

*To 'SURJ' or to 'SURF'?*  
*The Political Symbolism of Naming an Organization*

---

Layla Entrikin  
Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA



**Abstract:** From the fall of 2013 to the spring of 2014, one of Tulane University's few reproductive health organizations, Vox, underwent significant organizational changes. In response to the Louisiana legislature's attempts to shut down the state's remaining abortion clinics, the executive board members of Vox disassociated from the Planned Parenthood student organization to create a more politically active group. Subsequently, differences of ideological perspectives and personal conflicts within the executive board made the creation of a new organization increasingly difficult. Some members wanted to identify as Students United for Reproductive Justice (SURJ) while others identified as Students United for Reproductive Freedom (SURF). Each name carried its own ideological influences and histories. Exemplary of the many challenges associated with social movements, the SURF v. SURJ dilemma showcases an organizational desire to remain ideologically relevant potentially at the expense of efficacy. Examining Vox's shift from a Planned Parenthood affiliated organization to a politically autonomous group exemplifies many of the difficulties that organizations face when tasked with creating a new name, ideological framework, and objectives. This case will explore why and how Vox's leadership attempted to address these difficult questions of organizational identity. Furthermore, this case serves as a microcosm of the increasingly national awareness of the complexities and intersectionality pertaining to women's health issues as well as debates pertaining to feasible and effective responses to these issues.

### **Introduction**

One of Tulane University's few reproductive health organizations, Vox, was paralyzed by difficult choices. Planned Parenthood, Vox's organizational sponsor, often instructed members to refrain from political activism. They feared that a reporter may catch a sound bite of a member badmouthing political adversaries or making statements that did not reflect Planned Parenthood's political agenda resulting in a public relations disaster. Consequently, Vox lacked political autonomy. For this reason, Vox officially separated from Planned Parenthood. Subsequently, Vox, dissolved and set out to develop a new name and organizational identity.

In the fall of 2013, Vox's events chairwoman, Tamara Dukich, suggested a shift from reproductive freedom as an ideological framework to a new one: reproductive justice. Reproductive freedom largely focuses on the right to abortion, birth control, family planning, and women's right to make choices about their own bodies freely and autonomously. Reproductive justice similarly encompasses the spectrum of reproductive rights, but places a greater emphasis on social, political, and economic barriers that women of color face in their fight for reproductive autonomy. Gabriela Betancourt, responsible for organizing and staffing donation and

informational tables around campus, supported this shift. President Gabriella Landgraf-Neuhaus and public relations chairwoman Emma Johnson agreed with Betancourt as well. However, as the year progressed, doubt began to set in and ideological conflicts between executive board members flared. Two camps emerged: those in support of a reproductive justice framework and those who were unsure of making such a dramatic political shift. Landgraf-Neuhaus spearheaded the support for a reproductive justice framework while Dukich and Betancourt were more wary despite their initial support. Soft-spoken Landgraf-Neuhaus was unable to contend effectively with vocal opposition from Dukich and Betancourt, while public relations chairwoman Johnson felt trapped between the two warring factions of the organization. In an attempt to bridge the ever-growing divide between executive members, academic advisors held mediations. The executive board failed to choose a name and personal disagreements threatened the derailment of the organization's efficacy. Without a name, the organization could not create a new constitution, advertise on campus, or successfully use their newfound political autonomy. Given that the new name would reflect the values and mission of the organization, the executive board felt paralyzed – they had to choose the “right” name. They had to choose a name that would spark conversation, but also a name that would authentically and accurately represent an organization specific to Tulane's campus.

Late fall semester of 2013, legislative attempts to shut down all of the abortion clinics in Louisiana caused the organization to utilize its newfound political freedom. Hastily trying to identify and name their organization, the club provided the media with two names: Students United for Reproductive Justice (SURJ) and Students United for Reproductive Freedom (SURF). At the start of the 2014 spring semester, with more time to think critically about a new name, the discordant executive board had a decision to make – SURJ or SURF – but tensions were high, and the organization was at standstill. Would the executive board come together and choose the “right” name? Or would their nascent organization implode before its inauguration? Examining the nuances of how an organizational executive board makes such crucial decisions as a team—for better or for worse—is an invaluable aspect of understanding effective leadership. This case demonstrates an organization's shift in identity and ideology and highlights the challenges faced by the women leading these organizational shifts.

### **Reproductive Justice: A Brief History**

The history of reproductive rights in the United States has historically been dominated by a narrative of “choice,” narrowing the scope of the movement to the issue of abortion. While the right to abortion is significant to those fighting in this movement, many women of color and race scholars argue that this limited view of reproductive rights and autonomy fails to accurately address the needs of minority women. For example, the economic burden of abortion disproportionately impacts women of color. Furthermore, addressing the economic and political aspects of reproductive rights are intrinsically linked to social problems related to race and class. Additionally, years of marginalizing, abusing, and violating the reproductive rights of minority women in vulnerable positions left decades of emotional, physical, and psychological scarring. Though the history of reproductive injustice long precedes the terminology, the use of the phrase “reproductive justice” is relatively new. In 1983, 1,500 women of color gathered at Spelman College in Atlanta for the first National Conference on Black Women's Health Issues. The conference resulted in the formation of the National Black Women's Health Project (NBWHP) (Fried 2004). As the first organization to address the health needs of women of color, NBWHP became the antecedent to many other reproductive justice organizations. In 1994, after the

International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, several black women gathered in Chicago, Illinois to discuss health care for women of color. They concluded that “reproductive rights are essential to social justice” (SisterSong 2015). The term “reproductive justice” partnered these two concepts and was rooted in the belief that reproductive health care should be understood in relation to other issues of social inequality, such as poverty, economic injustice welfare reform, housing, prisoners’ rights, environmental justice, immigration policy, drug policies, and violence (Price 2010). In 2003, Loretta Ross, the founding National Coordinator of SisterSong, revived the application of the reproductive justice framework (SisterSong 2015).

SisterSong currently defines reproductive justice as “the human right to have children, to not have children, to parent children in safe and healthy environments...and the human right to bodily autonomy from any form of reproductive oppression” (SisterSong 2015). The overarching theme of reproductive justice is that reproductive rights do not stop at abortion. Therefore, reproductive justice extends to issues that affect many women of color such as access to birth control, access to comprehensive sex education, STI prevention and care, alternative birth options, adequate prenatal and pregnancy care, domestic violence assistance, and adequate wages. Additionally, reproductive justice is an inherently anti-racist framework; in order to use the reproductive justice framework, an organization must address the intersection of race and gender.

### **Reproductive Rights in the United States**

In 1973, *Roe v. Wade* declared that a right to privacy under the due process clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment included a woman’s decision to have an abortion. This right, however, did not preclude the states’ interest in protecting maternal health and protecting the “potentiality of human life” (Medoff 2008). The decision included a rigid framework that restricted states from enacting laws that overtly regulated any woman’s access to abortion services. This framework has essentially been dismantled over the last several years (Medoff 2008). However, many states attempted to exercise the limited power they had to restrict or regulate abortion services within their borders. In 1989, the state of Pennsylvania enacted the Pennsylvania Abortion Control Act. One of the first legislative pieces to impose significant obstacles to abortion access through state regulation, the act included mandatory counseling stipulations, a parental consent clause, and the introduction of a 24-hour waiting period. Following the introduction of the act, Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania quickly filed suit, questioning the constitutionality of such stringent restrictions.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* (1992) contended that while a woman has the constitutional right to terminate an unwanted pregnancy up until the point of fetal viability, the restrictions set in place by the state of Pennsylvania did not constitute an “undue burden” on access to abortion. An undue burden is defined as a state law or regulation that has the “purpose or effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion of a non-viable fetus” (Post 2007, 943). The Supreme Court never explicitly defined “substantial obstacle” or “undue burden” thus allowing states the freedom to create regulations and restrictions that previously would have been deemed unconstitutional. The “undue burden” interpretation of restrictive abortion law put forth by *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* became a benchmark in abortion policy, changing the tone and trajectory of the anti-abortion movement (Medoff 2009).

The aftermath of *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* allowed states to begin implementing what are now known as “TRAP” laws, or “targeted regulation of abortion providers.” A TRAP law can be identified in one of three ways: (1) a TRAP law may require an abortion provider to adhere to medically unnecessary standards (for building and personnel requirements); (2) a TRAP regulation may require unnecessary licensing of the clinic or charge unreasonable fees for licensure; or (3) a TRAP law may unnecessarily regulate the place in which abortions are performed, e.g. “require that abortions be provided only by hospitals, or designate abortions as ambulatory surgical centers, thereby subjecting them to heightened standards not necessary to ensure the safety of an abortion” (Young 2014, 949). Essentially, TRAP laws aim to shut down abortion clinics and restrict access to reproductive health care without explicitly making abortion illegal. TRAP tactics have become increasingly popular with the anti-choice community within the last five years.

### **Reproductive Rights in Louisiana**

The history of reproductive rights and access to reproductive health care in Louisiana is long and fraught with conflict. Named “the most pro-life state of 2013” by MSNBC, access to reproductive health care, and specifically abortion, has significantly dwindled in Louisiana over the last several years (MSNBC 2014). In November of 2013, the Department of Health and Hospitals (DHH) released a “declaration of emergency” that immediately enacted several new rules for outpatient abortion facilities licensing standards (Department of Health and Hospitals 2013). The new rules required patients to wait 30 days between blood tests and their abortion procedures. Additionally, the DHH required abortion clinics to increase the size of procedure rooms three-fold and provide separate recovering rooms. The DHH also required a specific type of flooring in abortion facilities (Grimes 2014). The intent of emergency regulations is to address medical crises that require a significant protocol shift, e.g. an outbreak of Ebola might require screening of all patients who have recently visited West Africa. As such, enacting an emergency regulation does not require lawmakers to go through the more traditionally drawn out process of legislation. However, these regulations give the DHH the authority to shut down any abortion-providing clinic for minor infractions without opportunity for appeal. The regulations potentially have the potential to effectively shut down all five of Louisiana’s remaining abortion clinics, making abortion unattainable and blocking access to other reproductive health care needs such as STI testing and contraception.

The New Orleans Abortion Fund (NOAF), along with several grassroots organizations including fledgling SURJ/SURF, fought to have the DHH’s emergency regulations overturned by creating several awareness campaigns. NOAF, a community based organization, aims to alleviate some of the economic burden of reproductive healthcare by providing financial assistance to those who cannot afford the full cost of an abortion. After intense public backlash, the DHH rescinded the 30-day waiting period stipulation. A public hearing scheduled for February 4<sup>th</sup> intended to finalize the regulations and provide a forum for organizations like NOAF to voice their opposition. However, on February 3<sup>rd</sup>, the DHH released a statement rescinding all other emergency regulations (Department of Health and Hospitals 2014).

In addition to the DHH’s proposal of emergency regulations, the Louisiana legislature passed several restrictive bills between 2013-2014. In April 2014, HB 1262 amended the Woman’s Right to Know Act.<sup>1</sup> The bill required physicians to provide any woman seeking an

---

<sup>1</sup> Introduced to the Louisiana legislature in 2011, “A Woman’s Right to Know” Act required all abortion providers to obtain the “informed consent” of any woman seeking abortion. A 24-hour waiting period is now required between

abortion a pamphlet called “Point of Rescue,” which “contains information on the alleged increased risks of psychiatric and psychological harm associated with abortion, sex trafficking, and coerced abortion” (RH Reality Check 2015). The bill also required women to sign a form confirming that they received the pamphlet. Introduced in May of 2014, HB388 would require abortion providers in the state of Louisiana to obtain admitting privileges from a local hospital (Culp-Ressler 2014). Admitting privileges maintain strict requirements proving difficult to secure. Clinicians must maintain specific types of insurance; the clinic in question must be situated a particular distance from the admitting hospital; and, most damagingly, a minimum number of patients must be admitted per year in order for the privileges to stay active, usually around 10 to 15. However, most abortion providers cannot admit even one patient per year. Anti-abortion advocates rationalize that admitting privileges would keep more women safe if they were to experience a complication from abortion. Complications from abortion are extremely rare. When they do occur, they are more likely to happen several days after the procedure than during the procedure itself. (Young 2014). Subsequently, admitting privileges are medically unnecessary to provide safe abortion. On June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Governor Bobby Jindal signed HB388 into law.

### **Vox: Voices for Planned Parenthood**

Vox is “a program to educate and mobilize students and youth in support of reproductive health and rights” (Planned Parenthood 2015). Vox chapters generally exist on college and university campuses. Each chapter organizes pro-choice events, promotes sexual health education, and lobbies their legislators to support Planned Parenthood health centers. At Tulane University, the Vox chapter stayed relatively active between the years of 2010 to 2012. During this time, the chapter successfully fundraised and tabled for Planned Parenthood. Two Vox executive board members in 2012 previously worked as interns for Planned Parenthood.

As an organization, the southern chapters of Planned Parenthood tend to lean towards a more conservative stance on activism. As largely a health services organization, their main concern is providing essential health services to women and families in need. Planned Parenthood relies to some degree on funding from the state and federal legislature. Subsequently, they are often hesitant to participate in political rallies, for fear of creating a public relations catastrophe. For this reason, Planned Parenthood and consequently, Vox, take precautionary steps to stay as politically neutral as possible.

In addition to attempting the regulation of abortion clinics through legislation, several anti-choice legislators threatened to cut funding to Planned Parenthood in 2012. Additionally, several anti-choice campaigns took root on Tulane’s campus, frequently chalking misinformation about fetal development and staging disruptive protests. The members of Vox wanted to respond more actively and intentionally than Planned Parenthood would allow. Vox’s Planned Parenthood liaison, Julie Mickelberry, discouraged counter-protests to the anti-choice activists in fear that a Vox member would be caught on camera engaging with one of the protesters. However, in the fall of 2012, Julie Mickelberry left her post at Planned Parenthood and Vox’s

---

the signing of an informed consent and the performance of abortion. Physicians must also use state-mandated and produced information on the potential risks to a woman’s physical and emotional health as a result of abortion (Woman’s Right to Know Act 2011). It has been shown, however, that much of the state-mandated information on abortion is medically inaccurate (Richardson 2006). Some have argued that the Woman’s Right to Know Act infringes upon a physician’s first amendment rights, and perverts the sanctity of the physician-patient relationship (Duane 2013).

lines of communication with Planned Parenthood waned. Given the political climate and desire to be more politically active, members of Vox approached Planned Parenthood about potentially changing their name to something unassociated with Planned Parenthood so that members may have more political autonomy. At the time, staff members of Planned Parenthood encouraged the split. They thought the students of Vox should take a more politically assertive stance given the recent barrage of attacks on reproductive rights in Louisiana. Stating that they would continue to support the organization – whatever the name – with materials and assistance, Planned Parenthood gave Vox their “blessing” to rename and disassociate from the Planned Parenthood agenda.<sup>2</sup>

### **University Organizational Rules: The Formation of a Club**

In the transition from Vox to SURJ/SURF, Tulane’s Undergraduate Student Government (USG) and Newcomb College Institute (NCI) stipulated that members must create a “new organization.” Given that the mission of Vox and the mission of SURJ/SURF maintained significant differences, namely the ability to publicly protest and speak out against anti-choice legislature, it made sense to create a solid foundation and separate identity for the organization moving forward.

USG and NCI require organizations to follow a certain set of protocols when founding a new student organization. The executive board was required to present USG and NCI with several documents: a membership petition with at least 10 signatures, the names and contact information of primary leadership and an academic advisor, an organizational constitution, contact information of a council chair, and a lengthy description of the purpose, types of programming, and membership demographics. NCI also required a rationale as to how the organization intends to support women and that the proposed organization was not already receiving funding or advising from other entities on campus. After submitting all of this information, the leadership would be contacted by USG and NCI, and would receive a time slot for a public hearing addressing the mission, purpose, and proposed programming, as well as why this club should exist on Tulane’s campus. Officers would then be subjected to a question and answer period. After a 48-hour period, USG would contact the officers and inform them of the decision about the organization.<sup>3</sup> For NCI, the Newcomb senate selects groups to discuss the purpose and intent of qualifying groups, and if approved, will allow the organization a one-year provisional period. After the provisional period, if the organization has effectively followed its constitution and operated successfully, they are granted active status within the NCI and can receive further funding.<sup>4</sup> In the spring of 2014, SURJ/SURF was granted active status.

### **Reorganizing and Renaming**

In fall of 2013, the members of Vox were pressed to choose new organizational name. Dukich and Betancourt began to advocate for the name “Students United For Reproductive Justice,” or SURJ. The organization held a series of forums to discuss possible name choices, such as Students United for Reproductive Freedom, Students United for Reproductive Health, etc. Professors from several different disciplines spoke about their understanding of a

---

<sup>2</sup> Karissa Haugeberg, personal interview, October 1, 2015, Hebert Hall Tulane University, New Orleans, LA.

<sup>3</sup> Undergraduate Student Government. 2015. “Starting a Student Organization.” <https://tulane.edu/studentaffairs/studentprograms/upload/StartAStuOrg.pdf> (November 1, 2015).

<sup>4</sup> Newcomb College Institute. 2015. “New Student Organization Application Form Fall 2011.” <https://tulane.edu/newcomb/new-newcomb-student-organization-application.cfm> (December 1, 2015).

reproductive justice framework versus a reproductive freedom framework. Some members, namely Dukich and Betancourt, no longer felt confident that their organization could support a reproductive justice framework on Tulane's largely white campus. However, many of the organization's other members felt more positively about the change, namely Landgraf-Neuhaus.

When the DHH released their "emergency" regulations in November of 2013, the then nameless SURJ/SURF began to organize closely with New Orleans Abortion Fund (NOAF), advocating and speaking out against legislators. During this time period, SURJ/SURF instrumentally contributed to the creation of the Louisiana Coalition for Reproductive Freedom (LCRF), founded during the period of time that SURJ/SURF, NOAF and other grassroots organizations were rallying against the DHH.<sup>5</sup> The controversy over the manner in which the DHH implemented these new regulations garnered national attention. When the media approached NOAF and other members of the LCRF for interviews and coverage of their organizational efforts, members of SURJ/SURF hastily made the choice to temporarily identify themselves as SURJ.<sup>6</sup>

### **Internal Struggles and Ideological Conflicts**

Throughout the rallying against DHH and after, interpersonal conflicts within the executive board began to fissure communication within the club. Issues of leadership and differences of opinion started to derail SURJ/SURF's ability to operate effectively as an organization. President Landgraf-Neuhaus, a generally reserved young woman, found communicating with her executive board difficult. During meetings, she often felt overrun with negative assumptions and a paralyzing need to be viewed as "politically correct." As a result, when trying to elaborate upon her reasoning for backing SURJ as a name, she either over-compensated by being overly abrupt or allowed public relations chairwoman Johnson to communicate for her. Johnson, hyper-productive and extremely articulate, felt trapped between the president, events chairwoman Dukich, and tabling chairwoman Betancourt. In an interview, she described feeling like an uncomfortable middleman, when all she really wanted to do was to "make something happen [for the organization]."<sup>7</sup> Betancourt, a Latina, was the only woman of color on the executive board. She felt her contributions were not being taken seriously enough and would often leave meetings emotionally exhausted. Additionally, in an interview she described feeling uncomfortable as the sole representation of color on the executive board and felt her experience on Tulane's campus as a woman of color was not enough to constitute a diverse perspective for the executive board.<sup>8</sup>

Betancourt partnered with Dukich, who she thought was more intentional about addressing issues of race within the reproductive rights movement. Poised but fiery, Dukich more effectively communicated her ideological perspective than Landgraf-Neuhaus at general body meetings, of which there were very few during this time. Johnson attempted to work from both sides while simultaneously creating a website, coordinating with NOAF, and generally keeping the club together. She found the politics of the name change exhausting, and continually

---

<sup>5</sup> Gabriella Landgraf-Neuhaus, personal interview, October 31, Tulane University Lavin-Bernick Center for University Life, New Orleans, LA.

<sup>6</sup> Emma Johnson, personal interview, October 28, 2015, Tulane University Lavin-Bernick Center for University Life, New Orleans, LA.

<sup>7</sup> Emma Johnson, personal interview, October 28, 2015, Tulane University Lavin-Bernick Center for University Life, New Orleans, LA.

<sup>8</sup> Gabriela Noa Betancourt, personal interview, October 18, Tulane University Lavin-Bernick Center for University Life, New Orleans, LA.

attempted to mobilize the group towards political action. SURJ/SURFs academic advisors, Karissa Haugeberg and Laura Wolford mediated some of the tension to no avail. At a point when tensions were high and the organization's viability questioned, Landgraf-Neuhaus thought the executive board and the advisors unfairly targeted her as the root of all of the organization's problems. As personal disagreements escalated, the club's ability to function drastically declined.

After the DHH rescinded its regulations, the executive board had more time to think critically about an official new name. Dukich and Betancourt argued that Tulane's predominantly white student population and SURJ's lack of diversity on the executive board sent a negative message. Given the history of "white feminists" co-opting movements started for and by women of color, their concerns were not unfounded (Price 2010). Oftentimes less than friendly to student activism, Tulane's student culture did not necessarily support a more complex, racially sensitive framework. Other progressive student groups often refused to co-program with an organization deemed "insensitive." Executive board members feared backlash from the other student groups on campus if they chose the "wrong" name. Betancourt argued that the organization's potential shift to SURJ, would require members to spend a significant amount of time educating and reflecting on what "reproductive justice" means for Tulane and the greater New Orleans community.<sup>9</sup> Dukich and Betancourt were wary of advocating on behalf of women in the New Orleans community if organization members had not critically thought about and discussed the implications of a reproductive justice framework, especially coming from a predominately white community like Tulane. Additionally, the history of Vox's activism predominantly focused on abortion rights, which is largely considered to be part of a reproductive freedom framework. As a reproductive justice organization, the club would be required to significantly expand their repertoire of programming. For this reason, Dukich and Betancourt were unsure that SURJ would be effective and feasible on Tulane's campus. Given their concerns, Dukich and Betancourt began to advocate for the new name to be "Students United for Reproductive Freedom (SURF)".

President Landgraf-Neuhaus thought differently. SURJ had already become an established name within the LCRF and promotional materials along with a website domain name had already been purchased. Media outlets previously attributed their activist work to an organization called SURJ. Landgraf-Neuhaus and public relations chairwoman Johnson saw using reproductive justice as framework as a both challenge and an opportunity. When interviewed, Johnson explained that she felt that using reproductive justice as a name and an ideological framework would serve as a constant reminder that reproductive rights do not end with abortion, but is in fact an umbrella of issues.<sup>10</sup> Both Landgraf-Neuhaus and Johnson thought that the name would direct the new organization towards more intersectional, anti-racist activist work. Johnson argued that the New Orleans community would benefit more from a reproductive justice framework. However, both Landgraf-Neuhaus and Johnson expressed that they understood that choosing reproductive justice over reproductive freedom was a risky political move that would require extra effort on the part of executive board to execute respectfully, effectively, and thoughtfully.

Throughout internal executive board meetings and open forums, tensions intensified to a point where some executive board members no longer spoke outside of meetings. The

---

<sup>9</sup> Gabriela Noa Betancourt, personal interview, October 18, Tulane University Lavin-Bernick Center for University Life, New Orleans, LA.

<sup>10</sup> Emma Johnson, personal interview, October 28, 2015, Tulane University Lavin-Bernick Center for University Life, New Orleans, LA.



ideological differences between executive board members about what a reproductive justice organization's goals and mission should be transformed into personal conflicts that severed communication within the executive board, and vice versa. Early spring 2014, no name had been officially chosen and no consensus had been reached. The desire to be ideologically ethical and the fear of making a political misstep prevented members from making any progress and interpersonal conflict further prevented any mutually acceptable solutions. With the executive board gridlocked, the fate of SURJ/SURF looked grim.

### **Epilogue**

After much debate, the decision about the organization's name was brought to a vote in the spring of 2014. Several faculty members were present, as well as representatives from Planned Parenthood and Law Students for Reproductive Justice. After final arguments, the executive board voted and SURJ won. General body meetings trickled to a halt due to the level of discord among executive board members and the process of creating a new club was exhausting. Landgraf-Neuhaus and Johnson crafted the new mission statement and constitution together. It reads as follows:

Students United for Reproductive Justice is an organization started at Tulane University to provide opportunities for students to become more involved in the New Orleans and Louisiana pro-choice communities. SURJ is a member of the Louisiana Coalition for Reproductive Freedom and partners with numerous local advocacy organizations including New Orleans Abortion Fund, Law Students for Reproductive Justice, and Medical Students for Choice to name a few.

SURJ focuses on all aspects of reproductive justice with an intersectional perspective. Some issues include access to contraception, sex education, access to abortion, forced sterilization, the state of pregnancy/motherhood for incarcerated women, domestic violence and abuse, advocacy for birthing centers and the medicalization of birthing.

Betancourt, disenchanted with the organization's work and feeling unheard, decided to resign. Dukich and several other board members stopped contributing significantly to the group. In subsequent years, the executive board experienced massive turnover. Johnson took over as president for the next academic year, but resigned due to the extreme political scrutiny and a desire to reduce her workload. By fall of 2015, none of the executive board members from the year of the name change were affiliated with SURJ. Programming has become largely educational rather than political notwithstanding their continued affiliation with the LCRF. By taking an educational approach, SURJ aims to bring a better awareness of the complexities and intersectionalities of reproductive justice to Tulane's campus.

## Appendix A

As the current Vice President of Students United for Reproductive Justice, I witnessed first hand some of the political controversy surrounding the SURJ v. SURF name debate. I attended the meeting in which the name change was voted on; I however abstained from voting because of my own lack of understanding surrounding the reproductive justice framework. At the time, I had only recently joined the club and the leadership structure was entirely unclear, and meetings were sporadic at best.

When I interviewed the former executive board members of SURJ/SURF and the academic advisors, across the board there was an unwillingness to disclose some of the more personal aspects of the internal disagreements. All members seemed uncomfortable “naming names” or disclosing any specific issues within the leadership structure. Many of them did not want to be directly quoted, which is why I have largely left out direct quotations. When asked about the mediations between members, no one would disclose who attended the mediation, or why they were asked to attend in the first place. Through personal observation, I was able to deduce some of that information. For ethical reasons, however, I have elected to leave out some of the personal underpinnings of my investigation.

## References

- Culp-Ressler, Tara. 2014. "Louisiana Is About To Shut Down Its Abortion Clinics With Texas-Style Restrictions." *Think Progress: Health*. 21 May.  
<http://thinkprogress.org/health/2014/05/21/3439960/louisiana-trying-close-abortion-clinics/> (October 4, 2015).
- Department of Health and Hospitals. 2013. "Declaration of Emergency, Abortion Facilities Licensing Standards" LAC 48:I Chapter 44 <http://rhrealitycheck.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Emergency-Rule-November-2013.pdf> (October 30, 2015).
- Department of Health and Hospitals. 2014. "Update to Planned February 4 Public Meeting Agenda." February 3. <http://dhh.louisiana.gov/index.cfm/newsroom/detail/2950> (October 30, 2015).
- Duane, Molly. 2013. "The Disclaimer Dichotomy: A First Amendment Analysis of Compelled Speech in Disclosure Ordinances Governing Crisis Pregnancy Centers and Laws Mandating Biased Physician Counseling." *Cardozo Law Review*, 35 (January 14, 2013): 349-389.
- Fried, Marlene Gerber, Loretta Ross, Elena Gutierrez, and Jael Silliman. 2004. *Undivided Rights Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice*. New York: South End.
- Grimes, Andrea. 2014. "Louisiana Would Have Required a 30-day Waiting Period Before Legal Abortion." *RH Reality Check*. January 27.  
<http://rhrealitycheck.org/article/2014/01/27/new-louisiana-rules-require-30-day-waiting-period-legal-abortion/> (October 30, 2015).
- Medoff, M. H. 2008. "Abortion costs, sexual behavior, and pregnancy rates." *The Social Science Journal* 45 (2008): 156-172. doi: 10.1016/j.soscij.2007.12.009
- Medoff, M. H. 2009. "Biased abortion counseling laws and abortion demand." *The Social Science Journal* 46 (May 4, 2009): 632-643. doi: 10.1016/j.soscij.2009.05.001
- MSNBC. 2014. "Louisiana Earns Top Spot for Most Pro-Life State in 2013." January 15.  
<http://www.msnbc.com/the-cycle/la-1-abortion-restrictions-2013> (October 30, 2015).
- Planned Parenthood of Southeastern PA. v. Casey*. 1992. 505 U.S. 833. LexisNexis Academic (October 30, 2015).
- Planned Parenthood. 2015. "Students Speak Out: Vox."  
<https://www.plannedparenthood.org/planned-parenthood-central-western-new-york/get-involved-locally/students-speak-out-vox> (November 1, 2015)
- Post, Robert. 2007. "Informed Consent to Abortion: A First Amendment Speech Analysis of Compelled Physician Speech." *University of Illinois Law Review* 3 (April 14, 2007): 939-990.

- Price, Kimala. 2010. "What is Reproductive Justice?: How Women of Color Activists Are Redefining the Pro-Choice Paradigm." *Meridians* (April 1, 2010). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/meridians.2010.10.2.42> (October 4, 2015).
- RH Reality Check. 2015. "Louisiana Bill to Amend Informed Consent Requirements (HB 1262)." July 8. <http://data.rhrealitycheck.org/law/louisiana-bill-to-amend-informed-consent-requirements-hb-1262/> (October 4, 2015).
- Richardson, Chinué., & Nash, Elizabeth. 2006. "Misinformed Consent: The Medical Accuracy of State-Developed Abortion Counseling Materials." *Guttmacher Policy Review*, 9 (2006). <https://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/gpr/09/4/gpr090406.pdf> (October 31, 2015).
- Roe v. Wade*. 1973. 410 U.S. 113, LexisNexis Academic (October 30, 2015).
- SisterSong. 2015. "What is Reproductive Justice?" <http://sistersong.net/reproductive-justice/> (October 30, 2015).
- Woman's Right to Know Act. 2011. LA Rev Stat 40:1299.35.6, LexisNexis Academic (December 1, 2015).
- Young, Laura. 2014. "Falling in to the TRAP: The Ineffectiveness of 'Undue Burden' Analysis in Protecting Women's Right to Choose." *Pace Law Review* 34 (2014): 947-981.