

## **Fetishism and Hysteria: The Economies of Feminism Ex Utero**

**Susan Squier**

---

*Laurie Foos's feminist novel Ex Utero is a comic exploration of the value of the uterus. Simultaneously recursive and resistant, Foos's novel reenacts, with a difference, two confining essentialisms: hysteria, a female disorder, and fetishism, whether understood as the psychosexual response to female lack, or as capitalism's motor, the displacement of desire onto commodities. The essay explores how, if we think of the womb neither as individual possession or commodified object, we can create a new space of possibility for women at the end of the millennium.*

---

"Fetishism's recursivity . . . allows it to become a vehicle for resisting confining essentialisms." (Apter & Pietz, p. 4)

In *Where Babies Come From: A Miracle Explained*, the American artist Ann Starr combines evocative line drawings and gouache watercolors with provocative text to explore male exploitation and control of female sexuality. Starr has created art books and paintings based on her observational drawing in the departments of pathology, radiology and anatomy of Children's Hospital, Boston, and Children's Memorial Hospital, Chicago. More recently, she has begun to explore the rich symbolic freight of gynecological medicine. *Where Babies Come From* (1997) takes the medical procedure of hysterectomy as a metaphor for woman's loss of sexual and reproductive agency. With a group of line drawings, the book introduces us to the protagonist's increasingly stooped female relatives—from the baby "Little Sniffy" and the little girls "Me" and "Sis" to ever-more-hump-backed Auntie, Ma, and cane-leaning Granny—including the wry caption "It is easy to tell that hysterectomies run in the family. A glance will tell."

Notable for its frank challenge to sexist notions of female creativity, this book also offers a valuable site to consider the ways that the uterus has been fetishized by

Brill Professor of Women's Studies and English, The Pennsylvania State University.

our culture. Starr's book turns on a paradox: though hysterectomized, the women in her fictional family still have "all dropped babies like tumors EX NIHILO" (Starr, p. 5). How is this possible? the narrator asks. "My conclusion: it's *sperm*. We've been lucky to marry really strong men, whose sperm must be compounded of Neptune's foam, emptied into our voids like ink from the barrels of Waterman pens!" (p. 10). In a compact image linking biological and literary creativity, Starr uses the Aristotelian model of procreation, in which the all-engendering sperm merely shelters in women's bodies until its male potency takes shape as a baby, to indict women as mere receptacles for masculine achievements (whether procreative or creative). To be a woman *is* to be hysterectomized, which is to be sterile and powerless, both physically and conceptually.

Starr's image of hysterectomy is not the only, or the inevitable, meaning we might attribute to the experience of being without a womb, however. As Laurie Foos's feminist novel *Ex Utero* reveals, if we think of the womb neither as individual possession or commodified object we can discover a new space of possibility for women at the end of the millennium. Simultaneously recursive and resistant, Foos's novel reenacts, with a difference, two confining essentialisms: *hysteria*, a female disorder, and *fetishism*, whether understood as the psychosexual response to female lack, or as capitalism's motor, the displacement of desire onto commodities.

Starr's book stays in the register of the individual (body and psyche) tracing how the miraculous event of male potency produces a race of hysterectomized and docile females. In contrast, Foos links the individual to the global, biological reproduction to commodity production. *Ex Utero* gives us not the miraculous but the ordinary: a uterus that goes astray in the Mall, realm of commodification and feminine culture, with its banalities and intimate discoveries.

The novel begins by linking the fetish to the most concrete model for hysteria, what the Greeks knew as the "wandering womb." The protagonist, Rita, has gone to the Mall to buy a pair of red stiletto heels as a "turn on" for her husband George, when she discovers to her alarm that she has lost her uterus.

Her stomach constricts with the empty feeling of fruitlessness, a dry rot inside her that she has felt since coming home from the shopping mall. It was at the mall, she believes, that her womb fell out and was lost in the crowd, in a mob of women with baby strollers, their feet stomping over her last shot at motherhood. (Foos, p. 1)

The novel triggered by this uncanny discovery could be described as picaresque, but in a feminist reversal, here the picaresque hero is the uterus itself. Rita's wandering womb—the phrase recalls Victorian explanations for female debility resulting from a choice of intellectual labor over such proper female work as cooking, darning clothes, and scrubbing the floor—is reported missing on cable TV:

WOMB, APPROXIMATELY THIRTY-ONE YEARS OLD, NEVER BEEN PREGNANT. LAST SEEN AT AREA SHOPPING MALL NEAR REYNOLDS' SHOES. BELIEVED TO BE PINK AND ABOUT THE SIZE OF A MAN'S FIST. ANYONE WHO HAS SEEN THIS WOMB OR HAS ANY INFORMATION, PLEASE CALL LOCAL AUTHORITIES. (Foos, p. 43)

The missing womb generates widespread media coverage and rampant male Eros, giving every man who hears the news an instant erection, and catapulting its be-reaved owner Rita into appearances on syndicated talk shows (scheduled by the infertility support group “The Fruitless Wombs”). The culmination is her hour-long spot on the Phil Donahue-like “Nodderman Show.” A kind of Charcot, Nodderman is an impresario who draws media attention to Rita’s lost womb.<sup>1</sup> But unlike Charcot, whose scientific posture was maintained even while he acted as showman, Nodderman, working at the moment of breakdown of the private/public distinction on which Charcot relied, has lost his objective distance. Just “another man,” he is moved and stimulated by Rita’s ordeal: “It’s a man’s world, he says, looking strangely sheepish” (Foos, p. 35).

Coached to say “womb” rather than uterus (“far too clinical”) and to clutch her stomach longingly, Rita is joined on stage by “a panel of gynecologists, an expert on menopause, and a well known sex therapist” who pronounce on her case. “There are several theories as to why this woman has lost her womb,” a gynecologist explains. “First off, she is married and childless; the pressure to procreate may often have severe physical effects . . . as evident here in the womb simply falling out and refusing to perform. Just closing up shop, if you will” (Foos, pp. 29–30). The metaphor is significant. As Emily Martin (1992) has detailed, it testifies to the masculinist mindset of conventional medicine: its devaluation of female genitalia, its horror at the female menopause, and its tendency to think of the female reproductive body as a machine for producing babies. In addition to this comparison of failed reproduction (the womb “refusing to perform”) to failed production (“closing up shop”), Foos adds two models of failed production, additional versions of “female reproductive failure” according to male gynecology. They are Adele and Lucy, two women who have very different responses to the news of Rita’s vanished womb.

Like Rita, these women hover at the crossroads of private psyche and society, maternity and merchandising, fertility and bestiality. Yet while Rita exemplifies hysteria, these women represent different aspects of fetishism, whether we understand it as the psychosexual preoccupation with an object that can (in fantasy) compensate for the phallic lack, or as the materialist search to purchase an object that can recompensate us for the boundlessness of our desire. In their different responses to Rita’s missing uterus, Adele and Lucy mark the intersection of the intrapsychic and capitalist economies: the hypervaluation of a fetishized uterine space.

Adele watches Rita on the Nodderman show and is shocked to find that in response to the spectacle of Rita’s uterine loss, her vagina has “disappeared . . . shut itself up like a steel trap. The folds of skin are gone, the opening closed over with her own flesh, like a slab of cement over a basement door.” “Good Lord, Leonard,” she says to her husband, “it’s simply closed up shop” (Foos, pp. 41–42). Introduced as “a woman so profoundly affected by my show that her sex organ sealed itself shut during a broadcast,” Adele becomes an instant celebrity. Nodderman encourages

her to “stand up and twirl around so that the audience at home can get a good view of her creaseless crotch” (Foos, pp. 109, 110).

If Adele incarnates female lack, with a crotch so creaseless it harbors neither vagina nor phallus, Lucy exemplifies the “liberated” woman whose reproductive failure undermines her rationality. Having chosen career over children, having “for years . . . told herself that periodic gynecological exams are part of the liberated woman’s way of life,” recently Lucy has begun menstruating uncontrollably under the pressure to join the women she sees in the Malls who “push baby strollers and buy red high heels” (Foos, p. 88). She has become prey to hysteria and is now governed by her animal instincts: to her surprise, she finds herself following her dog during their evening walks, “going over on her hands and knees the area where the dog has sniffed” (Foos, p. 88). The image connects the fetishistic search for a sexual smell or trace to the hysteric’s predicament, recalling the *Timaues*, where Plato observed, “The womb is an animal which longs to generate children. When it remains barren too long after puberty, it is distressed and sorely disturbed, and straying about the body . . . brings the sufferer into the extremest anguish and provokes all manner of diseases besides” (Plato, quoted in Beizer, 1994, p. 4). Having become a parody of that Platonic animal wisdom, Lucy finally bleeds unceasingly; she is followed continually by her dog Sophia, who laps up her menstrual blood until she dies “swollen to bursting, as if the dog’s womb has taken in all of Lucy’s grief” (Foos, p. 119). With Sophia’s death, Lucy realizes that she too must appear on the Nodderman show. As she tells Rod Nodderman: “The bleeding won’t stop . . . not with that womb out there in the world. Even my dog has become a casualty” (Foos, p. 121). A kind of media moral panic ensues, for as Rita acknowledges to the police, her lost womb has “started a frenzy among other women, married and single, young and old” (Foos, p. 150).

When Lucy, Adele and Rita appear on the Nodderman show, the confining essentialisms they embody—hysteria and fetishism—subversively lay the foundation for a reconceptualization of woman. She is freed from the patriarchally-constructed identity explored in Starr’s book, an identity shaped by the specter of lack and the burden of sexless reproductive servitude. Unlike Ann Starr’s Granny, “Little Sniffy,” and the other hysterectomized women who never recover their sexual organs or their sexual agency, Laurie Foos’s protagonist does recover her womb. It is found in the Mall parking lot, “by a six-year-old girl and her unwed mother on their way home from the shopping mall. . . . Police say there is no telling what kind of trauma the womb has endured until it is examined by a group of gynecologists and by Rita, its owner” (Foos, p. 164).

In a parodic concretizing of our contemporary tendency to criminalize pregnant women, the gynecologists and police converge to examine—even interrogate—the womb in the light of the 60-watt bulb in the county jail. “‘It would appear,’ the doctor says, leaning on every word, ‘that this womb has been used by another woman. There is evidence of pregnancy in every aspect of its shape’”

(Foos, p. 177). The crime here is not crack cocaine use or alcohol abuse, which would endanger the reproductive product. Instead, it is illicit traffic in reproductive commodities—operating without a vendor's license, or engaging in off the books surrogacy. The gynecologists are uninterested in any "black market" collaborations between women, however; they would prefer to restore things to their proper, legitimate economic and psychic context. They begin explaining to Rita "the procedure for reinserting the womb. They are not quite certain how it got out, they say, but if it got out at all it is certain to get back in" (Foos, p. 178).

Rita refuses to have the uterus reinserted, however, realizing that it will reinsert her in the economy of female lack and servitude. Instead, she calmly tells the gynecologists that she has decided to get on with her life. Now that the womb has been used, she says, she can start living without guilt. She doesn't need to have it put back in, she says. In fact, she's rather gotten used to being without it. "Apparently another woman has put it to good use," she tells them, slipping on her red heels and turning to walk out the door (Foos, pp. 178–179).

In good *Thelma-and-Louise* tradition, Rita hits the road. When the concluding chapter begins, "[somewhere] in the United States, Rita is driving along an open highway with her womb on the passenger's seat" (Foos, p. 193). Though she has considered giving the womb away to a museum or a needy multipara, she has finally "decided after all that the womb's place was with her, there on the passenger seat, her constant companion. Even if they never stayed in one place for very long, they always had each other" (Foos, p. 193). Taking the theme of female bonding to its essence, Rita's road trip expands on the reasons for female flight figured in Ridley Scott's movie. Like *Thelma and Louise*, Rita and her womb must endure the glare of the media as they flee the life of enforced femininity the media have helped to instill. *Thelma and Louise* travel from one anonymous motel and coffee shop to the next in order to protect their commitment to each other from the ravages of patriarchal law. Similarly, Rita keeps moving to protect her companion, her womb. "Even with her womb tucked safely in her purse, the fear of losing it never leaves her" (Foos, p. 196). But the uncertainty that dogged Rita when she first discovered she had lost her uterus—"Rita . . . does not know what she herself is capable of"—no longer troubles her.

Starr's book is set in the space of the clinic: surgery is her preferred metaphor for the kind of patriarchal power exercised on the bodies and minds of women. Foos, in contrast, has chosen the Mall as setting rather than the hospital, moving us beyond the realm of hysteria into the realm of fetishism. The Mall, like the "Nodderman show" which purveys private experience for public consumption, is a site where the essence of woman is defined, alienated, and put up for sale to the very subjects who would otherwise already possess it. Watching the Nodderman show, or buying the red stiletto heels, a woman hopes to reclaim the reproductivity or sexuality that she is constructed to desire by the very forces of the media or the market which have alienated them.

Foos's novel, in short, asks us to consider the relationship between economy and embodiment in the construction of the female subject. J. K. Gibson-Graham (1996) has made this link explicit, arguing that "it is necessary to defamiliarize the economy as feminists have denaturalized the body, as one step towards generating alternative social conceptions and allowing new political subjectivities to be born" (p. 97). Feminist theorists have replaced the notion of the body as a discrete, bounded object that can be possessed, deployed, and controlled, with a conception of the body as a "fluid, permeable and decentered totality in which physiological, erotic, mental, psychological, social and other processes mutually constitute each other, with no one process or zone being more invested with meaning or effectivity than another" (Gibson-Graham, p. 97).

Taking our cue from Gibson-Graham, we can rethink the economy as a fluid, permeable, and decentered totality, which invests meaning and agency broadly across the whole social field rather than vesting it in specific sites like the value added by middlemen, property, or the generation of profit. To apply this insight to Laurie Foos's novel, we can look for another economy operating beside *and even within* the capitalist economy of the Mall and the media. Could such a reconceptualization of the economic realm produce a broader range of options for women? Another example of reproductive exchange suggests that such might be the case. In a report recently broadcast on National Public Radio, Renee Montagne described the "British infertility controversy" arising from a shortage of donor ova. Montagne painted a dramatic contrast between the British management of infertility treatments, which holds that "British women cannot get paid for donating their eggs," and the vigorous market for egg donation in the United States. Bill Handel, owner of a Los Angeles egg donation agency, has developed a new scheme to market and sell donated ova via the Internet. Through this scheme, as Handel explains, "childless British couples" select a donor egg by consulting the coded Internet database of more than 300 egg donors, air-mail a frozen sperm sample to the USA, and receive by post a frozen embryo "shipped back to . . . the UK to be implanted in the recipient mom" (Montagne, 1998). The fee for such services is roughly \$25,000, of which ten percent (or \$2,500) goes to the woman who donates her egg.

If we focus on the U.S. egg donation schema offered by Handel's "Center for Surrogate Parenting and Egg Donation," it is clear that this too is a market organized around mobile female body parts. Moreover, the NPR report paints a stark choice between "the regulated British system and the free market American approach. . . . The U.K. keeps a confidential registry of all egg and sperm donors; the U.S. does not. And the U.K. keeps strict controls on when experimental treatments can be offered to the public; but in the U.S. it's basically buyer beware." In the NPR story, a transaction between women has been reframed as a contrast between two different economic systems, one highly regulated and one "free market," one in which "you can't simply go out and buy a baby or buy an embryo to create a

baby,” and the other one in which, as Bill Handel brags, “we have plenty of egg donors. We have plenty of sperm donors. We have plenty of surrogate mothers. Why? Because, God forbid, we actually compensate these people for doing it.” In short, Handel constructs the U.S. free market in ova as a positive entity, the U.K. regulated market as its negation: either you can buy ova, or you can’t; either you can pay women for donating their ova, or you can’t.

If we use *Ex Utero* to rethink the NPR story, we can see that the ostensible opposition NPR emphasizes, between “regulated” and “free market” sales of ova, is really only a contrast between different kinds of regulation. Different centralizing hierarchies are involved in the traffic in ova, none of which in any way represents the agency of the women involved, including of course the medical technologies and knowledges at work. The alternative to such centralizing, hierarchical, international regulation of ova, Foos’s novel reveals, is not really regulation at the level of “the local” or the immediate. Such a position would replicate in the realm of economics the essentialist perspective on women’s bodies, opposing a supposedly “natural” economic realm to one that is artificial, masculine and imposed, just as a supposedly “organic” female body is opposed to one that is artificial, masculine, and imposed.

The key lies in reconceptualizing the economy just as the novel forces us to rethink the female body: as fluid, distributed, decentered. One difference, Foos’s novel thus suggests, is a matter of “use value,” of putting the womb “to good use,” as opposed to the capitalization of exchange value in the U.S. form of regulation, and the symbolic capitalization of decision-making authority about exchange in the British system. Thus when Rita discovers that her uterus has been used, she accepts it calmly: “Apparently another woman has put it to good use,” she tells the detective (Foos, pp. 178–179). Another difference might well involve a certain kind of mobility or fluidity; that is, in Foos’s novel, it is Rita and her womb that move around a lot. In contrast, in processes of regulated exchange, only commodities are allowed to move—or to be more precise, nothing gets to move until it becomes a commodity. What value would there be in finding an alternative to mandatory capitalism, in the arena of reproduction as in the rest of life? Laurie Foos’s novel explains it succinctly: “They could all do with a little less of the mall in their lives, she thinks. If nothing else, Rita has surely taught them that” (Foos, p. 184).

Can we find in the web site of “The Center for Surrogate Parenting and Egg Donation” an alternative to the mandatory capitalism of the Mall? While marketing over the Internet may initially seem to offer an alternative system, Handel’s entrepreneurial bravado (“we have plenty of egg donors . . . Because, God forbid, we actually compensate these people for doing it”) suggests that this is a distinction without a difference. Rather than discovering an alternative space, we’ve entered a cul-de-sac, formed by the convergence of the two archetypal postmodern capitalist spaces: the virtual space of the web and the actual space of the Mall.

As far back as the first several decades of this century doctors were experimenting with ovarian transplants. As Dr. Harry Benjamin of New York reported in a speech to the Sexual Reform Congress in 1930,

Morris, New York, performed the first ovarian transplantation over 20 years ago and many have followed since. In recent years good results were reported by Bumm-Sippel (Berlin) . . . Thorek (Chicago) and others. These results consisted in a relief from the complaints of the menopause, artificial or physiological; in general improvement of health and increase of vitality; and in the occasional return of libido and menstruation (Sippel). (Benjamin, 1930, p. 567)

These transplants were carried out not only between human donors and recipients, but also between animal “donors” and human recipients, and even human donors and animal recipients. Moreover, in at least one instance, the desired goal was not only a return to health, but also a return to reproductive capacity. In 1926, *Time* Magazine reported that Dr. Serge Voronoff had “grafted within Nora, a mature female chimpanzee, the sex organs of human female. Then, with assistance from Dr. Elie Ivanoff of Moscow, he had artificially impregnated Nora with human sperms. She was to bear her baby in January and it would be, biologically, a human child” (*Time*, 1926, p. 16).<sup>2</sup> Nora’s human child was never born; Voronoff ultimately discovered that conception had not occurred. Nonetheless, the tale of Nora’s “graft” exists as a very rare instance of interspecies uterine and ovarian transplant.

Moreover, technological advances soon rendered the whole ovary transplant unnecessary: “the discovery of the female hormone and its clinical application could very frequently replace a transplantation. The administration of this hormone by hypodermic injections is the first and most important one of the *non-operative methods*” (Benjamin, 1930, p. 567). Benjamin is talking about the hormone’s rejuvenating properties, not about the problem of infertility, but the same technology that made it possible to engage in whole-organ transplants led to the technique of ovum transfer (Squier, forthcoming). By the time that it was possible to conceptualize transplanting the ovary not for rejuvenation but for reproduction, tissue-culture technology had made it possible to work at the microscopic level, transferring not the entire organ that produced the ova, but the ova themselves. The shift from the transplanted ovaries of the late 1920s to the surrogate pregnancies and egg donations of the 1990s also suggests that there has been a change in the organs understood as appropriate for transplantation.

Debates about the means for procuring organs (i.e., purchase versus gift) and the problem of donor organ shortages signal “an ongoing cultural dispute over the meaning of the body as its parts acquire utility beyond their natural anatomical functions,” Donald Joralemon has observed, with the result that “transplantation challenges traditional assumptions of self/body integrity by promoting a distinction between the brain as the center of consciousness and all other organs as replaceable parts” (Joralemon, 1995, p. 336). We can understand the nature of this cultural



dispute if we step back for a moment both from Foos's fiction and from the NPR story on ovum marketing, to address the fundamental question they raise by their very contrast. What is the status of the uterus as an organ? As a "multicellular part of an animal . . . which forms a structural and functional unit," surely the uterus resembles the heart, the lung, the liver, the ovary, the ovum (Abercrombie, Hickman, & Johnson, 1980, p. 230). That raises the further question, then: should people have access to uterine transplants, as they do liver, heart and lung transplants, as they do donated ova? The first three organs are available through another U.S. website, the "California Transplant Donor Network;" the last—as we know—through Bill Handel's "Center for Surrogate Parenting and Egg Donation."

However, the story of Voronoff's Nora aside, the uterus is not customarily a candidate for transplant. Instead of the donor uterus, we have the donor egg, the surrogate mother, as well as some future prospect of artificial gestation. How do we explain the cultural dispute over the meaning of this particular part of the body? Feminism tells us that for women, the uterus has long rivaled the brain as a site of core selfhood, in Joralemon's terms. Both are unique, neither is fungible; neither has value for trade or transplant. Both, we are coming to see, have been understood as *essential components of the person*, even if for women such essentialism has been confining. Without wanting to construct the uterus as a "replaceable part," we can still acknowledge that for women, the disruption of a traditional notion of self/body identity based on the uterus would be welcome.

Just such a disruption of traditional notions of self/body integrity lies at the center of Laurie Foos's comic tale of life *Ex Utero*. When Rita first notices that her womb is missing, she experiences it as an everyday loss: "Somehow, in her quest to achieve a versatile wardrobe, she'd lost her womb, the way some people misplace car keys or a pair of eyeglasses" (Foos, p. 2). Impossible that we should think of the womb just as an *accessory*; impossible equally that we should consider it centrally defining of Rita's identity. *Ex Utero* plays on the difficulty of this either/or choice, considering the economies that come into play as we establish the value of the uterus, whether we fetishize it as irreplaceable or respond hysterically to its loss by denying it any value at all. In that sense, Laurie Foos's surreal comedy about the woman who loses her uterus at the Mall can also be read as a significant parable for the woman who—like the women in Ann Starr's art book—must undergo a hysterectomy, as well as to women whose uterine loss is only figurative. Though Rita first responds to the loss of her womb at the Mall as a loss of her sexual and reproductive currency, her adventures in quest of the missing womb educate her in an alternative economy. Wending her way between over-valuation and under-valuation of her womb, between fetishism and hysteria, Rita finally learns how to resist the confinement of a uterine essentialism. Instead, her picaresque journey affirms the mobility of all women, freed from the world that defines and thus confines us strictly in terms of our sexual and procreative agency, to venture out into the wider world *ex utero*.

Escaping the empty identity of a mass-mediated, commodified female body, Rita has learned the range of her capabilities as she travels with her wandering womb. Foos's novel thus provides an optimistic rejoinder to Starr's *Where Babies Come From: A Miracle Explained*. While Starr portrays womblessness as the ultimate female impotence through its vision of male desexing of women in order to resexualize us under the control of men, Foos sketches a female movement from a sexualized female self (in the terms of hysteria and lack, established by men) to a self free from such confining, essentializing sexualization. Starr's book explores a male fantasy of reproduction that is premised on female vacancy and male plenitude, while Foos's book explores a woman's subversion of the reproductive regime that has confined women either to a male-defined, male-centered generation, or to a male-defined, male-centered sexuality. Through a feminist representation of hysteria and fetishism, Foos's novel has modeled a way to escape confining essentialisms.

## ENDNOTES

1. Charcot and Nodderman share the role of showman and media celebrity: "Noted in the annals of medical history for transforming hysteria from an anatomical (i.e. female) malady to a neurological (and therefore theoretically not sex-dependent) disease . . . Charcot was more commonly recognized in his day as a scientific showman, teacher-cum-ringmaster of the *lecons du Mardi*, weekly lecture-demonstrations during which the star Salpetriere hysterics were displayed, hypnotized, and put through a series of paces" (Beizer, 1999, p. 8, note 15).
2. For an extended discussion of the case of Voronoff's Nora, in relation to the reconstruction of the human lifespan, see Squier, "Incubabies," forthcoming. I have discussed this curious episode elsewhere as an example of the way that reproductive technology and rejuvenation therapy have been linked since the early years of this century.

## REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, M., Hickman, C. J., & Johnson, M. L. (1980). *The Penguin dictionary of biology*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Apter, E., & Pietz, W. (1993). *Fetishism as cultural discourse*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- Ape-child? (1926, August 16). *Time*, 16.
- Beizer, J. (1994). *Ventriloquized bodies: Narratives of hysteria in nineteenth-century France*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Benjamin, H. (1930). The reactivation of women. In N. Haire (Ed.), *Sexual reform congress W.L.S.R., the Proceedings of the Third Congress of the World League for Sexual Reform* (pp. 564–573). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.
- Foos, L. (1995). *Ex utero*. Minneapolis, MN: Coffee House Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. (1996). *The end of capitalism (as we knew it): A feminist critique of political economy*. Oxford and London: Blackwell Publishers.
- Joralemon, D. (1995). Articles and commentaries: Cultural perspectives on organ transplantation. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 9(3), 335–356.
- Martin, E. (1992). *The woman in the body: A cultural analysis of reproduction*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Montagne, R. (1998). "British Infertility Controversy," September 28, 1998, National Public Radio's "Morning Edition." Transcribed by Federal Document Clearing House, Inc.

- Squier, S. (1999). Incubabies and rejuvenates: The traffic between technologies of reproduction and age-extension. In K Woodward (Ed.), *Figuring age: Women, bodies, generations* (pp. 88–111). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Squier, S. (in press). Life and death at strangeways: The tissue-culture point of view. In Paul Brodwin (Ed.), *Biotechnology and culture: bodies anxieties ethics*. Forthcoming, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Starr, A., & Squier, S. (1998). Speaking Women's Bodies: a conversation. *Literature and Medicine*, 17(2), 231–254.
- Starr, A. (1997). *Where babies come from: A miracle explained*. Art book, available from the author, 7 Homestead Road, Wellesley, MA 02181-6923.

Copyright of Journal of Medical Humanities is the property of Kluwer Academic Publishing and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Copyright of Journal of Medical Humanities is the property of Springer Science & Business Media B.V. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.