechnics* 5.1:12–31.
- Kroløkke, Charlotte, Lene Myong, Stine Willum Adrian, and Tine Tjørnhøj-Thomsen, eds. 2015. *Critical Kinship Studies*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Leibetseder, Doris. 2018. "Queer and Trans Access to Assisted Reproductive Technologies: A Comparison of Three EU-States, Poland, Spain and Sweden." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 20.1:10–26.
- Leibetseder, Doris, and Gabriele Griffin. 2018. "Introduction: Queer and Trans Reproduction with Assisted Reproductive Technologies (ART), in Europe." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 20.1:1–9.
- Lie, Merete, and Nina Lykke, eds. 2016. *Assisted Reproduction across Borders: Feminist Perspectives on Normalizations, Disruptions and Transmissions*. New York: Routledge.
- Malmquist, Anna. 2015a. "Pride and Prejudice: Lesbian Families in Contemporary Sweden." PhD diss., Department of Behavioural Sciences and Learning, Linköping University.
- . 2015b. "Women in Lesbian Relations: Construing Equal or Unequal Parental Roles?" *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 39.2:256–67.
- . 2015c. "A Crucial but Strenuous Process: Female Same-Sex Couples' Reflections on Second-Parent Adoption." *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 11.4:351–74.
- . 2016. *Lesbiska småbarnsföräldrar: Utmaningar i en tid av möjligheter*. Gothenburg: Makadam.
- Mbembe, Achille. 2003. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture* 15.1:11–40.
- Mizielnińska, Joanna, and Agata Stasińska. 2018. "Beyond the Western Gaze: Families of Choice in Poland." *Sexualities* 21.7: 983–1001.

- . 2019. “Negotiations between Possibilities and Reality: Reproductive Choices of Families of Choice in Poland.” *European Journal of Women’s Studies*. doi.org/10.1177/1350506819887765.
- Mohr, Sebastian. 2015. “Living Kinship Trouble: Danish Sperm Donors’ Narratives of Relatedness.” *Medical Anthropology* 34.5:470–84.
- . 2018. *Being a Sperm Donor: Masculinity, Sexuality, and Biosociality in Denmark*. New York: Berghahn.
- Nebeling Petersen, Michael. 2018. “Becoming Gay Fathers through Transnational Commercial Surrogacy.” *Journal of Family Issues* 39.3:693–719.
- . Forthcoming. “The Mediation of Commercial Transnational Surrogacy: The Entanglement of Visual, Colonial and Reproductive technologies.” In *Queer(y)ing Kinship in the Baltic Region and Beyond: The Geopolitics of LGBTQ Reproduction, Family and Intimate Life*, edited by Ulrika Dahl et al. Stockholm: Södertörn Academic Press.
- Nebeling Petersen, Michael, Charlotte Kroløkke, and Lene Myong. 2017. “Dad and Daddy Assemblage: Resuturing the Nation through Transnational Surrogacy, Homosexuality, and Norwegian Exceptionalism.” *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 23.1:83–112.
- Nebeling Petersen, Michael, and Lene Myong. 2015. “(Un)Liveabilities: Homonationalism and Transnational Adoption.” *Sexualities* 18.3:329–45.
- Nordqvist, Petra. 2012a. “I Don’t Want Us to Stand Out More Than We Already Do’: Lesbian Couples Negotiating Family Connections in Donor Conception.” *Sexualities* 15.5–6:644–61.
- . 2012b. “Origins and Originators: Lesbian Couples Negotiating Parental Identities and Sperm Donor Conception.” *Culture, Health & Sexuality* 14.3:297–311.
- . 2014. “Bringing Kinship into Being: Connectedness, Donor Conception and Lesbian Parenthood.” *Sociology* 48.2:268–83.
- . 2017. “Genetic Thinking and Everyday Living: On Family Practices and Family Imaginaries.” *The Sociological Review* 65.4:865–81.
- Nordqvist, Petra, and Carol Smart. 2014. *Relative Strangers: Family Life, Genes and Donor Conception*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paternotte, David, and Roman Kuhar. 2017. *Anti-Gender Campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against Equality*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Puar, Jasbir K. 2007. *Territorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Riggs, Damien W., and Elizabeth Peel. 2016. *Critical Kinship Studies: An Introduction to the Field*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rubin, Gayle. 1975. “The Traffic in Women: Notes on the ‘Political Economy’ of Sex.” In *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by Rayna Rapp, 157–210. New York: Monthly Review.

- Ryan-Flood, Róisín, and Jenny Gunnarsson Payne, eds. 2018. *Transnationalising Reproduction: Third Party Conception in a Globalised World*. London: Routledge.
- Schneider, David. 1980. *American Kinship: A Cultural Account* [1968]. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smietana, Marcin. 2016. "Families Like We'd Always Known?": Spanish Gay Fathers' Normalization Narratives in Transnational Surrogacy." In *Assisted Reproduction across Borders: Feminist Perspectives on Normalizations, Disruptions and Transmissions*, edited by Merete Lie and Nina Lykke, 49–60. New York: Routledge.
- . 2018. "Procreative Consciousness in a Global Market: Gay Men's Paths to Surrogacy in the USA." *Reproductive Biomedicine & Society Online* 7:101–11.
- Smietana, Marcin, Charis Thompson, and France Winddance Twine. 2018. "Making and Breaking Families: Reading Queer Reproductions, Stratified Reproduction and Reproductive Justice Together." *Reproductive Biomedicine & Society Online* 7:112–30.
- Sorainen, Antu. 2014. "Queer Personal Lives, Inheritance Perspectives, and Small Places." *lambda nordica* 19.3–4:31–53.
- Sorainen, Antu, Olga Isupova, Anna Avdeeva, and Alisa Zhabenko. 2017. "Strategies of Non-Normative Families, Parenting and Reproduction in Neo-Traditional Russia." *Families, Relationships and Societies* 6.3:471–86.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1992. *Reproducing the Future: Essays on Anthropology, Kinship and the New Reproductive Technologies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Wade, Peter. 2009. *Race, Ethnicity and Nation: Perspectives from Kinship and Genetics*. New York: Berghahn.
- Wahlström Henriksson, Helena, and Klara Goedecke, eds. Forthcoming. *Close Relations: Critical Studies of Family and Kinship*. New York: Springer.
- Weeks, Jeffrey, Brian Heaphy, and Catherine Donovan. 2001. *Same Sex Intimacies: Families of Choice and Other Life Experiments*. London: Routledge.
- Weston, Kath. 1991. *Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship*. New York: Columbia University Press.

NOTES

1. Research for this extended introduction has been done by Ulrika Dahl as part of the project *Queer(y)ing Kinship in the Baltic Region*, funded by the Baltic Sea Foundation.
2. The result of the survey, "Nationell enkät om hbtq-personers erfarenheter och behov kopplat till föräldraskap och umgänge med barn," conducted by RFSL Stockholm has yet to be analysed fully. The data is owned by RFSL. See also Dahl (2018b).
3. There are many different kinds of statistics on this matter, none of them entirely reliable, but here are some recent sources: https://www.forskning.se/2015/12/08/forskarnas-relationstips-for-smabarnstiden/?fbclid=IwAR3MgS_0755vNkpy9B_LlQcLCQQgJh6gW5N81QyA8WAD8qKvmzzrfx1n3tA, and

https://www.economist.com/britain/2020/01/09/why-lesbian-couples-are-more-likely-to-divorce-than-gay-ones?fbclid=IwARoTSjqwqlot5LAsLy79bJ56pO2VV5hacKA9bMG4Mg7Hbx_M8P_pbIFbnrA.

4. For information about this Forte funded network, see: <https://www.gender.uu.se/forskning/forskning-family-and-kinship-studies>.