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The ‘Shadow’ of Eugenics

**Late 1800s, early 1900s:** Biostatisticians use genetics claims to promote eugenic reforms as ‘population control.’

**1940s:** Research centers & clinics develop “genetic hygiene” techniques to address “bad bloodlines.”

**1956-1966:** Identification of genetic conditions, testing innovations.

**Throughout:** Systematic forced sterilization targeting women of color and low-income white women.
Expectations for Individualized Responsibility

Health management is individual’s responsibility (toward the state).

Economic productivity as bodily independence vs. disability, dependence.

Public health agenda: screening and abortion of fetuses with genetic conditions as “cost-effectiveness,” reducing “burdens.”

Reproducing disabled children or parenting while disabled considered “irresponsible” or “irrational.”
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Research Methods

How does increasing use of prenatal genetic technologies illuminate changing perspectives about ‘meaningful’ existence?

Who should be responsible for reproducing children along these lines?

- “Casetext” database: WBL cases related to prenatal genetic testing.
- Included all WBL cases at federal appellate courts and all California courts.
- Analyzed cases between 1963 (first case) and 2021: 37 cases (16 in California).
Wrongful Birth and Wrongful Life (WBL)

**Wrongful Life (WL):** brought by or on behalf of the child with the genetic condition, alleging their birth was the result of the defendant’s negligent prenatal care.

‘Negligence’ deprived parents of “the decision to abort or never conceive.”

**Wrongful Birth (WB):** brought by parents against the healthcare provider for the deprivation of reproductive choice.

Had parents been informed ‘on time’ they would have exercised right to abortion.
Prenatal Genetic Testing Timeline

1950s-1970s
Development and clinical implementation of amniocentesis, an invasive prenatal genetic diagnostic test to sample fetal chromosomes.

1973
Roe v. Wade establishes pregnant person’s right to abort a fetus.

1979
National Institutes of Health release Consensus Statement stating that amniocentesis be routinely offered to women older than 35 years of age.

1983
- MSAFP testing developed, enabling prenatal genetic testing via maternal blood draw
- CVS testing developed, allowing invasive diagnostic testing of fetal chromosomes
- ACOG and AAP advise medical practitioners to offer prenatal diagnosis to ‘high-risk’ pregnant patients

2007
ACOG states that all pregnant patients, regardless of age, be offered prenatal genetic testing (particularly for Down’s Syndrome).

2011
Non-invasive Prenatal Testing (NIPT) released into the consumer health market.

2019
CAPS companies lobby Congress for NIPT coverage.
1) Courts frame disability as inherently unwanted; prenatal genetic testing should prevent these outcomes.

2) Courts see disability as individually embodied, not socially produced. Disability is a private burden for parents and providers to resolve.

3) As testing becomes common, courts transform disabilities into legally cognizable injuries that warrant damages/compensation.
#1 Technological Expectations
As tech advances, testing for normative health/ability emphasized


**Gildiner v. Thomas Jefferson Hospital (1978):** “failure to properly perform or interpret an amniocentesis could cause […] the unwanted birth of a child afflicted with Tay Sachs disease.”

**Curlender v. Bio-Science Lab (1980):** Supports systematic de-selection of fetuses with ‘unbearable conditions.’ Defendants’ duty breach is “proximate cause of an injury cognizable at law.”
#2 Parental Obligation
Responsibility shifts given prenatal care, but remains individualized

- **Park v. Nissen (1975):** Parental responsibility emphasized.

- **Curlender v. Biosciences (1980):** Physicians accountable for birth of disabled child when testing is standardized.

- **Berman v. Allan (1979):** “In failing to inform Mrs. Berman of the availability of amniocentesis, defendants directly deprived her (and her husband) [...] of the option to accept or reject a parental relationship with the child and thus caused them to experience mental and emotional anguish upon their realization that they had given birth to a child afflicted with Down Syndrome.”
Gletiman v. Cosgrove (1967): “If Jeffrey could have been asked as to whether his life should be snuffed out [...], our felt intuition of human nature tells us he would almost surely choose life with defects as against no life at all.”

Curlender v. Biosciences (1980): what matters is if “a plaintiff exists and suffers, due to the negligence of others,” rather than whether they should have existed at all.

Turpin v. Sortini (1982): “impaired life is not always more valuable than nonexistence.”
1. Overturning Roe v. Wade emphasizes family and disability support as private burden. Diminishes reproductive and disability protections.

2. Prenatal genetic technologies tied to social and historical legacies. Can we transform present use, so ableism is not the status quo?

3. Genomic technologies becoming more routine in pregnancy healthcare. Need thoughtful clinical practices and focus on inclusive social structures.
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