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Report on the May 27-29, 2016 meeting
The Population and Development Program at Hampshire College (PopDev) is grateful to the co-hosts and participants of Old Maps, New Terrain: Rethinking population in an era of climate change. We were fortunate to bring together a group that came from multiple social movements, scholarly disciplines and geographic regions to collaboratively analyze issues like the new population industry, “green” militarism and development, and the impacts of climate change and adaptation schemes. Together we mapped the shifting political landscapes, borders and terrains of population in this time of climate change.

At the meeting we recognized and celebrated scholar and activist Betsy Hartmann’s foundational work on population control, reproductive health and rights, environmental and climate security, and the “greening of hate” on her retirement from teaching as a professor of international development in the School of Critical Social Inquiry (CSI) at Hampshire College and as PopDev Director. Betsy Hartmann was PopDev Director for most of the program’s existence, from 1988 to 2014. She is responsible for strategically positioning PopDev to take on the idea of “overpopulation” and the complex and multiple ways it manifests in policy and scholarship related to family planning, environmental and climate change, immigration and international security, as well as in popular thinking and advocacy. Betsy continues to work with the program as PopDev’s Senior Policy Advisor, for which I am very grateful. She is also a Professor Emerita in CSI and continues to publish and give public talks.

PopDev extends a heartfelt thanks to the supporters of the Old Maps, New Terrain meeting. Thank you to the Civil Liberties and Public Policy Program at Hampshire College for the program’s generous support of PopDev. Thank you to The Antipode Foundation for a 2015-16 International Workshop Award in support of the meeting. Thank you to Hampshire College for hosting PopDev as part of the college community since 1986. And finally, thank you to the other meeting co-hosts: Diana Ojeda, Jade Sasser, Sarojini Nadimpally, and Betsy Hartmann.

The following report captures some of the key discussions and analyses that emerged at the meeting. Please note that ideas expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the Population & Development Program at Hampshire College.

You can hear directly from some of the meeting participants in our Old Maps, New Terrain video interview series. Visit our website at popdev.hampshire.edu to access the videos.

I welcome your comments at popdev@hampshire.edu.

Sincerely,

Anne Hendrixson
PopDev Director
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Background
From May 27–29, 2016, 28 scholars and activists convened for the Old Maps, New Terrain: Rethinking population in an era of climate change meeting at Hampshire College in Amherst, Massachusetts, US. Meeting participants were from 11 countries (Bangladesh, India, the Philippines, Kenya, South Africa, Colombia, Mexico, Canada, the UK, the Netherlands, and the US). Participants included scholars from multiple areas (gender studies, geography, feminist political ecology, public health, environmental studies and critical race theory) and activists from a variety of movements (land and water rights; immigrant rights; and reproductive, environmental, food and climate justice). These categories were blurred: many of us identify as both activist and scholar. The group also included four undergraduate student assistants from Hampshire College, as well as our meeting coordinator, Kaia Zimmerman.

The meeting was co-hosted and facilitated by the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College (PopDev) with three colleagues and political allies. Co-hosts included Anne Hendrixson (PopDev Director and Faculty Associate in the School of Critical Social Inquiry at Hampshire College); Betsy Hartmann (PopDev Senior Policy Analyst and Professor Emerita of Development Studies at Hampshire College); Diana Ojeda (Faculty Member at the Instituto PENSAR, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogotá, Colombia); Sarojini Nadimpally (Executive Director, Sama: Resource Group on Women and Health, New Delhi, India); and Jade Sasser (Assistant Professor, Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies, University of California, Riverside).

At the symposium, we collectively rethought population in the context of climate change, conflict and shifting geopolitics. Participants presented on contemporary political concerns related to changing demographic and environmental realities. We organized our inquiry into six in-depth sessions: 1) Old Maps, New Terrain introductions and framework; 2) Mapping the population (control) landscape; 3) The political economy of today’s population control industry; 4) Charting the landscape of climate change and militarized development; 5) Mapping the political landscape of dispossession; and 6) Anticipatory visions for the future. At the start of each session, a panel of participants made framing remarks and then together we considered the connections and disjunctures they revealed in the current geopolitical terrain.

We mapped a broad definition of population control that is both context-specific and localized, as well as useful in identifying the multiple and replicable ways that neo-Malthusian thinking shapes policy, philanthrocapitalism, scholarship, popular culture and activism. This mapping allowed us to see linkages between issues and movements, made our analysis intersectional and stronger, shifted participants’ relationships to the issues and one another, and allowed us to find important possibilities for connections in our scholarly and activist work moving forward.

This is a report on the Old Maps, New Terrain meeting.
Session 1: Old Maps, New Terrain Framework

The Old Maps, New Terrain Framework discussion featured the meeting co-hosts, who laid out the political questions and challenges that led us to hold the meeting. Co-hosts addressed five questions: 1) Why are we coalescing around these particular issues? 2) What is going on with gender? What is going on with race? 3) What is the range of powerful and impactful interests who are invested—financially and ideologically—in perpetuating and refashioning population in an era of climate change? 4) Why do we think that alternative visions for the future are necessary and possible? and 5) How do we frame a politics of solidarity and strong analysis that bridges movements?

Why are we coalescing around these particular issues?

Betsy Hartmann & Diana Ojeda

The Old Maps, New Terrain meeting was framed so as to rethink population in the context of climate change, conflict and shifting geopolitics. Panelists Betsy Hartmann and Diana Ojeda analyzed the reasons for examining these issues and the links between them.

Betsy Hartmann discussed how neo-Malthusianism acts as glue that adheres the issues together in dangerous ways. She defined neo-Malthusianism as an ideology that understands rapid population growth as a major, if not the major cause of poverty, environmental degradation, resource scarcity, and political instability. Neo-Malthusianism’s main solution is to promote the reduction of women’s fertility through the provision of effective contraception. Betsy suggested that in the current moment, the contraceptive solution is coupled with a narrow package of women’s empowerment measures that correlate with lower fertility such as better access to education, micro-credit and employment opportunities in the neo-liberal marketplace. In her words:

Neo-Malthusianism is about much more than population growth, however. It is a belief system and policy vehicle that both obscures and reinforces the role of powerful interests in generating social and economic inequality, dispossession, environmental degradation and political violence. As such, it is productive in numerous ways:

1. Its focus on population numbers and targets lends itself to technocratic social engineering and today’s faddish managerial obsession with measurable outcomes.

2. It pits an abstract Humanity against an abstract Nature: “People are bad for the environment.” It doesn’t ask which people and which institutions are degrading the environment and depleting resources, and why. But, of course, beneath the abstraction are real race, classed, and gendered bodies. “Overpopulation” summons up powerful stereotypes of barbarian hordes; poor, pregnant women of color; peasants that are destroying the land and biodiversity; and dangerous immigrants.

3. It forms a link between colonial, neo-colonial and post-colonial practices of privileging the global North over the global South, and rich elites over the so-called masses in both places. It gives to inequality a sense of biological and historical inevitability. It gives a similar inevitability to war and violent conflict.
4. It morphs easily into the strategic deployment of differential fertility rates by right-wing, nativist, patriarchal and fundamentalist forces. Higher fertility rates of Muslims threaten Hindus, or white Christian communities in Europe. Too many Palestinian babies, too few Israeli ones. The list goes on.

5. In forecasting doom unless birth rates fall and population comes into balance with nature, it reinforces apocalyptic thinking and a problematic sense of crisis and emergency—the end of the world is nigh, reproductive and human rights must be suspended for the greater good. This privileges the mainly male prophets, like conservation biologist Paul Ehrlich of population bomb fame, who claim they know how to save the world—and earn ego accolades and monetary profits along the way.

Yet neo-Malthusianism often has a progressive, feminist patina too, particularly when juxtaposed to the anti-abortion movement and other conservative and patriarchal forces that deny women access to safe birth control, including abortion. Here it’s important to acknowledge that population programs are sometimes the only place where women and young people can get access to contraceptives or rudimentary reproductive health care. Helped along by associated discourses about saving and empowering poor women as the best way to reduce birth rates, and protecting the environment for future generations, neo-Malthusianism appeals to many liberals, and many on the left too, especially here in the US.

This conference is going to look at the ways in which it thus serves as ideological glue: normalizing, naturalizing and often liberalizing regressive and repressive social, military and environmental policies in the present era of neoliberalism, grotesque wealth concentration, and climate change. Or to use another metaphor, if we can unravel the way neo-Malthusianism threads through the various arenas that we’re exploring here, we can hopefully weaken its influence. Of course it is just one of many threads that bend and bind the mind to an acceptance of inequality and injustice. But it’s an important one, and challenging it helps to free people’s political imagination to embrace new solidarities and a more positive view of the future.

*Diana Ojeda* addressed the importance of looking at these issues at a moment when climate change is not only depoliticized but also used as a very effective depoliticizing discourse. The production of a climatized nature has reconfigured old geographies of uneven resource access, generating new processes of dispossession. The green imperatives of climate change mitigation and adaptation work to legitimize these processes, rendering local communities as collateral damage. The results are a flattened out geography of climate change: a planetary illusion in which racial, classed and gendered disparities aren’t supposed to matter. These green imperatives also restrict dissident space and close the doors for a politics of affiliation, solidarity and coalitions.

The self-fulfilling prophecies enabled by such imperatives—such as “poor women in the global South are having too many children,” “peasants need to learn how to take care of the environment” or “only consumption will save us”—end up well positioned in public discourse. In that way, it is urgent to address how, in an era of multiple climate crises, official and media circles end up speaking of one climate emergency, one that is yet again profoundly infused with Malthusian narratives of impending doom.
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What’s going on with gender? What’s going on with race? How are they interconnected and related to this meeting?

Anne Hendrixson & Sarojini Nadimpally

Anne Hendrixson recognized the importance of examining gender and race in the context of other intersectional issues such as class, caste, religion, ethnicity and geographic location. She noted that population control is reliant on locating particular fertile bodies as the sites of intervention. Population control does not exist without a predetermined set of bodies that not only require fertility control, but can also be tagged both as the source of damaging population growth and additional problematic bodies. These bodies are simultaneously gendered, raced, classed and placed: population control primarily targets poor women of color from the global South, and also groups of women of color in the North, including incarcerated women and women who access welfare in the US.

In current US politics, immigrants are too often targeted as the source of unwanted population growth and their bodies subject to restrictive policies and bravado about the building of border walls. The Black Lives Matter movement has brought to the fore the need to address issues of racialized violence, including police violence against communities of color as population control.

While some population control initiatives have targeted men, most target women as the source of the population problem. Population control has disproportionately impacted women’s bodies and lives. However, simultaneously, population control and population control discourses contribute to hardened binary understandings of gender and sexuality in international development and family planning. Under population control, all people are women or men, and are heterosexual. Gender relations, gender fluidities, and differences between women on the basis of race, class, ethnicity and sexuality are absent. This undermines productive visioning of what effective policies might look like in a number of areas, but particularly sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR). It reinforces the idea that the primary goal of SRHR is fertility control, and that some people need to keep their fertility more under control than others.

At the same time, we have to grapple with the economic empowerment and women’s agency frameworks that deny the ongoing problems of population control and have far-reaching, negative impacts in international and national development schemes. Finally, we have to recognize that there has been some good work on women and adaptation to climate change, on women and sustainable development, and in reproductive justice.

Sarojini discussed the enduring neo-Malthusian tales about “overpopulation” and how they are employed in an era of climate change. She notes that these gendered and racialized tropes continue to place blame on poor women of color in the global South for out-of-control growth leading to environmental degradation. In her words:
Various international organizations and national governments have identified the issue of climate change as one of the major challenges faced today by the human civilization. The dominant discourse on climate change squarely blames the unbridled population growth, particularly in low and middle-income countries, for irreparable damages caused to ecosystems and environments. The identification of overpopulation as the root cause of socio-economic problems, including severe strain on natural resources leading to catastrophic changes in ecosystems, has a longer history. Repackaging the Malthusian idea of faster population growth and limited resources, and the discipline of demography, which emerged during the de-colonization period of the 1950s and 60s in leading economies of the West, not only influenced the policy making processes but also, to a large extent, shaped the commonsensical understanding of the general population. For instance, adopting the neo-Malthusian approach, the policy makers and experts in India identified overpopulation as one of the major causes of poverty, unemployment, illnesses and lack of education. It is, therefore, not surprising that population control was one of the core elements in the developmental strategies of the post-colonial government in India.

In the last three decades, with the specter of economic growth taking center stage in developmental strategies, the neo-Malthusian approach has repeatedly been invoked to blame overpopulation for climate change. It obfuscates the catastrophic impact on nature and the environment of a developmental model that is propelled by the idea of growth for growth’s sake. It’s ironical that today people in India, who are largely involved in the subsistence economy, are blamed for environmental damages, while the governments are giving mining leases to multi-national companies in ecologically sensitive zones.

What is the range of powerful and impactful interests who are invested—financially and ideologically—in perpetuating and refashioning population in an era of climate change?

Betsy Hartmann & Jade Sasser

_Betsy Hartmann_ identified four clusters of powerful and impactful interests that are shaping the population conversation in this time of climate change. First, she named the aid/philanthrocapitalist/pharmaceutical nexus. She used a definition of “philanthrocapitalism”, borrowed from Lindsay McGoey’s 2015 book *No Such Thing as a Free Gift*, as a philanthropic style that mimics the business practices of the for-profit world in non-profit contexts. Capitalism is thought to be “naturally” philanthropic. The Gates and Buffet Foundations are examples of such philanthrocapitalist entities that wield enormous influence, as do Bill Gates and Warren Buffet as individuals. As an example, Betsy noted “The Good Club” summit on May 24, 2009, covered in the *Sunday Times*. Convened by Gates, it was attended by Buffett, Ted Turner, David Rockefeller, Jr, and others, who, taking their cue from Gates, agreed that overpopulation was their umbrella cause. According to the article, a consensus emerged that “they would back a strategy in which population growth would be tackled as a potentially disastrous environmental, social and industrial threat.”

At the same time, Betsy argued, there is an increased corporatization of aid, including the partnerships made by USAID, DFID, UNFPA, and WHO with big pharma and philanthrocapitalists to develop and disseminate mass quantities of long-acting reversible contraception for purposes of international family planning, like the Sayana Press, a mechanism for self-injection of the hormonal contraceptive Depo-Provera. She noted the growing power of this nexus contrasting with a weakening of independent
oversight and the decline of critical investigative journalism. Here, Betsy referred to what journalists have called the “Bill Chill Effect” in which Gates’ funding of media outlets leads journalists to censor negative criticism. The lack of international oversight and critical journalism makes dissent harder.

Second, Betsy discussed anti-immigrant movements, using the example of the “greening of hate” in the US and the growing sophistication of messages. For instance, the Population Media Center and Foundation for Deep Ecology produced the 2015 coffee table book called *Overdevelopment, Overpopulation, Overshoot*, which blames most ecological crises on population growth, and features photos of crowds of brown people and close-ups of pregnant bellies. The Population Media Center’s Director, William Ryerson, was formerly on the board of Progressives for Immigration Reform, which is part of the anti-immigrant John Tanton network. The book’s foreword was written by the head of the Global Fund for Women.

Third, Betsy discussed the ways in which neo-Malthusian ideas are promoted through environmental studies education and textbooks in the US, Britain and India. She referred to PopDev’s study of US textbooks, which perpetuate ideas of “overpopulation” and “carrying capacity,” and PopDev’s alternative curriculum resource, *Population in Perspective*, now in its second edition.² In 2015, Sama produced a report on how Indian textbooks portray population as “overpopulation.”³

Fourth, Betsy noted that national security interests, the so-called “war on terror,” the militarization of humanitarian aid, and conservation and climate adaptation all powerfully influence the population discourse in this time of climate change. She noted that there is a need for more explicit mapping of the financial and ideological linkages between them.

Finally, she noted that the “visible and invisible elephant in the room” was the anti-abortion movement. Betsy remarked that anti-abortion activism and analyses makes these neo-Malthusian interests look progressive by comparison. She raised the important question: what do we do when they use our information and analysis? Jade Sasser made an important distinction between powerful interests and effective interests. In her remarks, she noted “some interests and groups can be extraordinarily effective while wielding a relatively small amount of economic or political power, particularly if they’re able to harness and expand the support for an ideology.” Jade discussed the ways in which donors work with scientists, NGOs and activists to promote family planning as the solution to climate change, including donors who give smaller grants, and how they have been extraordinarily successful.
Why do we think that alternative visions for the future are necessary and possible?

Anne Hendrixson & Jade Sasser

Anne Hendrixson gave two examples of why it is important for us to forward visions of the future that incorporate our hopes for social justice. She suggested that people are hungry to make positive change, but that some efforts to shape the future in the US are extremely problematic. First, Anne raised the example of the GINKs (Green Inclinations, No Kids) or those who feel like their “greenest act” is to abstain from having children. In essence, babies and children are understood only as negative “carbon footprints” and are thought to have an automatic, negative impact on the environment. This vision undermines a social justice approach to comprehensively addressing environmental problems and holding those most responsible for environmental degradation—like the US military and corporations—accountable.

Second, Anne mentioned what speakers at the 2013 Bioneers conference in San Rafael, California called the “Second Great Awakening.” They were referring to green, progressive entrepreneurs and community organizers, whom they understood to be recognizing and realizing the possibilities of a healthy, holistic future. Yet the 2013 Bioneers conference featured the neo-Malthusian population projections of the Washington, DC Worldwatch Institute, which injected an element of population apocalypse into the Bioneers vision of a green future. Neither the neo-Malthusian visions of the GINKs nor the Bioneers offer feminist alternatives that emphasize social justice and human rights. We need visions that stem from our theory and activism.

Jade Sasser suggested that visioning the future shapes what we see as possible. We need to conceptualize alternatives that offer hope and power. She discussed the idea that creating possible futures is not abstract. Demographers and climate modelers create models and projections that are used to build futures. These models are used to mobilize resources, and shape policy and discourses. Constructing alternative futures doesn’t necessarily mean employing the same tools, but it does require anticipation. Jade refers to Adams, et. al (2009) to define “anticipation” as “an emotional state; it’s a form of affect that structures how we approach events that we think might happen, but have not.” She suggests that our approaches to future events are related to our feelings about possibilities and the actions we see as possible to shape those eventualities. We influence the future in how we act on our anticipation of what will happen.

Jade asked the question, “What can we do about alternative futures in the context of populationism and population control?” She suggests that there are important activist efforts that are already providing alternative discourses and actions. For instance, the linking of social justice movements—reproductive, environmental, climate and food—with an explicitly anti-neo-Malthusian approach has been useful in providing alternatives. Another important intervention is reflected in the tactics and strategies from the Black Lives Matter movement in the US and “its insistence on disruption—disruption of political rallies, social gatherings, traffic—disrupting everyday life as usual.” Jade also noted the importance of youth
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activism that challenges neoliberal models of resource extraction, development and distribution, like in the international climate justice movement.

How do we frame a politics of solidarity and strong analysis that bridges movements?

Sarojini Nadimpally & Diana Ojeda

Sarojini tied her discussion of a politics of solidarity to the question of why alternative visions for the future are necessary. She contended that neoliberal ideology equates international development with economic growth, and, further, that this reification of economic growth places it above social and economic justice. In her words:

The insatiable hunger for economic growth is not only playing havoc with our ecosystems, but also widening the gap between the rich and the poor, leading to political conflicts everywhere. This model of development, which is based on high-energy inputs and is driven by the promotion of mindless consumption, is not sustainable in the long run. It’s therefore imperative to develop an alternative vision, which promotes sustainable developments with social and economic justice.

The current growth-driven model of development has all the potential to lead the human race into a nightmare of future dystopia unless it is challenged by a powerful global movement characterized by the politics of solidarities. The global solidarities and coming together of various movements can only be built on certain shared political principles. Principles of economic and social justice must become the bulwarks around which solidarities should be forged. This global movement armed with the invincible evidences should take up campaigns to convince national governments and international organizations to adopt an alternative model of development where the economy is geared towards fulfilling the basic needs of the majority of the population.

Diana Ojeda suggested that it is the role of social movements to push and confront neo-Malthusian discourses in an era of climate change and fight for social justice. She urged us: “Don't limit the discourse! Challenge everything!”
Session 2: Mapping the Population (Control) Landscape

In this session, speakers examined the shifting population landscape and current neo-Malthusian population narratives. How can we more comprehensively define population control to understand its many effects? How does population control manifest in this new landscape?

Population Control is Not (Just) History

Anne Hendrixson

Anne Hendrixson started with an overview of demographic trends and noted that the population landscape is shifting. In some ways, the global population panic is over. Smaller family size is the global norm and policy discourses reflect a more nuanced consideration of gender as well as demographic trends like age distribution and urbanization. However, neo-Malthusian ideology continues to influence population discourses, such as those of the demographic dividend/youth bulge theories, which suggest that young brown men (the youth bulge) are prone to violence and instability, whereas young women (the demographic dividend) have the potential to boost economic growth and strengthen nations, if they curtail their fertility. In contrast, aging populations are discussed in terms of dependency, an inability to work, and the potential for overwhelming governments.

Anne argued that the claim that top-down, target-driven population control is “history” is common in current scholarly and policy discourse about sexual and reproductive health and rights. She suggested that this claim is extremely problematic because it: 1) narrows the definition of population control and embeds it in the past; 2) gives undue importance to Cairo as the end of (population control) history; 3) ignores ongoing use of neo-Malthusian narratives that flame fears of current population growth; 4) discourages critical inquiry into population control as a present phenomenon; 5) suggests that stereotypes of the hyper-fertility of poor women of color are part of the past; 6) stymies challenges to current manifestations of population control and 7) blocks a productive revisioning of sexual and reproductive health. Contrary to the claim that population control is history, elements of this approach persist in the troubled present alongside human rights and women’s empowerment approaches, particularly in the Family Planning 2020 (FP2020) targets and promotion of long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARC). Anne called for an expanded definition of population control that would include the multiple ways in which fertility and families are controlled, including, for example, deportation, punitive welfare caps, and the carceral state. Such a definition would encourage resistance across movements.

The Embodied Violence of “Smart Economics”

Kalpana Wilson

Kalpana Wilson spoke on “The embodied violence of ‘Smart Economics.’” She critiqued the racialized and gendered discourses coming from international financial institutions, development agencies and corporations that promote fertility reduction as an economic growth strategy. She argued that these
discourses employ the language of reproductive rights and choices, but instead further erode rights and increase inequality. Population control facilitates neo-liberal policies that undermine social provision. For instance, a former UK Development Secretary characterized Implanon, a hormonal contraceptive, as “excellent value for money” in its potential for reducing the need for Tanzanian teachers and teachers’ salaries. Kalpana stressed that “practices of population policies, rather than giving women in the global South much-needed access to safe contraception they can control, involves coercive sterilizations and testing and dumping by pharmaceutical corporations of harmful long-acting hormonal contraceptives.” She spoke to the centrality of racism to such population interventions within national contexts and within global policy.

Further, Kalpana noted, “Smart Economics” are a commodification of women’s empowerment that leads to intensifying and extending women’s labor in all spheres. These promote “gendered and racialized ideas of poor women and girls in the global South as having an infinitely elastic capacity for labor, as well as for altruism.” She argues that “Smart Economics” shift “responsibility for survival onto women in low-income households (as women are thought to be the best managers of poverty); further incorporate women into global labor markets and value chains” and, instead of challenging unequal gender relations, uses them as a resource to promote women’s productivity. Further, “the underlying connection with “Smart Economics” is not one of promoting gender equality but of certain people and their bodies being seen as both disposable and dangerous in terms which are deeply racialized and gendered.” Kalpana calls for feminists to question the appropriation of “rights” language and the notion of gender equality in neo-liberal institutions.

Explaining Neo-Malthusianism? Demographic Anxieties, Anti-Feminisms, Islamophobia and Neoliberalism

Mohan Rao

Mohan Rao’s presentation was titled “Explaining Neo-Malthusianism? Demographic Anxieties, Anti-Feminisms, Islamophobia and Neoliberalism.” He noted the widespread appeal of neo-Malthusianism at a time when “politically correct, influential people” have stopped using metaphors of the population bomb and terms like yellow peril. He discussed how overlapping and reinforcing nativisms, fundamentalisms, masculinities, “pinkwashing” (Israel’s use of gay rights to mask anti-Palestinian policies) and Islamophobia bolster neo-Malthusian ideology. These blame “Muslim overpopulation” for violence and threat in multiple locations and contexts. Mohan spoke of “fear as a growth industry” in this respect. He spoke of examples like the 2011 mass murder in Norway, in which the white, male shooter, who held white supremacist, fundamentalist Christian views, aimed to draw attention to what he saw as the downfall of Norway under “multi-cultural Marxists.” Mohan highlighted the shooter’s admiration for Hindu fundamentalists in India, perceiving them as containing Muslims through violence.
Old Maps, New Terrain: Rethinking population in an era of climate change
May 27-29, 2016
Hampshire College, Amherst MA

Mohan next discussed the how racism and neo-Malthusianism are related through false eugenic science, sociobiology, and anti-immigrant rhetoric. Further, he examined how these flame neo-Malthusian fears and firm up essentialized identities in what he called “disciplines of identity”:

There is today in neo-liberal times, a reified politics of identity, feeding into neo-Malthusian anxieties. There is a paradox here: while neo-liberalism exalts and celebrates the individual, identities are increasingly drawn in communitarian terms, and carved in heartless stone. Sen notes wryly that we have today a “discipline of identity” based on the unfounded assumption that we must have a single or principle identity that we “discover.” Of course, this discovery is most often of a spurious ethnic kind, forgetting that the ethnic, or the nativist, is only one among many claims to loyalty, and indeed that there is frequently nothing authentic either about imagined ethnicity. Wedded here are essentialisms of various kinds: nativist post-modern, with fundamentalist neo-Orientalism, with right-wing neo-liberalism. Uniting all these essentialisms is also a fervent anti-feminism, seen as both tarnished by the Enlightenment project, anti-traditional and derivative. It is thus no accident that the Islamic Brotherhood in Egypt, the murderous Hindu fascists, George Bush and Anders Breivik echo each other in derivative irony. Entirely missing in these discourses is the notion of imperialism or neo-imperialism, which indeed gilds them, even as it holds them together.

Mohan went on to examine how communal identities can stoke communal violences and reinforce fears of overly fertile others, as well as promote pro-natalism as a way to supposedly strengthen racial, ethnic and religious identity groups. Here he discussed fears of differential fertility including Zionist fears of Palestinians outnumbering Jews in Israel, far-right groups fearing Muslim growth in Europe, and the Hindu Right fearing Muslim fertility in India, among others. He concludes by explaining the appeal of neo-Malthusianism and why it invokes complicity between unlikely groups:

Neo-Malthusianism offers a simple ordering of a complex, fractured and frightening world. In this ordering of the world, God is indeed in His heaven, and all would be well, had it not been for the predilection of the poor, the Them, to breed quite so incontinently. It is a profound alchemy of the mind that endows society with biological characteristics, all the better to control and recreate it. It allows us to think of the world without dangerous ideas of re-ordering a deeply unjust social order, indeed blaming victims, the “them,” who would otherwise threaten “us” with their demands for equality and justice. It is not only a beguilingly simple explanation of the world; this explanation has also the imprimatur of the state and all powerful organs of dissemination of knowledge and information, constantly reiterated and restated in any number of ways. Indeed, it might perhaps not be an exaggeration to state that more resources have been spent on creating this common sense, over more than a hundred years, than any other such idea in the world.

US Reproductive Justice Activism “Post”-Population Control

Zakiya Luna

Zakiya Luna spoke on “US Reproductive Justice Activism "Post"-Population Control.” She started by discussing the origins of the reproductive justice movement and how “reproductive justice” as a term was coined by feminists of color in 1994 to conceptualize reproductive rights within a social justice framework. She used both SisterSong’s definition of reproductive justice—“the right to not have children, right to have children, right to parent our children”—and Forward Together’s as “all people having the social, political, and economic power and resources to make healthy decisions about their gender, bodies, sexuality, and families for themselves and their communities.” Professor Luna went
on to situate her discussion in the environmental, political and social realities of Santa Barbara, where she teaches.

From here, she discussed the interwoven neo-Malthusian narratives of population and the environment, like University of California, Santa Barbara professor 1968 Garret Hardin’s *Tragedy of the Commons*, which argued that the commons are finite resources put under strain by population growth. The population control ideology and practice that grew out of the idea that “population growth is the problem” have moved into the reproductive rights discourse. She connected this to the reaction to the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill being critical to the formation of the environmental movement. With this, Professor Luna made the point that reproductive justice is situated and context specific.

She talked about the class project of Zachary King, a student in her graduate seminar on Reproductive Justice. King has been active in the environmental movement. Inspired by his experience and an article by another conference presenter, Professor Sasser, he began to explore these links. Through tracing publications of popular Green Inclinations, No Kids (GINKs) groups that argue that abstaining from having kids is a green act, he found specific links between their publications and pro-choice blogs that had reproductive justice connections. This shows how neo-Malthusian thinking has been re-packaged in ways that are not even recognizable to some pro-choice advocates who would otherwise be opposed to focusing on women’s reproduction as an environmental hazard.

In closing, Professor Luna posed several questions for us to consider:

1. What are people’s personal stakes in population control?
2. Why do current visions appeal/persist? (apocalyptic visions reveal/revel in fears that humans are basically selfish OR heroic rather than the messy middle)
3. Where are the points of commonality?
4. Where do we agree with the “opposition”?
5. What are the difficult conversations we need to have? (e.g., with family)
6. What are the practical steps to creating a new vision?

**Sex, Sustainability, Wine & Cheese**

Jade Sasser

*Jade Sasser* spoke on “Sex, Sustainability, Wine & Cheese.” She presented her research into environmental groups’ “population justice” advocacy, starting with an anecdote about an activist wine and cheese event hosted by the Sierra Club’s *Global Population Environment Program (GPEP)*. Starting in 2009, the Sierra Club ran a campaign to mobilize young activists, including trainings and activist tools. In these campaigns, Jade noted, “youth are mobilized because of their political organizing skills and desire to effect social change. However, these population-environment trainings are designed to depoliticize populationist thinking, in part by reframing it as socially just, and also by decontextualizing it historically.” Jade underscored that one of the “key tools of depoliticization is making population sexy,”
which is reflected in the names of campaigns and their advocacy tools. When pushed to the past, population can be repackaged as fun, sexy and appealing to youth. Jade’s research shows how these trainings 1) perpetuate populationist ideas about population trends, gender and the environment in the global South or, in her words, “produce a particular form of expertise”; 2) present strategies for participants to “represent women’s lives, educate others, and influence global population policies and programs,” or as Jade commented, to “produce targeted intervention strategies” and 3) “produce new development actors.”

How do we address population control today? Participant Discussion

All participants discussed the questions: 1) how can we more comprehensively define population control to understand its many effects? and 2) how does population control manifest in this new landscape? Participants were also invited to consider Zakiya Luna’s questions, above.

In response, participants debated the utility of a new term to better expand the understanding of “population control” to 1) include immigration restrictions, dispossession, the carceral state, and biomedical markets as well as coercive and targeted family planning programs, and 2) to foster cross-movement challenges to population control. Some participants suggested taking a wider lens, to look at systems that perpetuate population control—capitalism, neoliberalism, and white supremacy, for instance—to better understand how populations are methodically contained and controlled through multiple mechanisms. With a view to structuring such an expanded understanding, Lindsay Schubiner asked: what are the goals of population control? What are the tools used? What is mobilized to encompass the old narratives and the new narratives?

Participants underscored that the neoliberal emphasis on individual control of fertility obscures the role of systems and structures that delimit bodily integrity and target groups within the overall population. Loretta Ross reminded us, paraphrasing Dazon Dixon Diallo, founder and Executive Director of Sister Love, that the “population problem isn’t a population problem—some people have problems with certain parts of the population.”

Rajani Bhatia suggested exploring the potential of the term “bio-populationism” to theorize the multiple areas in which population control is enacted and the mechanisms employed therein. Others discussed the utility of “populationism.” Wendy Harcourt noted that recently a group of sociologists came up with the “biomedicalization” term. The term expanded formerly enclosed frames. She suggested that if we do the same, it might help us to show that population control has many different kinds of manifestations in this moment with roots in the past.

Participants highlighted the importance of upholding population control history in recognition of past abuses to understand its legacies, and to better track ongoing abuses. Some participants felt that incorporating a new term into the discussion could eclipse the history and power of the term “population control.” Other participants raised the issue that current population control abuses are
often masked in the language of “choice,” as an environmental and economic “win,” and even as reproductive justice, while regulating women’s bodies. Conversely, anti-abortion and -contraception activists are vocal in naming restrictions to reproduction as population control, and have become associated with the term. These trends make it difficult to challenge current population control abuses from a feminist, reproductive justice position. This means that any new term would need to strongly support reproductive justice and carefully promote self-determination and bodily autonomy as key. In addition, any term to critically address population control would need to complicate the ways in which population control reinforces damaging racial, gender and religious stereotypes, including Islamophobia.
Session 3: The Political Economy of Today’s Population Control Industry

Population control is enacted in and through multiple means, including family planning, racialized violence, prisons, welfare, closed and restricted borders, land grabs, and even war. This session focused on the current iteration of population control in relation to reproduction, health, and family planning. A new population industry has emerged which includes many familiar players and some newer ones, like the Gates and Clinton Foundations, which combine the power of their money with sophisticated public relations strategies. In this session we asked, what is the political economy landscape of big pharma/contraception, the aid industry, health policy, new reproductive technologies, the anti-abortion movement and philanthrocapitalism? What does it mean for the raced, classed and gendered embodiment of population control in particular locations?

A Lens on Women’s Health in South Africa

Marion Stevens

Marion Stevens provided “A Lens on Women’s Health in South Africa” in the context of overall South African health systems and policy. She spoke about the American capture of South African women’s health and how the American flag has descended over the South African government’s health policy because of influential funding from both public and private US donors in PEPFAR and USAID (the largest health funder in SA), as well as the corporate presence of Johnson & Johnson and the Gates Foundation in the country. Despite this influence, post-apartheid South Africa has developed a progressive population policy and legal framework that includes a broad understanding of sexual and reproductive health and gender.15

Marion highlighted the persisting inequalities and an economic, capitalist politic in which there is limited implementation of the policy. In February 2014, South Africa launched human rights based contraception and fertility planning guidelines, and at the same time launched mass dissemination of Implanon, the hormonal implant. One million women were implanted, and young black women were targeted for implantation. However, women are unable to get the implant removed, despite complications and adverse effects. In the context of health systems challenges, women receive poor quality of care and, sometimes, there is inadequate informed consent.

Marion noted that another inconsistency with the human rights based guidelines is the support for the ECHO Trial (Evidence for Contraceptive Options and HIV Outcomes Study), a randomized human trial that is recruiting in South Africa. ECHO is trying to determine if Depo-Provera causes an increased biological risk of HIV, as is suggested in a number of epidemiological studies. There has been resistance to human trials, given the possibility of increased HIV acquisition. However, the trial’s organizers have established a community board to contain dissent. Another example is abortion. Despite being on-demand at 12 weeks, abortion is mainly accessible only for middle class women. Ten percent of
maternal deaths annually are from unsafe abortion and these are generally poor black women, only 40% of surgical services are functional, and half of abortions are performed by an informal or illegal provider.

**Norplant in Bangladesh**

Shahina Parvin

*Shahina Parvin* presented her research on Norplant dissemination in Bangladesh. Between December 2000 and February 2002, Shahina conducted interviews with five health professionals who implanted Norplant, and with 32 women who used Norplant in three villages in the Joypurhat district in the northern part of Bangladesh. The hormonal implant Norplant has long been employed as a method of population control in Bangladesh. The Population Council initiated the research to develop Norplant in 1967, which was then produced in Finland by Leiraus Pharmaceutical in 1983. Between 1970 and 1975, many clinical trials were carried out to measure the most effective combination of capsules and hormone. Shahina noted that poor Bangladeshi women’s bodies have also been sites of experimentation. In 1985, 600 Bangladeshi women were implanted with Norplant as part of a trial designed to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the contraceptive.

In her research, Shahina found that the health professionals exercised their power by constructing knowledge about impoverished Bangladeshi women’s lives. They served the Bangladeshi state’s population control program, which is linked with the international population control program and pharmaceutical companies’ interests. At the same time, many users experienced debilitating adverse effects and were unable to get their implant removed. For instance, Shahina quoted a doctor who told her:

> It is not true that we do not remove Norplant. We remove Norplant when they face severe troubles. Poor women often come to remove it without a reason. We do not remove it for a silly reason because this is an expensive contraception and the government pays for it. We do not want to waste the money.

In contrast, Shahina quoted the perspective of a woman who could not get her implant removed. The interviewee stated, “I was dying. I did not get treatments when I had severe pain in my hand. I went to the hospital to remove it, but the doctors said that they do not have time for those of women, who are waiting to implant Norplant; therefore, how they will have time to remove.”

Shahina noted that now the Bangladeshi government is distributing a second generation of Norplant (also called Jadelle) which was approved in 1996 and has the same formulation and adverse effects as Norplant I. The main difference between the two is that Jadelle has fewer rods (two, rather than six)—which is thought to make it easier to implant—and suppresses ovulation for five years (rather than three). The Bangladeshi government is promoting Jadelle, citing fertility reduction as a strategy to pursue economic development and alleviate poverty. The poor are blamed for their own poverty, rather than the structural, international power dynamics under capitalism that perpetuate poverty.
Implications of Neoliberalism on Global Health

This speaker (who chooses to be anonymous) discussed the implications of neoliberalism on the global health regime—what she called the “fortifying of global health security.” White men and Western-funded solutions are at the center of this regime, which proliferates “white savior” narratives in the African health context. They facilitate a monopoly of giving, in which funds are siphoned from communities and used to bolster the “infrastructures that aid built.” In the case of the 2014 Ebola epidemic, when multilateral agencies, like the World Health Organization, were slow in their response, there was an influx of funds from philanthrocapitalists like Paul Allen of Microsoft and Mark Zuckerberg of Facebook, spurring the #tackleebola narratives. The speaker noted that these narratives lack a nuanced understanding of the complex causes of poverty in the Ebola-impacted countries, and tend to blame faulty or missing infrastructures while suggesting that Africans cannot be “architects of their own solutions.” This single issue, single response approach chips away at intersectional responses that appropriately include women and community input.

The speaker contrasted the global health regime with community platforms for determining health priorities. Using the Ebola epidemic as an example, she talked about Africa Responds, a collaborative platform through which African organizations and allies pooled their resources, networks, and collective voices to respond to the Ebola outbreak. The platform worked in support of locally rooted organizations that were at the frontline of the Ebola response and continue to support the bulk of the recovery efforts. Africa Responds and other community driven projects galvanized under the #unitedagainstebola campaign. In contrast to the #tackleebola narrative, #unitedagainstebola centered community and highlighted the role of Africans on the continent and in the diaspora in challenging dominant global health narratives, for example, by illustrating the impact of remittances from the African diaspora as an important source of funds in support of a community response. The speaker also referenced NEAR (Network for Empowered Aid Response), which is pushing back against the unequal power dynamics of the international aid industry and calling for a system that is “locally driven and owned, and is built around equitable, dignified and accountable partnerships.”

Politics of Life, Reproduction and the Zika Virus

Claudia Rivera Amarillo

Claudia Rivera Amarillo considered the politics of life and reproduction in relation to the Zika epidemic response in Colombia. The number of people with the Zika virus is high, particularly in Brazil and Colombia, even with underreporting. At the same time, climate change conditions, like El Nino, favor the progression of the mosquitoes that spread the virus. Claudia commented that in these conditions and because of the birth defects associated with Zika, “the entire epidemiologic surveillance system in Colombia is focusing on women.” The focus on women’s fertility and the Zika virus has done little to increase contraception and abortion access, particularly for young women in rural areas. As Claudia notes, “This highlights the tensions between control and ownership of women’s bodies in which debates about Zika disease, neurological complications and abortion in the country fall.”
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Control manifests in the monitoring of pregnancies—the Colombian Ministry of Health labeled all pregnancies in Colombia as “high risk” because of Zika, resulting in greater health agency monitoring of pregnant women. In addition, there have been restrictions on pregnant women’s mobility. Women in the cold Andes regions of Colombia have been told to stop travel to warmer climate zones. These restrictions correspond with racialized tropes about “white” urban areas in the Andes and “mestizos” and “blacks” in the warmer zones, who have historically been seen as barbarians. Claudia notes: “These imaginaries are enriched with the relationship between population pressure, environmental degradation and scapegoating of low-income people for such degradation. In the case of the Zika disease, it is possible to imagine that the increase and movement of nonhuman agents such as Aedes will become a part of these imaginaries.” The Aedes mosquito is seen as “climbing the mountain” along with the warmer weather, encroaching on the cooler climates. Claudia warns, “how this change will be integrated into the imaginaries that link climate change, mosquitoes, Zika disease and coercive policies on fertility among the poorest people in Colombia, is something that still remains to be seen.”

The birth defects associated with Zika contribute to challenges to legal abortion restrictions and the anti-abortion discourses in Colombia. There are three instances in which abortion is legal in Colombia: if the pregnant woman’s life is in danger, if the fetus is deformed, or if the pregnancy is a result of rape. In addition many institutions have established a 12-week cut-off for abortions if the fetus is deformed; however the Zika virus cannot be detected until week 12. At the same time, anti-abortion groups are secularizing their messages and relating women having abortions to other “biologized and politicized” threats to Colombian society. This language of threat is used in military metaphors about how to appropriately respond to the Zika virus. Claudia closed with the suggestion that “these metaphors of terror give special meaning to the WHO’s global category of emergency, but presented from the semantic field of local war: the mosquito is ubiquitous, unpredictable and adaptable, as the groups that have spread terror.” Instead, Claudia argued, we resist these militarized health efforts, “because resistance is also contagious.”

Population Control, Clinical Trials, and Systemic Violence in India

Sarojini Nadimpally

Sarojini Nadimpally gave an overview of key issues of population control, contraceptives and sex-selective abortion in India. She talked about current coercive population control measures in India that have not changed substantially in over seven decades. An emphasis on female sterilization is a part of this population control policy and has resulted in continued, targeted, sterilization abuses. For instance, in Bilaspur in 2014, 13 women died following sterilization. A fact-finding report by Sama: Resource Group for Woman and Health and colleagues found that “the tragic deaths of the 13 women, all in their 20s or 30s and the critical condition of the 70 other women, following procedures of laparoscopic sterilisation in Bilaspur district, Chhattisgarh, raise grave questions once again about the callous treatment of women, the poor and marginalised as well as the clear violations of ethical and quality
norms in the health care system. This unacceptable incident calls urgent attention to the unsafe, unhygienic conditions and the slipshod manner in which the sterilisations were conducted resulting in deaths and morbidities among the women.”

Further, Sarojini outlined important ethical and medical rights issues related to other sexual and reproductive health concerns in the context of population control efforts. First, she analyzed issues of abortion access. Abortion in India, which was seen a tool of population control in the 1970s, is now a tool of so-called “population stabilization.” Limiting family size to two children is seen as legitimate grounds for abortion. In a commentary published after the meeting, Sarojini articulated many of the same points she raised in her talk:

The debate on abortion often tends to pit women’s rights to reproductive autonomy and their bodily integrity against a foetus’ debatable right to life. The issue of when a foetus is considered to gain such “right to life” is also fraught with contentions. However, it is essential to engage with women’s bodily integrity by contextualising the issue by raising deeply unsettling questions about: disability, congenital deformities and caring for disabled children without adequate social security and infrastructural support. In polarised debates between people who identify as pro-life or anti-abortionists and pro-choice proponents, it is easy to pit one against the other, but it is far more complicated to bring them together. We need to guard against a eugenic push to beget “perfect” and “normal” children as well as resist the patriarchal pressure for sex-selective abortions in order to have an ethical approach to the debate on women’s reproductive rights.

In addition, Sarojini discussed issues with medical research in India in the context of population control and public health system inadequacies. There is no universal standard of ethics for human trials and research. In this vacuum, biomedical experimentation has moved into the global South and there is a globalization of clinical trials under the rules of trade of the World Trade Organization. NGOs participate in clinical trials in private/public partnerships with for-profit pharmaceutical companies and the government. For example, Sarojini cited the Human Papilloma Virus vaccine “demonstration projects” run by the US medical non-profit PATH (Program for Appropriate Technology in Health), the Gates Foundation, and the Indian Council for Medical Research and the state governments of Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat. The project was implemented on girls from poor, scheduled tribes, scheduled caste, and Muslim communities, most often without informed consent and with other breaches of ethical guidelines. Four girls died following administration of the vaccine.

Sarojini concluded that current population control efforts and the increased impact of the biomedicalization industry lead to incidents of violations and violence. Technocratic solutions by the state obfuscate the state’s responsibility, exacerbating inequality. This systemic violence is the consequence of our political and economic system. We need to identify this to formulate a response to the skewed priorities of the state and to promote access to affordable healthcare.
Where is the feminist response? Participant Discussion

In the question and discussion period, Rosalinda Ofreneo asked an important question: why is there such a strong comeback of implants without resistance from feminist groups? She suggested that there is a huge gap in knowledge about the push for mass dissemination. Shahina Parvin suggested that feminists have moved to other issues, but it is imperative that we continue criticism. Khushi Kabeer cited the NGO-ization of many movements as influencing feminist movements’ priorities. Groups’ funding is impacting their work, and Gates and other major donors are actually promoting these kinds of interventions, as they “are funding the organizations who then feel constrained, and unable to criticize these interventions even though they concern themselves with violence against women in other forms.” In response, Awino Okech suggested that we should remember to also “foreground the work and research feminist organizations do to build motivation for change.”
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Session 4: Charting the Landscape of Climate Change and Militarized Development

Neo-Malthusianism influences the framing of climate change in a number of inter-related ways. That family planning will both mitigate climate change and help women adapt to it is now a common claim of the population-environment lobby. Neo-Malthusian models of population and resource scarcity also undergird security narratives about the threats posed by so-called climate conflict and climate refugees. These narratives contribute to the militarization of climate change through promoting greater military control of disaster relief, development aid, conservation and climate adaptation, and border enforcement. They also serve to legitimize further US intervention in Africa. Meanwhile, certain notions of the Anthropocene and impending climate apocalypse mask the role of political economy in the climate crisis and incite Malthusian fears, even on the left. How do we foreground political economy and challenge these problematic politics? How do we forge stronger progressive links between reproductive justice, climate justice, and anti-war movements in our own countries and internationally?

Struggles Against Malthusian Climate

Larry Lohmann

Larry Lohmann spoke on “Struggles Against Malthusian Climate.” Larry opened by connecting land, labor and climate resistance struggles as challenging the “foundational processes of capital.” He argued that labor and resources are created, making capital accumulation possible, by taking people off the land in an ongoing process of enclosure of commons. Labor is then disciplined and made more productive with the assistance of thermodynamic (or “big-E”) Energy. He argued that this process is consistently “failing, incomplete and vulnerable” in part because of resistance movements fighting for fair wages and reasonable working conditions and against the “resource-ification” of the commons. Challenging the dominance of both big-E Energy and fossil fuels is connected to these struggles, although this is not always recognized.

What is capital’s response to these interconnected challenges to accumulation? One response, Larry asserted, is “to fight and hide these refusals, to ‘naturalize’ the foundational divisions underlying capital, and to say that these refusals are either irrational or do not exist.” He emphasized that this response follows the lead of Malthus, indeed, that “capital’s most fundamental resource against global warming struggles” is neo-Malthusianism. Neo-Malthusianism posits “population” eternally straining against the limits of “nature” (read, post-enclosure, as “resources”). Capital reiterates this binary opposition in its climate politics just as it has elsewhere for the last 200 years. It claims that the way to address global warming is for a non-natural “society” to “adapt” to changes in a nonsocial “nature” (climate), and at the same time that changes in that external “nature” must be managed or “mitigated.” So, today we have carbon markets, highly technical big-E Energy “alternatives” and, increasingly, geo-engineering. All of these capitalist “solutions” engender the same racism, classism and anti-woman violence that are
familiar from earlier Malthusianisms. In closing, Larry called for a global warming struggle that resists the “Malthusian structuring of climate” and links itself with labor and commons struggles.

Challenging the Youth Bulge Theory

Awino Okech

Awino Okech spoke about the so-called “youth bulge.” She critiqued the “youth bulge” theory as the securitization of politics, under which young people are understood as violent elements within violent environments, particularly in African contexts. Awino noted the rise of “youth” as a politicized category and the consequences of this categorization, such as the legitimization of violence and surveillance of young people post 9/11. This is coupled with an increase in statistics showing an upsurge of youth violence. Education is seen as a solution to mitigate violence. However, employment is linked with patronage and for those excluded from systems of patronage, education is not an option.

Awino addressed the multiple, gendered effects of “youth bulge” thinking. These include women’s rights reversals by regressive movements framed around the concept of containment. Governments are able to capture women’s rights as a way to show how progressive they are, demonstrating a “feminism by the state.” Women’s freedom of movement is often restricted, which impedes their abilities to move freely and to build networks and social capital. “There is a flashback to traditional roles,” Awino commented.

Notions of “youth,” which include people aged 21-45, are gendered as male. As such, too often women are eliminated from the discussion, which can restrict women’s involvement in resistance movements. There are underlying structural questions that youth are pushing against. Youth are mobilizing to upset the status quo, not to take power. Why then, when questions of class and race are contextualized and challenged, is gender naturalized?

Green Militarization in Conservation

Libby Lunstrum

Libby Lunstrum spoke on green militarization, which she defines as “a global trend in the use of military and paramilitary (military-like) actors, techniques, technologies, and partnerships in the pursuit of conservation.” Libby argued that this provides insight not only into current practices of conservation, but also into the militarization of climate change. This is important, she contends, because conservation and climate change are two of the biggest socio-environmental problems we face. Libby asked, what authorizes militarization in these contexts? How is threat/how are the threatened produced? And who are the actors?

In conservation, green militarization is employed through a multiplicity of practices. Libby used the example of the response to commercial rhino poaching in Kruger National Park in South Africa. These
include the paramilitarization of park rangers, deployment of troops on parkland, the use of military technology, intelligence gathering, relocation of so-called “insurgents,” shoot-on-sight policies, and conducting a “war on poaching.” This securitized approach to conservation has serious and fatal impacts on local communities. Libby noted that it “kills poor people, those who are exploited by ruthless criminal syndicates and leads to an arms race which puts rangers, rhinos, and poachers in harm’s way.” She asserted that “ultimately, this alienation of communities is bad for conservation” because it pits the community against the conversation efforts.

Libby analyzed the discursive moves that make green militarization possible in conservation, using the Kruger National Park example. Instead of simply arguing that green militarization is necessary because “people kill rhinos,” Libby noted a more complex construction of rhinos as a symbol of South Africa’s national heritage. In this story, “armed foreign poachers transgress the international border to violate national sovereignty and decimate South Africa’s natural heritage.” Libby argued that this framing justifies a war against poaching. Additionally, Libby discussed the web of people and institutions that supports and enables green militarization, including military actors, defense corporations, a segment of the public (in the South African context) and NGOs and donors. This multiplicity of actors makes it harder to contest.

Noting the links between biological diversity, conversation, population and green militarization, Libby urged for broadening of the scope of “population control” to incorporate not only lives that are seen as "avertable," but also those rendered "killable." This would require engaging with the blurry line between biopolitics and necropolitics.

Militarization of Climate Change

Betsy Hartmann

Betsy Hartmann analyzed the “Militarization of Climate Change,” focusing on the strategic demography of so-called climate conflict and climate refugees. Betsy defined strategic demography as the “deployment of population numbers and narratives to construct security threats,” which she notes has accelerated post-9/11 in the United States’ so-called War on Terror. Notions of climate conflict and climate refugees build on neo-Malthusian degradation narratives, which suggest that in rural areas of the global South, population pressure coupled with poverty is the main cause of land degradation. Betsy noted that:

Over the course of the 1970s and 1980s degradation narratives expanded to include a negative view of migration. After poor people deplete their immediate environments, the storyline goes, many migrate to other marginal lands, setting in motion the same vicious downward spiral. From the 1990s onwards they included the poor who flock to already-overcrowded cities where their young, unemployed sons become a “youth bulge” that gravitates to political extremism.
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Betsy asserted that the same logic is now being applied to climate change through constructing the threat of climate refugees and climate conflict. The narrative mobilizes assumptions that “poor dark people, especially in Africa, are essentially barbarians who automatically will engage in bloody battles over scarce resources like water and then migrate toward our borders.” Betsy critiqued US military and intelligence reports that promote the ideas of climate conflict, noting that a 2004 Pentagon-commissioned report on catastrophic climate change relies on the concept of “carrying capacity” to makes its alarmist claims.

As examples, Betsy cited the war in Darfur as one of the first conflicts to be named a climate conflict, despite evidence to the contrary that the authoritarian regime in Khartoum was the main instigator of the conflict. She asserted that “Syria is now the climate war du jour”. This means that the current refugee crisis in Europe is considered to be propelled by climate change. Betsy said:

Linking the current refugee crisis with climate change creates the impression that such a mass migration is a new normal which will continue in one form or another even after the Syrian war ends. Rather than seeing the current crisis as politically rooted and limited in time, it gives the impression that we are entering a world of “permanent emergency” in which nations need to retreat from their commitments to harbor refugees and instead beef up their borders and surveillance—which is precisely what is happening. It also strengthens the military’s hand by providing yet another rationale—the threat of climate conflicts—for devoting ever more resources to national security.

In national security circles, climate change is seen as a “threat multiplier.” Betsy suggested that this is a particularly useful rationale for further US military involvement in Africa, but also in Asia. The US military seeks greater control over disaster relief and development aid more broadly. Betsy noted that environmentalists endorse climate militarization for several reasons, in part because the “worst-case apocalyptic scenario appeals, including fear of the dark, overpopulated hordes, harkening back to Malthus.” She also noted the strategic calculation in backing this strategy in light of climate change denialism in the US. Environmentalists consider playing the national security card as one of the few ways to motivate conservatives in Congress to get on board with climate legislation. In conclusion, Betsy argued for the need to challenge the militarization of climate change and the ways in which it is colonizing environmental imaginations and distorting views of the future.
Session 5: Mapping the Political Landscape of Dispossession

In this session speakers discussed various processes and dynamics of dispossession in the face of climate crisis, and their articulations with violence and inequality in different geographical sites. They addressed the classed, gendered and racialized effects of climate change mitigation and adaptation projects on local resource access and control. In taking seriously the practices and narratives of climate change and their effects across distance and difference, speakers pushed forward a more nuanced and politically enabling analysis of environmental crises.

Climate Adaptation as Development as Usual in Bangladesh

Khushi Kabeer

*Khushi Kabir* discussed the appropriation of land and water in Bangladesh. Registering land use for commercial production and commodifying water have intensified as a response to climate change adaptation programs. Because Bangladesh is already experiencing the effects of climate change, the government is focused on adaptation as a recipient of climate change adaptation funds as opposed to negotiating on mitigation measures that also need to be taken up with those polluting nations who are shirking their responsibilities by merely providing adaptation funds to countries like Bangladesh. Khushi offered a critique of World Bank mitigation programs that mirror large-scale development from the 1990s for flood mitigation that have proved failures over time. They interrupted silting processes and natural irrigation, and ended up creating waterlogging and other severe environmental disruptions.

Likewise, climate change adaptation projects have meant not only development as usual, but an intensification of harmful practices. For instance, after signing the Paris Agreement, new projects are in the process of being built on the Bangladeshi coast, in the flood plains, and in fragile ecosystems such as ecologically crucial mangrove forests in the coastal belt of Bangladesh. In addition, land has been appropriated for shrimp farming as an industry only for export—again in the coastal belt—which has caused displacement of people. Finally, there is the most contentious project to be undertaken: a coal-based power plant on the edge of the Sundarbans, which studies have shown will destroy not just the largest mangrove forest, a UNESCO heritage site, but also add to the general deterioration of ecosystems, leading to increased climate vulnerability. Special economic zones have been established in which most farmers/producers are forced to move into cash crops in place of crops for local consumption, and end up merely being an agent of large-scale commercial global interests. Khushi contends that this is population control through displacement. People are relegated to the category of paid workers, creating the “other,” and extending the majority’s ideological control.
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Topographies of Abandonment: Adaptation, risk and dispossession in post-disaster Colombia

Alejandro Camargo

Alejandro Camargo critically analyzed how adaptation projects are actualized, experienced, and transfigured in the everyday life of rural people in northern Colombia. He argued that adaptation—as a global concept promising resilience and safety—mutates into local experiences and spaces of dispossession, abandonment, and exclusion. He outlined how rural men and women have challenged global notions of adaptation from their domestic agrarian spaces.

In 2010, Colombia experienced one of the most dramatic disasters in its history. Record-breaking rains associated with the global intensification of the La Niña phenomenon caused catastrophic flooding across rural areas. Thousands of peasants lost their crops, livestock and households and were forcefully displaced from their villages.

The Colombian government explained that this calamity was a manifestation of global climate change, and consequently it created a national plan of climate adaptation to restore the public infrastructure and housing in areas affected by the disaster. As a part of this program, local authorities defined risk areas in order to determine the geographical boundaries of adaptation programs. Yet these risk areas did not simply delimit a space officially considered to be unsafe. They also identified the people who inhabit those areas as subjects at risk. Because of this denomination, these people were asked to adapt through resettlement programs that would guarantee a safe life. For state institutions, the definition of risk areas was therefore a precondition to helping the people affected by the disaster.

However, Alejandro argued, for hundreds of families who ended up located in those zones, the enforcement of these geographies of risk and adaptation was a form of subtle dispossession of their homes, domestic spaces, and agrarian livelihoods. The backyards of their homes are spaces of life where women raise crops, medicinal plants, and domestic animals. These species and the labor of women provide vital elements for the social reproduction and resilience of their household.

For this reason, Alejandro noted, many families refused to give up their homes and to relocate to "safe" areas, where new houses were physically unsuitable for the reproduction of their agrarian domestic spaces. Government officials emphasized that by making that choice, these families would forfeit their rights to be beneficiaries of state-sponsored welfare and adaptation programs. In other words, these families would be condemned to live in a space of state abandonment. Yet people stood firm in their decision and refused to be “adapted to climate change.”
Dispossessions Through “Clean Development” and Militarization

Diana Ojeda

Diana Ojeda argued that the people’s dispossession from land in Colombia is the result of multiple forces: climate change mitigation strategies, entrepreneurial endeavors, and paramilitary operations. With climate change mitigation, “clean development” is pursued through the creation of carbon markets and claiming forests for foreign investment through carbon deposits. Diana contended that such mitigation projects rely on the means of dispossession for capital intervention. At the same time, the paramilitary enact “massive and spectacular violence over small parts of lands.” Paramilitary violence captures lands and lives. Following forcible dispossession by the military, the land is then taken by entrepreneurs for projects like expanding teak forests.

Diana suggested that there is a “dispossession following the dispossession.” There is “subtle” dispossession in the form of small-scale transitional justice, related to literal hectares repossessed and relocation that does not account for all of the impacts of dispossession: loss of water sources, mobilization of ongoing fear, and the protection of the teak. Diana contended that dispossession contributes to the securitization of the state. Dispossession also adds to discourses and policies labeling certain populations as “avertible,” as well as the “disposable,” like peasants. It erases the role of labor in dispossession.

Climate Politics and Lived Impacts in Mexico

Martha Pskowski

Martha Pskowski spoke on “Climate Politics and Lived Impacts in Mexico,” starting with a discussion of Mexico’s federal and several state governments. They have taken leading roles in climate change initiatives on the international stage. However, progress in Mexico on carbon-emissions reductions is meager. This is due in part to a lack of international funding for climate change mitigation and adaptation activities, but also can be attributed to Mexico’s push to increase energy production nationally, which drives up emissions overall. Fracking, hydroelectric dams, and wind power are all on the rise in Mexico. A new wave of mining concessions has also been granted under the current president. While Mexico boasts about its "green" energy development, many of these projects are being rolled out with business models identical to those of dirty energy industries.

The case of wind power in the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, Oaxaca is an iconic example. Indigenous groups have documented how a Spanish energy firm illegally claimed their territory to put up a massive wind farm. The energy generated there is fed into the national grid, and is not available for local energy needs. If clean energy is to take off in Mexico, it will have to reconcile with the dirty business practices of numerous companies involved and restructure to distribute benefits to local communities. Mexico has also been active in mitigation schemes such as REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation). While funding has been limited, the strong history of community forestry in Mexico
has pushed this program to meet the needs of forest-dwelling communities and holistically address the causes of deforestations.

**Dispossession Through Sustainable Development**

*Kiran Asher*

*Kiran Asher* discussed the need for a critical challenge to the tenets of “sustainable development” as a driver of dispossession. She argued that “if social justice and sustainability are imperatives in the 21st century, a feminist critique and politics is necessary to respond critically to the technical, apolitical, and de facto capitalist solutions that underlie the institutionalized and policy versions of sustainable development.”

To build this critique, Kiran started with an overview of post-World War II international development as the precursor to today’s sustainable development theory. Further, she reviewed the UN conferences, agencies, and conservation and environmental ethics that contribute to the problematic thinking that economic development and environmental conservation can synergistically achieve sustainable development.

Kiran looked at the ways in which international development has positioned “rural peasants and Third World women” in relation to the environment and sustainable development. These ideas have shifted over time, following international development trends. From the 1950s to the 1970s, tropes of so-called backward peasants and welfare recipients predominated. In the 1970s and 1980s, peasants and women were alternately seen as resource degraders and/or victims of underdevelopment. At the same time, they could be resource stewards with access to traditional knowledges. From the 1990s to today, peasants and women are painted as, in Kiran’s words, “sustainable users and managers...consumers and entrepreneurs.” They are seen as resisting economic globalization, promoting alternatives and participating in sustainable development.

Kiran concluded with a look at how “sustainable development” plays out in the Pacific lowlands of Colombia and shapes official discourses and social movements. She looked at how ideas of “sustainable development” influence the international development realm. Here she referenced the Center for International Forest Research (CIFOR), and two projects including sloping lands in Asia and REDD/REDD+. Finally, she examined how the scientific and policy community resist and reject critical insights from social science, and de facto and de jure facilitate dispossession through development.
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Session 6: Anticipatory Visions for the Future

In this session speakers discussed various processes and dynamics of dispossession in the face of climate crisis, and their articulations with violence and inequality in different geographical sites. They addressed the classed, gendered and racialized effects of climate change mitigation and adaptation projects on local resource access and control. In taking seriously the practices and narratives of climate change and their effects across distance and difference, speakers pushed forward a more nuanced and politically enabling analysis of environmental crises.

Imagining Feminist Futures

Wendy Harcourt

Wendy Harcourt opened the session with the assertion that feminism in academia is political, and that academe is central to imagining feminist futures. She outlined strategies for engaging in embodied thinking that opens opportunities for visioning such feminist futures. First, she recommended engaging in ontological politics and embodying what one is doing. In this, Wendy noted that as thinkers we should recognize that we need to be uncomfortable, that we should recognize and follow the chaotic. Second, Wendy highlighted the importance of decoloniality in helping us to recognize those histories and let go of our certainties. Third, Wendy argued for tools for surviving crisis narratives, which includes a fluid and discontinued place-based connection, that allow for place-based, globalized thinking. Fourth, Wendy explored connections between nature/culture. Fifth, she argued for a strategy that asks, “Will we be able to love the world we wish to create?” Will we be able to live with anxieties, unhealth?

Wendy argued for embracing hybridity and complexity in encouraging collective possibilities. She referred to the concept of intercultural and intergenerational “meshworks”—as opposed to networks—to stimulate and uphold collectivities. Wendy drew the idea of meshworks from her co-authored lead article, written with Arturo Escobar in their 2005 anthology Women and the Politics of Place.28 As part of creating meshworks, Wendy advised that we look not for enclosure, but for ourselves.

Other Worlds are Possible

Rosalinda Pineda Ofreneo

Rosalinda Pineda Ofreneo spoke on the theme of “Other Worlds are Possible” with an emphasis on plural worlds, as opposed to the singular “Another World is Possible” in the slogan of the World Social Forum. Other worlds are made possible by cross-movement organizing towards a social justice agenda, including a strong commitment to gender justice. Rosalinda argued that this is true despite the serious challenges we face. Rosalinda spoke about the context in the Philippines amidst climate change. The Philippines is the third most disaster-prone nation with a high rate of typhoons (20 per year). At the same time there is mal-development, including growth in unemployment, and high maternal mortality rates even as birth rates are going down.
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However, Rosalinda suggests that “Other worlds are possible, a life of dignity for all.” This is possible through social protections and a focus on social justice for the working poor. We must focus on reducing violence against women, and rethink reproductive health to enable a less technocratic approach, like home births. She notes that three out of four women prefer home birth. In addition, Rosalinda applauded moves towards food justice.

Promoting Climate Justice

Jacqueline Patterson

Jacqui Patterson placed the imperatives of climate justice in historical and geographical contexts. She highlighted the factors that have driven the current course of unsustainable development, including profits over people, rampant extraction, exploitation of humans and natural resources, excessive consumption, and “isms and phobias,” including fears and biases based in racialization, ethnicity, class, gender, and xenophobia. She spoke about how this path of overconsumption propels environmental injustices, particularly between the global North and South, as waste from the global North is dumped in the global South. The North is responsible for the carbon emissions driving climate change, whereas low-lying communities in the global South are feeling the effects. Similar environmental injustices are perpetuated within the global North as well; waste dumps and toxic energy producing plants are often located near poor communities of color in the US.

As examples of this, Jacqui discussed the oil and coal industries, and how the fossil fuel-based industry disproportionately affects black and brown people. She showed photos of an oil plant next to the Cesar Chavez High School’s athletic field in Houston, Texas and discussed the under-regulation of British Petroleum’s (BP) oil spill in the Gulf. Further, Jacqui talked about landfills in communities that suffer adverse health effects, lower property values and under-resourced school systems.

In conclusion, Jacqui talked about the “disaster discourse” of climate change that interlinks with problematic structures of criminalization and gendered violence. She pointed to human rights discourses and the Black Lives Matter movement to provide alternatives.

Population Control is White Supremacy

Tanya Fields

Tanya Fields addressed issues of population control as white supremacy. She put forth radical mothering and reproductive justice as pathways to systematically challenging population control and the targeting of Black women’s fertility. She started with the assertion that the notion of “overpopulation” is a myth that has nonetheless adversely affected Black women worldwide. Reproductive rights and the focus on birth control and abortion is limited—the reproductive justice framework encompasses more and is a better framework to support Black and immigrant women who have not had the same choices as white
women. Black and immigrant women have the highest risk of child removal and face disproportionate challenges to raising children. Here Tanya quoted a verse of poet Warsan Shire’s “Home”:

You have to understand,  
that no one puts their child in a boat 
unless the water is safer than the land

Tanya brought this into a historical context by talking about the goals of early birth controllers, like Margaret Sanger, who followed the racialized and biased eugenics science of the day and targeted birth control at the “unfit.” She noted that science reflects the politics of a society. Tanya left us with this statement: “Mothering for Black women is reproductive justice.”
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**Challenging Neo-Malthusianism and Forging Justice: Meeting Conclusion**

*Old Maps, New Terrain* revealed how interwoven neo-Malthusian ideologies drive population control today. Our discussions laid the foundation for productively expanding on understandings of “population control” to better encompass the range of systematic efforts to limit fertility, curtail family formations, and disrupt and target communities of poor, people of color, migrants, landless peoples, and people who are incarcerated in the global North and South, while simultaneously encouraging fertility among other communities, primarily the white, elite and wealthy. Such an expanded understanding could include:

- Current international and national family planning strategies’ use of targets and acceptor payments in promoting long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARC), like Implanon and Jadelle, as well as Depo-Provera and the Sayana Press.
- Surrogacy and other reproductive health technologies that facilitate conception and parenthood among those who can afford them.
- An additional term, like “bio-populationism” which could signal something different than and complement an expanded understanding of “population control” by theorizing the full range of contraceptive and conceptive reproductive technologies and how these encourage and discourage fertility among different populations. In addition, it could examine the politics of who lives and who dies (biopolitics and necropolitics).
- The impacts of green militarization and the ways in which securitization of land and people contributes to dispossession, dissolution of communities and disruption of livelihoods. Green development is another key factor in displacement and an increasingly important factor in this time of climate change.
- The heightening of borders and nativism, which is coupled with the control of migrants, detention of immigrants, and the containment of people through racialized and communal violences, detention and incarceration.
- The creation of “threat,” due to politically charged interpretations of population like “differential fertility,” Islamophobia, and racialized and ethnic stereotypes of violence. As Mohan Rao noted in his talk, “fear is a growth industry.”

At the meeting, we recognized that strategies to address the urgent problems of climate change often exacerbate existing inequalities and bolster neo-Malthusian thinking, contributing to an upsurge in population control rhetoric and practice. However, this population control rhetoric has shifted in important ways. The second session, *Mapping the Population (Control) Landscape* showed that it has been repackaged in environmentalism to appeal to new generations of activists and relate to current climate and environmental concerns (Sasser, Luna). Population control is relegated to the past, opening opportunities for the recognized missteps of the past—including coercive targets and payments in international family planning—to be repeated and at the same time be reinterpreted as “motivational”
rather than abusive (Hendrixson). In a similar vein, Kalpana Wilson argued that lowering fertility is again seen as good economic development practice. This rationale corresponds with an appropriation of women’s rights and empowerment discourses as “Smart Economics.” Mohan Rao noted that overlapping and reinforcing nativisms, fundamentalisms, masculinities, “pinkwashing” (using gay rights advances to mask anti-immigrant politics and other rights violations) and Islamophobia all bolster and shape neo-Malthusian ideology today.

The examples from the third session, *The Political Economy of Today’s Population Control*, showed the continuities of population control in family planning, post-Cairo, as well as the formation of a new population industry. Today’s population control industry has grown in the context of the rise of global health securitization in response to the Zika and Ebola epidemics (Rivera, Wako) and increased biomedicalization and incidence of human trials (Sarojini). Examples included Norplant promotion in Bangladesh (Parvin), mass sterilization camps in India (Sarojini), and Implanon promotion in South Africa, coupled with government scaling back from Depo-Provera and a human trial on the link between Depo and increased biological risk of HIV acquisition (Stevens). These examples exposed the influence of philanthrocapitalists like the Gates Foundation in supporting and shaping the new population industry in partnership with pharmaceutical industries, international agencies and governments, as well as non-profits like PATH. The discussion explored the difficulties in advocating for contraceptive access and safety and safe and legal abortion where LARC promotion is the primary goal of many international family planning efforts. Advocacy for safe contraception and abortion, as well as access to these resources, is complicated by anti-abortion and anti–contraception activists’ challenges to LARC, philanthrocapitalism, and abortion access.

Sessions four and five revealed the linkages between responses to climate change—including the militarization of climate change—the construction of threat, and neo-Malthusian thinking. Session four, *Charting the Landscape of Climate Change and Militarized Development* analyzed the “Malthusian structuring of climate” (Lohmann) and how this organizes and contributes to narratives of population-motivated threat, such as the “youth bulge” theory, which positions young men, particularly African men, as violent elements within violent environments (Okech). Climate crisis and Malthusian fears also contribute to tropes about climate conflict as driven by climate refugees who supposedly degrade the land and engage in resource wars (Hartmann). As climate change challenges are construed as threats to land as “resource,” and “nature,” approaches to conservation are manifesting “greening militarization” (Lunstrum). Similarly, when climate change is positioned as a “threat multiplier,” it becomes a rationale for further US military involvement in parts of Africa and Asia, including in disaster relief and development aid (Hartmann.)

In session five, *Mapping the Political Landscape of Dispossession*, speakers investigated how climate crisis responses in international and national development, green entrepreneurship, and militarization facilitate the appropriation of land and water for governments and corporations, and dispossess people. Examples included state appropriation of land and water in Bangladesh (Kabeer), dispossession of
peoples through climate change adaptation and mitigation schemes in Colombia (Camargo, Ojeda) as well as through “clean development” (Ojeda) and green and sustainable international and national development schemes (Asher, Kabeer, Pskowski). Speakers highlighted the racialized and gendered narratives that accompany such schemes.

The final session addressed *Anticipatory Visions for the Future*. Speakers considered the potential for visioning and realizing feminist futures arising out of people’s movements for social justice, including economic, food, environmental and climate and reproductive justices. This included discussion of the challenges we face with deep and systematic environmental and climate injustices (Patterson), population control and white supremacy propelling reproductive injustices (Fields), and mal-development negatively impacting people’s lives and health (Pineda Ofreneo). Others considered the potential for these challenges to spur other “worlds” (Pineda Ofreneo) to reduce violence, support food justice, and enable a less technocratic approach to reproductive health, as part of a larger social justice platform. Feminism in academia also opens opportunities for visioning other worlds through meshworks, including “surviving crisis narratives” (Harcourt).

When considering the spectrum of conversations from the meeting as a whole, participants articulated the pressing need to get such integrated analyses into mainstream discourses and among multiple movements, as well as in academia to 1) confront racism, 2) build solidarity, 3) influence academia, activism and philanthropy, and 4) offer feminist futures that build on socially just responses to climate change.

The *Old Maps, New Terrain: Rethinking population in an era of climate change* meeting brought together powerful ideas and people. As the last session aptly showed, the ways forward are not without significant challenge. However, the meeting highlighted the potential and need for solidarity—cross-border, movement, discipline, identity and area—to share ideas, news and solutions, and to uphold social justice and address climate change in meaningful, multi-layered ways.
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Betsy Hartmann is professor emerita of development studies and senior policy analyst of the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College in Amherst, MA. Her work focuses on the intersections between population, migration, environment and security issues, and she is widely published in popular, policy, and scholarly venues. She is the author of Reproductive Rights and Wrongs: The Global Politics of Population Control (third edition appearing in Fall 2016) and two political thrillers about the Far Right, The Truth about Fire and Deadly Election. She is the co-author of A Quiet Violence: View from a Bangladesh Village and co-editor of the anthology Making Threats: Biofears and Environmental Anxieties. Her book on apocalyptic thinking in the U.S., The America Syndrome, will be published by Seven Stories Press in Spring 2017.
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Chemi Chemi is a junior at Hampshire College, studying Public Policy and Women's Access to Reproductive Healthcare. She was born in Tibet and raised in Nepal until her family moved to the States in 2007. In the summer of 2014, she was a Reproductive Rights Activist Service Corps (RRASC) intern with The Doula Project in New York City. This past semester, she participated in the International Honors Program: Health and Community: Globalization, Culture, and Care. The program focused on access to healthcare using various lenses (i.e. History, Medical Anthropology, etc) in the following sites: San Francisco, Hanoi; Vietnam, Bushbuckridge; South Africa, and Buenos Aires; Argentina. She is passionate about reproductive justice and hopes to pursue a degree in Master of Public Health (MPH) in the near future.
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Claudia Rivera Amarillo, anthropologist, B.A. from National University of Colombia, M.A. in Social History from Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. Areas of interest: Sexuality, Health and Politics in Colombia and Brazil, Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, Prostitution, History of Science, History of the Pharmaceutical Industry in Latin America, Mental Health, Political Ecology, Conflict and Violence in Colombia. Her current research interests focus on Public Health, Biotechnology, Capitalism and Climate Change in Colombia and Brazil.
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Associate Professor, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Colombia

I’m a feminist geographer. My work combines political ecology and critical geopolitics in the study of processes and dynamics of dispossession carried out and legitimized in the name of nature. I’m an associate professor at Instituto Pensar, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana (Bogotá, Colombia). I’m a co-founder and coordinator of the Centro de Estudios en Ecología Política (Center for Political Ecology Studies) – CEEP in Bogotá. I hold a BA in History and a BA in Economics. I obtained my MA and PhD in Geography from Clark University. I’m interested in analyzing socioenvironmental conflicts from an interdisciplinary perspective that privileges an ethnographic approach to disputes and negotiations over natural resources. My research interests include land and watergrabbing, everyday state formations, climate change and ecotourism. I carry out research too on issues of obstetric violence and on gender-based violence at university campuses.
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Associate Professor, Clark University

I am a medical anthropologist whose research has primarily focused on francophone West Africa, Senegal in particular. My research examines health disparities, reproductive health, HIV/AIDS, and sex work.
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Etobssie Wako has over a decade of experience working with grassroots, national, and international organizations addressing reproductive health, rights, and justice issues. As an independent consultant, she has worked with non-profit organizations, government agencies, UN bodies, and foundations in supporting social justice movement-building, strategic planning, leadership development, program management, and evaluation design and implementation. Etobssie believes systems change and social justice are seeded and nurtured in communities, and as such is committed to strengthening grassroots organizing. She upholds her ancestral teachings that communities are architects of their own solutions, and believes in the power of creative, collaborative and futuristic ideas in informing transformative and sustained change.
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Patterson holds a master’s degree in social work from the University of Maryland and a master’s degree in public health from Johns Hopkins University. She currently serves on the International Committee of the US Social Forum, the Steering Committee for Interfaith Moral Action on Climate, Advisory Board for Center for Earth Ethics as well as on the Boards of Directors for the Institute of the Black World, Center for Story Based Strategy, GRID Alternatives, and the US Climate Action Network.
Old Maps, New Terrain: Rethinking population in an era of climate change
May 27-29, 2016
Hampshire College, Amherst MA

Jade Sasser
Assistant Professor, University of California, Riverside
Jade S. Sasser is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of California, Riverside. She holds a PhD in Environmental Science, Policy & Management and an MA in Cultural Anthropology from the University of California, Berkeley. Her book manuscript, Making Sexual Stewards: Population, Climate Activism, and Social Justice in the New Millennium, explores the role of climate change activism in contemporary debates over global population growth and women’s reproductive rights. Her broader research interests include climate change, international development, women’s health, and the intersections between gender and technology.

Kaia Zimmerman
PopDev Meeting Coordinator
Kaia Zimmerman is the PopDev Meeting Coordinator for Old Maps, New Terrain. She came to Hampshire College after working as a community organizer in the Bronx at the Banana Kelly Community Improvement Association. She has a BA from Sarah Lawrence College in community building and social justice, as well as visual arts.

Kalpana Wilson
London School of Economics; South Asia Solidarity Group
Kalpana Wilson writes and researches on questions of gender, race and imperialism in South Asia and Britain. Her research has explored women’s participation in rural labour movements in Bihar, India, population policies and reproductive justice, the appropriation of feminist ideas within neoliberal discourses, and the ways in which race is inscribed within development. Her book, Race, Racism and Development: interrogating history, discourse and practice (2012), published by Zed Books, places racism and constructions of race at the centre of an exploration of the dominant discourses, structures and practices of development, exploring themes of population control, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, human rights and security among others. She is a founder member of the UK based campaigning organisation South Asia Solidarity Group, which supports, publicises, and builds solidarity with people’s struggles for justice and democracy and against exploitation, gender and caste based oppression, imperialism, and war in the countries of South Asia. She teaches at the London School of Economics Gender Institute.
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Khushi Kabir
Nijera Kori

In 1972, immediately after the Liberation of Bangladesh, Khushi joined BRAC, as the first Bangladeshi woman, to live, work and be based in their very remote rural working area. She began working with like-minded young people with an alternative approach to development in 1980, joining Nijera Kori as its Coordinator. Nijera Kori is a national level NGO working for self-empowerment of marginalised and landless rural women and men at the grassroots. Nijera Kori believes in creating strong autonomous organizations of the rural poor to assert their rights and ensure their entitlements as citizens. Its mandate is to work with the people and not for the people.

Since 1975, she organised and facilitated several trainings, workshops, and consultations on Women, Development, Environment, Land and Human Rights Issues, and participated and presented papers in major conferences nationally, regionally and internationally. She is passionately involved in promoting gender equality and rights of women; rights of indigenous and other excluded communities; people’s rights and control over resources; environmental justice; food sovereignty; ensuring democratic values and accountability; and reinforcing secularism.

Currently, she is Chairperson, Association of Land Reform and Development-ALRD, a network of NGOs and Citizens active in Land Rights; Trustee, Centre for Policy Dialogue; Core Group member, Sangat-A Feminist Network; Member, APWLD-Asia People Women Law & Development; Chair, ASIA-Asia Solidarity against Industrial Aquaculture; Chair, Panos South Asia; One Billion Rising Global Coordinator for Bangladesh; Advisory Committee Member for the Mrinal Gore Interactive Centre under the Keshav Gore Trust, India; Bureau Member, South Asians for Human Rights.

Kiran Asher
Women, Gender, Sexuality Studies, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Grounded in two decades of field-based research in Latin America and South Asia, Kiran Asher’s diverse research interests focus on the gendered and raced dimensions of social and environmental change in the global south. Her publications include a monograph, Black and Green: Afro-Colombians, Development, and Nature in the Pacific Lowlands (Duke University Press, 2009). She is currently working on a theoretical and political critique of development theories and post-development proposals by drawing on feminist and marxist approaches in a postcolonial frame. From 2002-2013, she was Associate Professor of International Development and Social Change at Clark University, Massachusetts. From 2013-2015, she was a Senior Scientist in the Forests and Livelihoods Program at the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), in Bogor, Indonesia. She is now Associate Professor in the Department of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
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Larry Lohmann
The Corner House
Larry is an activist working with The Corner House, a research and advocacy organization based in the UK. He spent the 1980s teaching and working in environmental movements in Thailand. He has contributed to scholarly journals in sociology, politics, development, science studies, law, social policy, environment, accounting and Asian studies. He is a founding member of Durban Group for Climate Justice. His books include Mercados de Carbono: La Neoliberalizacion del Clima (Quito, 2012), and Pulping the South: Industrial Tree Plantations in the Global Paper Economy (with Ricardo Carrere) (London, 1996).

Libby Lunstrum
Associate Professor, Geography Department, York University
Libby Lunstrum is an Associate Professor of Geography at York University and Scholar at York’s Centre for Refugee Studies. Her research and teaching focus on political ecology especially of international borders, people-park relations, territorialisations and processes of bordering, and political violence. Her current research examines environmental displacement (tied to conservation and climate change), the political ecology of cross-border animal movement and wildlife crime, related militarization of conservation, and attempts to reinvent conservation to make it relevant to “non-traditional” groups. Her research focuses on Southern Africa (Mozambique and South Africa) and North America (Canada). You can find out more information at http://www.yorku.ca/lunstrum/.

Lindsay Schubiner
Senior Program Manager, Center for New Community
Lindsay Schubiner is the Senior Program Manager at the Center for New Community, where she works to counter organized nativism in the U.S. Lindsay previously served as a Congressional staffer handling immigration, housing, and health policy, and managed advocacy for sexual rights at American Jewish World Service. She holds a Master of Science from the Harvard School of Public Health.

Loretta Ross
SisterSong Former National Coordinator
Five Colleges Women's Studies Research Center
Loretta J. Ross was a co-founder and the National Coordinator of the SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective from 2005-2012, a national network founded in 1997 of women of color and allied organizations headquartered in Atlanta, GA. She is one of the creators of the theory of "Reproductive Justice" developed by African American women in 1994. As SisterSong’s leader, she led the national campaign against anti-abortion billboards targeting the African American community when she organized the “Trust Black Women” partnership. As part of a four-decade history in social justice activism, Loretta is an expert on women’s issues, hate groups, racism and intolerance, human rights, and violence against women.
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Loretta has appeared on CNN, BET, "Lead Story," "Good Morning America," "The Donahue Show," the National Geographic Channel, and "The Charlie Rose Show." She has been quoted as an expert in the New York Times, Time Magazine, The Los Angeles Times, the Washington Post and many other newspapers and magazines. She is a member of the Women's Media Center's Progressive Women's Voices.

She is the co-author of Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice, written with Jael Silliman, Marlene Gerber Fried, and Elena Gutiérrez. Her forthcoming book is entitled What is Reproductive Justice? co-written with Rickie Solinger and will be published in early 2017 by the University of California Press. She is a graduate of Agnes Scott College and holds honorary doctorate degrees from Arcadia University and Smith College.

Marion Stevens
Coordinator: WISH Associates
Research Associate: AGI/UCT
Chair: Sexual and Reproductive Justice Coalition

Marion Stevens has a background as a midwife, in medical anthropology and in public health and development. She has worked in the area of sexual and reproductive justice for over 20 years. Her work has included conducting participatory research, policy analysis and development and advocacy. She has worked with a range of stakeholders both locally and internationally. In 2010 she formed WISH Associates (Women in Sexual and Reproductive Rights and Health) and coordinates this network of seven South African consultant activists. She is also a research associate at the African Gender Institute at UCT and in 2015 she was elected chairperson of the Sexual and Reproductive Justice Coalition (SRJC).

Marlene Gerber Fried
Faculty Director, Civil Liberties & Public Policy Program (CLPP), Hampshire College
Abortion Rights Fund of Western MA
Women's Global Network for Reproductive Rights

Marlene Gerber Fried is a long-time reproductive rights activist. She was the founding president and a long time board member of the National Network of Abortion Funds (NNAF) and the Abortion Rights Fund of Western Massachusetts. She works on abortion access internationally with the Women’s Global Network for Reproductive Rights. She received the 2014 Felicia Stewart Advocacy Award from the American Public Health Association, and in 2015, NNAF established and awarded her the first Marlene Gerber Fried Abortion Access Vanguard Award. She is also a professor at Hampshire College and Faculty Director of the Civil Liberties and Public Policy Program (CLPP), an organization dedicated to reproductive rights education and leadership development. In 2010-2011 she was Interim President of Hampshire College. She edited, From Abortion Rights to Reproductive Freedom: Transforming A Movement, and co-authored with Silliman, Ross and Gutiérrez Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice, November, 2004, second edition, Haymarket Press, April, 2016.
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Martha Pskowski
National Anthropology and History Institute, Mexico (INAH)
Martha Pskowski is a journalist and researcher based in Mexico City. She graduated from Hampshire College in 2013 where she studied development and the environment and was a PopDev fellow. From 2014-15 Martha was a Fulbright fellow studying the impacts of climate change policy in indigenous communities at the National Anthropology and History Institute (INAH) in Mexico, where she now works as a research assistant. Her freelance journalism on migration, human rights and the environment has appeared in publications including VICE News, GOOD, and Truth-Out.

Mohan Rao
Professor, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi
Mohan Rao is Professor at the Centre of Social Medicine and Community Health (CSMCH), School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. A medical doctor specialised in public health, he has written extensively on health and population policy, and on the history and politics of health and family planning. He is the author of From Population Control to Reproductive Health: Malthusian Arithmetic (Sage, New Delhi, 2004) and has edited Disinvesting in Health: The World Bank's Health Prescriptions (Sage, New Delhi, 1999) and The Unheard Scream: Reproductive Health and Women's Lives in India (Zubaan/Kali for Women, New Delhi, 2004). He has edited, with Sarah Sexton of Cornerhouse, UK, the volume Markets and Malthus: Population, Gender and Health in Neoliberal Times (Sage, New Delhi, 2010). A volume edited with Sarah Hodges, Public Health and Private Wealth: Stem Cells, Surrogacy and Other Strategic Bodies (OUP) is forthcoming. He is actively involved with the Jana Swasthya Abhiyan.

Mst Shahina Parvin
Assistant Professor
I am an MA student in Sociology and prospective PhD student of Cultural, Social, and Political Thought at the University of Lethbridge, and an Assistant Professor from the Department of Anthropology at Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka, Bangladesh. Employing a Foucauldian discourse analysis, my MA Sociology thesis examines the discourses of motherhood and childlessness in relation to Assisted Reproductive Technologies in Bangladeshi media and fertility clinics, while my MA in Anthropology explored the biomedical control of poor Bangladeshi women’s bodies through trials of the contraceptive Norplant. During my career, I have received three research grants to conduct research on Munda ethnic minority women’s childbirth practices; Bangladeshi state power over minority Munda people, and Mazar culture and its consequences in Dhaka city. As such, my research career has focused on questions of gender, power, and medical, state and professional control of women’s bodies.
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Rajani Bhatia
Assistant Professor, University at Albany (SUNY)

Rajani Bhatia is Assistant Professor at the University at Albany in Women’s, Gender & Sexuality Studies. She completed her PhD from the Department of Women’s Studies at the University of Maryland in the spring of 2012. Her research interests lie in developing new approaches to feminist theorizations of reproduction and feminist science and technology studies. Topically, she has focused on issues that lie at the intersection of reproductive technologies, health, bioethics, and biomedicine. Through engagement as a scholar-activist within international and national women’s health and reproductive justice movements, Dr. Bhatia contributed to feminist analysis of global population control, right-wing environmentalism, coercive practices and unethical testing related to contraceptive and sterilization technologies both inside and outside the U.S. Her article, “Constructing Gender from the Inside Out: Sex Selection Practices in the United States,” in Feminist Studies summer 2010 (vol. 36, no. 2) reflects on transnational dynamics of sex selection practices. She is currently preparing a book manuscript on sex selection.

Rosalinda Pineda Ofreneo
College of Social Work & Community Development, University of the Philippines Diliman; Homenet Philippines

Rosalinda Pineda Ofreneo, Ph.D., is a full professor at the Department of Women and Development Studies, University of the Philippines College of Social Work and Community Development (UPCSWCD). She served as dean of the UPCSWCD from 2010 to 2013 and teaches a course at the Doctor of Social Development (DSD) program of the same College. She has been active in the women’s movement for more than four decades, working with organizations of rural women and women in the informal economy such as PATAMABA and Homenet Philippines. She has published many books and research papers, has edited a number of journals, and has traveled extensively to serve as resource speaker in international, national, and local conferences. Lately, she has been doing policy advocacy on adaptive social protection, disaster risk reduction and management, climate change adaptation, and solidarity economy. She was a founding member and former board member of the Women’s Studies Association of the Philippines (WSAP). She served as volunteer regional coordinator of Homenet Southeast Asia and is currently a board member of Homenet Philippines, Asian Solidarity Economy Council (ASEC) Philippines and the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) Philippines. She writes poetry and children’s stories, for which she has won a number of awards.
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Sarojini Nadimpally
Sama Resource Group for Women and Health

Sarojini Nadimpally has been working on women’s health and rights for over 20 years and is also one of the founder members of Sama-Resource Group for Women and Health. She was instrumental in building the resource group on women’s health through coordination of various strategies including capacity building of communities, research and advocacy. She was involved in the coordination of national level studies on assisted reproductive technologies including surrogacy and their implications on women and participants’ perspectives in clinical trials and access to medicines. Sarojini has co-coordinated Reproductive Tourism in India: actors, agencies and contemporary transnational networks, a joint project of the Centre for Social Medicine and Community Health, Jawaharlal Nehru University, SAMA and Kings’ College London, UK. She has been a part of many fact findings related to maternal deaths, sterilisations deaths, unethical clinical trials and issues related to communal riots in Gujarat and Muzaffarnagar. She has been a part of the study “Spectres of Malthus” reviewing population discourse in Indian textbooks.

She has contributed several articles/papers to national as well as international journals such as Globalisation and Health, Reproductive Health Matters, Economic and Political Weekly, to name a few. She recently co-edited an anthology for Zubaan publishing house on medicalization and reproductive technologies. She is a Member of Mission Steering Group of National Health Mission set up by Ministry for Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, and a member of Central Ethics Committee of the Indian Council of Medical Research.

Sydney Loving
Student, Hampshire College

I am a fourth-year student at Hampshire College from Dallas, TX. My area of study, in which I use writing, research and visual art, is the intersection of education and white supremacy. My concentration deals with the development of an interdisciplinary black history curriculum for primary and secondary school that utilizes archival research, art-making and Afropasturist texts to engage with non-linear/progressive notions of time.
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Tanya Fields
Executive Director, The BLK Projek

Tanya Fields is a food justice activist, educator, urban farmer, food blogger, and the founder and executive director of the BLK Projek. This Bronx-based food justice and health organization serves underserved woman of color by creating women-led economic development opportunities and is committed to urban farming and the elimination of food deserts. Fields and her work are gradually revolutionizing low-income neighborhoods in one of the poorest congressional districts in the country. Fields also writes a twice monthly column on food and food justice for EBONY.com and contributed a chapter for the book The Next Eco-Warriors by Emily Hunter. Fields has appeared on numerous TV programs including MSNBC's "Up With Chris Hayes" and "The Melissa Harris Perry Show."

Fields' inspiration came from her experiences as a single working mother of four, living in a marginalized community. She witnessed sexist institutional policies, structurally reinforced cycles of poverty, and harsh inequities in wealth and access to capital that result in far too many women being unable to rise out of poverty and sustain their families. In response, she founded the BLK ProjeK in 2009 and two years later, the organization was nominated for a 2011 Union Square Award which identifies visionaries responding to society's most pressing social, political and economic issues. She is also a Fellow with Green For All, a national organization working to build an inclusive green economy strong enough to lift people out of poverty. Fields is recognized for her effective strategies for engaging low-income communities of color in the So. Bronx in building healthy neighborhoods and climate solutions.

Prior to creating the BLK ProjeK, Fields earned a bachelor’s degree in political science from Baruch College and worked with several high-profile environmental organizations in the South Bronx - Mothers on the Move, Sustainable South Bronx and the Majora Carter Group.

Wendy Harcourt
Associate Professor, International Institute of Social Studies of Erasmus University

Dr Wendy Harcourt is Associate Professor in Critical Development and Feminist Studies at the International Institute of Social Studies of the Erasmus University in The Netherlands. Wendy joined the ISS in November 2011 after 23 years at the Society for International Development, Rome as Editor of the journal Development and Director of Programmes. Her research interests are feminist political ecology, sexuality and gender and critical development theory. Her monograph: 'Body Politics in Development: Critical Debates in Gender and Development' published by Zed Books in 2009, received the 2010 Feminist Women Studies Association Book Prize. She is series editor of Palgrave Gender, Development and Social Change book series and is actively involved in several journal boards and gender and development networks. She has edited 10 collections, the latest of which 'The Palgrave Handbook on Gender and Development Handbook: Critical engagements in feminist theory and practice' was published by Palgrave in January 2016.
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Zakiya Luna
Assistant Professor, University of California, Santa Barbara

I am an Assistant Professor of Sociology at University of California, Santa Barbara and faculty affiliate of the Center on Reproductive Rights and Justice at Berkeley Law. My research is in the areas of social change, sociology of law, health and inequality. Specifically, I am interested in social movements, human rights and reproduction with an emphasis on the effects of intersecting inequalities within and across these sites.

I was the lead author of the Reproductive Justice review article in the 2013 volume of the Annual Review of Law and Social Science. My work has also been published in Research in Social Movements; Conflict and Change; Sociological Inquiry; Feminist Studies; and Societies without Borders: Social Science and Human Rights. I am writing a book manuscript on the reproductive justice movement. I am co-editor and co-creator of the University of California Press book series, Reproductive Justice: A New Vision for the 21st Century. I serve on the American Sociological Association’s Public Understanding of Sociology committee.

I earned a joint PhD in Sociology and Women’s Studies from University of Michigan, where I also earned a Masters of Social Work. I was a UC President’s Postdoctoral Fellow at UC Berkeley affiliated with the Departments of Gender and Women’s Studies, Sociology and the Center for the Study of Law and Society. I was hosted by the Center on Reproductive Rights and Justice at Berkeley Law, which I accidentally helped co-found (long story). I was also the Mellon Sawyer Seminar Human Rights Postdoc at University of Wisconsin. I teach courses at the undergraduate and graduate level on reproduction and social movements. In my leisure time, I like learning to surf and baking.