



ANNUAL
REVIEWS **Further**

Click [here](#) to view this article's online features:

- Download figures as PPT slides
- Navigate linked references
- Download citations
- Explore related articles
- Search keywords

Reproductive Tourism: Through the Anthropological “Reproscope”

Michal Rachel Nahman

Department of Health and Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Bristol, Frenchay Campus, Bristol, BS16 1QY, United Kingdom; email: michal.nahman@uwe.ac.uk

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2016. 45:417–32

First published online as a Review in Advance on August 3, 2016

The *Annual Review of Anthropology* is online at anthro.annualreviews.org

This article's doi:
10.1146/annurev-anthro-102313-030459

Copyright © 2016 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

Keywords

reproductive tourism, reproscope, egg donation, surrogacy, globalization, exploitation

Abstract

This review analyzes the emerging literature on reproductive tourism through a metaphorical “reproscope,” focusing largely on cross-border egg donation and surrogacy as the prime areas of contemporary anthropological investigation. While acknowledging that reproductive travel is not new, this article recognizes that there has been an increased volume of such travel over the past couple of decades. It provides an overview of the major areas of anthropological investigation into these transnational phenomena, globalization, stratification, exploitation, race, nationalism, religion, biopower, and bioethics. I propose that these areas of investigation may provide key indications about the preoccupations of anthropology today. Namely, what kind of discipline does anthropology imagine itself to be?

INTRODUCTION

A look through our anthropological “reproscope” brings into view the following narrative: Global assisted reproduction has grown, in recent years, to a multibillion-dollar industry, with millions of cycles of in vitro fertilization (IVF) performed and more than five million babies born (Adamson et al. 2012, ESHRE 2014). This activity has increasingly included a rise in cross-border assisted reproduction, which has developed into its own billion-dollar industry. Human egg/oocyte donation/purchasing and surrogacy in particular, among the top reasons why people traverse national borders for assisted reproductive technologies (ARTs), have more than doubled over the past few years [exact numbers are unknown and therefore the European Society for Human Reproduction and Embryology (ESHRE) has convened a global task force to attempt to quantify the current total (Shenfield et al. 2010)]. At the same time, legal and ethical debates have caused old hubs for certain techniques and practices to be shut down and new hubs to open up. From the first IVF birth in 1978 to today, ART around the globe has moved from being a slightly hushed, secretive endeavor (Landau 1998) undertaken out of desperation to a more socially acceptable reproductive method for many. Hundreds if not thousands of online spaces are dedicated to IVF’s promotion: company websites, Facebook pages, Twitter feeds, and blogs of commissioning mothers and self-disclosing oocyte donors, all of which presents a vast “affective assemblage” of transnational reproduction (Kroløkke 2014b). Hampshire & Simpson (2015) call this time the third phase of IVF, where this technology is geographically, ethnically, and socioeconomically open to ever-more constituencies. Meanwhile, governments have begun to enact laws to facilitate and attract “fertility tourism” as well as to limit its potentially exploitative effects on their own “biological citizens” (Petryna 2013). This socially mediated sojourning brings into view a vast global movement of people, tools, techniques, gametes, and babies.

And the social scientists have followed on their own quests.

Contemporary anthropology boasts a burgeoning examination of reproductive tourism (a concept that has been subject to much critique and is viewed critically in this review). This work examines economies, labor, globalization, affect, morality, exploitation, colonialism, gender, race, class, subjectivity, altruism, and gift giving. The ethnographic work spans the major sites that have provided services and body parts, as well as places of origin for commissioning prospective parents: India, Thailand, Nepal, Dubai and the United Arab Emirates, Turkey, Israel, Latin America, Africa, the United States, Australia, Canada, Japan, and Europe. Several notable full-length ethnographies have been published that cover transnational ARTs and adoption over the past few years (Almeling 2011; Deomampo 2016; Howell 2006; Inhorn 2015; Nahman 2013; Pande 2014a,b; Ragoné 1994; Rudrappa 2015; Speier 2016; Teman 2010; Thompson 2005; Twine 2011; Vora 2015a; Whittaker 2015). Edited collections and review articles have also been published on the subject (Beck 2012, Görtin & Inhorn 2011, Inhorn & Görtin 2011, Hampshire & Simpson 2015). These reviews and ethnographies indicate that anthropologists are at the forefront of the social sciences in exploring both “infertility journeys” (Speier 2011) of prospective parents and the experiences of their egg and sperm donors and surrogates.¹

Without doubt, the most prolific anthropologist to have written about cross-border reproduction is Marcia Inhorn (1994, 2003, 2012, 2015), long-time researcher of reproduction in Egypt and the Arab Middle East. When it became apparent that her interlocutors were traveling for reproduction, undertaking quests beyond state borders, not just within them, she began to follow them. Her most recent and comprehensive ethnography of “reprotravel” (Inhorn 2015) explores

¹I have included qualitative sociologists’ works in this review because the line is blurred historically and in the present between the works of these two disciplines.

the tensions and hardships of 220 people from around the world who have sought IVF services in Dubai. There, the tensions between cosmopolitanism and “Emeritization” are experienced. Through deeply detailed, richly woven accounts of cross-border reproduction, Inhorn’s (2015) book advocates thinking more carefully about reproductive tourism as a concept and developing a reproxicon for exploring the multitude of issues that emerge from these travels and practices. Aiming not to separate the local and the global, as perhaps was a tendency in her earlier book *Local Babies, Global Science* (Inhorn 2003), *Cosmopolitan Conceptions: IVF Sojourns in Global Dubai* (Inhorn 2015) shows how Inhorn continually thinks through the links between medicine, reproduction, and anthropology in a manner that has been greatly influential on the field. Her book ends with a decidedly activist bent. Inhorn (2015) details several areas that she hopes will change in transnational reproduction: infertility prevention, support for the infertile (including support for those deliberately child-free), and finally her own personal commitment to the low-cost IVF movement.

What began in the 1970s with feminists either warning against the evils of ARTs or valorizing them as women’s salvation from the need to reproduce transformed more recently into an area of intensive investigation that has brought reproduction to the center of anthropological theorizing (Ginsburg & Rapp 1995), including an interest in kinship, identities, the gift, and neoliberalist enterprise (notably, Franklin 1997; Rapp 1999; Strathern 1992a,b; also see Inhorn & Birenbaum-Carmeli 2008 for a comprehensive review of the anthropology of ARTs; and Constable 2009 for review of work on family and intimacy). Scholars then turned to focus on how this subject links with, materializes, or reproduces culture, kinship, economies, nation, race, religion, and globalization (Franklin 1997; Kahn 2000; Nahman 2005, 2006, 2013; Roberts 2012). Thompson’s (2005) influential *Making Parents: The Ontological Choreography of Reproductive Technologies* describes the “ontological choreographies” that women undergo, a kind of strategic self-objectification to subject themselves to IVF. Franklin’s (2013) crucial theoretical intervention in *Biological Relatives: IVF, Stem Cells, and the Future of Kinship* demonstrates that, through the looking glass of IVF, biology itself becomes contingent (p. 28). There she asks, “[W]hat is IVF reproducing in lieu of children? What kind of new norm is IVF?” (Franklin 2013, p. 27). Her answers take us on a whirlwind, like Alice down the rabbit hole, to examine how IVF remakes gender and kinship as ideas and practices in the world. Following Thompson and Strathern, Franklin shows how yearnings to be parents and yearnings to be normatively gendered both become naturalized through IVF.

Given the wide range of work done on reproductive tourism outside anthropology (Cooper & Waldby 2014; Dickenson 2007; Ikemoto 2009; Kroløkke et al. 2012; Kroløkke 2014a,b, 2015; Storrow 2005; Widdows 2009; see Hudson et al. 2011 for a review), the anthropological work in this arena provides distinctive and valuable depth, detail, and the intimacy afforded by thick description and having “been there.”

Moving beyond a valorization of this work, I find it fitting in reflexive anthropological fashion to follow Strathern, Franklin, and Thompson by asking several questions. What becomes naturalized through the anthropological study of reproductive tourism? What do anxieties and debates about the naming of reproductive tourism, so central to many theoretical arguments, indicate about anthropological tensions around anthropology’s role? Is anthropology today simply about “naming” (Rabinow 1999), or do we have wider social and moral obligations (Fassin 2013, Scheper-Hughes 2009)? I argue that the study of reproductive tourism offers anthropology the potential to “reconstruct its theoretical scaffolding still in thrall to a few hegemonic metropolitan centers of knowledge production about, and dissemination throughout, the world” (Elie 2015, p. 9). The anthropology of reproductive tourism is, somewhat fittingly, a border object between what Robbins (2013) calls the anthropology of suffering and the anthropology of the good. The work in this area manifests the struggles experienced by anthropologists today regarding what kind of discipline we are. This struggle and the work produced by anthropologists are indelibly shaped

by the context of what is happening globally (a critique made by many, including Trouillot 2003, cited in Robbins 2013) in terms of economic crises, global wars on terror, and mass migrations of people from the Middle East to Europe.

This review poses some questions regarding how anthropologists have looked at cross-border reproduction to query what role this “looking” has had within and for the discipline more widely. What kind of knowledge object is reproductive tourism? How has the study of transnational reproduction drawn on the historical traces of anthropology to date? How has the study of reproduction across borders been a kind of tourism for anthropologists themselves, taking us on journeys in and out of various arenas and debates? I argue that reproductive tourism, or what I have called elsewhere “repro-migration” (Nahman 2013), is itself a reflection of aspects of anthropology today and that it affords moments of cultural critique and more nuanced understandings of what is common to the human experience of capitalism, racism, and globalization. By being itself a set of practices negotiated around borders, reproductive tourism puts into question the global utility of borders and what they mean to people who experience their limits and possibilities. Clearly repro-migrations, whether they are short term or long term, have a larger salience for anthropological thinking, as several ethnographies on the subject illustrate.

I begin by setting out the historical problem of reproductive tourism in/for anthropology, then I examine how anthropologists have responded to debates outside the field and how we have looked at and framed this problem through theories of biosociality and bioeconomy, moralities and ethics, globalization, stratification and capitalism, and nationalism and race. Under these broad categories, this review explores how we have mapped notions of kinship across borders, thinking about the global and the local, the reaffirmation of racial and national thinking, the exploitation of women, and ethical concerns. The essay then looks at debates about naming these practices in the study of cross-border fertility practices. The trope of a reroscope is used throughout to help remind us that we are examining not just the field of reproductive tourism but also rethinking our own stakes in ‘looking’ at reproductive tourism. I conclude the paper by reflecting that the research on reproductive tourism itself can be seen as a kind of reproductive telescope or reroscope. In so doing, the article is tracing the constellations produced through our rescopes and is bringing into sharp view elements of contemporary anthropological problem-framing and myth-making.

ANTHROPOLOGY OF REPRODUCTIVE TOURISM AS TOURISM OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Anthropological work on cross-border kinship, parenthood, and international familial connections forged in the contexts of war, trade, and slavery is not new (Boswell 1988, Briggs 2003, Dubinsky 2007, Fonseca et al. 2015, Gudeman 1971, Kearney 1995, Mintz 1998, Mintz & Wolf 1950). US international adoption of Greek, German, and other European children after the Second World War highlighted these practices (Howell 2006), often involving either child abandonment or subterfuge (Balcom 2006, 2007; Boswell 1988). Practices of cross-border adoption were also widespread in Ceausescu’s Romania and elsewhere (Kligman 1992). Yet I would argue that the scale of the current movement makes it distinctive today. As Inhorn & Gürtin (2011) show in discussing cross-border reproductive care, contemporary forms of reproductive tourism involve the collaboration of two globalized industries, namely tourism and IVF. New technologies of reproduction mean people are confronted by new kinds of decisions, but the decisions themselves, as Franklin (2011) has argued, are “familiar and even ‘ordinary’” (p. 815).

Yet the recent, intense anthropological scrutiny of reproduction across borders may in itself be reproductive, working as it does through social scientific concepts and applying them to the field of ARTs. This work might be characterized as consolidating the social scientific gaze or interpretive

authority on the subject itself: its authority to look at the world given greater credibility by its ability to reproduce its own way of looking at things. Much of the work on cross-border reproduction, while testing our conceptual tools, is revising old ways of looking at things and is concerned with reinvigorating and critiquing classic concepts and inventing new ones. Indeed, the social sciences have benefited greatly from this kind of renewal and change, for example in the valuable work of feminist anthropologists who have deconstructed and renewed the anthropology of kinship, the family, and gender [Carsten 2000; Edwards 2000; Franklin 1997; Strathern 1992a,b; Weston 2013 (1991); Yanagisako & Delaney 1995].

One significant contribution of this work is the breaking down of traditional analytical domains. Here, “the very act of description makes what is being described part of something else” (Strathern 1992a, p. 204, note 21). This dedomaining of knowledge constitutes a significant analytical contribution of the anthropology of reproductive tourism. Such an interpretive practice demonstrates how seemingly distinct arenas are, therefore, in unanticipated ways, parts of one another or “merographic,” as Strathern (1992a) and Franklin (2003) have classically shown.

Building on this classic work, what do the increasingly intensified and standardized practices of cross-border purchase of gametes tell us about what “IVF reproduces” other than babies (Franklin 2013, Pavone 2015)? For instance, one of the central questions of a project I began in 2000, and articulated in *Extractions: An Ethnography of Reproductive Tourism* (Nahman 2013), analyzes how the everyday practices and procedures of cross-border egg donation create and reinforce nationalized, racialized bodies, borders, and ideals.

This kind of critique also works at the level of metaphor, figuration, and “diffraction” (Haraway 1997). When I began to examine this topic, I asked whether eggs could be seen as synecdochal to the nation, i.e., do the identities imagined to be enclosed in these cells-becoming-babies mirror how the nation and its borders are imagined? I had been thinking at the time of racist reproductive practices in Israel and the policing of national borders more generally. And indeed I found that borders are policed at the level of the body and the nation in similar ways (Nahman 2005, 2006, 2008, 2013). Everyday Israeli responses to the second Palestinian *Intifada* seemed, for example, resonant with what was transpiring with cross-border reproduction. There was both a descriptive and an analytic element involved in viewing together the Israeli–Palestinian conflict and cross-border egg donation. Observing jointly these two disparate arenas of practices and narratives offered an ethnographic benefit to understanding both subjects more deeply than could have been done if each was considered separately. I called these relationships “synecdochic ricochet effects,” gleaned in ethnographic moments (Nahman 2006). In a similar vein, Vora’s account of surrogacy in India critiques the imagined body of the surrogate as an “empty space.” She shows how that figuration illuminates colonial imaginaries of “newly encountered land as empty and unpopulated” (Vora 2015a,b, p. 144). In a collection of essays entitled *Race, Ethnicity and Nation: Perspectives from Kinship and Genetics* (Wade 2007), several authors present similar findings: Campbell explores how “cultural projects are being realized by clinical means” (p. 95) in gamete-matching practices; Marre shows how Spanish families attempt to preserve something of the country and culture of their child’s origin in transnational adoption; and Howell & Melhuus found that in contrast to Norway’s public aversion to being a “sorting society,” transnational adoption and ARTs instantiate biological and cultural fundamentalism among commissioning and adoptive parents. All are instances of de- and cross-domaining in cultural practices. They exemplify ethnographic work that thinks beyond domains that may not form new wholes but whose analytic mergers enable new insights into each part, by viewing or scoping cross-border reproduction from a position that reframes or recasts analytical domains. This work, in a sense, mirrors what happens more widely under global capitalism, where some boundaries become eroded and new possibilities emerge. These occasionally allow glimpses of a potentially positive future.

BIOPOWER, BIOECONOMIES, AND BIOSOCIALITIES

From a perspective less concerned with core anthropological tropes and their undoing, and more closely affiliated to Foucauldian questions of power, concepts such as “biological citizenship” (Petryna 2013) and “biosociality” (Rabinow 1995) put the notion of power, political and economic inequality, war, histories of colonialism, and global stratification at the forefront of analysis (Bharadwaj 2008; Gupta 2006, 2012; Nahman 2008, 2011, 2013; Pande 2009, 2010, 2011, 2014a,b; Pfeffer 2011; Rudrappa 2012, 2015; Vora 2013, 2014, 2015a,b; Whittaker 2009, 2010, 2011, 2015; Vertommen 2016). This literature perhaps comments critically without being prescriptive. But in another vein, it also intervenes as Scheper-Hughes (2009) has suggested.

Much of the movement across borders today is a consequence of regulations that limit the numbers of donors in a specified country, prohibitive costs to many potential users, legislation barring certain categories of people from procreating through ARTs in their home countries, and adoptive protocols that make home-country adoption a challenge or close to impossible. Women in economically poorer countries have been seen as “bioavailable” or “biodesirable” (Cohen 2005, Gunnarsson Payne 2015). The rise of Internet-based communication has driven and enabled prospective parents to search online for other routes to reproduction, and clinics or reproductive service providers in some countries have taken up the new and highly profitable business opportunities that have emerged in this arena. Concepts such as “bioeconomy” and “biosociality” have been used to understand this emergence.

Deomampo (2013), in a rare ethnographic investigation of the intermediaries in Indian surrogacy, examines how women both gain power and are subject to power in the practices of the caretaker-agent role. Pande’s (2011, 2010, 2014a,b) analysis of surrogate mothers living in a surrogate hostel examines how the mother-worker role is both taken on and resisted. Pande’s work on the complexities of the negotiation of the surrogate’s role by the women themselves demonstrates again the value of seeing reproductive travel from the perspective of those who must stay put. Pande’s firsthand account of living among surrogates positions her well to narrate these complexities.

My study of Romanian oocyte sellers (Nahman’s 2006, 2013), also gleaned from living briefly in an oocyte extraction clinic in Bucharest, explores the tensions between being subjected and empowered. Such tensions mean that egg donors cannot be thought of solely as exploited victims; conventional categories of “eggsploitation” (a widely used antisurrogacy term) versus free-market liberation are, in a sense, devoid of meaning in this context. Taking the women’s own words, Nahman sees the oocyte donors as “egg sellers” and “theorists of reproduction” at the same time, following anthropological traditions of emic analysis (Abu-Lughod 1993).

Vora’s (2013) account of how Indian surrogates’ bodies become “potentialized” shows how longer-term benefits can be accrued by surrogates, including those of emotions and care. Thus transnational transactions in bodily substance can be promissory in terms of capital accumulation not only for clinics and doctors (Thompson 2005) but also for egg donors, surrogates, and the like. These interpretations of what surrogates and egg donors acquire from engaging in such practices should provoke ongoing debate about whether eggs and embodied potentialities of surrogates are commodities or assets (see Birch & Tyfield 2013 for a critique of the overuse of the prefix “bio-”). From such analyses as above there emerges a sense for the nuanced biosocialities lived by the least empowered actors in the arena of reproductive tourism.

Indeed Foucauldian ideas of biopower figure strongly in the new anthropological literature on reproductive tourism. Inhorn (2011), following Bharadwaj (2008), has proposed a notion of a “bioscape” as exemplified in the intensified flows of biological substances and parts across borders—what Bharadwaj called “biocrossing” to connote “a crossing between biology, biology

and machine and across geo-political, commercial, ethical and moral borders” (Bharadwaj 2008, p. 102). These symbolic-material crossings, Bharadwaj warns, provide sites, too, where, in addition to critiquing the enactments of biopower by science, medicine, and technology, anthropologists’ own assertions about the new nature/culture splits and imploding boundaries should also be something we analyze.

In examining the complex and multiple workings of power in transnational reproduction, anthropologists have moved beyond dualistic power/resistance and global/local dyads toward theorizing “global assemblages” (Ong & Collier 2005). This perspective enables us not only to examine the moral and ethical repercussions of technologies and practices of cross-border reproduction, but also to query anthropologically the discipline’s role in the wider society. Reproductive tourism then becomes an epistemological site for queer/querying anthropology.

MORALITIES AND ETHICS

Scholarly and activist discussions have centered on the ethics of these processes, whether payment for eggs and sperm and babies should or should not be practiced (cf. Thompson 2007 for a strong argument in support of paying egg donors who donate for stem cell research). Some anthropologists have called for a universal feminist bioethics, based on global solidarity (Gupta 2006), and a ban on paid surrogacy and egg donation (Gupta 2012). Discussions in feminist bioethics and philosophy have often aimed at banning such cross-border practices, having been deemed exploitative (Dickenson 2007, Widdows 2009). Analyzing the global market for surrogacy through the frame of reproductive justice and its race and class dimensions, Twine (2011) provides a deeper examination of the effects of racism on the global scene of surrogacy. As seen with the organ-trafficking debates, perspectives have diverged significantly (Scheper-Hughes 2002). With respect to cross-border reproduction, anthropologists have tended to see their role as responsible for depiction, description, and critical analysis (though see Franklin 2013 and Bharadwaj 2008 for more epistemological questions). Yet, there has been a more recent move toward thinking through intervention (Gupta 2012, Rudrappa 2015) or through “interferences” (Nahman 2012).

Debates in the feminist bioethics literature (Dickenson 2007, Pfeffer 2011, Widdows 2009) have been a centrally defining aspect of anthropological concern as well (Tanderup et al. 2015). Yet, some of the anthropologists approach it differently, attempting critique of the universal subject and questioning Western liberal human rights discourses. The critique of “exploitation” (Mitra 2015; Nahman 2008; Pande 2014a,b; Rudrappa 2015; Vora 2015a; Whittaker 2009, 2010, 2011, 2015; Whittaker & Speier 2010), when considered in light of postcolonial thinking, ethnographic depth, and deep identification with the Other by anthropologists, produces a sensitized, nuanced understanding of the complexity underpinning reproductive tourism. Although very well intentioned, calls for “a more equitable” system of globalized reproduction, as Cooper & Waldby (2014) enjoin in their book *Clinical Labor: Tissue Donors and Research Subjects in the Global Bioeconomy*, often fail to highlight how this kind of labor is situated in a self-reproducing, chaotic system of capitalism (cf. Bear 2015a, Bear et al. 2015). There is nothing sensational about how egg donors or surrogates are treated; it is emblematic of “banal capitalism” (Nahman 2013). Or as Rudrappa (2015) opines in her ethnography of surrogacy in India, *Discounted Life: The Price of Global Surrogacy in India*,

If reproductive justice is to prevail, women must have access to comprehensive health care, where their nuclear and extended family members’ health and medical needs are met, in order for them to live full and satisfying lives. And crucially, reproductive justice cannot prevail without an acute consciousness

of social hierarchies that can only be confronted with the force of a critical mass of actors working in tandem with each other, across various social strata. If and when these conditions are met, then transnational surrogacy has the potential to be a part of reproductive justice. (p. 173)

Rudrappa is suggesting that policy interventions are insufficient for ameliorating the experiences of surrogates. Such a suggestion involves a vastly different reprobe with magnification of the problem and solution. The various ways that anthropologists have contributed to the morality and ethics debate, detailed above, as well as to interdisciplinary collaborations (such as that evidenced in Grtin & Inhorn 2011 and Inhorn & Grtin 2011 and the collaborative work with scientists and doctors in Inhorn & Patrizio 2009 and Inhorn et al. 2012) could be examined in greater depth. One future line of inquiry into cross-border reproduction could be an analytical mapping of the kinds of interventions that social scientists have undertaken in this field and the epistemological and sociocultural implications of those efforts.

GLOBALIZATION AND STRATIFICATION

Globalization is one of the central unifying themes of research on social stratification. As travel becomes ever cheaper and makes sense as a way to expand and deepen reproductive practices of clinics, hopeful parents-to-be come to accept it as an ideal option (Bergmann 2011, Grtin & Inhorn 2011, Grtin 2011, Inhorn 2011, Nahman 2011, Pande 2011, Whittaker 2011). This action often shifts people's understandings of themselves as national subjects and of their intended children as racialized or unracialized subjects as well as shifts their understandings of culture in general (Wade 2007). On other occasions, it merely hardens or reifies national, racial, and cultural understandings, for instance, when prospective parents desire racially similar children or want to preserve a child's so-called cultural heritage (Bharadwaj 2008; Campbell 2007; Marre 2007; Nahman 2011, 2013; Twine 2011).

Reproductive traveling can be seen as one aspect of "medical migration," producing new subjectivities and mobilities under globalization (Roberts & Schepers-Hughes 2011, Sobo 2009). Within anthropological investigations of reproductive tourism, there is scholarly interest in ethics, an impetus toward critique, and a highlighting of traditional themes of gender, religion, home and belonging, and transnational kinships (Bharadwaj 2008, Grtin 2011, Inhorn 2012, Kahn 2000, Teman 2010, Whittaker 2011, Zanini 2011). It is these aspects that unite the globalized practices of cross-border reproduction (Franklin 2011, Pande 2011). That is, cultures of trans-border reproduction may be more similar than different when viewed through the lens of narratives of hope, family, religion, and relatedness (see also Wade 2007).

It is not that globalization is homogenizing; rather, global capitalism may create similar interests and dispositions for people around the world through its constant re-stratification of market possibilities. Anthropology has been interested in the particular, and feminist anthropologists have offered groundbreaking critiques of universalizing tendencies of classical theory, especially in ideas such as "local biology" (Lock 1995). The recent range of diverse studies of reproductive travel around the world reveals that despite unique instances of "push and pull," there is more that unites globally than that which separates in reproductive tourism. Without making an economic reductionist argument, global histories of colonialism, imperialism, and contemporary late capitalist ethos saturate this commonality. Nahman (2013) argues, for example, that Israeli cross-border egg donation can be viewed as emblematic of reproductive tourism under global capitalism. Hence, we may need a reversible reprobe that allows us to see national detail while also viewing common aspects of globalization in order to provide rich analyses, description, and commentary. Observing what may be similar or common amid difference may be one area of critical descriptive

and theoretical intervention to be made by this field of study to move us beyond reproducing and consolidating accepted interpreting practices.

Mohanty (1988) long ago referred to shared legacies of colonialism, racism, and gender oppression as a “common context of struggle.” A legacy of that concept resides in the work proposing that we examine global stratification and inequalities (Franklin 2011; Inhorn 2015; Lewis 2016; Nahman 2011, 2013; Pande 2011; Pfeffer 2011; Pollock 2003; Ragoné 2005; Spar 2006; Tober 2001). Reproductive travel sheds light on global divisions in terms of class, race, and gender and provides further justification for the argument that to separate the so-called global from the local is to miss the intersectional, interwoven nature of these issues and forms of identification. Inequalities are mutually produced within a wider system of historical, social, and economic processes, making work in this area an apt lens. Reproductive travel affords moments of radical social critique, as this literature shows.

CAPITALISM, NATIONALISM, AND RACE

Legal asymmetries have facilitated the evasion of the laws in certain countries in order to help intended parents realize their fertility goals (Bergmann 2011, 2014; Nahman 2011). Some Israeli physicians, for example, saw themselves as pioneers, helping women to become mothers at whatever cost: taking eggs from working-class Israeli women (in this case, Jewish Israelis almost certainly from North African and Asian backgrounds) by subjecting them to ovarian hyperstimulation and the overproduction of oocytes for the purpose of implanting those eggs in women who were paying out of pocket for IVF and egg donation in private Israeli clinics (for intra-Jewish racial politics within Israel, see Lavie 2011a,b, 2012, 2014). As this practice became a sensitive issue within Israel, raising a specter of moral and bioethical backlash, a transnational opening was realized.

Whereas Israelis did not feel comfortable exploiting women in their own country, when women from another country (in this instance, Romania) were the donors, out of sight was often out of mind. Dickenson has called this widespread experience “the Lady Vanishes.” I called this “reverse traffic” (Inhorn 2015, Nahman 2011), that is, not trafficking eggs per se, but circumventing laws to keep differently situated groups of women geopolitically hidden from one another to facilitate the emotional transformation necessary for undergoing fertility treatments, often at the expense of other women’s subjection to exploitation. Central in the analysis of these processes was how racially desirable these Romanian women were to the Israeli commissioning couples by producing what I called a “different mixture” (Nahman 2006), a merging of the racialized and eugenic notions of increased vitality with whiteness, Europeaness, internalized anti-Semitism, and therefore imagined “racial improvement.” This process is part of the ontological choreography that oocyte recipients undergo (Thompson 2005) in service to personal, national, and neoliberal goals. What I observed in Israeli cross-border reproduction has also been seen by anthropologists worldwide: a contradictory and ambivalent process within cross-border reproduction that both highlights global racial and economic inequalities as well as hides them. These were processes of whitening or imagining such whitening as a way of Europeanizing the Jewish state. Cross-border reproductive travel remakes and re-entrenches national imaginaries, colonialism, and race (Campbell 2007; Nahman 2006, 2013; Schurr 2016; Speier 2016; Vora 2014).

Banerjee (2014) refers to a “transnational reproductive caste system” in which social stratification along the lines of race is heightened rather than reduced. This notion contradicts the somewhat-more-hopeful, cosmopolitan images of the fertility tourism industry that sees crossing borders as opening up peoples’ ideas of acceptability and desirability in terms of racial imaginings (Inhorn 2015). Anthropologies of reproduction, medical anthropology, and the social study of

science and technology (STS) began to look beyond the bounds of the nation-state by using a more global and transnational lens (Ong and Collier 2005) as events on the ground gained velocity, and this drive is seen in the repro-migration literature as well (Bergmann 2011; Grtin 2011; Inhorn 2011; Inhorn & Patrizio 2009; Pande 2010, 2011; Wade 2007; Whittaker 2009, 2010, 2011; Whittaker & Speier 2010).

Some analysts purport that reproductive technologies define the present era of capitalism and globalization (Franklin 2005; Nahman 2013; Strathern 1992b, 1995). This kind of anthropological parable-making is a way to tackle the topic of reproductive tourism as yet another aspect of contemporary culture. The debates within this arena of research span topics such as kinship, love, religion, travel, intimacy, commercialization, ethics, and globalization. Anthropologists bring their expertise in creating detailed narratives and a curiosity to explore the different vantage points where reproduction and tourism are brought together. Examining reproduction and global movement together has become a task at which anthropologists are now skilled, a shape-shifting research subject that moves around and is now our specialty in many senses. How and why have anthropologists become specialists at this work? Despite the importance and service of multisited research to anthropology more widely, might we at times be unwittingly providing service to the global repro-tourism industry itself through this approach?

Some have commented that reproduction with IVF itself is already a “global form” (Beck et al. 2012), highlighting a more symbolic understanding of how IVF practices and artifacts (eggs, sperm, embryos) index the globe (Franklin 2005). The past decade has provided a literalizing or enactment (Mol 2002) of this globalization of reproduction through the diverse practices of people and clinics. Reproduction has become extended to a form of traveling one does or a form of traveling one’s future babies or gametes do, not unlike older practices of international adoption (Cannell 1990) and surrogacy. Yet the scale and scope of eggs and sperm traveling or leading people to travel for their procurement raise new questions.

Naming

Anthropologists and others have grappled with the problematics of naming reproductive tourism. We became wary of this nomenclature (Bergmann 2011, Inhorn & Patrizio 2009, Matorras 2005, Nahman 2013, Whittaker 2009) because of its implications of free and easy travel, for the way it upholds neoliberal values of individual choice-as-pleasure (Franklin 1997). Attention to the critique of Appadurai (1996) warns that if analysis of reproductive travel merely privileges cultural flows of people across borders without attention to power relations, we risk a very nonspecific, nonparticular view of these practices. Inhorn & Patrizio (2009) have been central to developing concepts such as “reproductive exile,” borrowing this term from Matorras (2005), and “reproductive return,” which detail aspects of homecoming and diaspora. Others have suggested “the new opportunism” (Whittaker 2011), “infertility journeys” (Speier 2011), “eggs-ploitation” (Pfeffer 2011), and “reprotravel” (Inhorn 2015). Cross-border reproductive care has been an influential concept and the accepted term within the clinical literature (Grtin & Inhorn 2011, Inhorn & Grtin 2011), although care was often lacking in instances of transnational reproduction. The concept of “repro-migration” (Nahman 2013) denotes a specific kind of “medical migration,” which helps view kinship, love, and global biopolitics in contemporary global travel practices (Roberts & Scheper-Hughes 2011). The reproductive tourism concept is useful only if it implies a critical stance toward the industry’s attempts to profit from human need (as in fertility or medical tourism). The term minimizes the pain and dilemmas experienced by those who seek to have children abroad and serves as a weak shorthand for the internal debates that prospective parents face. It also elides

reference to those who cannot travel but whose services are purchased (donors and surrogates). We anthropologists have tried to be faithful to our interlocutors by finding innovative ways of naming this phenomenon. We have also aimed to expand and deepen anthropological knowledge, showing the various strands of theorizing into which our work has fed.

CONCLUSION: REPROSCAPES AND REPROSCOPES

In this spirit, I suggest we think more deeply about Inhorn's concept of the "reproscape." In expanding Appadurai's description and analysis of globalization, Inhorn argues, "reproductive tourism might be thought of productively as a more complex 'reproscape'—a kind of 'meta-scape' combining numerous dimensions of globalization and global flows" (Inhorn 2011, pp. 89–90). Reproductive travel involves multiple dimensions, as the literature discussed above demonstrates. This body of work has opened up a space for ethnographically describing and interpreting global complexities in a non-unidirectional way. At the same time, this new body of literature has included analysis of rising cosmopolitanism and also of the ways that stratification and inequalities are reproduced. However, it may be at the metaphorical level that Appadurai's and Inhorn's use of "scape" is most useful for thinking about the role of reproductive tourism in and for anthropology itself.

If "scape" means "view," "picture," or "representation," then reproscape represents the perspective of the researcher who is examining transnational reproduction. A scape is an excellent metaphor for analyzing global flows, but it is also useful for thinking about anthropologists' own representations of those flows. I suggest that it is not simply the scape or scene that we need to discuss; our frame should also reveal who is doing the viewing or "scoping." The interpreter of the scape also needs to be included in the setting. What are our particular professional scopic preoccupations? I offer the concept of an anthropological reproscope, underlining the particular ways in which we anthropologists view and frame transnational reproduction.

New work on reproductive tourism has explored many avenues for seeing how people create and live in their moral and social worlds and how they reproduce them. The tendency to reify the global and the local, a tendency shared with much of the social sciences, has shifted toward greater complexity and depth. Moving away from "methodological nationalism" to think about reproduction crossing borders, we have a conceptual opportunity to employ the "transnational migration" concept (Wimmer & Glick-Schiller 2002). Work on transnational reproduction has self-consciously engaged with issues of power, relative disempowerment, and complex positionings under global capitalism, in large measure by examining seemingly separate arenas of practice together. As we move beyond boxing diverse aspects of assisted cross-border reproduction into the prepackaged, readily available concepts that we anthropologists have made up, are we discussing anything beyond naming? Although naming and renaming empirical practices are time-honored parts of anthropology's culture of critique, which other kinds of critiques can we offer and which sorts of interventions might be made here beyond the field of anthropology? Contemporary cross-border reproduction has literalized the feminist idea that modern technologically facilitated birth and reproduction is a transformative, ritualized journey for women (Davis-Floyd 1991). Our task now may be to think through the ways that this field literalizes, ritualizes, and is potentially transformative of our own theoretical perspectives.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author is not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

LITERATURE CITED

- Abu-Lughod L. 1993. *Writing Women's Worlds: Bedouin Stories*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Adamson GD, Zegers-Hochschild F, Ishihara O, Sullivan E, Mansour R, et al. 2012. ICMART world report: preliminary 2008 data. *Hum. Reprod.* 27(Suppl. 2):ii38–39
- Almeling R. 2011. *Sex Cells: The Medical Market for Eggs and Sperm*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Appadurai A. 1996. Global ethnoscaapes: notes and queries for a transnational anthropology. In *Modernity at Large*, pp. 48–65. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Balcom K. 2006. Constructing families, creating mothers: gender, family, state and nation in the history of child adoption. *J. Women's Hist.* 18(1):219–32
- Balcom K. 2007. "Phony mothers" and border-crossing adoptions: the Montreal-to-New York black market in babies in the 1950s. *J. Women's Hist.* 19(1):107–16
- Banerjee A. 2014. Race and a transnational reproductive caste system: Indian transnational surrogacy. *Hypatia* 29(1):113–28
- Bear L. 2015. Beyond economization: state debt and labor. In *Fieldsights: Theorizing the Contemporary. Cult. Anthropol. Online*. March 30. <http://culanth.org/fieldsights/659-beyond-economization-state-debt-and-labor>
- Bear L, Ho K, Tsing A, Yanagisako S. 2015. Gens: a feminist manifesto for the study of capitalism. In *Fieldsights: Theorizing the Contemporary. Cult. Anthropol. Online*. March 30: <http://culanth.org/fieldsights/652-gens-a-feminist-manifesto-for-the-study-of-capitalism>
- Beck S, Knecht M, Klotz M. 2012. *Reproductive Technologies as Global Form: Ethnographies of Knowledge, Practices, and Transnational Encounters*. Vol. 19. Frankfurt, Ger.: Campus Verlag
- Bergmann S. 2011. Reproductive agency and projects: Germans searching for egg donation in Spain and the Czech Republic. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 23(5):600–8
- Bergmann S. 2014. Fertility tourism: circumventive routes that enable access to reproductive technologies and substances. *Signs* 40(1):280–88
- Bharadwaj A. 2008. Biosociality to bio-crossings: encounters with assisted conception and embryonic stem cells in India. In *Genetics, Biosociality and the Social Sciences: Making Biologies and Identities*, ed. S Gibbon, C Novas, pp. 98–116. London: Routledge
- Birch K, Tyfield D. 2013. Theorizing the bioeconomy, biovalue, biocapital, bioeconomics or . . . what? *Sci. Technol. Hum. Values* 38(3):299–327
- Boswell J. 1988. *The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Briggs L. 2003. Mother, child, race and nation: the visual iconography of rescue and the politics of transnational and transracial adoption. *Gender Hist.* 15:179–200
- Campbell B. 2007. Racialization, genes and the reinventions of nation in Europe. See Wade 2007, pp. 95–124
- Cannell F. 1990. Concepts of parenthood: the Warnock report, the Gillick debate and modern myths. *Am. Ethnol.* 17:667–86
- Carsten J. 2000. *Cultures of Relatedness: New Approaches to the Study of Kinship*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Cohen L. 2005. Operability, bioavailability and exception. See Ong & Collier 2005, pp. 79–90
- Cooper M, Waldby C. 2014. *Clinical Labor: Tissue Donors and Research Subjects in the Global Bioeconomy*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Davis-Floyd R. 1991. Ritual in the hospital: giving birth the American Way. In *Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. P Whitten, DE Hunter, pp. 275–85. Boston: Little, Brown. 6th ed.
- Deomampo D. 2013. Transnational surrogacy in India: interrogating power and women's agency. *Front. J. Women Stud.* 34(3):167–88
- Deomampo D. 2016. *Transnational Reproduction: Race, Kinship, and Commercial Surrogacy in India*. New York: N. Y. Univ. Press
- Dickenson D. 2007. *Property in the Body: Feminist Perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Dubinsky K. 2007. Babies without borders: rescue, kidnap and the symbolic child. *J. Women's Hist.* 19(1):142–50

- Edwards J. 2000. *Born and Bred: Idioms of Kinship and New Reproductive Technologies in England*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Elie SD. 2015. Anthropology as an emerging global discipline: a new research ethic. *Glob. J. Anthropol. Res.* 2:7–29
- ESHRE (Eur. Soc. Hum. Reprod. Embryol.). 2014. *ART factsheet*. July, ESHRE, Grimbergen, Belg.
- Fasin D. 2013. Why ethnography matters: on anthropology and its publics. *Cult. Anthropol.* 28(4):621–46
- Fonseca C, Marre D, San Román B. 2015. Child circulation in a globalized era: anthropological reflections. In *The Intercountry Adoption Debate: Dialogues Across Disciplines*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Sch. Press
- Franklin S. 1997. *Embodied Progress: A Cultural Account of Assisted Conception*. London: Routledge
- Franklin S. 2003. Rethinking nature-culture: anthropology and the new genetics. *Anthropol. Theory* 3(1):65–85
- Franklin S. 2005. Stem cells R us: emergent life forms and the global biological. See Ong & Collier 2005, pp. 59–78
- Franklin S. 2011. Not a flat world: the future of cross-border reproductive care. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 23(7):814–16
- Franklin S. 2013. *Biological Relatives: IVF, Stem Cells, and the Future of Kinship*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Ginsburg F, Rapp R, ed. 1995. *Conceiving the New World Order: The Global Politics of Reproduction*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: Univ. Calif. Press
- Gudeman S. 1971. The compadrazgo as a reflection of the natural and spiritual person. *Proc. R. Anthropol. Inst. G. B. Irel.* 1971:45–48+4+49–71
- Gunnarsson Payne J. 2015. Reproduction in transition: cross-border egg donation, biodesirability and new reproductive subjectivities on the European fertility market. *Gender Place Cult.: J. Fem. Geogr.* 2(1):107–22
- Gupta JA. 2006. Towards transnational feminisms: some reflections and concerns in relation to the globalization of reproductive technologies. *Eur. J. Women's Stud.* 13:23–38
- Gupta JA. 2012. Reproductive biocrossings: Indian egg donors and surrogates in the globalized fertility market. *IJFAB: Int. J. Fem. Approaches Bioethics* 5(1):25–51
- Gürtin Z. 2011. Banning reproductive travel? Turkey's ART legislation and third-party assisted reproduction. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 23:555–64
- Gürtin Z, Inhorn M. 2011. Introduction: travelling for conception and the global assisted reproduction market. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 23(5):535–37
- Hampshire K, Simpson B, eds. 2015. *Assisted Reproductive Technologies in the Third Phase: Global Encounters and Emerging Moral Worlds*. London: Berghahn Books
- Haraway DJ. 1997. *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium. FemaleMan_Meets_OncoMouse: Feminism and Technoscience*. New York: Routledge
- Howell S. 2006. *The Kinning of Foreigners: Transnational Adoption in a Global Perspective*. London: Berghahn Books
- Hudson N, Culley L, Blyth E, Norton W, Rapport F, Pacey A. 2011. Cross-border reproductive care: a review of the literature. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 22:673–85
- Ikemoto LC. 2009. Reproductive tourism: equality concerns in the global market for fertility services. *Law Inequal.: J. Theory Pract.* 27:277–309
- Inhorn MC. 1994. *Quest for Conception: Gender, Infertility and Egyptian Medical Traditions*. Philadelphia: Univ. Pa. Press
- Inhorn MC. 2003. *Local Babies, Global Science: Gender, Religion, and In Vitro Fertilization in Egypt*. New York: Routledge
- Inhorn MC. 2011. Diasporic dreaming: return reproductive tourism to the Middle East. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 23:582–92
- Inhorn MC. 2012. *The New Arab Man: Emergent Masculinities, Technologies, and Islam in the Middle East*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Inhorn MC. 2015. *Cosmopolitan Conceptions: IVF Sojourns in Global Dubai*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Inhorn MC, Birenbaum-Carmeli D. 2008. Assisted reproductive technologies and culture change. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 37:177–96
- Inhorn MC, Gürtin ZB. 2011. Cross-border reproductive care: a future research agenda. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 23(5):665–76

- Inhorn MC, Patrizio P. 2009. Rethinking reproductive ‘tourism’ as reproductive ‘exile.’ *Fertil. Steril.* 92:904–6
- Inhorn MC, Shrivastav P, Patrizio P. 2012. Assisted reproductive technologies and fertility “tourism”: examples from global Dubai and the Ivy League. *Med. Anthropol.* 31(3):249–65
- Kahn SM. 2000. *Reproducing Jews: A Cultural Account of Assisted Conception in Israel*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Kearney M. 1995. The local and the global: the anthropology of globalization and transnationalism. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:547–65
- Kligman G. 1992. Abortion and international adoption in Ceausescu’s Romania. *Fem. Stud.* 18(2):405–19
- Kroløkke C. 2014a. Eggs and euros: a feminist perspective on reproductive travel from Denmark to Spain. *Int. J. Fem. Approaches Bioethics* 7(2):144–63
- Kroløkke C. 2015. Have eggs, will travel: the experiences and ethics of global egg donation. *Somatechnics* 5(1):12–31
- Kroløkke C, Foss KA, Pant S. 2012. Fertility travel: the commodification of human reproduction: Charlotte Kroløkke, Karen A. Foss, and Saumya Pant, Guest Editors. *Cult. Polit.* 8(2):273–82
- Kroløkke CH. 2014b. West is best: affective assemblages and Spanish oöcytes. *Eur. J. Women’s Stud.* 21(1):57–71
- Landau R. 1998. The management of genetic origins: secrecy and openness in donor assisted conception in Israel and elsewhere. *Hum. Reprod.* 13(11):3268–73
- Lavie S. 2011a. Mizrahi feminism and the question of Palestine. *J. Middle East Women’s Stud.* 7(2):56–88
- Lavie S. 2011b. Staying put: crossing the Israel-Palestine border with Gloria Anzaldúa. *Anthropol. Humanism* 36(1):101–21
- Lavie S. 2012. Writing against identity politics: an essay on gender, race, and bureaucratic pain. *Am. Ethnol.* 39(4):779–803
- Lavie S. 2014. *Wrapped in the Flag of Israel: Mizrahi Single Mothers and Bureaucratic Torture*. Oxford, UK: Berghahn Books
- Lewis S. 2016. Gestational labours: care politics and surrogates’ struggle. In *Intimate Economies: Bodies, Emotions, and Sexualities on the Global Market*, ed. S Hoffman, A Moreno. London: Palgrave Macmillan. In press
- Lock M. 1995. *Encounters with Aging Mythologies of Menopause in Japan and North America*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Marre D. 2007. “I want her to learn her language and maintain her culture”: transnational adoptive families’ views of “cultural origins.” See Wade 2007, pp. 73–93
- Matorras R. 2005. Reproductive exile versus reproductive tourism. *Hum. Reprod.* 20:3571
- Mintz S. 1998. The localization of anthropological practice. From area studies to transnationalism. *Crit. Anthropol.* 18(2):117–33
- Mintz S, Wolf E. 1950. An analysis of ritual co-parenthood (compadrazgo). *Southwest. J. Anthropol.* 6(4):341–68
- Mitra S. 2015. *Forces and flows of the market of commercial surrogacy: Expansion of market in and around India*. Presented at Indiscip. Workshop: The ART of Reproducing Difference: Discussing (In)Equality in the Context of Reproductive Travel, Oct. 29–30, Inst. Soc. Anthropol., Univ. Bern, Switz.
- Mohanty CT. 1988. Under Western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Fem. Rev.* 30:61–88
- Mol A. 2002. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. London: Duke Univ. Press
- Nahman M. 2006. Materialising Israeliness: difference and mixture in transnational ova donation. *Sci. Cult.* 15(3):199–213
- Nahman M. 2007. Synecdochic ricochets: biosocialities in a Jerusalem IVF clinic. In *Biosocialities, Genetics and the Social Sciences: Making Biologies and Identities*, ed. S Gibbon, C Novas, pp. 117–35. London: Routledge
- Nahman M. 2008. Nodes of desire: transnational egg sellers as theorists of reproduction in a neo-liberal age. *Eur. J. Women’s Stud.* 15:65–82
- Nahman M. 2011. Reverse traffic: intersecting inequalities in human egg donation. *Reprod. Biomed. Online* 23:626–33
- Nahman M. 2012. Making interferences: the cultural politics of egg ‘donation.’ In *Reproductive Technologies as Global Form. Ethnographies of Knowledge, Practices, and Transnational Encounters*, ed. M Knecht, M Klotz, S Beck, pp. 305–30. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Nahman M. 2013. *Extractions: An Ethnography of Reproductive Tourism*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan

- Nahman MR. 2005. *Israeli extraction: an ethnographic study of egg donation and national imaginaries*. PhD Diss., Univ. Lancaster
- Ong A, Collier SJ. 2005. *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. London: Blackwell
- Pande A. 2009. 'It may be her eggs but it's my blood': surrogates and everyday forms of kinship in India. *Qual. Sociol.* 32:379–97
- Pande A. 2010. Commercial surrogacy in India: manufacturing a perfect 'mother-worker'. *Signs: J. Women Cult. Soc.* 35:969–94
- Pande A. 2011. Transnational commercial surrogacy in India: gifts for global sisters? *Reprod. Biomed. Online* 23:618–25
- Pande A. 2014a. This birth and that: surrogacy and stratified motherhood in India. *PhiloSOPHIA: J. Cont. Fem.* 4.1:50–64
- Pande A. 2014b. *Wombs in Labor: Transnational Commercial Surrogacy in India*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
- Pavone V. 2015. IVF as a looking glass: kinship, biology, technology and society through the lens of assisted reproductive technologies. *BioSocieties* 10(1):111–15
- Petryna A. 2013. *Life Exposed: Biological Citizens After Chernobyl*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Pfeffer N. 2011. Eggs-ploiting women: a critical feminist analysis of the different principles in transplant and fertility tourism. *Reprod. Biomed. Online* 23:634–41
- Pollock A. 2003. Complicating power in high-tech reproduction: narratives of anonymous paid egg donors. *J. Med. Humanit.* 24(3–4):241–63
- Rabinow P. 1995. Artificiality and enlightenment: from sociobiology to biosociality. In *Essays in the Anthropology of Reason*, pp. 91–111. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Rabinow P. 1999. *French DNA: Trouble in Purgatory*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Ragoné H. 1994. *Surrogate Motherhood: Conception in the Heart*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press
- Ragoné H. 2005. Surrogate motherhood: rethinking biological models, kinship, and family. In *Cross-Cultural Perspective*, ed. CB Brettell, CF Sargent, pp. 471–80. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Rapp R. 1999. *Testing Women, Testing the Fetus: The Social Impact of Amniocentesis in America*. New York: Routledge
- Robbins J. 2013. Beyond the suffering subject: toward an anthropology of the good. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.* 19(3):447–62
- Roberts EFS. 2012. *God's Laboratory: Assisted Reproduction in the Andes*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: Univ. Calif. Press. 1st ed.
- Roberts EFS, Scheper-Hughes N. 2011. Introduction: medical migrations. *Body Soc.* 17:1–30
- Rudrappa S. 2012. India's reproductive assembly line. *Contexts* 11(2):22–27
- Rudrappa S. 2015. *Discounted Life: The Price of Global Surrogacy in India*. New York: N. Y. Univ. Press
- Scheper-Hughes N. 2002. The ends of the body: commodity fetishism and the global traffic in organs. *SAIS Rev.: J. Int. Aff.* 22(1):61–80
- Scheper-Hughes N. 2009. Making anthropology public. *Anthropol. Today* 25(4):1–3
- Schurr C. 2016. From biopolitics to bioeconomies: the ART of (re-)producing white futures in Mexico's surrogacy market. *Environ. Plann. D: Soc. Space* doi: 10.1177/0263775816638851
- Shenfeld F, de Mouzon J, Pennings G, Ferraretti AP, Nyboe Andersen A, et al. 2010. Cross border reproductive care in six European countries. *Hum. Reprod.* 25(6):1361–68
- Sobo EJ. 2009. Medical travel, what it means, why it matters. *Med. Anthropol.* 28(4):326–35
- Spar DL. 2006. *The Baby Business: How Money, Science, and Politics Drive the Commerce for Conception*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Bus. Sch. Press
- Speier A. 2011. Brokers, consumers and the internet: how North American consumers navigate their infertility journeys. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 23(5):592–99
- Speier A. 2016. *Fertility Holidays: IVF Tourism and the Reproduction of Whiteness*. New York: N. Y. Univ. Press
- Storror RF. 2005. Quests for conception: fertility tourists, globalization and feminist legal theory. *Hastings Law J.* 57:295
- Strathern M. 1992a. *After Nature: English Kinship in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

- Strathern M. 1992b. *Reproducing the Future: Essays on Anthropology, Kinship and the New Reproductive Technologies*. New York: Routledge
- Strathern M. 1995. Displacing knowledge: technology and the consequences for kinship. See Ginsburg & Rapp 1995, pp. 346–68
- Tanderup M, Reddy S, Patel T, Nielsen BB. 2015. Informed consent in medical decision-making in commercial gestational surrogacy: a mixed methods study in New Delhi, India. *Acta Obstet. Gynecol. Scand.* 94:465–72
- Temam E. 2010. *Birth of a Mother: The Surrogate Body and the Pregnant Self*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Thompson C. 2005. *Making Parents: The Ontological Choreography of Reproductive Technologies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Thompson C. 2007. Why we should, in fact, pay for egg donation. *Regen. Med.* 2(2):203–9
- Tober DM. 2001. Semen as gift, semen as goods: reproductive workers and the market in altruism. *Body Soc.* 7(2–3):137–60
- Trouillot MR. 2003. *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Modern World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Twine FW. 2011. *Outsourcing the Womb: Race, Class, and Gestational Surrogacy in a Global Market*. New York: Routledge
- Vertommen S. 2016. Towards a political economy of egg donations: doing it the Israel way. In *Critical Kinship Studies: Kinship (Trans)formed*, ed. C Kroløkke, L Myong, SW Adrian, T Tjørnhøj-Thomsen, pp. 169–84. London: Rowman and Littlefield Int.
- Vora K. 2013. Potential, risk and return in transnational Indian gestational surrogacy. *Curr. Anthropol.* 54(Suppl. 7):S97–106
- Vora K. 2014. Experimental sociality and gestational surrogacy in the Indian ART clinic. *Ethnos: J. Anthropol.* 79(1):63–83
- Vora K. 2015a. *Life Support: Biocapital and the New History of Outsourced Labor*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
- Vora K. 2015b. Re-imagining reproduction: unsettling metaphors in the history of imperial science and commercial surrogacy in India. *Somatechnics* 5(1):88–103
- Wade P, ed. 2007. *Race, Ethnicity and Nation: Perspectives from Kinship and Genetics*. New York/Oxford, UK: Berghahn Books
- Weston K. 2013 (1991). *Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
- Whittaker A. 2009. Global technologies and transnational reproduction in Thailand. *Asian Stud. Rev.* 33:319–32
- Whittaker A. 2010. Medical travel and global health governance: challenges posed by medical travel in Asia-Pacific. *Glob. Soc. Policy* 10:396–415
- Whittaker A. 2011. Reproduction opportunists in the new global sex trade: PGD and non-medical sex selection. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 23(5):609–17
- Whittaker A. 2015. *Thai in Vitro: Gender, Culture and Assisted Reproduction*. Vol. 30. Berghahn Books
- Whittaker A, Speier A. 2010. ‘Cycling overseas’: critical perspectives on cross-border travel for medically assisted reproductive technologies. *Med. Anthropol.* 9:363–83
- Widdows H. 2009. Border disputes across bodies: exploitation in trafficking for prostitution and egg sale for stem cell research. *J. Fem. Approaches Bioethics* 2(1):5–24
- Wimmer A, Glick-Schiller N. 2002. Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Glob. Netw.* 2(4):301–34
- Yanagisako SJ, Delaney C. 1995. *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*. New York: Routledge
- Zanini G. 2011. Abandoned by the state, betrayed by the church: Italian experiences of cross-border reproductive care. *Reprod. BioMed. Online* 23(5):565–72



Contents

Perspective

A Life in Evolutionary Anthropology <i>Clifford J. Jolly</i>	1
---	---

Archaeology

Archaeological Evidence of Epidemics Can Inform Future Epidemics <i>Sharon N. DeWitte</i>	63
Collaborative Archaeologies and Descendant Communities <i>Chip Colwell</i>	113
Reaching the Point of No Return: The Computational Revolution in Archaeology <i>Leore Grosman</i>	129
Archaeologies of Ontology <i>Benjamin Alberti</i>	163
Archaeology and Contemporary Warfare <i>Susan Pollock</i>	215
The Archaeology of Pastoral Nomadism <i>William Honeychurch and Cheryl A. Makarewicz</i>	341
Urbanism and Anthropogenic Landscapes <i>Arlen F. Chase and Diane Z. Chase</i>	361
Decolonizing Archaeological Thought in South America <i>Alejandro Haber</i>	469

Biological Anthropology

Out of Asia: Anthropoid Origins and the Colonization of Africa <i>K. Christopher Beard</i>	199
Early Environments, Stress, and the Epigenetics of Human Health <i>Connie J. Mulligan</i>	233

Native American Genomics and Population Histories <i>Deborah A. Bolnick, Jennifer A. Raff, Lauren C. Springs, Austin W. Reynolds, and Aida T. Miró-Herrans</i>	319
Disease and Human/Animal Interactions <i>Michael P. Muehlenbein</i>	395
Anthropology of Language and Communicative Practices	
Intellectual Property, Piracy, and Counterfeiting <i>Alexander S. Dent</i>	17
Science Talk and Scientific Reference <i>Matthew Wolfgram</i>	33
Language, Translation, Trauma <i>Alex Pillen</i>	95
(Dis)fluency <i>Jürgen Jaspers</i>	147
Some Recent Trends in the Linguistic Anthropology of Native North America <i>Paul V. Kroskrity</i>	267
Sociocultural Anthropology	
Urban Space and Exclusion in Asia <i>Erik Harms</i>	45
Historicity and Anthropology <i>Charles Stewart</i>	79
Anthropological STS in Asia <i>Michael M. J. Fischer</i>	181
Cancer <i>Juliet McMullin</i>	251
Affect Theory and the Empirical <i>Danielyn Rutherford</i>	285
Where Have All the Peasants Gone? <i>Susana Narotzky</i>	301
Scripting the Folk: History, Folklore, and the Imagination of Place in Bengal <i>Roma Chatterji</i>	377
Reproductive Tourism: Through the Anthropological “Reproscope” <i>Michal Rachel Nabman</i>	417

Design and Anthropology	
<i>Keith M. Murphy</i>	433
Unfree Labor	
<i>Filipe Calvão</i>	451
Time as Technique	
<i>Laura Bear</i>	487

Indexes

Cumulative Index of Contributing Authors, Volumes 36–45	503
Cumulative Index of Article Titles, Volumes 36–45	507

Errata

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Anthropology* articles may be found at <http://www.annualreviews.org/errata/anthro>