Forced Sterilization of Immigrant Latin American Women in the US

Historical and Contemporary Focus Using Critical Discourse Analysis and Intersectionality Analyzing Discourses on Immigrant Latin American Women Related to Forced Sterilization at Irwin County ICE Detention Center

Development and International Relations – 7th Semester Project

Supervisor: Pauline Stoltz

Written by:
Amalie Winther Andersen 20201258
Christina Binderup Mikkelsen 20172968
Emily Boem Palomo 20201276

Date: 21/12 2020

Characters: 107.060

Table of Contents

Abstract

This project addresses the recent report of immigrant Latin American women being forcibly sterilized in the Irwin County ICE detention center through an intersectional approach and by using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) on data retrieved from news articles from the past six years and sources on the history of the practice of forced sterilization. The problem formulation: why are immigrant Latin American women vulnerable to forced sterilization in the ICE detention camp in the US, reported in 2020? is answered by combining research into the history of the practice of forced sterilization in the US, specifically from the origins of the eugenics movement to the cases of forced sterilization happening from the late 1950s to the early 1970s, and an analysis of discourse surrounding immigrant Latin American women today. The principle findings are that contemporary discourses echo the historical ones against people of various intersecting inequalities, but in this case especially women, creating an "us vs them" rhetoric that frames them as a threat to American welfare system and values. The results indicate that immigrant Latin American women are in fact vulnerable to forced sterilization efforts because of their position within the intersecting inequalities of gender, race and status, but that it is exacerbated by the negative discourses that the political elites and media (re)produce about them.

1. Introduction

At Irwin County Detention Center, a facility privately owned by the prison company LaSalle Corrections and currently being used as a place to detain Latin American immigrants that were caught trying to cross the US border illegally by the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), an independent investigation was launched following the allegations of a whistleblower nurse, Dawn Wooten (Washington & Olivares, 2020). Nurse Wooten reported that, amid staggering negligence in regard to following safety protocols to avoid the spread of covid-19, women were being forcibly sterilized by one doctor named Mahendra Amin, a man referred to by the staff and detainees as the "uterus collector" (ibid.). The finding of the independent investigation later confirmed that the procedures performed on a still unknown total number of women, but we know of at least 57 women as of October 2020, were "unnecessary", "overly aggressive" and "in the uniform absence of truly informed consent." (ibid.). None of whom had received further gynecological care since ICE had stopped sending patients to Amin 5 weeks prior (ibid.).

The victims reported receiving unwanted medical procedures, and many were not even sure which procedures exactly they had undergone, and that they were left bloody, still bleeding and/or badly bruised after the operations. The operations performed on the oblivious women include tubal ligations, hysterectomies, and injections of the birth control drug Depo-Provera, with dangerous side-effects. Several of the women who got operated on would later be deported (ibid.).

We have chosen to further explore this topic in particular because, when it had initially piqued our interest, it had not occurred to us that this might not be an isolated incident, and that we would soon discover the long and complex history of forced sterilization of minority women in the US. We then proceeded to delve deep into the beliefs and practices surrounding the issue and in doing so we came to realize the extent of power abuse and imbalance occurring around it and just how prevalent they were then and are now.

1.1 Problem Formulation and Subject Delimitation

In order to study why these cases of forced sterilization at ICE have happened, we recognize that we are navigating in a complex puzzle of reality concerning power, intersectionality, history, culture, context, politics, and much more. But due to time and space limitation we have

narrowed down our focus. We realize that a piece of this puzzle is the construction of discourses that (re)produce inequality and dominance through prejudice and stereotyping of immigrant Latin American women by right-wing anti-immigration politicians and media, which construct a reality in which the women vulnerable to forced sterilization are positioned, understood within a historical and eugenics-centric understanding of forced sterilization. Our research will primarily focus on the discourse surrounding instances of forced sterilization of minority women in the US. In two distinct historical instances: the late 1950s to early 1970s and the present day ICE, all the while being conscious of the fact that there is not much, if any, academic literature on the latter due to it being so recent. We want to look into why this has happened, because we believe that it should not be happening. Leading to our problem formulation:

Why are immigrant Latin American women vulnerable to forced sterilization in the ICE detention camp in the US, reported in 2020?

We inquire into the reasons surrounding the circumstances in which immigrant Latin American women find themselves in order to be subjected to forced sterilization, in the US, in 2020. To answer our problem formulation, we have formulated three research questions, creating the framework for the project:

1. What are the discourses surrounding minority women exposed to forced sterilization in the late 50s to early 70s?
2. What are contemporary right-wing political discourses on immigrant Latin American women in the US news media?
3. What similarities can be drawn between our findings in research question 1 and research question 2 understood within an intersectional framework with focus on inequalities of gender, race and status?

We will answer the first question by using research by Rebecca M. Kluchin (2009) on the discourses framing minority women from the late 50s to early 70s. The second question will be answered by using the method of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyze five contemporary news articles focusing on the discourse surrounding immigrant Latin American women in the US. To answer research question 3 we will combine the knowledge from the first two questions and use intersectionality to understand these women's unique position, by

examining the intersecting inequalities that apply to the women on whom these forced sterilizations were performed.

Based on the findings from the research questions we will discuss the results in relation to the cases of forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE camp in order to understand why this has happened. In proceeding to do this we have formulated a discussion question:
- How are the historical and present discourses on immigrant Latin American women and their intersectional position linked to the forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE detention camp?

Together all of the answers to these questions will help us answer our problem formulation.

As a starting point of our research, we will define some of the terms that will be used throughout this project. We will be referring to the procedures that the women have been victims of as "forced sterilization" because none of the women who went through the procedures have given informed consent to it. Hereto, we have chosen to include what could be considered as "coerced sterilization" into the definition of forced sterilization, since women who consented to a procedure without understanding it, still is considered an exploitative act towards these women in which an authority figure forced them into sterilization (Patel, 2017: 2). We have chosen this term because it best matches the situation occurring in the Irwin County ICE facility, which will be hereafter referred to as "camp" in order not to comply with the terminology given to us by ICE itself, in which the women unknowingly underwent invasive surgery without prior discussion or warning about what was going to happen to them (Project South, 2020).

2. Brief Historical Overview of Eugenics in the US

Delving briefly into the history of the beliefs and practices that have come to be known as eugenics, and later neo-eugenics, this chapter is relevant because they appear to be at the root of the beliefs and practices still being perpetrated today, the very same beliefs and practices that we consider a major factor in our object of research.

While the idea of using selective breeding to create a better offspring dates back to ancient Greece, the origins of the eugenics movement as is it known today come from early 1900s

Europe, especially the United Kingdom, and were directly inspired by Darwin's theories of evolution and natural selection and Francis Galton, the man credited with having first developed this research, called it "eugenics" from the Greek word "eu" meaning "good" and the suffix -genēs which means "born" (Levine & Bashford, 2010).

The popularity of eugenics made it across the Atlantic very early on, with the first eugenic policies being implemented in the US in the early 1900s. Although some started out with so called "positive eugenics", meaning that it encouraged reproduction between those perceived to be "genetically desirable"; an example of this the Fitter Family Contests, exhibitions of one's family at the local fair with prizes handed out to the healthiest, strongest and most conventionally attractive family by the time's standards (ibid.). There are also, however, so-called "negative eugenics", which aimed to eliminate those people who were considered physically, mentally and even morally undesirable through sterilization and/or segregation (ibid.). Early eugenics policies in the US include the anti-miscegenation laws which criminalized interracial marriages (ibid.). For the most part, in the early 20th century, the people most impacted by negative eugenics practices were women deemed unfit to bear and/or raise children under the definition of being "feebleminded" (ibid.). Because it would have been too high a cost for the government to maintain these women inside institutions, such as mental hospitals, until they were no longer of child-bearing age, the easiest solution was to sterilize them and then let them out into society (ibid.). Emblematic of this is the 1927 case of Buck vs Bell, in which a petition was filed to sterilize the then 18 year old Carrie Buck, because she posed a threat to society, on the grounds that she was "feebleminded within the meaning of the law", as was her mother and as would be her child (Lombardo, 2008: 104). So, with the sentence "three generations of imbeciles is enough" (Lombardo, 2008: 169) the Supreme Court ultimately ruled that compulsory sterilization for the "unfit" was for the "health and protection of the State" (ibid.) and it has, to this day, never been expressly overturned (ibid.).

The eugenics movement then lost some of its popularity after World War II, due to it being extensively used by the Nazis. But it never disappeared and veered more towards "social engineering" as it responded to the social anxieties of the time, such as concerns about welfare, Mexican immigration and the civil rights movement, and was based on the conviction that even broader "defects" such as poverty, were genetically transmitted and had to be targeted and stopped (Kluchin, 2009: 10, 20). This shift, together with advancements in birth control

technology and application would define the next era for the movement, that would be referred to hereafter as "neo-eugenics" (ibid.).

The aim of this chapter is to briefly illustrate the origins of the eugenics movement and their relation to modern neo-eugenics in order to better understand the influence it holds over the contemporary discourse that also impacts the immigrant Latin American women who were forcibly sterilized at the ICE camp, as well as their predecessors.

3. Research Review

To gain insight in already existing knowledge and research within our field of study we did a short research review. We approached this by especially using the search words: forced sterilization, coerced sterilization, involuntary sterilization, U.S.A., US, immigrant women, Latin American women, discourse, Mexican Women. We used AAU online library and Google Scholar as our search engines and combed for research done on forced sterilization with a focus on the US. We organized and systematized our research review by making use of the presented search strategy and chain search, looking at the bibliographies of the relevant results (Rienecker & Jørgensen, 2014: 148-149). It should be mentioned that due to time and space limitation, our research review has been done more broadly and not as in-depth as it could have been carried out. But this still gave us a fair idea about existing research and how we position ourselves within this.

There has not been published research on this most recent case of forced sterilization in the US at the ICE detention camp we are exploring. There has been published research and literature on US' history with forced sterilization, which we have presented partly above and some we would like to highlight here. We furthermore found interesting and relevant research on discourses on minority women, especially immigrant Latin American women in the US and the correlation with forced sterilization, which we will present below.

Several researchers go into the idea of women being "unfit" to bare children, reasoning for sterilization. Alexandra Minna Stern in "Sterilized in the Name of Public Health" (2005) connected 20.000 involuntary sterilization in California at state-run homes or hospital between 1909 to 1979 and traced pro-sterilization arguments founded in eugenics and protection of public health (Stern, 2005: 1128). She explored the "…intersection of race, sex, immigration,

sterilization, and health policy…" (Stern, 2005: 1129). From this intersectional point of departure, the article highlights that most women who were sterilized in California were foreign born and deemed "unfit" to procreate and therefore exposed to sterilization "…in the name of public health" (Stern, 2005: 1136). Also, Kluchin's chapter on "Sterilizing "Unfit" Women" in her book "*Fit to be Tied: Sterilization and Reproductive Rights in America, 1950-1980*" (2009) scrutinizes the history of forced sterilization in the US from late 50s to early 70s with a focus on minority women. Here Kluchin presents discourses surrounding mainly black and Latin American women such as the "pregnant pilgrim" and demonstrates how these discourses, and other means, legitimized forced sterilization of minority women in the US (Kluchin, 2009: 85-86). Kluchin's research will be used in answering research question 1 and a more detailed recap of the findings will be presented in section 6.1.

Stern and Kluchin evidently shows that especially minority women were categorized as "unfit" to have children, reasoned within an eugenics logic, creating a legitimization for sterilizing these women often without consent. Research shows that this also accounts for immigrant Latin American women, who were depicted as "unfit" mothers due to discourses characterizing them as "hyper-fertile" and therefore a threat and a burden on US society.

Mary Romero in "Constructing Mexican Immigrant Women as a Threat to American Families" (2011), focuses on Mexican immigrant women, especially mothers, and analyze anti-immigration discourse used by Mothers Against Illegal Aliens (MAIA) which draw heavily on Homeland Security rhetoric and immigration law enforcement (Romero, 2011: 50). Romero studies MAIA based on the fact that the group "… reflects the larger discourse constructing Mexican immigrant women and their children as an economic and security threat to their own children and families of U.S. citizens" (Romero, 2011: 50). Romero especially highlights how Mexican immigrant mothers are perceived as breeders and identify four discursive themes that construct these mothers as "unfit" (Romero, 2011: 49, 58). One of the themes is especially interesting for our project which is "…reproduction is used as an opportunistic strategy to gain benefits" (Romero, 2011: 49). She points out "Recognizing the role that state's immigration policy and law enforcement plays in creating immigration as an eminent threat is significant in understanding how an emotional anti-immigration sentiment is fueled" (Romero, 2011: 64). Hereto, Romero points out MAIAs usage of rhetoric such as "anchor babies" or "jackpot babies" fuel a white racist ideology, which constructs Mexican women as "unfit" to be mothers (Romero, 2011: 64). Within a similar research framework, Helena R. Gutiérrez in her book "*Fertile Matters*" (2008) in chapter "They Breed like Rabbits", she explores how Mexican-origin women's reproduction has been stereotyped and demonized

in the US. Gutiérrez especially points out discourses constructing Mexicans as "hyper-fertile" and too "stupid" to use birth control, just eating up welfare (Gutiérrez, 2008: 52). She emphasizes that Mexican women's fertility became a public concern in the US and that especially the media played a role in creating a negative picture of childbearing "aliens" which needed regulation, resulting in sterilization abuse (Gutiérrez, 2008: 75-77).

Romero and Gutiérrez emphasizes the role of authoritative figures such as Homeland Security, immigration law enforcement and media in constructing discourses on Latin American women and their consequences such as forced sterilization, here showing the unequal nature of who are victims of forced sterilization.

Thomas W. Volscho in "Racism and Disparities in Women's Use of the Depo-Provera Injection in the Contemporary USA" (2011) study ethnic disparity in the usage of Depo-Provera, a temporary sterilization drug. Through statistical analysis using datasets from 2002 and 2004 Volscho explores "... racial pattern and prevalence of Depo-Provera use among non-sterile women age 18 to 44" (Volscho, 2011: 674). Concluding that Depo-Provera is more often given to women of color than European American women finding racial and ethnic disparity in long-acting provider-controlled birth control (Volscho, 2011: 684). Volscho uses the concept of *sterilization racism* which

> "...refers to the organization of racist controlling images, policies, and practices of delivering reproductive healthcare that operate to constrain, minimize, or completely eliminate the reproductive activities of women of color while sustaining and ensuring the reproductive rights of European American women." (Volscho, 2011: 676).

Hereby working with *racial frame*, a concept referring to organized sets of racial stereotypes and ideas as part of sterilization racism, asserting that women of color are more likely to be encouraged to use long-acting birth control, because of their race (Volscho, 2011: 676).

Volscho's research reveals the racist nature of Depo-Provera injections, thus confirming sterilization racism. The concept of sterilization racism is a useful concept, which the project will adopt in the discussion, as it helps highlight a racist tendency that is seen in the forced sterilization practice of the immigrant Latin American women at ICE detention camp.

Based on our short research review, we argue that our contribution to this field of study is to explore the cases of forced sterilization that has been carried out on immigrant Latin American women at the ICE detention camp, which there has not been published research on. We acknowledge that intersectionality and discourse analysis have been used to connect discourses

on Latin American women to forced sterilization in previous research. This project will therefore be building on this existing knowledge, drawing on similar method and theory to answer our problem formulation of why cases of forced sterilization have happened at ICE. Thus, positioning us within an understanding that discourses framing immigrant Latin American women positions them vulnerable to forced sterilization from an intersectional perspective. We hereby consider how the forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE detention camp echoes the US' history of sterilizing especially minority women based on a discursive construction of the women as "unfit", "pregnant pilgrims", "breeding like rabbits" and so on (Gutierrez, 2008: 52; Kluchin, 2009: 85-86; Romero, 2011: 58). To explore this our methodological step will be elaborated below.

4. Method and Methodology

This project will explore components to why the forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE detention camp has happened. For this purpose, we have decided to focus on the role of discourses, in understanding the contemporary representation of immigrant Latin American women and compare and understand those from historical cases of legitimizing forced sterilization. Here the project builds on research and news articles which reflect and present anti-immigration opinions, that especially focus on immigrant Latin American women, which will be the basis of our theoretical analysis. The project has an inductive approach to the field of study and in the pursuit of answering the problem formulation and research questions, the project will use Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyze our selected data. The precision of the field of study, choice of method, data selection, analysis strategy, data processing, and assessment of our methodological approach will all be elaborated in this chapter.

4.1 Object of Research

We have had an interest in exploring the cases of forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE camp in Georgia US and why these cases have happened. As mentioned before, this is the newest disclosed instance of forced sterilization in the US, but not the first. We thereby find it relevant to explore the recent case of forced sterilization within a

historical context by discerning a discursive aspect of legitimizing the actions towards the women exposed to this extreme act.

This project will not focus on the specific medical procedures that have been carried out by sterilization per sé, but rather look at structures that have enabled the act of forced sterilization both historically and contemporary. Here we specifically will look into discourses and their role in (re)production of dominance and inequality towards immigrant Latin American women, by having a critical perspective towards US right-wing anti-immigration political discourse (re)produced by politicians and media. We will explore the discourses framing especially immigrant Latin American women, linking that to historical cases of forced sterilization and thereto understanding the women's intersectional position as marginalized and vulnerable to the forced sterilization that has taken place at the ICE detention camp.

4.2 Theory of Science

In this section, we will account for science theoretical consideration, including our approach and reflection upon our role as researchers.

4.2.1 Our Approach

We understand forced sterilization as a phenomenon that is constructed on the basis of dominance and power abuse, which gain legitimacy via discourses (van Dijk, 1993: 249-250). In focusing on discourses as taking part of (re)producing inequality towards the immigrant Latin American women we understand that the social reality is a social construct and we, therefore, accept a social constructivist perspective in our study of why the forced sterilization has happened (Suurmond, 2005: 19; Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 14). We hereby acknowledge that discourses and how we talk about issues play an active role in constructing the world and social relations, and that our understanding of reality therefore is constructed through language (Suurmond, 2005: 19; Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 406). Hence, we seek not to produce objective true knowledge, as it is not the aim of discursive knowledge production, but rather to query the knowledge that claims or appears to be true and objective (Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 233). Thus, recognizing that there exists no universal knowledge, but the knowledge we are exploring is local and context sensitive within the US (Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 428). We hereto wish to question and understand the reality that individuals act from and explore the dynamic between power and knowledge (Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 233, 407). From this standpoint, we are

interested in examining the role of discourses concerning immigrant Latin American women in grasping the enactment of forced sterilization at the ICE detention camp, as research on history has shown the correlation between negative discourse framing minority women and forcibly sterilizing them. This will be carried out to gain knowledge about why these procedures have happened. To explore this, we have decided to make use of CDA, which will be elaborated later.

To gain more knowledge about the forced sterilization of the immigrant Latin American women at the ICE, we have tried to access our field of study openly by approaching it inductively. It means we go from research and data analysis to theory (Bryman, 2016: 22). As we began our research journey into understanding why these cases of forced sterilization have happened, we started to research other cases of forced sterilization of women within the US context, as presented in our research review. Here we came to understand historical cases of forced sterilization of minority women, especially in the late 50s to the early 70s and the reasoning behind these. These reasonings were tied up on certain ideas and discourses that deemed motive for the deed. This historically based understanding of the correlation between forced sterilization and discourses framing minority women will be linked to explore the forced sterilization of the women at ICE within an intersectional framework, to understand why these women have been exposed to these procedures. And so, we will be drawing on existing knowledge to gain perspective into this recent case of forced sterilization, to create a better understanding of why this has happened. This interaction between history and contemporary research can be understood from the hermeneutic spiral as a method of interpretation to achieve understanding of social phenomena (Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 110, 111, 404; Chilua, 2019: 6). Specifically, based on our data analysis process and its interpretative steps, we will combine the findings with historically based research to achieve understanding of the phenomenon of forced sterilization seen at the ICE and why it has happened through critically exploring discourses (Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 107, 110). Hereby looking at the meaning of texts through interpretation, recognizing that there exist different ways of interpreting the same problem and it is therefore our role as researchers to interpret the essence in our data (Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 108-109).

4.2.2 Our Role

Entering this field of study, we had considerations about the link between our role as researchers and what we wished to research. When doing CDA, we as researchers take an explicit socio-political stance within the problem area we study (van Dijk, 1993: 252). As van Dijk explains, we need to "Spell out … [our] point of view, perspective, principles, and aims, both within…[our] discipline and within society at large" (ibid.). On that account, our point of view is that this should not have happened, feeding our wonder why this has happened in the first place. Hereby, taking a stance in solidarity with the immigrant Latin American women exposed to the forced sterilization at ICE, aiming at illuminating some of the structures behind this happening. We herein want to highlight our bias since we, the researchers, are all white European women and therefore have not experienced the position the women in focus are in, we want to underline our solidarity stance in this project. Thus, we are not trying to understand the women's experiences but instead understand underlying structures that position them vulnerable to forced sterilization. In establishing our position, perspective and aim of this project we are aware that it influences all levels of theory, method and in general the outcome of our project (ibid.).

We have not taken part in the creation of data, such as conducting interviews, observations, or surveys but rather made use of news articles which Alan Bryman points out "... are 'given' data and as such are not influenced by an interviewer" (Bryman, 2016: 300). The data has thereby not been influenced by us when it was produced. It will however be influenced by us since we are selecting the articles and act as instruments for the data analysis, processing and interpretation, which is influenced by our stance on this topic, the aim of this project and our understanding of reality (Wadel, 1991: 78-79: van Dijk, 1993: 279). We therefore acknowledge that we bring our own knowledge and prejudices in the process of understanding (Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 428). Due to the CDA approach this is something we have been able to embrace since CDA research cannot and should not be neutral as an explicit socio-political stance is taken (van Dijk, 1993: 252, 270).

4.3 Data Selection

In this section we will elaborate on our data selection method on the historical and present data and the criteria we have set out in the selections.

4.3.1 Choice of Data

In selecting data for our analysis, we chose data that we saw as "…important in constructing the object of analysis" (Bryman, 2016: 540). To analyze the object of the project, why the forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE has happened, we understand the procedure as a social practice with relation to text that discursively frames models of immigrant Latin American women and victimizes them. As indicated previously, our historical research showed the correlation between discourses framing minority women and forced sterilization, we hereto underline a relevance of studying "...how texts are intertextually related to other texts, highlighting a historical view of the text as transforming the past and influencing the present" (Ciluwa, 2019: 6). We, therefore, argue for our choice of data is grounded in the relevance of an intertextual focus by comparing discourses and cases of forced sterilization from late 50s to early 70s with contemporary discourses to understand the cases of forced sterilization at the ICE.

We more specifically chose secondary data within the US context being existing research on the historical period and contemporary news articles that we argue reflects a discursive negative framing of immigrant Latin American women. Since we have a historical and contemporary focus, the two pillars have different data selection criteria, which are detailed below.

4.3.2 Data from the Late 1950s to Early 1970s

As explained earlier, our research focuses on comparing historical and contemporary discourses which we based on our research of historical cases of forced sterilization and the evident correlation between negative discourses framing minority women and forced sterilization. In understanding and elaborating on the historical aspect of forced sterilization in the US and discourses we have chosen to use the chapter "Sterilizing "Unfit" Women" in her book "*Fit to be Tied: Sterilization and Reproductive Rights in America, 1950-1980*" (2009) by Kluchin in our analysis. The reason behind using this specific book chapter is its comprehensive presentation of the existing research surrounding cases of forced sterilization of minority women, especially black women, in the 50s to late 70s and the discourses surrounding the victims of said act. There will in section 6.1 be further explained how we consider the differences and similarities between the two groups, black women and Latin American women, as being vulnerable to forced sterilization, arguing our reason behind using this specific research in analyzing the object of our project.

"Sterilizing "Unfit" Women" will be used as data, by taking key findings from this already existing research to answer our research question 1: What are the discourses surrounding minority women exposed to forced sterilization in the late 50s to early 70s? We will therefore not carry out data analysis on this data, since it has already been carried out. We hereby are aware that we are not doing a data analysis on this, but instead making a conscious choice of which findings to draw in relevance to our project, which hereto inspired our data selection for our contemporary data.

4.3.3 News Articles from the Last Six Years

In selecting data which displays contemporary discourses with relevance to our object of research, we wished to select text that framed especially immigrant Latin American women. We specifically were interested in texts that showed political right-wing anti-immigration discourses framing immigrant Latin American women. This turned out to be easier said than done, as Latin American immigrants in mass-media often are portrayed as one unified group. We then proceed to look at general discourses surrounding Latin American immigrants, bearing in mind that women are included under this term and from an intersectional perspective they were the one's exposed to the forced sterilization.

We searched through different US news sites mainly Fox News, Washington Post, NBC, CNN, New York Times, NPR and did internet searches both using a sampling of keywords in different combinations, such as: Latin American women, Latin Americans, immigrants, Mexican women, fertility and pregnancy. Due to time limitation, there were limits to the amount of data that we have been able to collect and analyze. Hereto, we ended up selecting five online national news articles published in the US by four different news sources (see table 1) which we deemed interesting and relevant in enabling us to answer research question 2: What are contemporary right-wing political discourses on immigrant Latin American women in the US news media?

A criterion for our data selection was to explore discourses that were dominating at the time of the forced sterilizations at the ICE. Therefore, have all the articles been published within the last six years, since we know these procedures have happened within the recent years. This was to ensure the data reflected discourses at the approximately time period of the sterilization to facilitate a correlation between the two. All the articles have been accessed and downloaded on either the 1st or 7th of December 2020, enabling us to code the articles. The articles can be found in the appendix. From here on the articles will be referenced to by using the appointed numbers in the table below.

Article	Title	Content overview	Media	Date	Accessed
1	Donald Trump just released an epic statement raging against Mexican immigrants and 'disease'	Transcription of a Trump statement on Mexican and Latin American immigrants. Here describing his view of immigrants from Latin America	Business Insider	06-07-2015	01-12-2020
2	Ex-ICE chief Homan: 'It's terrible what's about to happen' at border under Biden	Interview with former ICE director Tom Homan expressing his concerns regarding the Mexican border and immigration policies for when Joe Biden steps in as president	Fox News	10-11-2020	01-12-2020
3	Trump administration rule to restrict green cars for welfare-reliant immigrant takes effect	Article on the "public charge" rule that restricts green cards for immigrants likely to be dependent on welfare, going into official's arguments for the rule and public response	Fox News	27-02-2020	01-12-2020
4	Trump officials move to deny green cards, path to citizenship for poor immigrants	Article also on the "public charge" rule, looking into different opinions on the effect of the rule	The Washington Post	13-09-2019	01-12-2020
5	U.S taxpayers bear weight of anchor babies	This is an editorial which goes into the debate on 'birth tourism' among Hispanic women, calling their children 'welfare babies' pointing to it as a burden on U.S. taxpayers	Investor's Business Daily	28-08-2015	07-12-2020

Table 1: overview of data material

In the selection of the specific articles, we have tried to choose articles that illuminate the different inequalities that position the immigrant Latin American women and how they are framed. Specifically, article 1 was selected as it is a political statement that shows direct prejudice and racism towards Latin American immigrants by Donald Trump, US presidential candidate at the time and a highly influential political figure. Article 2 was selected because it is a statement by a former ICE director emphasizing his opinion on border politics and Latin American immigrants. Article 3 was selected because it gives us insight into politicians' reasoning and opinions on a policy on immigrants and welfare, stereotyping immigrants as welfare burdens. Similarly, for article 4. And lastly, article 5 was selected based on its expressive negative opinion and framing of immigrant Latin American women and their fertility.

The aim of analyzing the selected data is to understand the articles (re)production of discourses, in understanding the inequality and dominance that are enacted towards the immigrant Latin American women by creating a negative discursive model of them (van Dijk, 2015: 479). A critical target of CDA is power elites who enact power and dominance and create the positioning of for example immigrants (van Dijk, 1993: 252). We have therefore selected data that reflect US' right-wing anti-immigration political discourses and opinions by e.g., Trump, former ICE director and others. By selecting our data focusing on the right-wing political discourse (re)produced by politicians and media, we realize our analysis is going to reflect certain discourses and attitudes towards immigrant Latin American women. Since our goal is to reflect the discourses that (re)produce inequality towards the women, we have decided to keep a concentrated focus on politicians and media that take part in this. Thus, we acknowledge that we are looking at a one-dimensional aspect of a multi-dimensional case but doing so because of our historical understanding of the correlation between discourses and previous cases of forced sterilization of minority women in the US.

After all, we have to clarify our acknowledgment of data limitations. In selecting and analyzing the data, we have focused on quotes from politicians cited in the news articles. In this regard, we are aware that it is the journalists who have chosen the quotes; hence, the media also has a central role in the discourse (re)production. We therefore rely on the journalist and the media in analyzing discourses, hereto realizing the power of the media. This power aspect in the (re)production of discourse will be elaborated in the CDA part below.

Lastly, we are aware that the articles have been created and published by different media sources, which is influential in many ways to how problems are framed and communicated. Our data has many Fox News articles, as it is a republican leaning media source and has therefore published many relevant articles in relation to the project's object of research. For this we need to disclose that we have not engaged in the specific ethics and political standpoint of each media source, as well as the purpose of the different articles' genres. We are aware of the context sensitivity of CDA, but the reason for this has mainly been time and space limitation. We are aware of the relevance and influence of this in our data and we thus acknowledge this as a limitation in our project.

4.4 Data Analysis Strategy and Processing

In this section, we will explain our usage of Critical Discourse Analysis, clarifying the approach's key concepts and explain our process of coding the data guided by our CDA steps.

4.4.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

The project will be using CDA to analyze our selected contemporary data, in exploring the role of discourse in (re)producing negative models of immigrant Latin American women and its enactment of inequality (van Dijk, 1993: 249). This will be carried out with an active stance in solidarity with the women who have experienced the abuse. As indicated, the project will have a critical perspective towards political right-wing anti-immigrant discourses produced and reproduced by politicians and media, as presented in our data selection (van Dijk, 1993: 279). The process will more precisely be carried out by using CDA to analyze the selected news articles from the last six years, with a focus on how these women are being framed in contemporary discourses to answer research question 2. The most interesting findings will hereafter be presented and compared in relation to the historical data from late 50s to early 70s in order to answer research question 3: What similarities can be drawn between our findings in research question 1 and research question 2 understood within an intersectional framework with focus on inequalities of gender, race and status?

This will then be discussed in relation to the cases of forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE detention camp US in understanding why these cases have happened.

The project will have a critical approach to discourses based on the constructivist role and power discourses pose (Suurmond, 2005: 19). We define discourses as understood from a

Foucauldian perspective as "…a term that denoted that way in which a particular set of linguistic categories relating to an object and the ways of depicting it frame the way we comprehend that object" (Bryman, 2016: 531). The object here is, as presented, immigrant Latin American women. Understanding that "…social-power abuse and inequality are enacted, reproduced, legitimated, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (van Dijk, 2015: 466) we understand that the (re)production and dominance of discourses framing immigrant Latin American women have consequences as our understanding of reality is constructed through language (Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 236, 406). Here dominance is understood as the exercise of social power by elites, institutions which results in inequality (van Dijk, 1993: 249). CDA is therefore a suitable approach to provide insight into how US politicians and media's "…language use produces and legitimates racism..." (Bryman, 2016: 562) and other inequalities. We are herewith aware that discourses are not static but dynamic, and that culture, history, society, context and more are interrelated in discourse construction and production. Discourses do not solely construct the social world, but interdependently construct with everything surrounding it, therefore it can be helpful to look at the historical context of discourses (Bryman, 2016: 541).

The project mainly uses Teun A. van Dijk's (1993) perspective on CDA, but our process will not be restricted to his approach as CDA approaches are overlapping (van Dijk, et.al., 2011: 6). Since CDA does not have a step-by-step method of doing the analysis, we will take inspiration from different CDA applications (Huckin, 1997: 78; Suurmond, 2005: 17; van Dijk, 2015: 1). We will be using CDA as a qualitative method in describing, explaining, and interpreting the data (Chiluwa, 2019: 6). van Dijk's approach has a strong attribute in its aim of describing dominant discourses roles in manufacturing concrete models and by exploring social inequality (van Dijk, 1993: 258-259). As van Dijk puts it:

> "Via repeated political or media discourse about similar events, and via specific discourse moves of generalization, they may condition the generalization and abstraction of specific mental models to more general structures of knowledge and ideology, for instance about immigration..." (van Dijk, 2015: 473).

Thus, CDA is a tool to help us understand and expose the social inequality that the women exposed to because of a generalized model of immigrant Latin American women (van Dijk, 2015: 466).

We understand that there already exists an unequal power distribution based on who has discourse control, control of speech acts, genre, topics, and other communicative effects (van Dijk, 2015: 471). An example would be, Trump in his statement talking about Latin American immigrants, using negative metaphors on Mexicans has a stronger effect than if it was the other way around. This type of power we identified as power from the political elite and it reflects their access to public discourses and role in "discursive management of the public mind" (van Dijk, 1993: 280) realizing that discursive power and dominance are dynamic and can be subtle (ibid.). Furthermore, we acknowledge that the media also has power as touched upon before (van Dijk, 2015: 469). Van Dijk argues that "publishers and editors may thus give priority to negative topics about immigrants in the media and ignore or ban topics about white elite racism" (van Dijk, 2015: 471). Thus, in our analysis of online news articles, with quotes or statements from politicians, we acknowledge that the media has an enormous influence, hence power, in its redistribution and contribution of political discourse. From this understanding we recognize that the journalist captures the content and engages in the (re)production of discourse.

"To examine the enactment of power and dominance…" (van Dijk, 1993: 270) in the articles we have selected, we will "…systematically discuss its major discourse dimensions" (ibid.). Here we will especially focus on representations of immigrant Latin American women referenced to as strategies used by the media and politicians. These strategies are what we wish to explore as we understand them as creating models of Latin American immigrant women that result in domination by representing and stereotyping "them" in a certain way. This is understood to be either consciously or not, either way, it has an effect that we wish to explore (van Dijk, 1993: 262). We took inspiration from Thomas N. Huckin (1997) in his way of applying CDA by looking at them as a whole, then reading sentence by sentence, and then focusing on specific words (Huckin, 1997: 81-84). This gave us a structure to begin our analysis, which we divided into three steps which all consisted of coding the data and writing notes at the same time. This was a dynamic and flexible process arranged into three steps of analysis and interpretation which involved asking "who uses language, how, why and when… and to what effect?" (van Djik as quoted in Bryman, 2016: 540). Hereto we wish to highlight that the "who" and "when" aspect of our CDA was targeted in the data selection process, as we had a focus on who the articles quoted and when the articles were published. The next steps will therefore especially deal with "how", "why" and "to what effect".

Step one

For the first step we individually looked at the text as a whole, focusing on the framing of immigrant Latin Americans that is (re)produced through the political discourse seen in the articles. We then moved on to reading the text sentence-by-sentence looking specifically at the framing of the content, presupposition, discursive differences within the texts, arguments, style, and rhetoric (Huckin, 1997: 78). We hereto coded individually on our computers, using individual highlighting systems and notetaking.

Illustrating our process using Trump's proclamation: "The United States has become a dumping ground for Mexico and, in fact, for many other parts of the world" (article 1). Here uses a metaphor, presupposing that Mexican immigrants are "garbage", strategically framing it as a fact while using negative loaded words such as "dumping ground" which indicates his view of immigrants as being bad people and shows the racist tendencies in this rhetoric and in the discourse structures.

Step two

After the first step of individually analyzing the data, we shared our findings. We collectively compared our codes and notes, and as step two went back into the articles together, for a second round of interpretation of the articles based on our individual findings in the first step. We went through the same process as in step one. This led to the features of the texts that were most interesting from a critical point and thereby finding the concrete discourse structures that we were critical towards with our research question in mind (Huckin, 1997: 80). This led us to a focus on a "us" and "them" rhetorical strategy, identifying political discourse on welfare dependable immigrants and models of Latin American as illegal mothers with their "anchors babies".

Step three

With the three identified discourses in mind, we then looked over the articles a third time to get all of the information out of our data to engage critically with the discourses, finding strategies that go into understanding how the articles (re)produce a certain model of Latin American immigrants, only sometimes explicitly including women.

After systematically analyzing our data we selected the most interesting and influential strategies framing discursive models of immigrant Latin American women, also referred to as cognitive and ideological manipulations, which we will present in our findings (van Dijk, 2015:

473). For this, we are well aware that we might paint a simplistic picture of the power dimension we are exploring in this project (van Dijk, 1993: 280). Hereto, we would like to emphasize our acknowledgement of the fact that we are dealing with complicated power dynamics but kept a focus on the right-wing elite and media and their (re)production of discourses (ibid.). The reasoning behind this is explained best by van Dijk, "This choice is not motivate by the wish to picture these elites as the villains in the simplistic story of social inequality, but rather to focus on the unique access of these elites to public discourse, and hence on their role in the discursive management of the public mind" (ibid.).

4.5 Assessment of Methodological Approach

In researching the cases of forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE detention camp in the US we will emphasize critique and a broad assessment of our research, some have already been highlighted (Juul & Pedersen, 2012: 426). Hereto we have to be critical towards our approach, CDA, as it is an approach with many different interpretations, some consider it to be without a method or argue that CDAs method is alike other discourse analytical approaches and others dispute a third (van Dijk, 2015: 1; Suurmond, 2005: 17; Chiluwa, 2019: 6). This can be quite hard to navigate in when wanting to be true towards the choice of approach and there is no clear prescription. At the same time, it gives us, as researchers, a flexible framework to research within. Thus, we need to reflect critically upon our usage of CDA and general research approach. We recognize that our analysis is going to be biased since there is paid most attention to the field of study top-down and it is our critical point-of-view and stance of the project topic that guides our research (van Dijk, 1993: 250, 252). Hereto we have prioritized to be as transparent as possible in our different steps and usage of CDA throughout our method and since taking a stance on the object of research is part of the CDA approach, we, therefore, argue that our analysis is valid as we are being true to our approach. We could have had a more multidisciplinary approach which would have been appropriate in the CDA spirit since there would have been a more relational focus between text, society, and culture (van Dijk, 1993: 253). Because of time and space limitations, this was not a possibility that we could have explored more than we have.

5. Intersectionality

Our primary tool of interpretation will be the theoretical approach provided by intersectionality. Emerging from activist women's movements, especially within the Black community, the concept of *intersectionality* was first used by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1991 describing the way various inequalities could interact as an *intersection*, specifically in reference to gender, race and class (Crenshaw, 1991: 1242). The dimensions of inequality that intersectionality takes into account are often dynamic and changing, making intersectionality an apt lens through which to observe instances that are still occurring.

There are three main approaches to intersectionality once its objects of observation are broken down into separate categories, and they are: the anti-categorical, intra-categorical and inter-categorical approaches (McAll, 2005: 1773). The anti-categorical approach critiques and deconstructs the categories, but this approach could seem oversimplified, the intra-categorical approach investigates the way in which boundaries within categories are made and their effects on each other while the inter-categorical approach makes a strategic use of categories to investigate the multiple and conflicting dimensions between them (ibid.). We acknowledge how useful it is to our project to understand these various approaches, while at the same time keeping in mind that intersectionality can also be read as a continuum, as a much more fluid approach to reality, which is as complex as the approach itself.

Taking into account our situatedness as western, European, white and not lower class women and that intersectionality as an approach is fairly young, we realize how that might impact the outcome of our research and are keeping in mind the limitations this can have, mainly the risk of overlooking or missing certain aspects because we chose to focus only on a select few inequalities; nevertheless we firmly believe that intersectionality is the most useful tool we could apply and we will be using the intra-categorical approach because, due to its focus on how the different dimensions within categories and the way they affect each other, we feel that it is the one that best addresses the complexities of our topic; ostensibly the fact that these women were and continue to be subjected to forced sterilization is a product of the interaction of "categories" they find themselves to be a part of i.e. being a woman of reproductive age and an immigrant and coming from Latin America etc.

We will be using intersectionality as an analytical approach to analyze the social inequalities that affect these women while emphasizing the contexts of place and time of the power relations perpetrated by the discourse set forward by the media and political elites.

Moreover, integrating intersectionality and CDA will allow us to analyze the social inequalities by favoring solidarity within the analysis itself.

And finally, we would also like to point out that intersectionality is the preferred approach to use while analyzing cases which are relative to gender based violence, because the "complex inequalities" interacting with each other in the forced sterilization case we are analyzing fall into the category of "widespread uncriminalized violence against women and minoritized ethnic and national groups [that is] *de facto* condoned by the state" (Walby, 2009: 192).

6. Findings and Analysis

In this chapter we will present research on historical cases of forced sterilization from the late 50s to the early 70s, looking especially at the discourses on minority women in that time period and how those became reasons for forced sterilization. After that, we will present the findings of our CDA on contemporary discourses on immigrant Latin American women and end the chapter by comparing the presented findings from the first two sections, understanding it from an intersectional perspective. These three sections will individually deal with answering one research question each.

6.1 A Pivotal Decade in US' Eugenics' History

Previously in this project it has been explained how eugenics and forced sterilization have a long history. The purpose of this section is to go deeper into a pivotal time period in the history of eugenics, between the late 50s and the late 70s, which entails some crucial information and where structural changes happened that had a big impact on the topic of forced sterilization. It will be based on the chapter "Sterilizing "unfit" Women" in Kluchin's book *"Fit to be Tied: Sterilization and Reproductive Rights, 1950-1980"* (2009). This will be used to answer our research question 1: What are the discourses surrounding minority women exposed to forced sterilization in the late 50s to early 70s?

In 1964 the Civil Rights Act was set in action, this meant that people of color suddenly had access to federal programs and services, including welfare, which they had previously been largely excluded from due to racial segregation (Kluchin, 2009: 73-74). At first glance this seems like an indisputably good thing, however, to women of color this turned out to be a

bittersweet transition. Combined with the emergence of government sponsored family planning, this caused a shift in the demographic of women who were victims of forced sterilization, from poor white women to poor black women, with the rate of black women being sterilized going from 23% to 64% (Kluchin, 2009: 73-74, 94). Because of the Civil Rights Act women of color came more into contact with doctors, social workers, lawyers and/or judges, most of whom viewed these women as "defective" and therefore took it upon themselves to sterilize them in order to reduce their dependence on the welfare system (Kluchin, 2009: 73-74, 94). This also marks a shift from eugenics, with a focus on keeping "bad genes" out of society, to neo-eugenics with a focus on preventing people from causing a strain on the welfare system by having children they cannot provide for (ibid.).

When black people gained access to the welfare system it also meant a change in how welfare recipients were viewed: from the image of a 50s innocent white widow, who had lost her husband and therefore her income, to the one of a hypersexual single black woman, who kept having children to receive welfare and have the state to support her instead of getting a job (Kluchin, 2009: 75). What is also very important to point out here is that these stereotypes and discourses are only used to describe women. Historically women have been viewed as less worthy of welfare than the male recipients who were no longer able to work due to age, illness or even injury, and you can see how the discourses of women on welfare became more degrading when women of color gained access (ibid.). This is an example of how the intersection of different inequalities is affecting how these women are viewed differently because of race and class. This all combined created the discourse of the "welfare queen".

Articles from the time period also painted a picture of black women deliberately getting pregnant to receive welfare or not being worthy of welfare because they were inherently unfit and dishonest (Kluchin, 2009: 76). The discourse about the "welfare queen" could also be seen used in political statements of the time, such as in 1961 the city manager of Newburgh, New York Joseph Mitchell made racial politics part of his welfare policy, by accusing black people, especially those who were migrants, of taking advantage of the welfare system instead of paid labor. He accused black women of becoming pregnant out of wedlock on purpose to receive welfare, thereby linking dependency and illegitimacy (Kluchin, 2009: 76-77). He argued that the city had a "culture of welfare", which is linked to very common neo-eugenic thinking, where culture is cited as the cause for how "unfit" women reproduce their "immorality" and raise their children to be "defective" and "lazy" citizens as well. These views lead to national debate which caused this association between black illegitimacy, immorality and welfare to be set in the mind of the public (Kluchin, 2009: 76-77). This was closely connected to the idea

that "unfit" women who received financial aid should not have reproductive autonomy: if they could not take care of their own children then their reproductive decisions should lay with the government and taxpayers (ibid.).

The discourse of "the welfare queen" punished poor black women as it suggested that they "chose" to engage in "deviant" sexual behavior while also arguing that hypersexuality and promiscuity were an "inherent" part of them that drove them to behave that way (Kluchin, 2009: 78). By doing so it combined biological, economic and moral factors - it was both a question of nature and nurture. The stereotype of black women as biologically "promiscuous" and "hypersexual" only applied to them via the implication that this "vulgarness" and behavior were inherent to these women's culture, which made it so it could not and would not be associated with white women (ibid.). This meant that the women at the intersection of being black, mothers, poor and especially unwed, were seen as "unfit". This however meant that they were caught in this position: they were being criticized for being unfit based on race and class, which prevented them from ever achieving the acceptance of being "fit", as certain factors were seen as inherent to their race (ibid.). These tendencies were also seen in certain scientists' works, who conducted a study that showed how black people scored lower on IQ tests, which "demonstrated" that black people were less intelligent than white people (Kluchin, 2009: 80-82). This was then used to explain why black neighborhoods stayed poor and financial aid did not help, they contributed to a discourse which framed black people as "not intelligent enough" and therefore could not make good decisions on reproduction either (ibid.). Now it is important to note that these ideas received backlash especially from civil rights groups, but they also resonated with others, particularly conservative white working/middle class Americans, who viewed integration as a threat to their own social and economic status (Kluchin, 2009: 83). For them these ideas were an opportunity to defend their own white privilege (ibid.). This discourse about the "welfare queen" caused a lot of resentment towards women of color from conservatives because they found it opposite to the American values they believed and stood for (Kluchin, 2009: 83-84). The middle-class had grown and more than doubled during the postwar years, mainly due to the G.I. bill, which provided veterans with education and homeowner or business loans (ibid.). But this white middle class viewed the support they had received very differently to the aid that was given to the poor women of color, they viewed themselves as deserving of aid, whereas the discourse of these women of color "taking advantage" of the welfare were "unworthy", "unfit" and representing "non-American" values (ibid.). With this view it almost became an act of patriotism to prevent these "unfit" women

from receiving "underserved" support and being a burden on society, while simultaneously reproducing "undesired" values, through their offspring, and, therefore, as suggested by aforementioned conservative politicians and scientists, sterilization was an effective means to prevent this (Kluchin, 2009: 84). The discourse of the "welfare queen" is a prime example of how negative discourse created by scientists and political elites can be spread by the media to the public and function as justification for extreme measures, such as forced sterilization to be used against its targets.

While the discourse of the "welfare queen" is predominantly applied to black women and it might seem like a discrepancy with the topic of this project, forced sterilizations in the ICE detention camp, where the women affected were mostly immigrant women of Latin American descent. However, we argue that this discourse still has great relevance as it has since expanded to include a broader array of women of color, especially those who are immigrants, since it also paved the way for or adapted into another discourse: the "pregnant pilgrim" (Kluchin, 2009: 84-85). This was used to describe Latin American immigrant women, especially in states such as California, who in the late 60s to early 70s experienced a rise in immigration from Latin American countries (ibid.). However, the discourse surrounding the issue made the problem seem bigger than it was, the public debates on illegal immigrants receiving welfare caused a lot of anger (Kluchin, 2009: 85). The "pregnant pilgrim" was one of the specific discourses on Latin American immigrant women, it described a pregnant Mexican woman who would cross the border, with the sole purpose of giving birth in an American hospital making her child an American citizen and thereby making her eligible for welfare. The "pregnant pilgrim" and Latin American immigrants were linked to all sorts of problems, such as population control and environmental preservation, they were blamed for having too many children and thereby cancel out the benefits of conservation (Kluchin, 2009: 85). And they were also blamed for spending too much of the taxpayer's money by being on welfare, in jails or in mental institutions in large numbers, all money they were not "entitled to" (ibid.). This ignited debates about who had a legitimate claim to public services. Again, white middle-class Americans were angered by this notion of the "pregnant pilgrim", they believed that because they paid taxes, they had the right to decide how and on who it was spent on (Kluchin, 2009: 85-86). We once again see the argument that these poor women of color upheld un-American values, they chose to be on welfare, instead of working hard and adopting an American work-ethic, in order to sustain themselves. Furthermore, the discourse framed Latin American women who came to the country as immigrants, known as "pregnant pilgrims", was that they were unethical and living

off welfare they were not entitled to and not willing to take a paid job instead, these women were also perceived as being "hyper fertile" and therefore having large families that the welfare system would have to support (ibid.). The public discourse was that the "pregnant pilgrim" was a threat to society, her hyperfertility contributed to her dependency on welfare because she chose to keep having kids, whom she could not support on her own (ibid.). Like with the "welfare queen" some scientists and politicians were feeding this discourse by showing "evidence" that these women were "dangerously hyper fertile" causing a strain on welfare funds and overpopulation issues (ibid.). Once again sterilization was seen by some as a solution, as it could prevent these "hyper fertile" women from having these large families and limit their dependence on welfare: if they did not give birth to an American citizen, they did not have access to the funds, funds some people did not believe they were entitled to in the first place (Kluchin, 2009: 87). It is important to note that throughout this time period it was a debated issue, as not everyone agreed with these neo-eugenic ideas (Kluchin, 2009: 91-94). Whether or not these women were subjected to forced sterilization also depended on whether they ended up in the hands of a doctor, judge or social worker who decided to take advantage of existing eugenics laws (ibid.). While there were laws set in place to try to prevent "unnecessary" forced sterilizations, that was not enough (ibid.). There are many cases of doctors using the loophole of "obtaining consent" from women who were illiterate or did not speak the language (ibid.). Latin American women especially were approached by doctors while at the hospital to give birth, so this consent would be obtained while under destress and/or under the influence of medicine (ibid.). There have been cases of doctors harassing these women from the moment they entered the hospital to the time they left to obtain consent to sterilization, and unfortunately many times these women who had been coerced into it were not aware what exactly had happened to them (Kluchin, 2009: 91-94, 101-106).

To answer our first research question, we have presented two discourses about women of color, the first one, the "welfare queen", emerged in the late 50s and early 60s and described an idea that poor black women, especially does who were single mothers, chose to have kids out of wedlock and take advantage of the welfare system instead of getting a job (Kluchin, 2009: 78, 87). The discourse presented them as hypersexual, lazy and of bad morals and that they would pass this "culture" on to their children (ibid.). As a response to this discourse legislative proposals for sterilization started emerging and by the late 60s and early 70s public hospital physicians started taking advantage of the family planning and legitimization of long-term and permanent contraception to make their own sterilization plans (Kluchin, 2009: 85-87). In the

early 60s there was an attempt from the lawmakers' side to get women into contact with these public health providers and get funding for sterilization, but by the 70s, when the "pregnant pilgrim" discourse first appeared, these structures were already in place, which then allowed forced sterilization to flourish (ibid.). The "pregnant pilgrim" discourse adopted a lot of the characteristics of the "welfare queen", undeserving women of color who had children to take advantage of the system and receive money from the state instead of supporting themselves. Being dependent on welfare and spending tax-payers money was one of the main arguments used by those who advocated for these discourses, they were using money they were not "entitled to' and that was showing bad moral and un-American values, because they believed these people to be lazy, if they would just work hard enough then they could achieve the American dream. This was the story being told in both discourses and for both discourses some of these traits were inherent as well, like with black women being hypersexual and Latin American women being hyper fertile, both presented as an issue because they would conceive too many children that they would not be able to support. The two discourses are quite similar with the first one paving the way for the other, just adding the dimension of the Latin American women being immigrants and of course they were originally talking about different races or ethnicities, but it is largely the same argument: they were a burden on society. The outcome was also largely the same - it allowed people to take extreme measures such as forced sterilization for the "greater good" of society, while the intersection of race, social status and gender kept these victims from doing much about it (Kluchin, 2009: 74). This section demonstrates just how the views and discourses of the time surrounding these women of color contributed greatly to them being especially vulnerable to forced sterilization.

6.2 Contemporary Discourses on Immigrant Latin American Women

In this section we will present our most interesting and relevant findings from our CDA of our selected news articles from the last six years. We will specifically go into presenting discourses as being based on an "us" vs. "them" rhetoric, discourses stereotyping Latin Americans as welfare-dependable and lastly discourses on Latin American women as illegal mothers with "anchor babies" This section will answer research question 2: What are contemporary right-wing political discourses on immigrant Latin American women in the US news media?

In order to answer the research question, we will present identified strategies used by right-wing politicians and media that creates a negative model of immigrant Latin American

women, through prejudice and stereotyping, hereto (re)producing discourses that frame these women.

We need to clarify that parts of this section deals with statements and articles regarding Latin American immigrants in general. However, we still see Latin American women as part of these discourses even when it is not explicitly stated.

6.2.1 "Us" vs. "Them"

Based on our data analysis we came across an extensive usage of rhetorical figures of "them" in contrast to "us". Since we are exploring the "… reproduction of dominance through discourse understanding…" (van Dijk, 1993: 262) by looking at models of immigrant Latin American women presented in the articles, we find it relevant and essential to go into this discursive strategy usage of "us" and "them". We argue that this dichotomous rhetoric creates a standpoint and a strong structure in the political discourses framing immigrant Latin American women that we see in our data. Particularly, we see a manufacturing of a discursive model on immigrant Latin Americans that is especially based on a negative representation of "them" (van Dijk, 1993: 258-259).

The quotes from politicians in the selected articles are full of deceits such as "us", "them" and "our". To exemplify the usage of pronouns: quoted by acting Deputy Homeland Security Secretary Ken Cuccinelli at the time of the publishing of the article: "…our American community…" (article 3), White House press secretary Stephanie Grisham: "…newcomers to our society…" (article 3) and Trump uses the word "our" four times and "them" two times in his short statement (article 1). This use of pronouns is especially influenced by the social and political positions of the actors quoted (van Dijk, 1993: 277). As already highlighted, we look at especially right-wing political discourses (re)produced by politicians and media, who have an anti-immigration position. Therefore, we see in the text that representing "us" is especially founded in a strategy that positions "them" as "outsiders" and distances "us" from "them". This enact what van Dijk would call group dominance by linking a model of Latin Americans with negative attitudes which create consequences for "them", by creating a hierarchy where one group is "better" than the other based on the context (van Dijk, 1993: 254, 259, 263).

The strategy of representing "us" in contrast to "them", is based on a highly dichotomous rhetoric seen in all of the articles which follows a positive representation of "us" and negative representation of "them", whereas "them" is presented as a unified group of all

Latin American immigrants (van Dijk, 1993: 263). This is especially a strategy Trump made use of in his statement published in 2015. Trump produced a negative model of Latin American immigrants, by using the metaphor: "The United States has become a dumping ground for Mexico" (article 1) thereby, painting a picture of people from Mexico as being "garbage". Furthermore, he expresses a generalization that immigrants from Latin America are not "good people" by saying that Mexico is "… not sending their best [people]" (article 1). Additionally, Trumps presents this as a fact by saying "it only makes common sense" (article 1) that the US is not getting the "best" or "right" people. By presenting it as a fact he is naturalizing the statement and naturalizing it to be a fact that the US is receiving "undesirable" immigrants. Hereto Trumps ends his statement on Latin American immigrants by emphasizing his aim and wish to "The issues I have addressed and continue to address are vital steps to make America great again!" (article 1). This rhetorical strategy further creates a representation of "us", the US and its citizens, would be "great" if there were no more of "them". Arguing for the vitality of keeping out "bad" Latin American immigrants for a better US.

Trump was running for president at the time of the statement therefore we argue that he produced and reproduced racism at a high political level and had authority to present these models of Mexicans and Latin Americans in general, backed up by media distribution of the statement, reaching a lot of people (van Dijk, 1993: 268). Understanding the context model of Trump's statement he as a white presidential candidate directed his speech about "them", Mexicans and Latin Americans, towards his supporters and the general US population (van Dijk, 1993: 262). This enactment of white group dominance by presenting these models in his political position, clearly has a constituting effect on the models of Latin American immigrants that he is framing, which have consequences for "them" even though he is not directing the statement directly towards Latin Americans (van Dijk, 1993: 263). Trump's statement directly and "…indirectly supports the system of ethnic-racial dominance, that is, racism" (van Dijk, 1993: 279) which especially is to be understood from the context and authority of Trump, his statement and the media. These strategies as presented above, following van Dijk, then justify inequality since it creates a model of Latin American immigrants by focusing on negative representation of "them" (van Dijk, 1993: 263). So, the Trump statement and the other articles creates a racialized model of immigrant Latin Americans that causes inequality by positioning "them" beneath "us".

This formation of a model of Latin Americans is especially made credible by the strategies highlighted above (van Dijk, 1993: 264). We also see the strategies are tied to nationalistic rhetoric where there is emphasized a discrepancy between "them" and "us" based

on a understanding of American values. As quoted by Cuccinelli in article 3 commenting on the "public charge" rule: "…it's a core American value of self-sufficiency and it's just plain old logic…". Self-sufficiency is highlighted as an American value, which is pointed out in the context of talking about immigrants. Here, what is interesting is the use of American values as a persuasive strategy to make negative statements about "them" credible (van Dijk, 1993: 264). American values thus become a rhetorical strategy that emphasizes a gap between "us" and "them" by emphasizing that immigrants lack American values, indirectly arguing that the model of Latin Americans are "not desirable" in the US.

This part has demonstrated that the discourse structures and strategies we have identified and exposed in our CDA is based on negative opinions about immigrants from Latin America, uttered by politicians and redistributed by the media, highly based on stereotypes and prejudice against "them". We argue that the negative model of Latin Americans expressed through an adverse "them" is communicative discrimination, which is an instance of discourse dominance that creates inequality and social injustice grounded in racism, which also target immigrant Latin American women (van Dijk, 1993: 260). Racism is therefore being produced and reproduced through right-wing political discourse as seen in Trump's statement, but also through the media's redistribution of the statements through articles. In this enactment of dominance, we see a discursive marginalization of Latin Americans immigrants which is based on prejudice and generalizing a negative representation of "them" by systematically associating "them" with cultural differences in contrast to "us" as present above, but also with problems regarding welfare which we will look into now (van Dijk, 1993: 264).

6.2.2 Welfare Dependent Immigrants

Above we have highlighted how a negative "us" vs. "them" dichotomy is present in contemporary discourses about Latin American immigrants, where they are being represented as "worse" people than the Americans and as possessing un-American values. This part will go into how they are framed as an economic burden on US society.

In relation to explaining the "public charge" rule Deputy Homeland Security Secretary Cuccinelli is quoted saying "what country wants to bring welfare problems into its society?" (article 3) He then goes on saying that the US is happy to welcome new people if they can "stand on their own two feet" (article 3). This goes hand in hand with what was explained above, pointing out that a good American value is to be self-sufficient. But in this

rhetoric, even the fact that it is called "public charge" rule is insinuating that immigrants are equal to welfare issues, which is also clearly seen in the above statement. Cuccinelli is creating a model of Latin American immigrants not being able to provide for themselves therefore bringing "welfare problems" into US society. This is one example of strategies being used to paint a picture of these immigrants being an issue to society, especially in an economic sense. In another article Cuccinelli is quoted about it being important that immigrants who gain access to the United States are self-sufficient and "will not be reliant on the welfare system […] which is so expensive, frankly" (article 4). In this statement it is apparent that poor immigrants are perceived as a burden on the welfare system, they are viewed as an economic problem as it is too expensive to have immigrants supported by welfare. Former ICE director Thomas Homan also adds to this discourse, by saying that if the government stops deportations, then the US will "lose the border" because many immigrants will come to the US because "[they] won't be deported and we'll give [them] free healthcare?" (article 2), thereby adding a dimension of Latin American immigrants "taking advantage" of the system. This negative rhetoric is used as an argument for trying to keep these immigrants who will be a "public charge", bringing "welfare problems" and be "an economic burden on the welfare system" out of the US.

In the Fox News article (article 3) this "public charge" rule is presented as "long awaited" and "latest in a series of Supreme Court wins on immigration-related policies". So, in a republican friendly news media, this is seen as a positive change. Cuccinelli himself also tries to paint a picture of this reflecting the wishes of the average American, saying that "most ordinary Americans" that he has talked to are "stunned" and tell him "I can't believe we needed to do this, I can't believe that welfare is available for people who aren't American citizens or who aren't already here on a permanent basis" (article 3) and he has not met many who had a "favorable response to this" (article 3). This strategy used by Cuccinelli and Fox News, having an important role in the framing of the "public charge" rule by distributing Cuccinelli's opinions, is presenting the rule as a wish from "most Americans" and that it is seen as a positive change by the general public. The rhetoric hereto presents the positive attitude among the US citizens toward the change as a fact that and uses this as a justifying argument for the implementation of this policy.

Another interesting aspect these quotes bring forward are presenting a problem concerning that "welfare is available for people who aren't American citizens" (article 3) this again brings forward the "us" vs. "them" dichotomy and raises the question of who is presented to be eligible for welfare:

"This final rule will protect hardworking American taxpayers, safeguard welfare programs for truly needy Americans, reduce the Federal deficit, and re-establish the fundamental legal principle that newcomers to our society should be financially self-reliant and not dependent on the largess of United States taxpayers" (article 3)

This quote by White House press secretary Stephanie Grisham shows many different dimensions to the discourses surrounding immigrants, once again the "us" vs. "them" is apparent - the "hardworking American taxpayers" that need protection from the immigrants. This clearly shows how immigrants are presented, by explaining what they are not perceived as i.e "hardworking" and "truly needy". By using positive rhetoric about the Americans, Grisham highlights a negative model representing immigrants as "lazy" and not truly in need of welfare, but just taking advantage of "the largess of United States taxpayers". By framing Latin American immigrants this way, she is implying that people who deserve welfare are US citizens who pay taxes, while immigrants "choose" to not work or contribute to the country and are therefore not deserving of its welfare.

The above quote highlights most of the aspects focused on in this part, it shows how immigrants are represented as an economic burden, as lazy and undeserving of welfare. They are seen as a burden to the US and US society. The negative discourse shown here is a strategy used by the right-wing politicians and media which generalizes and stereotypes Latin American immigrants as a welfare burden on the US (van Dijk, 1993: 264). In this part we have highlighted how immigrants in general are seen as a burden, in this next part we will go into how the reproductive capabilities of immigrant Latin American women are also presented as a "burden".

6.2.3 Illegal Mothers and Their "Anchor Babies"

Another aspect of the concept of "burden" on society these immigrants are represented to pose is their alleged ulterior motive to enter the country in the first place: producing offspring specifically in order to gain access to the welfare system. The term used to refer to children born to non-citizen mothers that give birth in countries with birthright citizenship, and who would then be able to help the mother and other family members gain legal residency, is "anchor baby". The fact that a term such as this exists already alert to discourses framing these women.

This section looks into the rhetoric used to frame immigrant Latin American women as a threat to the economy, because they would be preying on "honest citizens' taxpayer money", and society as an issue concerning poor immigrant parents and pregnant women who would be taking advantage of the welfare system by relying on the birth of so called "anchor babies" on American soil. The authorless editorial simply titled "U.S. Taxpayers Bear Weight of Anchor Babies" from conservative financial news source Investor's Business Daily (article 5) is the only instance in which women are specifically mentioned within the articles we have analyzed, with an emphasis on their role as "breeders". This article relies heavily on statistics as a strategy, which is usually seen as "neutral"; however, prejudiced rhetoric is produced and reproduced by the use of specific adjectives surrounding the statistics themselves such as "a *whopping* 75% [of Latin American immigrants using federal welfare programs]", where emphasis is added to the numbers in order to present the numbers in a subtly pejorative way in the minds of the readers.

This negative rhetoric continues by using words such as "exploiting" welfare programs even when the benefits of it are implied to have been obtained legally through the children's citizenship.

A familiar refrain, this time backed with statistics, reminds us that the women themselves are only the source of the problem, with the real threat remaining their children's access to the welfare system, with the crux of the issue being presented in the following quote:

> "The findings show a much larger share of immigrants are unable to support their children and turn to the nation's welfare system to support themselves or their children," the Washington-based CIS said. "Our immigration system is allowing in immigrants who are not able to support their own children." (article 5)

And placing the responsibility of that on pregnant women entering the country illegally. The neo-eugenics influence is clear within the message that is being conveyed: poor foreigners that cannot support themselves are entering the country with the intent of adding to the population members of their family who will also not be able to support themselves and thus burdening the country's welfare system.

Article 5 also claims that "birth tourism" benefits illegal immigrant parents because, if the government is the one providing food and healthcare for their children then the parents can spend their money elsewhere. It explains the reasonings behind that claim by further

exacerbating the "us" vs "them" rhetoric by stating that immigrants are not "assimilated into American culture" but at the same time they "[are] assimilating into [the US] welfare system" (article 5) stating that the problem is "much bigger than the numbers, which are already alarming." (article 5). While providing no source, they make sure the emphasis is on the threatening nature of a much larger unknown number.

With its final remarks the article ends by acknowledging the fact that the US welfare system is designed, in large part, to help low-income workers with children an adding that "Because we have opened our southern border to a rising tide of low-income workers with children — including hundreds of thousands carrying children in utero — we risk bankrupting our welfare system." (article 5). In this quote stating that hundreds of women are carrying their unborn children into the US to give birth and receive welfare, causing a large burden on the welfare system. This media source is directly connecting pregnant immigrants with the bankruptcy of the welfare system, stating that these women and their reproductive systems are a huge issue.

As stated in article 3 one of the key objectives is to restrict access to the country to individuals deemed "most likely to rely on welfare" which ties in directly with the current border patrol's Remain-in-Mexico policy which sends migrants at the border back to Mexico to await their immigration hearings (article 3) which especially applies to pregnant women, women that "trump has criticized" (article 5), at the border and having them wait in camps in order for them to not give birth on American soil. What most of the articles appear to want to ultimately prevent is immigrant families from exploiting the legal loophole that having children creates. Because of the birthright it would not be immigrants receiving the welfare: it would be citizens.

This part highlights a framed model of immigrant Latin American women and their capabilities to procreate as a threat by being able to produce "anchor babies" and therefore "will become" "a burden" to the US welfare system. (Re)producing a discourse of immigrant Latin American women as being the "core" of the "issue" by giving birth to welfare-dependent citizens.

6.2.4 Summary

We will here summarize our CDA findings in order to answer research question 2: What are contemporary right-wing political discourses on immigrant Latin American women in the US news media?

We have identified that the contemporary right-wing political discourse on immigrant Latin American women is founded in a discourse structure highly based on stereotypes and prejudice against "them", generalizing a negative representation of "them" in contrast to "us", based on racism by systematically associating "them" with cultural differences presented as inferior to "us". We have pointed out how Latin American immigrants are framed as an economic burden. They are presented as not able of being self-sufficient and therefore being welfare dependent. This is coupled with a negative discourse that frames Latin American immigrants as reproducing un-American values, such as being lazy and not willing to support themselves, thus being seen as undeserving welfare recipients. Hereto, we established that immigrants are presented as taking advantage of the US system, a rhetoric that also emphasizes the framing of immigrant Latin American women entering the country to give birth to their "anchor babies", perceiving these women as a threat. Discursively framing immigrant Latin American women's reproductive capabilities as the cause for future "burdens" on the US welfare system.

6.3 Comparison of Historical and Contemporary Discourses

In the previous two sections we have presented different discourses around women of color, immigrants and immigrant Latin American women. In the first section we dove into the historical discourses surrounding women who were victims of forced sterilization in the late 50s to the early 70s. The second section dealt with contemporary political discourses represented in news articles from the past six years. In this section we will answer research question 3: What similarities can be drawn between our findings in research question 1 and research question 2 and then understood within an intersectional framework with focus on inequalities of gender, race and status? This will be done by outlining how similarities can be traced from the historical discourses to the current ones and how the interaction of the aforementioned categories affects immigrant Latin American women today.

An ongoing theme whether we are talking about the "welfare queen", the later discourse of the "pregnant pilgrim" or the current discourses we have analyzed, is the fact that a distinction is made between "us" and "them". The "us" in this case being white American born citizens and the "them" being women of color, Latin American women or just immigrants in general. This distinction as we have outlined above is a strategy used by US right-wing power elites, such as

republican politicians and conservative media outlets to create a negative model of this group of people, that is argued to be due to their culture, ethnicity or even their race.

Another common strategy in both time periods is framing immigrants as an economic threat. Both the "welfare queen", the "pregnant pilgrim" and the current discourses, women of color and immigrants in particular are being framed as an economic "burden" on society. It is presented that these people uphold values that are perceived as inherently un-American, such as not being willing to work hard to support themselves but instead choosing to be on welfare and not contributing positively to society. They are represented as being poor because they are "lazy" and would rather "take advantage" of the taxpayer's money, a negative model that the elites have created to present immigrant Latin Americans as undeserving of welfare.

Our findings also showed that the framing of Latin American women as "pregnant pilgrims" from the early 70s is still circulating to this day. The model of Latin American immigrant women, coming to the US to have children in order to receive welfare is still presented as an issue. The idea that the women's capabilities to procreate is a "burden" and "threat" to the welfare system of the US is still present in current discourse but has just received a new name more focused on the child itself as an "anchor baby'". This negative image of Latin American immigrant women trying to take advantage of the US welfare system through their babies, is prevalent both in historic and present discourses, showing that these women's fertility was, and still is, seen as a threat.

Based on this comparison, we see a lot of similarities between the historical discourses on minority women from the 50s to the 70s and contemporary discourses framing immigrant Latin American women. We argue that it is with all these acts of dominance with which politicians and media especially, paint immigrant Latin American women as being inferior to "us" (white, middle class) US citizens, and as our historical outline has shown all of the above have previously justified extreme measures to be taken against "them" such as forced sterilization. Similarly, contemporary discourses echo this eugenic and neo-eugenic thinking, where one group is seen as having values and/or traits that are deemed bad for society, and it is therefore necessary to prevent them from reproducing (Kluchin, 2009: 78).

Hereto, we find it interesting and relevant to look at these discourses' patterns at the intersection between different inequalities appear firstly the "us" vs "them" and framing them as having bad un-American values is connected to their race and culture. Secondly, the framing of" them" as not being self-sufficient, an economic burden and not contributing to society is connected to their social status and the cause of their poverty. Lastly, the framing of Latin

American women as being "hyper-fertile" and having "anchor babies" they will not be able support, is related to their gender and this is an important "puzzle piece" to this issue, as forced sterilization is mostly happening to women. So, in the discourses through time, a pattern of the intersection of ethnicity, social status and gender can be seen as playing a big role in them being particularly vulnerable to practices as forced sterilization.

7. Discussion

We have now presented our findings in the analysis and we now wish to answer our discussion question: How the historical and contemporary discourses on immigrant Latin American women and their intersectional position are linked to the forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE detention camp, Georgia?

In this project we have shown how women of color and Latin American immigrant women have been put in a vulnerable position based on the intersection of their race, social status and gender. It is however not the intersection of these categories in itself that is the main issue, but the issue that has been constructed about these women in this position by negative discourses. We see that Latin American women have been and are targets of discursive marginalization by the elite, this "…systematic association of ethnic minorities with problematic cultural differences…" (van Dijk, 1993: 264) by a US-narrative that Americans are better and superior, by stereotyping and exaggerating some characteristics of Latin American women, creating a position understood from intersectionality where the immigrant Latin American women are vulnerable. By understanding the discourses and how this is done, we can understand how these women are viewed as being a "burden" on society, something that must be "stopped". This is where historically forced sterilization has been used as a tool and the discourses have been used as justification for this, thereby by understanding the discourses we can understand some of the underlying structures such as the inherent racism. We hereby argue that, based on our historical research in understanding discourses legitimization of forced sterilization of minority women and the similar logic that exist in today's discourses surrounding immigrant Latin American women, that the discourses placed upon the women play a role in the forcible sterilization that have been done on several women within the recent years at the Irwin County ICE detention camp. We will now in this discussion go further into how.

When looking at the cases of forced sterilization at the ICE detention camp by using the history of forced sterilization in the US during the late 50s to 60s to compare and understand it becomes apparent how similar it is. And this brings the question of how is this abuse still happening? From what we know the abuse the women at this ICE detention camp have experienced is very similar to the experiences we know from history. They ended up in the hands of a doctor who took advantage of the language barrier to avoid getting full consent, who talked them into having more aggressive procedures than they actually needed leaving them sterilized and then sending women back to the center who did not understand, what had been done to them or exactly what consequences it would have. This also means that exactly how many women this has been done too is unclear, but we know of at least 57 (Washington & Olivares, 2020). This way of abusing these women's vulnerable position to get a coerced consent is exactly what we saw in the 60s and 70s as outlined in section 6.1, if you ended up in the hands of a doctor who prescribed to the neo-eugenic discourses, they would use these loopholes, to perform sterilizations on Latin American women. So, is this just a case of one bad doctor? It is one option, certainly that is what the people responsible for the ICE detention camp would like us to believe, saying they have stopped referring patients to this particular doctor (Washington & Olivares, 2020).

If this was a rogue doctor acting on his own, we cannot say anything about his motivations, with the information we have now, but from the historical research we know that many of the doctors performing forced sterilizations believed in the negative discourses set forward about Latin American women. Those doctors believed minority women such as immigrant Latin American women would end up having many children and be a burden on society, therefore they felt the right to decide how many, if any, children these women should have (Kluchin, 2009: 104, 107). So, while we cannot be sure about the origins of his intentions, history tells us that the current discourses we have identified could have had an influence on how this doctor viewed the women and therefore felt he could justify putting them through the abuse of forcibly sterilizing them. This also means that even if "the uterus collector" did act on his own, we are still looking at a structural issue, where these discourses are reproducing hate and essentially racist, sexist and anti-immigrant thinking.

However, if we take a look at how the ICE and the LaSalle Corrections, the private prison group that runs the camp, have handled the situation in being accused of neglecting the immigrants at their facility in this whistleblower case it could seem to be a deeper issue, than just one doctor (Washington & Olivares, 2020). They have deported at least five women who

have accused the doctor of performing unwanted procedures on them, preventing them from witnessing in the federal investigation (ibid.) In our analysis we also showed how the former ICE director Thomas Homan (article 2) added to the negative discourse surrounding Latin American immigrants. None of this of course proves that the ICE administration had any active role in the forced sterilization, that is still to be investigated, however, it does show a negative attitude towards the people they are supposed to care for and them trying to "cover up" the situation, which could just be an attempt to avoid more bad press. But in the end, it doesn't even matter if they played an active role, the issue is that it happened while these people were under their care, so if they did not play an active role, they either neglected these people and failed to take care of them or they chose to not act until it showed up in the media. And the fact that the structures were in place that allowed this to happen, show some large structural issues connected to what Volscho calls racism sterilization, the power elites are constructing a discourse about immigrants that is negative, anti-immigrant and more or less overtly racist and this trickles down to the reproductive healthcare that is provided to these women (Volscho, 2011: 676). Women of color are more likely to be encouraged to use long-acting birth control, such as Depo-Provera, because official policies are trying to limit the amount of pregnancies these women have and they are assumed to be to unreliable to use other types of birth control, which again is connected to the history of eugenic thinking (Gutiérrez, 2008: 52; Volscho, 2011: 674). The discourses we have analyzed is an expression of these structures, it shows how these republican elites are expressing racist views, by creating a negative model connected to immigrant Latin American women, having very real consequences for the people inflicted. These discourses then, appear to be connected to the intersecting inequalities within which the women who are suffering from sterilization abuse find themselves, mainly gender, race and status, while at the same time victimizing poor immigrants who are the ones that end up in ICE detention camps.

So, we have discussed the correlation between the historical and contemporary discourses linking them to the cases of forced sterilization at the ICE, with awareness that we cannot say anything in particular about "the uterus collector" 's intention. Nevertheless, we still argue that based on the intersectional position of the immigrant Latin American women, seen in discourses framing them grounded in an eugenics logic is evidently linked to these cases of forced sterilization.

8. Conclusion

In this project we have had the aim of exploring the most recent cases of forced sterilization of immigrant Latin American women at the ICE detention camp in Irwin county, Georgia US, here contributing with new knowledge. Hereto, we set out to understand why this has happened within a historical framework, drawing on historical knowledge on forced sterilization especially from the late 50s to the early 70s to understand these contemporary cases of forced sterilization. We here re-iterate the problem formulation: Why are immigrant Latin American women vulnerable to forced sterilization in the ICE detention camp in the US, reported in 2020?

To answer our problem formulation, we further formulated three research questions to frame our research: (1) What are the discourses surrounding minority women exposed to forced sterilization in the late 50s to early 70s? (2) What are contemporary right-wing political discourses on immigrant Latin American women in the US news media? (3) And what similarities can be drawn between our findings in research question 1 and research question 2 understood within an intersectional framework with focus on inequalities of gender, race and status?

To answer research question 1, we focused on existing research on the correlation between forced sterilization and discourses on immigrant minority women from the late 50s to early 70s, presented by Kluchin (2009). Here we mainly focused on discourses on "the welfare queen" and "the pregnant pilgrim". To answer research question 2, we based our analysis on five online news articles from different media sources, containing quotes from mainly right-wing politicians expressing anti-immigration opinions, (re)producing negative models of immigrant Latin American women. Hereto, we analyzed our data by using CDA, which resulted in identifying three overall strategies which relate to how models of immigrant Latin American women are comprehended, a "us" vs. "them"-rhetoric, framing "them" as an economic and "selective" welfare burden and lastly, framing 'them' as having lots of babies as a strategic decision for them and their babies to become US citizens, thus benefiting from welfare themselves and as a way of financial support for the whole family/as many children as they might have.

To answer research question 3, we combined and compared our findings from research question 1 and 2, while understanding this within an intra-categorical intersectional framework. Here we came to the conclusion that there are many similarities in how immigrants, and specifically immigrant women, were and are framed in both time periods. The historical discourses can be traced to the present and the framing of "them" has not changed much. The

framing of immigrant Latin American women from a "us" vs. "them" is still present today, presenting "them" as inferior to "us". The negative model of Latin American immigrants being an economic "burden" on society, receiving welfare, but perceived as undeserving of, is clearly seen in the historical and contemporary discourses. A small change has happened with the "pregnant pilgrim", as the discourse has received a new name "anchor babies", however the idea is roughly the same, being that they come to the US and give birth to their "anchor babies" to "exploit" the welfare system. Hereto, we found that the discourses were related to different inequalities intersecting: the "them" vs. "us" is related to their "inferior" race, the "dependent on welfare" is related to their social status and them "having babies to take advantage of welfare" is related to gender.

We then argue and discuss the intersecting categories that the immigrant Latin American women are positioned within, which we assert to be reflected in and (re)produced through discourses and understand, from historical knowledge of legitimizing forced sterilization, the ways in which the discourse surrounding them leads to their position of vulnerability to forced sterilization.

Herein we convey the fact that underlying "eugenics values" are still very much present in people's attitude towards certain groups of people, and some of the most targeted groups remain poor people, immigrants and women.

9. Bibliography

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chiluwa, I. (2019). Discourse Analysis and Conflict Studies. *SAGE Research Methods Cases in Political Science and International Relations*, 1-13.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*, 1241-1299.

Gutierrez, E. R. (2008). "They Breed like Rabbits". In *Fertile Matters: The Politics of Mexican-Origin Women's Reproduction* (pp. 35-54). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Huckin, T. N. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. Miller, *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications* (pp. 78-92). Washington: ERIC.

Juul, S., & Pedersen, K. B. (2012). *Samfundsvidenskabernes Videnskabsteori.* Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Kluchin, R. M. (2009). *Fit to Be Tied: Sterilization and Reproductive Rights in America, 1950-1980.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Levine, P., & Bashford, A. (2010). Introduction: Eugenics and the Modern World. *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*.

Lombardo, P. A. (2008). *Three Generations, No Imbeciles: Eugenics, the Supreme Court, and Buck V. Bell.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

McCall, L., (2005), The Complexity of Intersectionality, Signs, Volume 30, Number 3, pp. 1771-1800, The University Chicago Press.

Patel, P. (2017). Forced Sterilization of Women as Discrimination. *Public Health Reviews 38:15*, 1-12.

Project South. (2020, November 14). *Lack of Medical Care, Unsafe Work Practices, and Absence of Adequate Protection Against COVID-19 for Detained Immigrants and Employees Alike at the Irwin County Detention Center*. Retrieved from Projectsouth.org: https://projectsouth.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/OIG-ICDC-Complaint-1.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3kcnEm06jKMVvXe0IOn_zbcDgOqC0LpPKXgcCxv1b WfJhr5h--SrXLIUc - accessed 16-11-2020

Rienecker, L., & Jørgensen, P. S. (2014). Litteratur- og informationssøgning til opgaven. I *Den gode opgave* (pp. 141-161). Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Romero, M. (2011). Constructing Mexican Immigrant Women as a Threat to American Families. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family Vol. 37, No. 1*, 49-68.

Stern, A. M. (2005). Sterilized in the Name of Public Health: Race, Immigration, and Reproductive Control in Modern California. *American journal of public health*, 1128-1138.

Suurmond, J. M. (2005). *Our Talk and Walk.* The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society vol. 4(2)*, 249-283.

van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin, *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis Second Edition* (pp. 466-485). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Volscho, T. W. (2011). Racism and Disparities in Women's Use of the Depo-Provera Injection in the Contemporary USA. *Critical Sociology*, 673-688.

Walby, S. (2009). *Globalization and Inequalities: Complexity and Contested Modernities.* London: SAGE.

Wadel, C. (1991). Fra observajon til data. I *Feltarbied i egen kultur* (pp. 75-96). Flekkefjord: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Washington, J., & Olivares, J. (2020, October 27). *Number of Women Alleging Misconduct by ICE Gynecologist Nearly Triples.* Retrieved from The Intercept: https://theintercept.com/2020/10/27/ice-irwin-women-hysterectomies-senate/ - accessed 02-12-2020