

Lesbian mothers, gay sperm donors, and community: Ensuring the well-being of children and families

Damien W. Riggs

School of Psychology, The University of Adelaide

As Australian reproductive health continues to be shaped by legal and social heterosexism, lesbian women seeking to conceive are often reliant upon gay men to act as known donors. As previous legal cases demonstrate, this can result in contestations between donors and recipients that result in negative wellbeing outcomes for both parties, and which highlight the limitations of coalitionism within gay and lesbian communities. Using data collected via interviews with Australian gay men who have acted as known donors, this paper examines some of the ways in which such men experience the negotiating of sperm donation, and how this is often shaped by normative assumptions surrounding lesbian parenting and reproduction. Importantly, the findings also emphasise the positive experiences of sperm donation of some gay men. Suggestions are made for opportunities to increase the likelihood of positive outcomes for negotiations between donors and recipients, with a particular focus upon children's rights as citizens.

Keywords

Gay sperm donors, lesbian mothers, children's rights, family wellbeing

This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *Health Sociology Review*, 17, 232-240. Copyright e-content management.

Introduction

As recognition of the rights of non-heterosexual communities in Australia slowly grows, so is this accompanied by new challenges and contestations for the members of such communities. One particular example of this occurs in instances where gay men agree to donor to lesbian women who wish to become pregnant. Such negotiations between lesbians and gay men have a relatively long history, beginning most notably during the women's rights and lesbian separatist movements of the 1970s, in which lesbians sought to gain greater control over their reproductive lives (Dempsey 2005). Current negotiations between lesbians and gay men differ, however, due to the growing recognition of children's rights to information about their genetic history and the need to consider this when making decisions about conception and the status of donors in children's lives.

The assistance that donors provide in the formation of lesbian families thus represents an ongoing site of contestation within non-heterosexual communities across Australia. Such contestations have sequelae for the emotional and relational wellbeing not only of lesbian parents and their children, but also for donors and for the broader communities within which all parties live. Specifically, when negotiations between donors and recipients break down after conception or birth of a child, this can negatively affect the wellbeing of the newly formed family. Furthermore, gay men who agree to act as known donors, but who are not supported to adequately consider the implications of this for their emotional well-being following the conception and birth of the child, may face considerable challenges in understanding their place in a relationship to the child and what this means for their sense of self as a gay man. Finally, non-heterosexual communities, which are often depicted as open and inclusive, may experience considerable conflict and a lack of cohesion when the needs of differing groups within such communities are situated in direct opposition to one another.

With these challenges to the wellbeing of individuals, families and communities in mind, this paper examines the experiences of a group of Australian gay men who have engaged in the provision of sperm to lesbian couples. In interviews conducted by the author, some of these men - stepping outside of the interview schedule and its focus on motivations to donating - spent considerable time elaborating the perceptions they held of their engagement with the women for whom they were donating, and what this meant for their sense of community. These men expressed concern about being treated as a means to an end, a concern expressed in previous research on the experiences of sperm donors (e.g. Daniels 1991). Where the men in the present research differed, however, was in their status as *known* donors, and the implications of this for their potentially ongoing relationship with the recipients of their donations and the children born to the recipients.

In order to provide a context for the data, the following sections proceed by first outlining previous instances where lesbian mothers and gay known donors have experienced legal conflict over their competing needs following donor conception, with an emphasis upon the effects of this upon both individual and family wellbeing. The importance of considering gay men's location *as men*

within non-heterosexual communities is then highlighted, with attention drawn to the impact upon gay donors of social contexts wherein men's rights over parenting continue to dominate. The analysis then examines a series of extracts focusing on the theme of representations of lesbian mothers/recipients from the aforementioned research project, and in so doing highlights the experiences of gay men who act as known donors to lesbian recipients. The paper concludes by proposing that what is required is a focus not solely upon the citizenship rights and needs of lesbians and gay men, but rather upon the rights of future citizens, namely children born of donor conception. Such a focus, it is suggested, may represent one way of reconfiguring community and individual debates over the role of known donors so as to contribute to positive wellbeing outcomes for all involved.

Families, litigation and wellbeing outcomes

Since the early 1990s, both within Australia and the US, we have witnessed the rise of high profile cases involving litigation between lesbian mothers and the gay men who have donored to them. Such cases highlight the contentions that exist within non-heterosexual communities, and the limits of coalitionism in regard to the members of such communities working together to secure group rights, rather than working against one another to secure individual rights. Importantly, such cases highlight the ways in which legal recognition of the rights of some non-heterosexual individuals can come at the expense of others. Two particular examples serve to illustrate this.

In the US, Arnup and Boyd (1995) report on the case of *Thomas S. v Robin Y.*, in which a gay donor sued for recognition of paternity and access to a child born from his donation of sperm to a lesbian couple. Whilst the initial judgment found that the donor did not have rights to claim paternity or access – a finding that clearly recognised a two-parent lesbian family as a legitimate family form – this was overturned on subsequent appeal, with the New York Supreme Court asserting that the case was not about breaking up the lesbian family (as the mothers stated), but about whether it was appropriate to terminate the rights of a 'biological parent'. As such, notions of biology were seen to trump both the intentions of all parties prior to conception (i.e. for the donor to have no parental role and access only on the terms set by the child and mothers), and the actual level of parenting undertaken by all parties subsequent to the birth of the child (i.e. the donor had no involvement in the child's life for the first two years and only became involved on the instigation of the mothers and the child). Furthermore, this case highlights how the donor's identity as a *gay* man informed the Supreme Court's decision: the majority evoked the donor's sexuality to justify recognition of filiation on the basis that to do so would be to discriminate against him as a gay man (Arnup and Boyd 1995).

In Australia, the case of *Re: Patrick* also involved a gay known donor suing for access and recognition of paternity. This case was different, however, in that the donor made claim to an agreement, prior to the birth, that he would be actively involved in the child's life. The mothers disputed this, and claimed that the levels of access being sought would significantly undermine their family and that the demands of the donor had negative health impacts upon their lives. In the

decision, Judge Guest found that whilst he recognised the lesbian mothers as having formed a 'homo-nuclear family', and whilst a donor could not be recognised as a parent under Australian family law, the child would still benefit from access (awarded at a level comparable to a heterosexual father post-separation). In so doing, Guest sought to identify, through the donor, a 'father' for the child, thus reinforcing the centrality of biology as an inherent right to parentage. Furthermore, Guest refuted the mothers' claims that access would 'destroy' their family, constructing such claims as 'fanciful' (Kelly 2002). The impact of this upon the family was irrevocably damaging, as following the decision the birth mother ended both her own life and that of the child.

As these two examples suggest, the needs and rights of lesbians and gay men are often in conflict when it comes to the donation of sperm, and such conflict has serious implications for both the families that result from sperm donation, and for sperm donors themselves. When lesbian-headed families are implicitly or explicitly constructed as 'needing' an identified father for children, this serves to undermine the legal validity of the family, which research has identified as having negative health outcomes for lesbian-headed families (Short 2007). For donors, a lack of clarity or consideration prior to donation can result in emotional and psychological consequences that lead them to engage the law to arbitrate their relations with the women they donor to. Whilst the analysis provided later in this paper outlines the concerns that gay men have about donating in this context of litigation, it is first important to draw attention to gay men's location *as men* in a legal and social context that often privileges the needs of men over those of women and children.

Masculinities, fathers, and community

As was suggested in the introduction, the community contexts within which lesbians and gay men negotiate donating continue to change. In the 1970s, gay men entered into negotiations with lesbians that centred upon women's rights to reproduction and lesbian challenges to patriarchy: "Becoming donors was not only about supporting the rights of women to control their own reproduction, but also a challenge to the construction of patriarchal relations through the heterosexual family" (van Reyk 1995: 82). The visibility of feminist accounts of patriarchy within non-heterosexual communities may thus be seen to have significantly shaped gay men's early engagements in sperm donation. Ensuing decades, however, have seen moves toward increasing numbers of gay men focusing upon their own reproductive needs. At the same time, and perhaps not unrelatedly, there has been increased attention paid, both within Australia and internationally, to voices from the ever growing men's movement and its focus upon securing the rights of men as parents. Men's rights groups that emphasise the rights of fathers typically utilise the notion that 'all children need a father' and that men are more than simply sperm donors in order to legitimate their rights claims (Kaye and Tolmie 1998). It is in this context of contestations over families and rights that gay men who act as sperm donors negotiate their relationships to recipients. This may, at least in part, be seen to engender conflict between gay men and the women to whom they donate sperm: gay men are not outside of discourses of father's rights, and may thus be influenced by the demand for men's rights.

Academic writing on the two aforementioned cases further suggests the importance of considering gay men's location *as men* in litigation over paternity and access (e.g. Arnup and Boyd 1995; Dempsey 2004; Kelly 2002). Such writing has drawn attention to the ways in which heterosexist and (hetero)patriarchal social contexts (which function to deny lesbian access to donor sperm through clinics) has resulted in increasing numbers of women being forced to negotiate with individual men to access sperm. As the two cases cited above highlight, this can be dangerous for lesbian mothers for, as Dempsey (2005: 188) suggests, whilst "gay donors were considered [in the 1970s] 'safer' than heterosexual donors by some women because they assumed gay men were less likely to waver in their support for lesbians' rights to be parents[, and whilst it] was also believed that the homophobia prevalent in the legal system would mean a gay man would be less likely than a lesbian woman to be granted parental status in a court of law", this is increasingly not the case. As more gay men 'discover' a desire to become parents, and as the law seeks not necessarily to recognise gay men's rights, but certainly to recognise *fathers'* rights, it is likely to be the case that gay men are not automatically the 'safe option' they may once have been for lesbians wishing to become pregnant. As such, and as Arnup and Boyd (1995: 89) suggest, "it remains very difficult for women to affirm the role of a man in their children's lives without becoming subject to legal threat to their definition of family".

Considering the needs of known donors must thus occur alongside a recognition of the current social and legal contexts wherein men more broadly not only benefit from the fact that the law is centred upon a (hetero)patriarchal understanding of parenting and families, but where men as fathers are increasingly having their calls for rights affirmed. Furthermore, and as Moore (2002) suggests, social representations of sperm (and by implication sperm donation) are gendered through the depiction of sperm as 'active', 'agentic' and 'powerful' – terms typically associated with men, and which serve to reinforce particular normative understandings of masculinity and reproduction that construct women (and their ova) as passive recipients of both men and sperm. Again, it may be suggested that gay men are never outside of this – their role as donors is always already mediated by their role as men living within a patriarchal society that shapes gay men's beliefs and communities. As such, and as the following analysis demonstrates, gay men bring with them to donating a range of expectations and beliefs about family, masculinity and community that must be considered if donors are to be better supported in making choices around sperm provision that enable positive well-being for all parties.

Data and method

This research was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of The University of Adelaide. The following analysis draws upon a subset of 30 interviews conducted in early 2008 with Australian men who have acted as sperm donors. The subset is constituted of the 21 men who self-identified as gay. Of these men, six were parents themselves, with half of the sample aged 45 years or above and the other half aged under 45 years. Men came from one of four states involved in the research: South Australia, New South Wales, Victoria and

Tasmania. Interviews were conducted by the author, and transcribed orthographically for analysis. All participants were allocated pseudonyms and identifying information removed to ensure anonymity.

The 21 interviews conducted with gay men were read through repeatedly to identify dominant themes, following the tenets of thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006). Whilst the interview schedule broadly focused on motivations for donating, the emotions experienced as a result of donating, and methods for attracting more donors to clinics, all of the interviewees spent considerable time talking on topics of their own interest. Three main themes emerged from data (other than the themes of motivation and emotions that were the focus of the research). These were 1) constructions of biology, 2) issues involving the 'best interests of the children', and 3) representations of lesbian mothers/recipients (see Riggs under review, for an extended summary of participant demographics, participant motivations, and their relationship to the first two themes identified). This paper focuses on the final theme identified, which appeared as a dominant theme across 13 of the 21 interviews with gay men (more than one third of the entire data set), thus signifying it as an important theme in this subset of the overall data. Importantly, only one of the nine heterosexual participants spoke of representations of lesbian mothers/recipients. This would appear to suggest, at least in this data set, that these are issues of most relevance to gay sperm donors.

The analysis that follows focuses on a sample of representative extracts pertaining to the theme of representations of lesbian mothers/recipients. This theme was comprised of two sub-themes: 1) negative and 2) positive representations of negotiations with lesbian recipients. Nine gay participants provided primarily negative representations of lesbian mothers/recipients, with the three extracts analysed being broadly indicative of the dominant ways in which this occurred. Four gay participants spoke positively of lesbian recipients, and the two extracts analysed are indicative of the positive accounts.

Analysis

Negative representations of lesbian mothers/recipients

The primary way in which negotiations between donors and recipients were constructed by the participants was with negative reference to both individual women, and lesbian communities more broadly. In Extract 1 Chris speaks of his experience of attending a community forum at which lesbian mothers spoke about negotiating with donors and raising children:

Extract 1

Chris: I came away from the [community event on parenting] and felt sad. I think women are wonderful people and to have children is wonderful and that is fine. But a man is also part of the conception and it can be a truly shared thing. Perhaps in the past men have been awful to women, I am not one of them. I left there and I was saying 'here is a guy here, me, who wants to be honoured by having children with somebody who truly cares for the child and wants a shared experience', yet I left with the impression that men were considered bastards and thus I didn't want to participate in it.

In this extract Chris, who had previously been a donor, and who had attended a community event with the aim of again being a donor, appears quite conflicted when he attempts to reconcile the rights of others with his own perception of rights as a man. This in part appears to result from his emphasis upon the 'necessity' of men to conception. Chris' emphasis upon wanting a *shared* experience, whilst legitimate in its own right, ignores the fact that lesbian mothers have the right to seek donors who will only be involved on the basis of the child's directions – Chris generalises from mothers who want known, but uninvolved donors, to the desires of all mothers. Furthermore, his reference to lesbian constructions of 'men as bastards' references a particular incident witnessed by Chris at the forum, where one mother spoke of a very negative experience with a donor, similar to those described earlier in the paper. That Chris was willing to view this as a generalisation about all men, or even to suggest that such a generalisation (as based on a mistrust of donors) would be illegitimate, demonstrates his inability to consider differing experiences and desires for conception, and instead involves recentring the 'fact' of men's role in reproduction.

One possible means to reworking this notion of necessity is provided by Dempsey (2004), who proposes that what is required is for donors to engage in the construction of a 'donor identity' that is not enacted until the child conceived of their donation expresses a desire to know their donor. Such an approach would recognise that, yes, donors are instrumental to conception, but that they are not central to the life of the child conceived of their donation, unless the child wishes for them to be so.

In the following extract Joe, who had previously donated for a number of lesbian couples, talks about the difficulties of knowing where he stands as a donor, and the differing needs of lesbian mothers:

Extract 2

Interviewer: So do you have involvement with the children?

Joe: The mothers want me to be known, but they don't want me to have any basic hands on role in the child's upbringing. It is sort of nebulous, the concept of the known donor; it is a bit like how long is a piece of string. Some women complain on the web boards that their donors don't take a more active part, and others complain that their donors are wanting to interfere too much. It is never sorted out in black and white beforehand. In hindsight I should have had contracts, but I was a neophyte then and the mothers were neophytes as well. We just sort of proceeded on goodwill and ignorance and it has blown up occasionally.

In this extract Joe depicts the differing interests of lesbian mothers as competing, rather than simply individual, approaches to parenting. That some women would want more involvement whilst others should want little is only surprising if, as Joe suggests, these issues are not discussed beforehand. Drawing upon Joe's experiences, it may be possible to suggest that clear contracts which state the

intentions and roles of all parties before conception would be beneficial for increasing the likelihood that differences in opinion do not become legal battles over access and paternity.

Interestingly, whilst Joe emphasises the differing needs of mothers, and the conceptual problems with defining the 'known donor', he was hesitant throughout the interview to identify what his own needs and intentions were. Whilst he very much centred his discussions upon notions of 'goodwill', as highlighted in this extract, he also at times displayed his own investment in being involved with the children conceived. Yet as he went on to share at the end of the interview: "You are trying to put your best foot forward [when you post your availability as a donor on the internet] and market yourself into genetic immortality". Discussions about 'genetic immortality' featured in many of the interviews, and often signalled some of the primary motivations as to why men engaged in sperm donation. Recognising the role that such motivations play is thus important for understanding how they may conflict with the needs or intentions of women who may view genetics differently in the context of their own families.

In the following extract Paul, who was in the process of acting as a known donor, reports the particularly negative view that he believes is held about gay men within lesbian communities:

Extract 3

Interviewer: What representations of donors do you see within your communities?

Paul: With the exception of one lesbian couple that I know, the rest haven't wanted the donor to be involved on any level. They've either chosen to go to a sperm bank or they have chosen a friend of a friend. To me this is interesting because it makes me wonder if this is in part because these women don't want men involved in their lives because they don't like men full stop. That is why you could say sometimes I have an issue with lesbian parenting perhaps.

Interviewer: So how do you see lesbian mums talking about donors specifically then?

Paul: Only as a commodity. And furthermore I have found it interesting when half of the lesbian couples I have known have had boys and they haven't known what to do. Perhaps they would rather have had a girl. That's not going to make me any friends probably I know that.

Here Paul is clear that he sees donors talked about as a 'commodity'. Whilst this is a valid concern, and one identified in earlier Australian research on the experiences of donors conducted by Daniels (1991), it is important to view this comment about donors as a commodity in light of his previous statement about donor involvement and lesbian parenting. Paul seems invested in constructing lesbians' right to choose the level of involvement of donors as resulting from lesbians not 'liking men full stop'. That some mothers would wish to create

family that is lesbian-centred thus appears to be read by Paul as being anti-male. His construction of lesbian-headed families as 'anti-male' thus allows Paul to claim 'an issue with lesbian parenting'. This is furthered in his comments supposing that some lesbian mothers may prefer girls. The fact that women may find parenting boys challenging is constructed not as resulting from gender differences, but from an 'anti-male' sentiment amongst lesbian mothers. In constructing this argument, Paul engages in what Ripper (2007) has identified as the evaluative component of sperm provision, whereby potential donors are seen by some recipients as assessing their suitability as mothers. Paul appears to engage in such an assessment about the lesbian mothers that he knows, yet as per the previous extract from Joe, there is little accompanying evaluation of his own interests in parenting and his own strengths or weaknesses as a potential carer.

The three extracts analysed in this section highlight the diverse ways in which some of the gay participants spoke negatively of lesbian mothers/recipients. Some of the men, such as Chris, constructed men as 'necessary' to children, the corollary being that women who do not share this view are selfish. Other men, such as Joe, reported goodwill as their primary motivation to donating, yet constructed lesbian recipients as having competing or unfair requirements of donors. Finally, some gay men such as Paul appeared to hold negative perceptions of lesbian mothers in general. Whilst all of these men had previously donated to lesbian women and some planned to do so again in the future, these negative representations of lesbian mothers/recipients may well shape future interactions with the women and their children.

Positive representations of lesbian recipients

Importantly, however, not all donors reported negative representations of lesbian mothers/recipients. Four of the gay men provided positive representations of lesbian recipients. Some of these men emphasised the benefits of donating that arise from seeing the happiness of others, as exemplified in the following extract:

Extract 4

Interviewer: What are your feelings about donating and the child conceived as a result?

Dan: I think that, for me, what known donating brings with it is the fact that you are seeing other people's happiness. For me, because I have developed a friendship with these women, I have seen that they have gotten to where they wanted to be, which was to have a baby together. To see these people who are now good friends and know they are happy, that is the pay off, not any potential future contact with their child.

In this extract Dan, who had previously donated to a lesbian couple, emphasises the benefits of donating as providing the possibility of witnessing a friend's happiness. Dan's emphasis upon the happiness of the women he donated for, whilst obviously bringing him happiness too, appears to reflect a genuine care

about the needs of others to create family. For Dan, it appears to be the friendship that is important, not Dan's investment in the child born to the mothers. Importantly, throughout the interview Dan emphasised the centrality of the contract he has with the women he donored for, and his own clarity about his motivations for donating. Following on from the suggestions made in Extract 2, then, it would appear likely that contracts go at least some way toward providing all parties will clear guidelines as to their roles, which may thus afford space for the development of friendships which may help to secure commitment to the contract.

In the following and final extract Rick, who had donored to two lesbian couples, presents an image of donating whereby the process is positive for the relationships it engenders:

Extract 5

Rick: The objectification that you experience at the clinic doesn't really matter next to the esteem in which [the recipients] hold you as a person. I guess the reason I said [the negative experiences at a clinic] didn't matter in the end was because what was important was my motivation with the women. I know to them I am not a means to an end. Of course those thoughts come up: you think 'do they only see me that way?' But then when they want you to be involved in their child's life you realise no, I am not just a sperm donor or sperm maker, I am something more.

In this extract Rick acknowledges the challenges that arise from donating through a clinic, but that this is ameliorated by the esteem that the recipients hold him in as a donor. Throughout the interview Rick clearly elaborated his commitment to the women he was donating for as being both personal (a commitment to them as friends) and political (a commitment to assisting lesbian women conceive in a context of institutional heterosexism). He was also clear that his motives were not about his own desire to reproduce. As such, Rick's final comment about being involved in the child's life reflects something other than a possessive investment in paternity or access, and instead references what Dempsey (2004) terms as the adoption of a 'donorhood' rather than fatherhood role. Thus Rick is not simply a 'sperm maker', but rather he is 'something more' – someone who is recognised by the mothers as important, both as a friend and as a donor. This form of recognition, whilst potentially readable as similar to the desire for recognition deployed in the cases outlined earlier, is different for its location within a relational context between the mothers and the donor, rather than the donor and (proprietary claims to) the child.

Conclusions

In focusing on both the positive and negative aspects of negotiations between lesbian recipients and gay men as known sperm donors, this paper has emphasised both the aspects of negotiations that appear to work, and those that don't. In regard to the latter, the role of the donor post-birth may become problematic if contracts are not clearly negotiated, if donors have not honestly considered their own intentions and desires, and if the role of lesbian choice is dismissed in donating negotiations. It is important that gay men recognise the

many differing ways in which lesbians may come to parenting, and their individual beliefs around donor involvement. Understanding known donor conception as often necessary due to institutional heterosexism may help to clarify the role of donors in relation to those recipients who primarily or solely need genetic material in order to conceive (genetic material that is in some Australian states legally denied to them as lesbian women), and who are thus not seeking donors to be involved in parenting. In regard to the aspects of negotiations that *do* appear to work, these include donors being clear about their reasons for donating, the relationships they have built with the lesbian mothers, and a commitment to beginning from a starting place that emphasises the happiness of others in one's own happiness.

In light of these factors that influence outcomes, it is important to return to a point raised in the introduction, namely the question as to whose rights are emphasised in individual and community discussions over lesbian conception and gay men as donors. If the emphasis is solely upon the needs of individual adults, then it is likely that we will continue to see disagreements (both legal and non-legal) that arise from the conflicting needs of the adult parties. If, instead, the focus is upon the needs and rights of children, then all adults involved may be encouraged first to plan for the potential needs of children (i.e. to know donors, or to have access to meet donors should they choose), and second to then wait for children to determine those needs themselves. In this regard, it is unfortunately the case that discourses of 'best interests of the child' are often wielded by adults seeking particular rights for themselves (Riggs 2006). It is less often the case that children are heard and their views centred in discussions between adults. Considering children as citizens with rights thus offers an alternate perspective that holds the potential to shift the ways in which the potentially competing needs of donors and recipients are viewed.

Of course adults will often try to steer children's viewpoints and intervene on their behalf in legal and interpersonal contexts, but if greater community weight is placed upon the voices of children, then there may be increased opportunities for all parties to avoid conflict by deprioritising their own investments and feelings of propriety, and instead emphasising what children are actually saying. The construction of clear contracts may often be central to this, as until children can voice their needs, there must be agreement as to who will care for the child and how this will be achieved. Agreements that recognise the mother or mothers as primary decision makers, and where donors are primarily 'actors waiting in the wings' (Dempsey 2004), will likely result in situations where all parties are clear as to their roles, roles that will develop or remain the same, depending on the needs of the child *as they determine them*. Van Reyk (2004: 174), himself a donor, states this best:

As more gay men and lesbians enter into complex child bearing and child rearing relationships, we move into territory that is increasingly more contested and volatile. Our challenges in negotiating this territory, balancing protection and control, are greater. I believe we can meet these challenges if our activism is informed by two tenets. The first is that we deploy the language of intimacy, support and care when describing the relationships we are building, and resist the impulse

to deploy the language of conjugality and consanguinity. The second is that we place the child at the centre of the relationship and strive at all times to arrive at decisions that are for the child's benefit, no matter at what cost to ourselves.

Focusing on relationships and their centrality to families, communities and interpersonal interactions, would thus appear the best approach to negotiating agreements between sperm donors and recipients that are aimed at providing the best possible wellbeing outcomes for all parties, and which recognise children as citizens with rights that are distinct from their parents and those involved in their conception.

Acknowledgements

I begin by acknowledging the sovereignty of the Kurna people, upon whose land I live in Adelaide, South Australia. My thanks go to all of the participants, for sharing their stories and for exposing me to such a broad range of ideas about their experiences as known donors. Thanks are also due to the two reviewers for such excellent feedback and suggestions, and to Greg Fell for proof reading. This research was supported by a Faculty of Health Sciences Small Research Grant, 13103310.

References

Arnup, K. and Boyd, S. (1995) 'Familial disputes? Sperm donors, lesbian mothers, and legal parenthood' in Herman, D. and Stychin, C. (eds) *Legal Inversions: Lesbians: Gay Men, and the Politics of Law* Temple University Press: Philadelphia, pp. 77-101.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology' *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3:77-101

Daniels, K.R. (1991) 'Relationships between semen donors and their networks' *Australian Social Work* 44:29-35.

Dempsey, D. (2004) 'Donor, father or parent? Conceiving paternity in the Australian Family Court' *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family* 18:76-102.

Dempsey, D. (2005) 'Lesbians' right to choose; Children's right to know' in Grace Jones, H. and Kirkman, M. (eds) *Sperm Wars: The Rights and Wrongs of Reproduction* Sydney: ABC Books, pp. 185-195.

Kaye, M. and Tolmie, J. (1998) 'Discursing dads: The rhetorical devices of fathers' rights groups' *Melbourne University Law Review* 22:162-194.

Kelly, F. (2002) 'Redefining parenthood: Gay and lesbian families in the Family Court - the case of *Re: Patrick*' *Australian Journal of Family Law* 16:204-226.

Moore, L.J. (2002) 'Extracting men from semen: Masculinity in scientific representations of sperm' *Social Text* 20:91-117.

Riggs, D.W. (2006) 'Developmentalism and the rhetoric of *Best Interests of the Child*: Challenging heteronormative constructions of families and parenting in foster care' *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 2:57-73.

Riggs, D.W. (under review) 'Australian heterosexual and gay known sperm donors: Their motivations and beliefs' *Australian Journal of Emerging Technologies*.

Ripper, M. (2007) 'Fishing for taddies: Emotion work in lesbian's search for sperm donors in Australia' *Gay and Lesbian Issues and Psychology Review* 3:16-24.

Short, L. (2007) 'Lesbian mothers living well in the context of heterosexism and discrimination: Resources, strategies, and legislative change' *Feminism and Psychology* 17: 57-74.

van Reyk, P. (1995) 'Donor dads: The sperm givers' view' in Wakeling, L. and Bradstock, M. (eds) *Beyond Blood: Writings on the Lesbian and Gay Family* Sydney: BlackWattle Press, pp. 8-85.

van Reyk, P. (2004) 'Baby love: Gay donor father narratives of intimacy' in Riggs, D.W. and Walker, G.A. (eds) *Out in the Antipodes: Australian and New Zealand Perspectives on Gay and Lesbian Issues in Psychology* Perth: Brightfire Press, pp. 155-176.