

are well aware of the Forum for Medical Ethics Society and the journal published by this Society, the *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*. This journal – the only one of its kind – has, over the past two decades and more, published several essays on wrongdoings in medical education and practice in India, both in the public and private sectors. It has also published essays which are critical of such public, policy-making bodies as the Medical Council of India and Indian Council of Medical Research, and contain suggestions for improvement. The authors have failed to make any reference to the Society and refer to just one paper published in the journal on page 174 of the book. Consequently, neither the Society, nor the journal finds a place in the index. I wonder whether the Society and journal have fallen short of the expectations of Drs Gadre and Shukla or whether they find them unworthy of mention.

2. From a study of this book, it would appear that 2016 has seen the first appearance of this text in print. A brief survey, however, shows that it was published in a book entitled *Voices of conscience from the medical profession*, released on February 26, 2015 at AIIMS. The text of that book was based on the Marathi *Kaifiyat – Pramanik Doctoranchi*, which has been brought out in two editions (2014, 2015).
 - a. As far as I can gather from news reports, all three publications are based on the same interviews with 78

practising doctors.

- b. I am unable to find references to these earlier publications in the book under review and wonder why this is so.
3. Dr Abhay Shukla is a member of the advisory bodies for the National Rural Health Mission and the National Human Rights Commission. It would be of interest to know what these national bodies, especially the latter, have done to rectify the wrongs listed in this book and how effective those measures have been. Unfortunately, there is no mention of these in this book.
4. Publishing books and reports is a very worthwhile activity. It spreads information far and wide. We know from experience, however, that their impact on wrongdoers is limited. It would have helped the reader to learn of the efforts made by the authors themselves to compel the guilty to change their practices and the success attendant on their endeavours.
5. The authors have not addressed in any detail the failings in medical colleges run by governments and municipal corporations, the reasons for their decline over the past few decades and the consequences for the very poor who are forced to flock to them. The focus on the private sector has resulted in a lopsided consideration of the ills that plague the poorest of our citizens.

Overseas children: challenges in international surrogacy arrangements

RAKHI GHOSHAL

Paula Gerber and Katie O'Byrne, editors. *Surrogacy, law and human rights*. Oxford, England: Routledge; 2015, pp 238, Hard cover £70.00 Kindle edition \$ 9.49. ISBN: 9781472451248 (hbk)/ 9781472451262 (ebk)

The practice, the contract, the challenges

A couple from the UK travelled to Ukraine in search of a surrogate mother. According to the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority (HFEA)(UK), a birth mother is the legal parent of the child, irrespective of citizenship, and so in this case, it considered the Ukrainian surrogate the legal mother. However, Ukraine law ruled that the surrogate could not be the legal parent, leading to an impasse that left the child without a country and a parent. The UK courts eventually ruled in favour of the commissioning couple, but the absence

of international guidelines on surrogacy contracts continues to throw up challenges that violate the human rights of one or all parties involved.

Surrogacy contracts are commonly made between people from different jurisdictions. Consequently, arriving at a mutually beneficial endpoint becomes difficult, if not impossible. The edited volume under review takes up the task of unpacking the problems that plague this domain and discusses the practical implications and consequences of the absence of international guidelines. It examines the problems of a lack of international surrogacy laws from the perspectives of the three primary stakeholders, the surrogates, the commissioning parents and the children born through surrogacy. Consequently, the articles examine the promises and problems in surrogacy, and take different positions vis-à-vis the availability of the surrogacy as a service.

Tammy Johnson discusses the landscape of the regulation of surrogacy in Australia, which largely permits only altruistic surrogacy and criminalises transnational arrangements. Johnson argues for a nationally homogenised regulatory model and recommends legalisation of surrogacy against

Author: **Rakhi Ghoshal** (rakhi.ghoshal@gmail.com), Consultant Researcher, Spandan Apartments, Kalikapur, Kolkata 700 078, West Bengal, INDIA

To cite: Ghoshal R. The overseas child: understanding international surrogacy. *Indian J Med Ethics*. 2017 Jan-Mar; 2(1) NS:62-4:

Published online on November 7, 2016.

© *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics* 2016

financial compensation so that surrogates can better place their claims and exploitation is minimised. She also recommends that only gestational surrogacy be permitted, ie the surrogate should only gestate the embryo, and her eggs should not be used. Richard Storrow provides an overview of surrogacy practices and norms in the USA; akin to the Australian regime, surrogacy regulations in the USA span from the prohibitive to the permissive, challenging interstate contracts.

Sonia Allan argues that the commonly drawn distinction between traditional surrogacy and compensated surrogacy is fallacious: in both cases, the child is actually “sold”. To claim that there is no genetic connection between the gestational surrogate (who does not use her eggs but only gestates the foetus) and the foetus violates the former’s human rights, especially when research has shown that the surroundings of the gestating woman actively inform foetal growth, not to mention that it is her placenta which helps the foetus live and grow.

In 2012, the Centre for Social Research in India interviewed around 100 surrogates and other stakeholders and concluded that most women had decided to become surrogates “due to poverty”, exposing a system rife with inequalities, even though such women are known to use the language of altruism. Allan argues that women learn (or are made to learn) this language, but in reality, it is all about unequal socioeconomic locations. She demands a ban on commercial surrogacy because true agency and decision-making are simply not possible in commercial surrogacy. This demand resonates strongly with the current Indian scenario where, as on August 24, 2016, commercial surrogacy has been subjected to a caveat-less ban. The rationale for the ban is similar to some of Allan’s arguments, viz that exploitation of women who come from economically compromised backgrounds needs to be stopped. However, arguments are flying thick and fast about how this law is itself working to reify the identity of those who work as surrogates as mere wombs with no voice or agency to think for themselves. While a range of physically and economically exploitative jobs in the informal sector never receive any footage, surrogacy has been banned on these very grounds. This urges us to remain alert to other agendas of the state, to the ideological positions that are circulated beneath the moral guise of the ban. The ban imposed by the Indian state is designed in a pro-poor language, talking about the rights of underprivileged women but only when they rent out wombs. It is intriguing to observe that the same state does not think much before erasing their livelihoods by building dams, or allowing corporates to indiscriminately mine their lands.

Not necessarily exploitative

Surrogacy helps ascertain an individual’s/couple’s right to a biological child and thus extends one’s reproductive freedom by providing access to wombs outside the woman’s (ie the intending mother’s) body. However, this access to other wombs

– ie the extension of reproductive freedom can only happen through the language of a social contract which needs to be drawn up between the individual/couple and the one whose womb is hired. “While [a] contract is designed to facilitate the competition of the market, it is not generally equipped to balance power relations in an intimate dealing”, thereby meriting juridical monitoring, says Kate Galloway. She points out that the normative stance is to equate reproductive “right” with the commissioning couple (their right to have a biological offspring) and reproductive “justice” with the surrogate woman (ensuring a just surrogacy contract). In arguing that for the surrogate, too, the question can be one of reproductive right, Galloway contests the mainstream feminist position that surrogacy, by default, is exploitative in purpose and essence.

Fighting the assumption that infertile Australian couples are, by default, exploitative human beings, Anita Stuhmcke stresses the dyad of reproductive choice and autonomy, and insists on the decriminalisation of surrogacy. The “solution”, she argues, does not lie in criminalising a practice but in making regulations humane and transparent, echoing what Amrita Pande reasons in the context of the ongoing debates on surrogacy in India. Pande points out the inherent contradiction in the logic of the recent blanket ban, premised as it is, on an idea of compulsory exploitation of women. While the fear of exploitation of workers in the informal sector has pushed demands for protection, humane regulations and more transparency; in the case of surrogacy, the same fear is making us ban the practice without entering into any dialogue with the “workers” involved.

Refuting the popular assumption that surrogacy is all about exploitation of poor women by richer couples, Normann Witzleb and Anurag Chawla point out that surrogates are known to have taken care of their own children’s weddings, invested in property, borne the treatment costs of their family members and started their own businesses with the money received. It becomes, they argue, rather patronising to presume that the poor and less educated are not equipped to decide for themselves. Soon after the August 2016 ban on surrogacy in India, Geeta Pandey spoke to some surrogates in Chennai, and documented how they were using the money earned to repay debts, send their children to better schools, set up businesses and build their own tenements. Exploitation and liberation can, at times, be two sides of the same coin – complicating the baselines for those who draft policies and design laws.

And finally

It is important to acknowledge that cross-border (or intra-country) surrogacy contracts are not designed with the intention of exploiting poor women; infertile couples are not evil beings who set out to oppress the poor. Surrogacy contracts get drawn as couples/individuals experience the urge to have a genetic child and, for all practical purposes, undergo the process economically – a complex trajectory which has worked such that richer nations have, in effect, converted parts of the developing world into “surrogacy

hot-spots". The ethics of wanting an "own child" and societal pressures that make childlessness a fault or disease, is a different debate, and often gets conflated with the one on surrogacy as exploitative by definition.

This edited volume calls several of the existing knots into question; it promotes no one unanimous ideological position but highlights the complex nature of the issue. However, the arguments in favour of designing better laws and ensuring safeguards for the surrogates outweigh those arguing for a blanket ban. From a regime of no laws, conflicting inter-country laws and restrictive laws, it is time to move to one with transparent, beneficial and humane laws, those which will take the rights of all parties into account. Unfortunately, in India, right now, the flow is in the reverse direction – and surrogates are lining up in silent protest, demanding that they *also* be consulted, that they be offered more agency and bargaining power rather than be completely dispensed with

by a patriarchal state that decides who should reproduce, for whom, and how.

A personal favourite is the chapter by Anthony Wood that lends a rather intimate and subjective touch to this academic subject. Located at the cusp of legal studies, human rights and sociology, this compilation makes a valuable contribution to some extremely topical concerns.

References

1. Pande A. Surrogates are workers, not wombs. *The Hindu* [Internet]. Aug 29, 2016 [cited 2016 Sep 25]. Available from: http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/surrogates-are-workers-not-wombs/article9043014.ece?utm_source=InternalRef&utm_medium=relatedNews&utm_campaign=RelatedNews
2. Pandey G. Indian surrogate mothers talk of pain of giving up baby. *BBC News* [Internet]. Aug 15, 2016 [cited 2016 Sep 25]. [http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-37050249?post_id=1230826136947687_1230826430280991#_="](http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-37050249?post_id=1230826136947687_1230826430280991#_=)

If you are looking for India's finest medical journal, then here it is.

The National Medical Journal of India is a premier bi-monthly multi-disciplinary health sciences journal which publishes original research, reviews, and other articles relevant to the practice of medicine in India. The journal aims to instruct, inform, entertain and provide a forum for the discussion of social, economic and political health issues. It is included in the Index Medicus

SUBSCRIPTIONS

	One year	Two years	Three years	Five years
Indian	Rs 600	Rs 1100	Rs 1600	Rs 2600
Overseas	US \$85	US \$150	US\$220	US\$365

(Pubmed), Excerpta Medica (EmBase), BIOSIS, Current Contents/Clinical Medicine and Science Citation Index.

Personal subscriptions paid from personal funds are available at 50% discounted rates

Bank draft/cheque should be made in favour of *The National Medical Journal of India*. Please add Rs 75 for outstation cheques. Journals can be sent by registered post on request at an added cost of Rs 90 per annum. Requests to be made at the time of subscribing.

Please send your subscriptions, queries to:

The Subscription Department, *The National Medical Journal of India*, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Ansari Nagar, New Delhi 110029.

Tel: 91-11-26588802

FAX: 91-11-26588663

E-mail: nmji@nmji.in

Website: www.nmji.in



The National Medical Journal of India
On the frontline of Indian medicine