Chandra Talpade Mohanty

FEMINISM WITHOUT BORDERS

Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS   DURHAM & LONDON 2003

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Under Western Eyes: Feminist
Scholarship and Colonial Discourses

Any discussion of the intellectual and political construction of "Third World feminisms" must address itself to two simultaneous projects: the internal critique of hegemonic "Western" feminisms and the formulation of autonomous feminist concerns and strategies that are geographically, historically, and culturally grounded. The first project is one of deconstructing and dismantling; the second is one of building and constructing. While these projects appear to be contradictory, the one working negatively and the other positively, unless these two tasks are addressed simultaneously, Third World feminisms run the risk of marginalization or ghettoization from both mainstream (right and left) and Western feminist discourses.

It is to the first project that I address myself here. What I wish to analyze is specifically the production of the "Third World woman" as a singular, monolithic subject in some (Western) feminist texts. The definition of colonization I wish to invoke here is a predominantly discursive one, focusing on a certain mode of appropriation and codification of scholarship and knowledge about women in the Third World through the use of particular analytic categories employed in specific writings on the subject that take as their referent feminist interests as they have been articulated in the United States and Western Europe. If one of the tasks of formulating and understanding the locus of Third World feminisms is delineating the way in which they resist and work against what I am referring to as "Western feminist discourse," then an analysis of the discursive construction of Third World women in Western feminism is an important first step.

Clearly, neither Western feminist discourse nor Western feminist political practice is singular or homogeneous in its goals, interests, or analyses. However, it is possible to trace a coherence of effects resulting from the implicit

assumption of "the West" (in all its complexities and contradictions) as the primary referent in theory and praxis. My reference to "Western feminism" is by no means intended to imply that it is a monolith. Rather, I am attempting to draw attention to the similar effects of various textual strategies used by writers that codify others as non-Western and hence themselves as (implicitly) Western. It is in this sense that I use the term "Western feminist." Similar arguments can be made about middle-class, urban African or Asian scholars who write about their rural or working-class sisters and assume their own middle-class cultures at the norm and codify working class histories and cultures as other. Thus, while this chapter focuses specifically on what I refer to as "Western feminist" discourse on women in the Third World, the critiques I offer also pertain to Third World scholars who write about their own cultures and employ identical strategies.

It ought to be of some political significance that the term "colonization" has come to denote a variety of phenomena in recent feminist and left writings in general. From its analytic value as a category of exploitative economic exchange in both traditional and contemporary Marxisms (see, in particular, Amin 1977, Baran 1962, and Gunder-Frank 1967) to its use by feminist women of color in the United States to describe the appropriation of their experiences and struggles by hegemonic white women's movements (see especially Joseph and Lewis 1981, Moraga 1984, Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981, and Smith 1983), colonization has been used to characterize everything from the most evident economic and political hierarchies to the production of a particular cultural discourse about what is called the Third World. However sophisticated or problematical its use as an explanatory construct, colonization almost invariably implies a relation of structural domination and a suppression—often violent—of the heterogeneity of the subject(s) in question.

My concern about such writings derives from my own implication and investment in contemporary debates in feminist theory and the urgent political necessity of forming strategic coalitions across class, race, and national boundaries. The analytic principles discussed below serve to distort Western feminist political practices and limit the possibility of coalitions among (usually white) Western feminists, working-class feminists, and feminists of color around the world. These limitations are evident in the construction of the (implicitly consensual) priority of issues around which apparently all women are expected to organize. The necessary and integral connection between feminist scholarship and feminist political practice and organizing de-

termines the significance and status of Western feminist writings on women in the Third World, for feminist scholarship, like most other kinds of scholarship, is not the mere production of knowledge about a certain subject. It is a directly political and discursive practice in that it is purposeful and ideological. It is best seen as a mode of intervention into particular hegemonic discourses (e.g., traditional anthropology, sociology, and literary criticism); it is a political praxis that counters and resists the totalizing imperative of age-old "legitimate" and "scientific" bodies of knowledge. Thus, feminist scholarly practices (reading, writing, critiquing, etc.) are inscribed in relations of power—relations that they counter, resist, or even perhaps implicitly support. There can, of course, be no apolitical scholarship.

The relationship between "Woman" (a cultural and ideological composite other constructed through diverse representational discourses—scientific, literary, juridical, linguistic, cinematic, etc.) and "women" (real, material subjects of their collective histories) is one of the central questions the practice of feminist scholarship seeks to address. This connection between women as historical subjects and the representation of Woman produced by hegemonic discourses is not a relation of direct identity or a relation of correspondence or simple implication.[2] It is an arbitrary relation set up by particular cultures. I would like to suggest that the feminist writings I analyze here discursively colonize the material and historical heterogeneities of the lives of women in the Third World, thereby producing/representing a composite, singular "Third World woman"—an image that appears arbitrarily constructed but nevertheless carries with it the authorizing signature of Western humanist discourse.[3]

I argue that assumptions of privilege and ethnocentric universality, on the one hand, and inadequate self-consciousness about the effect of Western scholarship on the Third World in the context of a world system dominated by the West, on the other, characterize a sizable extent of Western feminist work on women in the Third World. An analysis of "sexual difference" in the form of a cross-culturally singular, monolithic notion of patriarchy or male dominance leads to the construction of a similarly reductive and homogeneous notion of what I call the "Third World difference"—that stable, ahistorical something that apparently oppresses most if not all the women in these countries. And it is in the production of this Third World difference that Western feminisms appropriate and colonize the constitutive complexities that characterize the lives of women in these countries. It is in this process of discursive

homogenization and systematization of the oppression of women in the Third World that power is exercised in much of recent Western feminist discourse, and this power needs to be defined and named.

In the context of the West's hegemonic position today—the context of what Anouar Abdel-Malek (1981) calls a struggle for "control over the orientation, regulation and decision of the process of world development on the basis of the advanced sector's monopoly of scientific knowledge and ideal creativity" (145)—Western feminist scholarship on the Third World must be seen and examined precisely in terms of its inscription in these particular relations of power and struggle. There is, it should be evident, no universal patriarchal framework that this scholarship attempts to counter and resist—unless one posits an international male conspiracy or a monolithic, ahistorical power structure. There is, however, a particular world balance of power within which any analysis of culture, ideology, and socioeconomic conditions necessarily has to be situated. Abdel-Malek is useful here, again, in reminding us about the inherence of politics in the discourses of "culture":

> Contemporary imperialism is, in a real sense, a hegemonic imperialism, exercising to a maximum degree a rationalized violence taken to a higher level than ever before—through fire and sword, but also through the attempt to control hearts and minds. For its content is defined by the combined action of the military-industrial complex and the hegemonic cultural centers of the West, all of them founded on the advanced levels of development attained by monopoly and finance capital, and supported by the benefits of both the scientific and technological revolution and the second industrial revolution itself. (145–46)

Western feminist scholarship cannot avoid the challenge of situating itself and examining its role in such a global economic and political framework. To do any less would be to ignore the complex interconnections between First and Third World economies and the profound effect of this on the lives of women in all countries. I do not question the descriptive and informative value of most Western feminist writings on women in the Third World. I also do not question the existence of excellent work that does not fall into the analytic traps with which I am concerned. In fact, I deal with an example of such work later on. In the context of an overwhelming silence about the experience of women in these countries, as well as the need to forge international links between women's political struggles, such work is both pathbreaking

and absolutely essential. However, I want to draw attention here both to the explanatory potential of particular analytic strategies employed by such writing and to their political effect in the context of the hegemony of Western scholarship. While feminist writing in the United States is still marginalized (except from the point of view of women of color addressing privileged white women), Western feminist writing on women in the Third World must be considered in the context of the global hegemony of Western scholarship—that is, the production, publication, distribution, and consumption of information and ideas. Marginal or not, this writing has political effects and implications beyond the immediate feminist or disciplinary audience. One such significant effect of the dominant "representations" of Western feminism is its conflation with imperialism in the eyes of particular Third World women. Hence the urgent need to examine the political implications of our analytic strategies and principles.

My critique is directed at three basic analytic principles that are present in (Western) feminist discourse on women in the Third World. Since I focus primarily on the Zed Press Women in the Third World series, my comments on Western feminist discourse are circumscribed by my analysis of the texts in this series.[5] This is a way of focusing my critique. However, even though I am dealing with feminists who identify themselves as culturally or geographically from the West, what I say about these presuppositions or implicit principles holds for anyone who uses these methods, whether Third World women in the West or Third World women in the Third World writing on these issues and publishing in the West. Thus I am not making a culturalist argument about ethnocentrism; rather, I am trying to uncover how ethnocentric universalism is produced in certain analyses. As a matter of fact, my argument holds for any discourse that sets up its own authorial subjects as the implicit referent, that is, the yardstick by which to encode and represent cultural others. It is in this move that power is exercised in discourse.

The first analytic presupposition I focus on is involved in the strategic location of the category "women" vis-à-vis the context of analysis. The assumption of women as an already constituted, coherent group with identical interests and desires, regardless of class, ethnic, or racial location, or contradictions, implies a notion of gender or sexual difference or even patriarchy that can be applied universally and cross-culturally. (The context of analysis can be anything from kinship structures and the organization of labor to media representations.) The second analytical presupposition is evident on the method-

ological level, in the uncritical way "proof" of universality and cross-cultural validity are provided. The third is a more specifically political presupposition underlying the methodologies and the analytic strategies, that is, the model of power and struggle they imply and suggest. I argue that as a result of the two modes—or, rather, frames—of analysis described above, a homogeneous notion of the oppression of women as a group is assumed, which, in turn, produces the image of an "average Third World woman." This average Third World woman leads an essentially truncated life based on her feminine gender (read: sexually constrained) and her being "Third World" (read: ignorant, poor, uneducated, tradition-bound, domestic, family-oriented, victimized, etc.). This, I suggest, is in contrast to the (implicit) self-representation of Western women as educated, as modern, as having control over their own bodies and sexualities and the freedom to make their own decisions.

The distinction between Western feminist representation of women in the Third World and Western feminist self-presentation is a distinction of the same order as that made by some Marxists between the "maintenance" function of the housewife and the real "productive" role of wage labor, or the characterization by developmentalists of the Third World as being engaged in the lesser production of "raw materials" in contrast to the "real" productive activity of the First World. These distinctions are made on the basis of the privileging of a particular group as the norm or referent. Men involved in wage labor, First World producers, and, I suggest, Western feminists who sometimes cast Third World women in terms of "ourselves undressed" (Rosaldo 1980), all construct themselves as the normative referent in such a binary analytic.

Women as a Category of Analysis; or, We Are All Sisters in Struggle

The phrase "women as a category of analysis" refers to the crucial assumption that all women, across classes and cultures, are somehow socially constituted as a homogeneous group identified prior to the process of analysis. This is an assumption that characterizes much feminist discourse. The homogeneity of women as a group is produced not on the basis of biological essentials but rather on the basis of secondary sociological and anthropological universals. Thus, for instance, in any given piece of feminist analysis, women are characterized as a singular group on the basis of a shared oppression. What binds women together is a sociological notion of the "sameness" of their op-

pression. It is at this point that an elision takes place between "women" as a discursively constructed group and "women" as material subjects of their own history. Thus, the discursively consensual homogeneity of women as a group is mistaken for the historically specific material reality of groups of women. This results in an assumption of women as an always already constituted group, one that has been labeled powerless, exploited, sexually harassed, and so on, by feminist scientific, economic, legal, and sociological discourses. (Notice that this is quite similar to sexist discourse labeling women as weak, emotional, having math anxiety, etc.) This focus is not on uncovering the material and ideological specificities that constitute a particular group of women as "powerless" in a particular context. It is, rather, on finding a variety of cases of powerless groups of women to prove the general point that women as a group are powerless.

In this section I focus on six specific ways in which "women" as a category of analysis is used in Western feminist discourse on women in the Third World. Each of these examples illustrates the construction of "Third World women" as a homogeneous "powerless" group often located as implicit victims of particular socioeconomic systems. I have chosen to deal with a variety of writers—from Fran Hosken, who writes primarily about female genital mutilation, to writers from the Women in International Development (WID) school, who write about the effect of development policies on Third World women for both Western and Third World audiences. The similarity of assumptions about Third World women in all these texts forms the basis of my discussion. This is not to equate all the texts that I analyze, nor is it to equalize their strengths and weaknesses. The authors I deal with write with varying degrees of care and complexity; however, the effect of their representation of Third World women is a coherent one. In these texts women are defined as victims of male violence (Fran Hosken); as universal dependents (Beverly Lindsay and Maria Cutrufelli); victims of the colonial process (Maria Cutrufelli); victims of the Arab familial system (Juliette Minces); victims of the Islamic code (Patricia Jeffery); and, finally, victims of the economic development process (Beverley Lindsay and the [liberal] WID school). This mode of defining women primarily in terms of their object status (the way in which they are affected or not affected by certain institutions and systems) is what characterizes this particular form of the use of "women" as a category of analysis. In the context of Western women writing/studying women in the Third World, such objectification (however benevolently motivated) needs to be both named

and challenged. As Valerie Amos and Pratibha Parmar argue quite eloquently, "Feminist theories which examine our cultural practices as 'feudal residues' or label us 'traditional,' also portray us as politically immature women who need to be versed and schooled in the ethos of Western feminism. They need to be continually challenged" (1984, 7).[6]

WOMEN AS VICTIMS OF MALE VIOLENCE

Fran Hosken, in writing about the relationship between human rights and female genital mutilation in Africa and the Middle East, bases her whole discussion/condemnation of genital mutilation on one privileged premise: that the goal of this practice is to "mutilate the sexual pleasure and satisfaction of woman" (1981, 11). This, in turn, leads her to claim that woman's sexuality is controlled, as is her reproductive potential. According to Hosken, "male sexual politics" in Africa and around the world shares "the same political goal: to assure female dependence and subservience by any and all means" (14). Physical violence against women (rape, sexual assault, excision, infibulation, etc.) is thus carried out "with an astonishing consensus among men in the world" (14). Here, women are defined consistently as the victim of male control—as the "sexually oppressed."[7] Although it is true that the potential of male violence against women circumscribes and elucidates their social position to a certain extent, defining women as archetypal victims freezes them into "objects-who-defend-themselves," men into "subjects-who-perpetrate-violence," and (every) society into powerless (read: women) and powerful (read: men) groups of people. Male violence must be theorized and interpreted within specific societies in order both to understand it better and to organize effectively to change it.[8] Sisterhood cannot be assumed on the basis of gender; it must be forged in concrete historical and political practice and analysis.

WOMEN AS UNIVERSAL DEPENDENTS

Beverly Lindsay's conclusion to the book *Comparative Perspectives of Third World Women: The Impact of Race, Sex, and Class* (1983) states that "dependency relationships, based upon race, sex, and class, are being perpetuated through social, educational, and economic institutions. These are the linkages among Third World Women." Here, as in other places, Lindsay implies that Third World women constitute an identifiable group purely on the basis of shared dependencies. If shared dependencies were all that was needed to bind Third

World women together as a group, they would always be seen as an apolitical group with no subject status. Instead, if anything, it is the common context of political struggle against class, race, gender, and imperialist hierarchies that may constitute Third World women as a strategic group at this historical juncture. Lindsay also states that linguistic and cultural differences exist between Vietnamese and black American women, but "both groups are victims of race, sex, and class" (306). Again, black and Vietnamese women are characterized by their victim status.

Similarly, examine statements such as "My analysis will start by stating that all African women are politically and economically dependent" (Cutrufelli 1983, 13); "Nevertheless, either overtly or covertly, prostitution is still the main if not the only source of work for African women" (Cutrufelli 1983, 33). All African women are dependent. Prostitution is the only work option for African women as a group. Both statements are illustrative of generalizations sprinkled liberally through Maria Cutrufelli's book *Women of Africa: Roots of Oppression*. On the cover of the book, Cutrufelli is described as an Italian writer, sociologist, Marxist, and feminist. Today, is it possible to imagine writing a book entitled *Women of Europe: Roots of Oppression?* I am not objecting to the use of universal groupings for descriptive purposes. Women from the continent of Africa can be descriptively characterized as "women of Africa." It is when "women of Africa" becomes a homogeneous sociological grouping characterized by common dependencies or powerlessness (or even strengths) that problems arise—we say too little and too much at the same time.

This is because descriptive gender differences are transformed into the division between men and women. Women are constituted as a group via dependency relationships vis-à-vis men, who are implicitly held responsible for these relationships. When "women of Africa" as a group (versus "men of Africa" as a group?) are seen as a group precisely because they are generally dependent and oppressed, the analysis of specific historical differences becomes impossible, because reality is always apparently structured by divisions—two mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive groups, the victims and the oppressors. Here the sociological is substituted for the biological, in order, however, to create the same—a unity of women. Thus it is not the descriptive potential of gender difference but the privileged positioning and explanatory potential of gender difference as the origin of oppression that I question. In using "women of Africa" (as an already constituted group of oppressed peoples) as a category of analysis, Cutrufelli denies any historical specificity to the location

of women as subordinate, powerful, marginal, central, or otherwise, vis-à-vis particular social and power networks. Women are taken as a unified "power-less" group prior to the analysis in question. Thus it is merely a matter of specifying the context after the fact. "Women" are now placed in the context of the family or in the workplace or within religious networks, almost as if these systems existed outside the relations of women with other women, and women with men.

The problem with this analytic strategy is that it assumes men and women are already constituted as sexual-political subjects prior to their entry into the arena of social relations. Only if we subscribe to this assumption is it possible to undertake analysis that looks at the "effects" of kinship structures, colonialism, organization of labor, and so on, on "women," defined in advance as a group. The crucial point that is forgotten is that women are produced through these very relations as well as being implicated in forming these relations. As Michelle Rosaldo argues, "[W]oman's place in human social life is not in any direct sense a product of the things she does (or even less, a function of what, biologically, she is) but the meaning her activities acquire through concrete social interactions" (1980, 400). That women mother in a variety of societies is not as significant as the value attached to mothering in these societies. The distinction between the act of mothering and the status attached to it is a very important one—one that needs to be stated and analyzed contextually.

MARRIED WOMEN AS VICTIMS OF THE COLONIAL PROCESS

In Claude Lévi-Strauss's theory of kinship structure as a system of the exchange of women, what is significant is that exchange itself is not constitutive of the subordination of women; women are not subordinate because of the fact of exchange but because of the modes of exchange instituted and the values attached to these modes. However, in discussing the marriage ritual of the Bemba, a Zambian matrilocal, matrilineal people, Cutrufelli in *Women of Africa* focuses on the fact of the marital exchange of women before and after Western colonization, rather than the value attached to this exchange in this particular context. This leads to her definition of Bemba women as a coherent group affected in a particular way by colonization. Here again, Bemba women are constituted rather unilaterally as victims of the effects of Western colonization.

Cutrufelli cites the marriage ritual of the Bemba as a multistage event "whereby a young man becomes incorporated into his wife's fami' ~oup as

he takes up residence with them and gives his services in return for food and maintenance" (43). This ritual extends over many years, and the sexual relationship varies according to the degree of the girl's physical maturity. It is only after she undergoes an initiation ceremony at puberty that intercourse is sanctioned and the man acquires legal rights over her. This initiation ceremony is the more important act of the consecration of women's reproductive power, so that the abduction of an uninitiated girl is of no consequence, while heavy penalty is levied for the seduction of an initiated girl. Cutrufelli asserts that European colonization has changed the whole marriage system. Now the young man is entitled to take his wife away from her people in return for money. The implication is that Bemba women have now lost the protection of tribal laws. The problem here is that while it is possible to see how the structure of the traditional marriage contract (versus the postcolonial marriage contract) offered women a certain amount of control over their marital relations, only an analysis of the political significance of the actual practice that privileges an initiated girl over an uninitiated one, indicating a shift in female power relations as a result of this ceremony, can provide an accurate account of whether Bemba women were indeed protected by tribal laws at all times.

It is not possible, however, to talk about Bemba women as a homogeneous group within the traditional marriage structure. Bemba women before the initiation are constituted within a different set of social relations compared to Bemba women after the initiation. To treat them as a unified group characterized by the fact of their "exchange" between male kin is to deny the sociohistorical and cultural specificities of their existence and the differential value attached to their exchange before and after their initiation. It is to treat the initiation ceremony as a ritual with no political implications or effects. It is also to assume that in merely describing the structure of the marriage contract, the situation of women is exposed. Women as a group are positioned within a given structure, but no attempt is made to trace the effect of the marriage practice in constituting women within an obviously changing network of power relations. Thus women are assumed to be sexual-political subjects prior to entry into kinship structures.

WOMEN AND FAMILIAL SYSTEMS

Elizabeth Cowie (1978), in another context, points out the implications of this sort of analysis when she emphasizes the specifically political nature of

kinship structures that must be analyzed as ideological practices that designate men and women as father, husband, wife, mother, sister, and so on. Thus, Cowie suggests, women as women are not located within the family. Rather, it is in the family, as an effect of kinship structures, that women as women are constructed, defined within and by the group. Thus, for instance, when Juliette Minces (1980) cites the patriarchal family as the basis for "an almost identical vision of women" that Arab and Muslim societies have, she falls into this very trap (see esp. 23). Not only is it problematical to speak of a vision of women shared by Arab and Muslim societies (i.e., over twenty different countries) without addressing the particular historical, material, and ideological power structures that construct such images, but to speak of the patriarchal family or the tribal kinship structure as the origin of the socioeconomic status of women is to assume again that women are sexual-political subjects prior to their entry into the family. So while, on the one hand, women attain value or status within the family, the assumption of a singular patriarchal kinship system (common to all Arab and Muslim societies) is what apparently structures women as an oppressed group in these societies! This singular, coherent kinship system presumably influences another separate and given entity, "women." Thus, all women, regardless of class and cultural differences, are affected by this system. Not only are all Arab and Muslim women seen to constitute a homogeneous oppressed group, but there is no discussion of the specific practices within the family that constitute women as mothers, wives, sisters, and so on. Arabs and Muslims, it appears, don't change at all. Their patriarchal family is carried over from the times of the prophet Muhammad. They exist, as it were, outside history.

WOMEN AND RELIGIOUS IDEOLOGIES

A further example of the use of "women" as a category of analysis is found in cross-cultural analyses that subscribe to a certain economic reductionism in describing the relationship between the economy and factors such as politics and ideology. Here, in reducing the level of comparison to the economic relations between "developed and developing" countries, any specificity to the question of women is denied. Mina Modares (1981), in a careful analysis of women and Shiism in Iran, focuses on this very problem when she criticizes feminist writings that treat Islam as an ideology separate from and outside social relations and practices, rather than as a discourse that includes rules for economic, social, and power relations within society. Patricia Jeffery's (1979)

otherwise informative work on Pirzada women in purdah considers Islamic ideology a partial explanation for the status of women in that it provides a justification for purdah. Here, Islamic ideology is reduced to a set of ideas whose internalization by Pirzada women contributes to the stability of the system. However, the primary explanation for purdah is located in the control that Pirzada men have over economic resources and the personal security purdah gives to Pirzada women.

By taking a specific version of Islam as the Islam, Jeffery attributes a singularity and coherence to it. Modares notes: " 'Islamic Theology' then becomes imposed on a separate and given entity called 'women.' A further unification is reached: Women (meaning all women), regardless of their differing positions within societies, come to be affected or not affected by Islam. These conceptions provide the right ingredients for an unproblematic possibility of a cross-cultural study of women" (63).

Marnia Lazreg (1988) makes a similar argument when she addresses the reductionism inherent in scholarship on women in the Middle East and North Africa:

A ritual is established whereby the writer appeals to religion as the cause of gender inequality just as it is made the source of underdevelopment in much of modernization theory in an uncanny way, feminist discourse on women from the Middle East and North Africa mirrors that of theologians' own interpretation of women in Islam. The overall effect of this paradigm is to deprive women of self-presence, of being. Because women are subsumed under religion presented in fundamental terms, they are inevitably seen as evolving in nonhistorical time. They virtually have no history. Any analysis of change is therefore foreclosed. (87)

While Jeffery's analysis does not quite succumb to this kind of unitary notion of religion (Islam), it does collapse all ideological specificities into economic relations and universalizes on the basis of this comparison.

WOMEN AND THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The best examples of universalization on the basis of economic reductionism can be found in the liberal literature about women in international development. Proponents of this school seek to examine the effect of development on Third World women, sometimes from self-designated feminist perspectives. At the very least, there is an evident interest in and commitment

to improving the lives of women in "developing" countries. Scholars such as Irene Tinker and Michelle Bo Bramsen (1972), Ester Boserup (1970), and Perdita Huston (1979) have all written about the effect of development policies on women in the Third World. All four women assume "development" is synonymous with "economic development" or "economic progress." As in the case of Minces's patriarchal family, Hosken's male sexual control, and Cutrufelli's Western colonization, development here becomes the all-time equalizer. Women are affected positively or negatively by economic development policies, and this is the basis for cross-cultural comparison.

For instance, Huston (1979) states that the purpose of her study is to describe the effect of the development process on the "family unit and its individual members" in Egypt, Kenya, Sudan, Tunisia, Sri Lanka, and Mexico. She states that the "problems" and "needs" expressed by rural and urban women in these countries all center around education and training, work and wages, access to health and other services, political participation, and legal rights (116). Huston relates all these "needs" to insensitive development policies that exclude women as a group or category. For her, the solution is simple: implement improved development policies that emphasize training for women field-workers; use women trainees and women rural development officers; encourage women's cooperatives; and so on (119–22). Here again, women are assumed to be a coherent group or category prior to their entry into "the development process." Huston assumes that all Third World women have similar problems and needs. Thus, they must have similar interests and goals. However, the interests of urban, middle-class, educated Egyptian housewives, to take only one instance, could surely not be seen as being the same as those of their uneducated, poor maids. Development policies do not affect both groups of women in the same way. Practices that characterize women's status and roles vary according to class. Women are constituted as women through the complex interaction between class, culture, religion, and other ideological institutions and frameworks. They are not "women"—a coherent group—solely on the basis of a particular economic system or policy. Such reductive cross-cultural comparisons result in the colonization of the specifics of daily existence and the complexities of political interests that women of different social classes and cultures represent and mobilize.

It is revealing that for Huston, women in the Third World countries she writes about have "needs" and "problems" but few if any have "choices" or the freedom to act. This is an interesting representation of women in the Third

World, one that is significant in suggesting a latent self-presentation of Western women that bears looking at. She writes, "What surprised and moved me most as I listened to women in such very different cultural settings was the striking commonality—whether they were educated or illiterate, urban or rural—of their most basic values: the importance they assign to family, dignity, and service to others" (115). Would Huston consider such values unusual for women in the West?

What is problematical about this kind of use of "women" as a group, as a stable category of analysis, is that it assumes an ahistorical, universal unity between women based on a generalized notion of their subordination. Instead of analytically demonstrating the production of women as socioeconomic political groups within particular local contexts, this analytical move limits the definition of the female subject to gender identity, completely bypassing social class and ethnic identities. What characterizes women as a group is their gender (sociologically, not necessarily biologically, defined) over and above everything else, indicating a monolithic notion of sexual difference. Because women are thus constituted as a coherent group, sexual difference becomes coterminous with female subordination and power is automatically defined in binary terms: people who have it (read: men) and people who do not (read: women). Men exploit, women are exploited. Such simplistic formulations are historically reductive; they are also ineffectual in designing strategies to combat oppressions. All they do is reinforce binary divisions between men and women.

What would an analysis that did not do this look like? Maria Mies's work illustrates the strength of Western feminist work on women in the Third World that does not fall into the traps discussed above. Mies's study (1982) of the lace-makers of Narsapur, India, attempts to analyze carefully a substantial household industry in which "housewives" produce lace doilies for consumption in the world market. Through a detailed analysis of the structure of the lace industry, production and reproduction relations, the sexual division of labor, profits and exploitation, and the overall consequences of defining women as "nonworking housewives" and their work as "leisure-time activity," Mies demonstrates the levels of exploitation in this industry and the impact of this production system on the work and living conditions of the women involved in it. In addition, she is able to analyze the "ideology of the housewife," the notion of a woman sitting in the house, as providing the necessary subjective and sociocultural elements for the creation and mainte-

nance of a production system that contributes to the increasing pauperization of women and keeps them totally atomized and disorganized as workers. Mies's analysis shows the effect of a certain historically and culturally specific mode of patriarchal organization, an organization constructed on the basis of the definition of the lace-makers as nonworking housewives at familial, local, regional, statewide, and international levels. The intricacies and the effects of particular power networks not only are emphasized but form the basis of Mies's analysis of how this particular group of women is situated at the center of a hegemonic, exploitative world market.

Mies's study is a good example of what careful, politically focused, local analyses can accomplish. It illustrates how the category of women is constructed in a variety of political contexts that often exist simultaneously and overlaid on top of one another. There is no easy generalization in the direction of "women in India" or "women in the Third World"; nor is there a reduction of the political construction of the exploitation of the lace-makers to cultural explanations about the passivity or obedience that might characterize these women and their situation. Finally, this mode of local, political analysis, which generates theoretical categories from within the situation and context being analyzed, also suggests corresponding effective strategies for organizing against the exploitation faced by the lace-makers. Narsapur women are not mere victims of the production process, because they resist, challenge, and subvert the process at various junctures. Here is one instance of how Mies delineates the connections between the housewife ideology, the self-consciousness of the lace-makers, and their interrelationships as contributing to the latent resistances she perceives among the women:

> The persistence of the housewife ideology, the self-perception of the lace-makers as petty commodity producers rather than as workers, is not only upheld by the structure of the industry as such but also by the deliberate propagation and reinforcement of reactionary patriarchal norms and institutions. Thus, most of the lace-makers voiced the same opinion about the rules of *purdah* and seclusion in their communities which were also propagated by the lace exporters. In particular; the *Kapu* women said that they had never gone out of their houses, that women of their community could not do any other work than housework and lace work etc., but in spite of the fact that most of them still subscribed fully to the patriarchal norms of the *gosha* women, there were also contradictory elements in their con-

sciousness. Thus, although they looked down with contempt upon women who were able to work outside the house—like the untouchable *Mala* and *Madiga* women or women of other lower castes—they could not ignore the fact that these women were earning more money precisely because they were not respectable housewives but workers. At one discussion, they even admitted that it would be better if they could also go out and do coolie work. And when they were asked whether they would be ready to come out of their houses and work—in one place in some sort of a factory—they said they would do that. This shows that the purdah and housewife ideology, although still fully internalized, already had some cracks, because it has been confronted with several contradictory realities. (157)

It is only by understanding the contradictions inherent in women's location within various structures that effective political action and challenges can be devised. Mies's study goes a long way toward offering such analysis. While there are now an increasing number of Western feminist writings in this tradition,[19] there is also, unfortunately, a large block of writing that succumbs to the cultural reductionism discussed earlier.

Methodological Universalisms; or, Women's Oppression As a Global Phenomenon

Western feminist writings on women in the Third World subscribe to a variety of methodologies to demonstrate the universal cross-cultural operation of male dominance and female exploitation. I summarize and critique three such methods below, moving from the simplest to the most complex.

First, proof of universalism is provided through the use of an arithmetic method. The argument goes like this: the greater the number of women who wear the veil, the more universal is the sexual segregation and control of women (Deardon 1975, 4–5). Similarly, a large number of different, fragmented examples from a variety of countries also apparently add up to a universal fact. For instance, Muslim women in Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan, India, and Egypt all wear some sort of a veil. Hence, the argument goes, sexual control of women is a universal fact in those countries (Deardon 1975, 7, 10). Fran Hosken writes, "Rape, forced prostitution, polygamy, genital mutilation, pornography, the beating of girls and women, purdah (segregation of women) are all violations of basic human rights" (1981, 15). By equating purdah with

rape, domestic violence, and forced prostitution, Hosken asserts that purdah's "sexual control" function is the primary explanation for its existence, whatever the context. Institutions of purdah are thus denied any cultural and historical specificity and contradictions, and potentially subversive aspects are totally ruled out.

In both these examples, the problem is not in asserting that the practice of wearing a veil is widespread. This assertion can be made on the basis of numbers. It is a descriptive generalization. However, it is the analytic leap from the practice of veiling to an assertion of its general significance in controlling women that must be questioned. While there may be a physical similarity in the veils worn by women in Saudi Arabia and Iran, the specific meaning attached to this practice varies according to the cultural and ideological context. In addition, the symbolic space occupied by the practice of purdah may be similar in certain contexts, but this does not automatically indicate that the practices themselves have identical significance in the social realm. For example, as is well known, Iranian middle-class women veiled themselves during the 1979 revolution to indicate solidarity with their veiled, working-class sisters, while in contemporary Iran, mandatory Islamic laws dictate that all Iranian women wear veils. While in both these instances, similar reasons might be offered for the veil (opposition to the Shah and Western cultural colonization in the first case and the true Islamization of Iran in the second), the concrete meanings attached to Iranian women wearing the veil are clearly different in both historical contexts. In the first case, wearing the veil is both an oppositional and a revolutionary gesture on the part of Iranian middle-class women; in the second case, it is a coercive, institutional mandate (see Tabari 1980 for detailed discussion). It is on the basis of such context specific differentiated analysis that effective political strategies can be generated. To assume that the mere practice of veiling women in a number of Muslim countries indicates the universal oppression of women through sexual segregation not only is analytically reductive but also proves quite useless when it comes to the elaboration of oppositional political strategy.

Second, concepts such as reproduction, the sexual division of labor, the family, marriage, household, patriarchy, and so on are often used without their specification in local cultural and historical contexts. Feminists use these concepts in providing explanations for women's subordination, apparently assuming their universal applicability. For instance, how is it possible to refer to "the" sexual division of labor when the content of this division

changes radically from one environment to the next and from one historical juncture to another? At its most abstract level, it is the fact of the differential assignation of tasks according to sex that is significant; however, this is quite different from the meaning or value that the content of this sexual division of labor assumes in different contexts. In most cases the assigning of tasks on the basis of sex has an ideological origin. There is no question that a claim such as "Women are concentrated in service-oriented occupations in a large number of countries around the world" is descriptively valid. Descriptively, then, perhaps the existence of a similar sexual division of labor (where women work in service occupations such as nursing, social work, etc., and men in other kinds of occupations) in a variety of different countries can be asserted. However, the concept of the "sexual division of labor" is more than just a descriptive category. It indicates the differential value placed on men's work versus women's work.

Often the mere existence of a sexual division of labor is taken to be proof of the oppression of women in various societies. This results from a confusion between and collapsing together of the descriptive and explanatory potential of the concept of the sexual division of labor. Superficially similar situations may have radically different, historically specific explanations and cannot be treated as identical. For instance, the rise of female-headed households in middle-class America might be construed as a sign of great independence and feminist progress, the assumption being that this increase has to do with women choosing to be single parents, with an increasing number of lesbian mothers, and so on. However, the recent increase in female-headed households in Latin America,[11] which might at first be seen as indicating that women are acquiring more decision-making power, is concentrated among the poorest strata, where life choices are the most constrained economically. A similar argument can be made for the rise of female-headed families among black and Chicana women in the United States. The positive correlation between this and the level of poverty among women of color and white working-class women in the United States has now even acquired a name: the feminization of poverty. Thus, while it is possible to state that there is a rise in female-headed households in the United States and in Latin America, this rise cannot be discussed as a universal indicator of women's independence, nor can it be discussed as a universal indicator of women's impoverishment. The meaning of and explanations for the rise obviously vary according to the sociohistorical context.

Similarly, the existence of a sexual division of labor in most contexts cannot be sufficient explanation for the universal subjugation of women in the workforce. That the sexual division of labor does indicate a devaluation of women's work must be shown through analysis of particular local contexts. In addition, devaluation of women must also be shown through careful analysis. In other words, the "sexual division of labor" and "women" are not commensurate analytical categories. Concepts such as the sexual division of labor can be useful only if they are generated through local, contextual analyses (see Eldhom, Harris, and Young 1977). If such concepts are assumed to be universally applicable, the resultant homogenization of class, race, religion, and daily material practices of women in the Third World can create a false sense of the commonality of oppressions, interests, and struggles between and among women globally. Beyond sisterhood there are still racism, colonialism, and imperialism.

Finally, some writers confuse the use of gender as a superordinate category of analysis with the universalistic proof and instantiation of this category. In other words, empirical studies of gender differences are confused with the analytical organization of cross-cultural work. Beverly Brown's (1983) review of the book *Nature, Culture and Gender* (Strathern and McCormack 1980) best illustrates this point. Brown suggests that nature:culture and female:male are superordinate categories that organize and locate lesser categories (such as wild:domestic and biology:technology) within their logic. These categories are universal in the sense that they organize the universe of a system of representations. This relation is totally independent of the universal substantiation of any particular category. Brown's critique hinges on the fact that rather than clarify the generalizability of nature:culture :: female:male as superordinate organization categories, *Nature, Culture and Gender* construes the universality of this equation to lie at the level of empirical truth, which can be investigated through fieldwork. Thus, the usefulness of the nature:culture :: female:male paradigm as a universal mode of the organization of representation within any particular sociohistorical system is lost. Here, methodological universalism is assumed on the basis of the reduction of the nature:culture :: female:male analytic categories to a demand for empirical proof of its existence in different cultures. Discourses of representation are confused with material realities, and the distinction made earlier between "Woman" and "women" is lost. Feminist work that blurs this distinction (which is, interestingly enough, often present in certain Western feminists' self-representation)

eventually ends up constructing monolithic images of "Third World women" by ignoring the complex and mobile relationships between their historical materiality on the level of specific oppressions and political choices, on the one hand, and their general discursive representations, on the other.

To summarize: I have discussed three methodological moves identifiable in feminist (and other academic) cross-cultural work that seeks to uncover a universality in women's subordinate position in society. The next and final section pulls together the previous ones, attempting to outline the political effects of the analytical strategies in the context of Western feminist writing on women in the Third World. These arguments are not against generalization as much as they are for careful, historically specific generalizations responsive to complex realities. Nor do these arguments deny the necessity of forming strategic political identities and affinities. Thus, while Indian women of different religions, castes, and classes might forge a political unity on the basis of organizing against police brutality toward women (see Kishwar and Vanita 1984), any analysis of police brutality must be contextual. Strategic coalitions that construct oppositional political identities for themselves are based on generalization and provisional unities, but the analysis of these group identities cannot be based on universalistic, ahistorical categories.

The Subject(s) of Power

This section returns to my earlier discussion of the inherently political nature of feminist scholarship and attempts to clarify my point about the possibility of detecting a colonialist move in the case of a hegemonic connection between the First and Third Worlds in scholarship. The nine texts in Zed Press's Women in the Third World series that I have discussed focused on the following common areas in examining women's "status" within various societies: religion, family/kinship structures, the legal system, the sexual division of labor, education, and, finally, political resistance. A large number of Western feminist writings on women in the Third World focus on these themes. Of course the Zed texts have varying emphases. For instance, two of the studies, *We Shall Return: Women of Palestine* (Bendt and Downing 1982) and *We Will Smash This Prison: Indian Women in Struggle* (Omvedt 1980), focus explicitly on female militancy and political involvement, while *The House of Obedience: Women in Arab Society* (Minces 1980) deals with Arab women's legal, religious, and familial status. In addition, each text evidences a variety of methodologies and de-

grees of care in making generalizations. Interestingly enough, however, almost all the texts assume "women" as a category of analysis in the manner designated above.

Clearly this is an analytical strategy that is neither limited to these Zed Press publications nor symptomatic of Zed Press publications in general. However, each of the texts in question assumes that "women" have a coherent group identity within the different cultures discussed, prior to their entry into social relations. Thus Gail Omvedt can talk about "Indian women" while referring to a particular group of women in the state of Maharashtra; Cutrufelli can discuss "women of Africa," and Minces can talk about "Arab women"—all as if these groups of women have some sort of obvious cultural coherence, distinct from men in these societies. The "status" or "position" of women is assumed to be self-evident because women as an already constituted group are placed within religious, economic, familial, and legal structures. However, this focus whereby women are seen as a coherent group across contexts, regardless of class or ethnicity, structures the world in ultimately binary, dichotomous terms, where women are always seen in opposition to men, patriarchy is always necessarily male dominance, and the religious, legal, economic, and familial systems are implicitly assumed to be constructed by men. Thus, both men and women are always apparently constituted whole populations, and relations of dominance and exploitation are also posited in terms of whole peoples—wholes coming into exploitative relations. It is only when men and women are seen as different categories or groups possessing different already constituted categories of experience, cognition, and interests as groups that such a simplistic dichotomy is possible.

What does this imply about the structure and functioning of power relations? The setting up of the commonality of Third World women's struggles across classes and cultures against a general notion of oppression (rooted primarily in the group in power—i.e., men) necessitates the assumption of what Michel Foucault (1980, 135–45) calls the "juridico-discursive" model of power, the principal features of which are "a negative relation" (limit and lack), an "insistence on the rule" (which forms a binary system), a "cycle of prohibition," the "logic of censorship," and a "uniformity" of the apparatus functioning at different levels. Feminist discourse on the Third World that assumes a homogeneous category—or group—called women necessarily operates through the setting up of originary power divisions. Power relations are structured in terms of a unilateral and undifferentiated source of power and a

cumulative reaction to power. Opposition is a generalized phenomenon created as a response to power—which, in turn, is possessed by certain groups of people.

The major problem with such a definition of power is that it locks all revolutionary struggles into binary structures—possessing power versus being powerless. Women are powerless, unified groups. If the struggle for a just society is seen in terms of the move from powerlessness to power for women as a group, and this is the implication in feminist discourse that structures sexual difference in terms of the division between the sexes, then the new society would be structurally identical to the existing organization of power relations, constituting itself as a simple inversion of what exists. If relations of domination and exploitation are defined in terms of binary divisions—groups that dominate and groups that are dominated—then surely the implication is that the accession to power of women as a group is sufficient to dismantle the existing organization of relations. But women as a group are not in some sense essentially superior or infallible. The crux of the problem lies in that initial assumption of women as a homogeneous group or category ("the oppressed"), a familiar assumption in Western radical and liberal feminisms.[13]

What happens when this assumption of "women as an oppressed group" is situated in the context of Western feminist writing about Third World women? It is here that I locate the colonialist move. By contrasting the representation of women in the Third World with what I referred to earlier as Western feminisms' self-presentation in the same context, we see how Western feminists alone become the true "subjects" of this counterhistory. Third World women, in contrast, never rise above the debilitating generality of their "object" status.

While radical and liberal feminist assumptions of women as a sex class might elucidate (however inadequately) the autonomy of particular women's struggles in the West, the application of the notion of women as a homogeneous category to women in the Third World colonizes and appropriates the pluralities of the simultaneous location of different groups of women in social class and ethnic frameworks; in doing so it ultimately robs them of their historical and political agency. Similarly, many Zed Press authors who ground themselves in the basic analytic strategies of traditional Marxism also implicitly create a "unity" of women by substituting "women's activity" for "labor" as the primary theoretical determinant of women's situation. Here

again, women are constituted as a coherent group not on the basis of "natural" qualities or needs but on the basis of the sociological "unity" of their role in domestic production and wage labor (see Haraway 1985, esp. 76). In other words, Western feminist discourse, by assuming women as a coherent, already constituted group that is placed in kinship, legal, and other structures, defines Third World women as subjects outside social relations, instead of looking at the way women are constituted through these very structures.

Legal, economic, religious, and familial structures are treated as phenomena to be judged by Western standards. It is here that ethnocentric universality comes into play. When these structures are defined as "underdeveloped" or "developing" and women are placed within them, an implicit image of the "average Third World woman" is produced. This is the transformation of the (implicitly Western) "oppressed woman" into the "oppressed Third World woman." While the category of "oppressed woman" is generated through an exclusive focus on gender difference, "the oppressed Third World woman" category has an additional attribute—the "Third World difference." The Third World difference includes a paternalistic attitude toward women in the Third World.[14] Since discussions of the various themes I identified earlier (kinship, education, religion, etc.) are conducted in the context of the relative "underdevelopment" of the Third World (a move that constitutes nothing less than unjustifiably confusing development with the separate path taken by the West in its development, as well as ignoring the directionality of the power relationship between the First and Third Worlds), Third World women as a group or category are automatically and necessarily defined as religious (read: not progressive), family-oriented (read: traditional), legally unsophisticated (read: they are still not conscious of their rights), illiterate (read: ignorant), domestic (read: backward), and sometimes revolutionary (read: their country is in a state of war; they must fight!). This is how the "Third World difference" is produced.

When the category of "sexually oppressed women" is located within particular systems in the Third World that are defined on a scale that is normed through Eurocentric assumptions, not only are Third World women defined in a particular way prior to their entry into social relations, but, since no connections are made between First and Third World power shifts, the assumption is reinforced that the Third World just has not evolved to the extent that the West has. This mode of feminist analysis, by homogenizing and systematizing the experiences of different groups of women in these countries, erases all mar-

ginal and resistant modes and experiences.[15] It is significant that none of the texts I reviewed in the Zed Press series focuses on lesbian politics or the politics of ethnic and religious marginal organizations in Third World women's groups. Resistance can thus be defined only as cumulatively reactive, not as something inherent in the operation of power. If power, as Michel Foucault has argued, can be understood only in the context of resistance,[16] this misconceptualization is both analytically and strategically problematical. It limits theoretical analysis as well as reinforces Western cultural imperialism. For in the context of a First/Third World balance of power, feminist analyses that perpetrate and sustain the hegemony of the idea of the superiority of the West produce a corresponding set of universal images of the Third World woman, images such as the veiled woman, the powerful mother, the chaste virgin, the obedient wife, and so on. These images exist in universal, ahistorical splendor, setting in motion a colonialist discourse that exercises a very specific power in defining, coding, and maintaining existing First/Third World connections.

To conclude, let me suggest some disconcerting similarities between the typically authorizing signature of such Western feminist writings on women in the Third World and the authorizing signature of the project of humanism in general—humanism as a Western ideological and political project that involves the necessary recuperation of the "East" and "Woman" as others. Many contemporary thinkers, including Michel Foucault (1978, 1980), Jacques Derrida (1974), Julia Kristeva (1980), Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1977), and Edward Said (1978), have written at length about the underlying anthropomorphism and ethnocentrism that constitute a hegemonic humanistic problematic that repeatedly confirms and legitimates (Western) man's centrality. Feminist theorists such as Luce Irigaray (1981), Sarah Kofman (see Berg 1982), and Helene Cixous (1981) have also written about the recuperation and absence of woman/women within Western humanism. The focus of the work of all these thinkers can be stated simply as an uncovering of the political interests that underlie the binary logic of humanistic discourse and ideology, whereby, as a valuable essay puts it, "the first (majority) term (Identity, Universality, Culture, Disinterestedness, Truth, Sanity, Justice, etc.), which is, in fact, secondary and derivative (a construction), is privileged over and colonizes the second (minority) term (difference, temporality, anarchy, error, interestedness, insanity, deviance, etc.), which is, in fact, primary and originative" (Spanos 1984). In other words, it is only insofar as "woman/women" and "the East" are defined as others, or as peripheral, that (Western) man/humanism

can represent him/itself as the center. It is not the center that determines the periphery, but the periphery that, in its boundedness, determines the center. Just as feminists such as Kristeva and Cixous deconstruct the latent anthropomorphism in Western discourse, I have suggested a parallel strategy in this in uncovering a latent ethnocentrism in particular feminist writings on women in the Third World.[17]

As discussed earlier, a comparison between Western feminist self-presentation and Western feminist representation of women in the Third World yields significant results. Universal images of the Third World woman (the veiled woman, chaste virgin, etc.), images constructed from adding the "Third World difference" to "sexual difference," are predicated upon (and hence obviously bring into sharper focus) assumptions about Western women as secular, liberated, and having control over their own lives. This is not to suggest that Western women are secular, liberated, and in control of their own lives. I am referring to a discursive self-presentation, not necessarily to material reality. If this were material reality, there would be no need for political movements in the West. Similarly, only from the vantage point of the West is it possible to define the Third World as underdeveloped and economically dependent. Without the overdetermined discourse that creates the Third World, there would be no (singular and privileged) First World. Without the "Third World woman," the particular self-presentation of Western women mentioned above would be problematical. I am suggesting, then, that the one enables and sustains the other. This is not to say that the signature of Western feminist writings on the Third World has the same authority as the project of Western humanism. However, in the context of the hegemony of the Western scholarly establishment in the production and dissemination of texts, and in the context of the legitimating imperative of humanistic and scientific discourse, the definition of "the Third World woman" as a monolith might well tie into the larger economic and ideological praxis of "disinterested" scientific inquiry and pluralism that are the surface manifestations of a latent economic and cultural colonization of the "non-Western" world. It is time to move beyond the Marx who found it possible to say: they cannot represent themselves; they must be represented.

CHAPTER TWO

Cartographies of Struggle: Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism

The US and the USSR are the most
powerful countries
in the world
but only 1/8 of the world's population.
African people are also 1/8 of the world's
population.
of that, 1/4 is Nigerian.
1/2 of the world's population is Asian.
1/2 of that is Chinese.
There are 22 nations in the middle east.
Most people in the world are Yellow, Black, Brown, Poor, Female, Non-Christian
    and do not speak English.
By the year 2000 the 20 largest cities in the world will have one thing in common
    none of them will be in Europe none in the United States.
—Audre Lorde, January 1, 1989

I begin this essay with Audre Lorde's words as a tribute to her courage in consistently engaging the very institutional power structures that define and circumscribe the lives of Third World women.[1] The poem also has deep personal significance for me: Lorde read it as part of her commencement remarks at Oberlin College, where I used to teach, in May 1989. Her words provide a poetic cartography of the historical and political location of Third World peoples and document the urgency of our predicament in a Eurocentric world. Lorde's language suggests with a precise force and poignancy the contours of the world we occupy now: a world that is definable only in relational terms, a world traversed with intersecting lines of power and resistance, a world that

CHAPTER NINE

"Under Western Eyes" Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles

I write this chapter at the urging of a number of friends, and with some trepidation, revisiting the themes and arguments of an essay written some sixteen years ago. This is a difficult chapter to write, and I undertake it hesitantly and with humility—yet feeling that I must do so to take fuller responsibility for my ideas, and perhaps to explain whatever influence they have had on debates in feminist theory.

"Under Western Eyes" was not only my very first "feminist studies" publication, it remains the one that marks my presence in the international feminist community. I had barely completed my Ph.D. when I wrote this essay; I am now a professor of women's studies. The "under" of Western eyes is now much more an "inside" in terms of my own location in the U.S. academy. The site from which I wrote the essay consisted of a very vibrant, transnational women's movement, while the site I write from today is quite different. With the increasing privatization and corporatization of public life, it has become much harder to discern such a women's movement from the United States (although women's movements are thriving around the world), and my site of access and struggle has increasingly come to be the U.S. academy. In the United States, women's movements have become increasingly conservative, and much radical, antiracist feminist activism occurs outside the rubric of such movements. Thus, much of what I say here is influenced by the primary site I occupy as an educator and scholar. It is time to revisit "Under Western Eyes," to clarify ideas that remained implicit and unstated in 1986 and to further develop and historicize the theoretical framework I outlined then. I also want to assess how this essay has been read and misread and to respond to the critiques and celebrations. And it is time for me to move explicitly from critique to reconstruction, to identify the urgent issues facing feminists at the

beginning of the twenty-first century, to ask the question: How would "Under Western Eyes"—the Third World inside and outside the West—be explored and analyzed almost two decades later? What do I consider to be the urgent theoretical and methodological questions facing a comparative feminist politics at this moment in history?

Given the apparent and continuing life of "Under Western Eyes" and my own travels through transnational feminist scholarship and networks, I begin with a summary of the central arguments of "Under Western Eyes," contextualizing them in intellectual, political, and institutional terms. Basing my account on this discussion, I describe ways the essay has been read and situated in a number of different, often overlapping, scholarly discourses. I engage with some useful responses to the essay in an attempt to further clarify the various meanings of the West, Third World, and so on, to reengage questions of the relation of the universal and the particular in feminist theory, and to make visible some of the theses left obscure or ambiguous in my earlier writing.

I look, first, to see how my thinking has changed over the past sixteen years or so. What are the challenges facing transnational feminist practice at the beginning of the twenty-first century? How have the possibilities of feminist cross-cultural work developed and shifted? What is the intellectual, political, and institutional context that informs my own shifts and new commitments at the time of this writing? What categories of scholarly and political identification have changed since 1986? What has remained the same? I wish to begin a dialogue between the intentions, effects, and political choices that underwrote "Under Western Eyes" in the mid-1980s and those I would make today. I hope it provokes others to ask similar questions about our individual and collective projects in feminist studies.

Revisiting "Under Western Eyes"

DECOLONIZING FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP: 1986

I wrote "Under Western Eyes" to discover and articulate a critique of "Western feminist" scholarship on Third World women via the discursive colonization of Third World women's lives and struggles. I also wanted to expose the power-knowledge nexus of feminist cross-cultural scholarship expressed through Eurocentric, falsely universalizing methodologies that serve the nar-

row self-interest of Western feminism. As well, I thought it crucial to highlight the connection between feminist scholarship and feminist political organizing while drawing attention to the need to examine the "political implications of our analytic strategies and principles." I also wanted to chart the location of feminist scholarship within a global political and economic framework dominated by the "First World."[4]

My most simple goal was to make clear that cross-cultural feminist work must be attentive to the micropolitics of context, subjectivity, and struggle, as well as to the macropolitics of global economic and political systems and processes. I discussed Maria Mies's study of the lacemakers of Narsapur as a demonstration of how to do this kind of multilayered, contextual analysis to reveal how the particular is often universally significant—without using the universal to erase the particular, or positing an unbridgeable gulf between the two terms. Implicit in this analysis was the use of historical materialism as a basic framework, and a definition of material reality in both its local and micro-, as well as global, systemic dimensions. I argued at that time for the definition and recognition of the Third World not just through oppression but in terms of historical complexities and the many struggles to change these oppressions. Thus I argued for grounded, particularized analyses linked with larger, even global, economic and political frameworks. I drew inspiration from a vision of feminist solidarity across borders, although it is this vision that has remained invisible to many readers. In a perceptive analysis of my argument of this politics of location, Sylvia Walby (2000) recognizes and refines the relation between difference and equality of which I speak. She draws further attention to the need for a shared frame of reference among Western, postcolonial, Third World feminists in order to decide what counts as difference. She asserts, quite insightfully, that

Mohanty and other postcolonial feminists are often interpreted as arguing only for situated knowledges in popularisations of their work. In fact, Mohanty is claiming, via a complex and subtle argument, that she is right and that (much) white Western feminism is not merely different, but wrong. In doing this she assumes a common question, a common set of concepts and, ultimately the possibility of, a common political project with white feminism. She hopes to argue white feminism into agreeing with her. She is not content to leave white Western feminism as a situated knowledge, comfortable with its local and partial perspective. Not a bit of

it. This is a claim to a more universal truth. And she hopes to accomplish this by the power of argument. (199)

Walby's reading of the essay challenges others to engage my notion of a common feminist political project, which critiques the effects of Western feminist scholarship on women in the Third World, but within a framework of solidarity and shared values. My insistence on the specificity of difference is based on a vision of equality attentive to power differences within and among the various communities of women. I did not argue against all forms of generalization, nor was I privileging the local over the systemic, difference over commonalities, or the discursive over the material.

I did not write "Under Western Eyes" as a testament to the impossibility of egalitarian and noncolonizing cross-cultural scholarship, nor did I define "Western" and "Third World" feminism in such oppositional ways that there would be no possibility of solidarity between Western and Third World feminists.[5] Yet, this is often how the essay has been read and utilized.[6] I have wondered why such a sharp opposition has developed in this form. Perhaps mapping the intellectual and institutional context in which I wrote back then and the shifts that have affected its reading since would clarify the intentions and claims of the essay.

Intellectually, I was writing in solidarity with the critics of Eurocentric humanism who drew attention to its false universalizing and masculinist assumptions. My project was anchored in a firm belief in the importance of the particular in relation to the universal—a belief in the local as specifying and illuminating the universal. My concerns drew attention to the dichotomies embraced and identified with this universalized framework, the critique of "white feminism" by women of color and the critique of "Western feminism" by Third World feminists working within a paradigm of decolonization. I was committed, both politically and personally, to building a noncolonizing feminist solidarity across borders. I believed in a larger feminist project than the colonizing, self-interested one I saw emerging in much influential feminist scholarship and in the mainstream women's movement.

My newly found teaching position at a primarily white U.S. academic institution also deeply affected my writing at this time. I was determined to make an intervention in this space in order to create a location for Third World, immigrant, and other marginalized scholars like myself who saw themselves erased or misrepresented within the dominant Euro-American

feminist scholarship and their communities. It has been a source of deep satisfaction that I was able to begin to open an intellectual space to Third World/immigrant women scholars, as was done at the international conference I helped organize, "Common Differences: Third World Women and Feminist Perspectives" (Urbana, Illinois, 1983). This conference allowed for the possibility of a decolonized, cross-border feminist community and cemented for me the belief that "common differences" can form the basis of deep solidarity, and that we have to struggle to achieve this in the face of unequal power relations among feminists.

There have also been many effects—personal and professional—in my writing this essay. These effects range from being cast as the "nondutiful daughter" of white feminists to being seen as a mentor for Third World/immigrant women scholars; from being invited to address feminist audiences at various academic venues, to being told I should focus on my work in early childhood education and not dabble in "feminist theory." Practicing active disloyalty has its price as well as its rewards. Suffice it to say, however, that I have no regrets and only deep satisfaction in having written "Under Western Eyes."

I attribute some of the readings and misunderstandings of the essay to the triumphal rise of postmodernism in the U.S. academy in the past three decades. Although I have never called myself a "postmodernist," some reflection on why my ideas have been assimilated under this label is important.[7] In fact, one reason to revisit "Under Western Eyes" at this time is my desire to point to this postmodernist appropriation.[8] I am misread when I am interpreted as being against all forms of generalization and as arguing for difference over commonalities. This misreading occurs in the context of a hegemonic postmodernist discourse that labels as "totalizing" all systemic connections, and emphasizes only the mutability and constructedness of identities and social structures.

Yes, I did draw on Foucault to outline an analysis of power/knowledge, but I also drew on Anour Abdel Malek to show the directionality and material effects of a particular imperial power structure. I drew too on Maria Mies to argue for the need for a materialist analysis that linked everyday life and local gendered contexts and ideologies to the larger, transnational political and economic structures and ideologies of capitalism. What is interesting for me is to see how and why "difference" has been embraced over "common-

ality," and I realize that my writing leaves open this possibility. In 1986 I wrote mainly to challenge the false universality of Eurocentric discourses and was perhaps not sufficiently critical of the valorization of difference over commonality in postmodernist discourse.[9] Now I find myself wanting to reemphasize the connections between local and universal. In 1986 my priority was on difference, but now I want to recapture and reiterate its fuller meaning, which was always there, and that is its connection to the universal. In other words, this discussion allows me to reemphasize the way that differences are never just "differences." In knowing differences and particularities, we can better see the connections and commonalities because no border or boundary is ever complete or rigidly determining. The challenge is to see how differences allow us to explain the connections and border crossings better and more accurately, how specifying difference allows us to theorize universal concerns more fully. It is this intellectual move that allows for my concern for women of different communities and identities to build coalitions and solidarities across borders.

So what has changed and what remains the same for me? What are the urgent intellectual and political questions for feminist scholarship and organizing at this time in history? First, let me say that the terms "Western" and "Third World" retain a political and explanatory value in a world that appropriates and assimilates multiculturalism and "difference" through commodification and consumption. However, these are not the only terms I would choose to use now. With the United States, the European Community, and Japan as the nodes of capitalist power in the early twenty-first century, the increasing proliferation of Third and Fourth Worlds within the national borders of these very countries, as well as the rising visibility and struggles for sovereignty by First Nations/indigenous peoples around the world, "Western" and "Third World" explain much less than the categorizations "North/South" or "One-Third/Two-Thirds Worlds."

"North/South" is used to distinguish between affluent, privileged nations and communities, and economically and politically marginalized nations and communities, as is "Western/non-Western." While these terms are meant to loosely distinguish the northern and southern hemispheres, affluent and marginal nations and communities obviously do not line up neatly within this geographical frame. And yet, as a political designation that attempts to distinguish between the "haves" and the "have-nots," it does have a certain political value. An example of this is Arif Dirlik's formulation of North/South as a metaphorical rather than geographical distinction, where "North" refers to

the pathways of transnational capital and "South" to the marginalized poor of the world regardless of geographical distinction.[10]

I find the language of "One-Third World" versus "Two-Thirds World" as elaborated by Gustavo Esteva and Madhu Suri Prakash (1998) particularly useful, especially in conjunction with "Third World/South" and "First World/North." These terms represent what Esteva and Prakash call social minorities and social majorities—categories based on the quality of life led by peoples and communities in both the North and the South.[11] The advantage of one-third/two-thirds world in relation to terms like "Western/Third World" and "North/South" is that they move away from misleading geographical and ideological binarisms.

By focusing on quality of life as the criteria for distinguishing between social minorities and majorities, "One-Third/Two-Thirds Worlds" draws attention to the continuities as well as the discontinuities between the haves and have-nots within the boundaries of nations and between nations and indigenous communities. This designation also highlights the fluidity and power of global forces that situate communities of people as social majorities/minorities in disparate form. "One-Third/Two-Thirds" is a nonessentialist categorization, but it incorporates an analysis of power and agency that is crucial. Yet what it misses is a history of colonization that the terms Western/Third World draw attention to.

As the above terminological discussion serves to illustrate, we are still working with a very imprecise and inadequate analytical language. All we can have access to at given moments is the analytical language that most clearly approximates the features of the world as we understand it. This distinction between One-Third/Two-Thirds World and, at times, First World/North and Third World/South is the language I choose to use now. Because in fact our language is imprecise, I hesitate to have any language become static. My own language in 1986 needs to be open to refinement and inquiry—but not to institutionalization.

Finally, I want to reflect on an important issue not addressed in "Under Western Eyes": the question of native or indigenous struggles. Radhika Mohanram's critique of my work (1999) brings this to our attention. She points out the differences between a "multicultural" understanding of nation (prevalent in the United States) and a call for a "bicultural" understanding of nation on the part of indigenous people in Aotearoa/New Zealand. She argues that my notion of a common context of struggle suggests logical alliances

among the various black women: Maori, Asian, Pacific Islander. However, Maori women see multiculturalism—alliances with Asian women—as undermining indigenous rights and biculturalism and prefer to ally themselves with Pakeha (white, Anglo-Celtic people [Mohanram 1999, 92–96]).

I agree that the distinction between biculturalism and multiculturalism does pose a practical problem of organizing and alliance building, and that the particular history and situation of Maori feminists cannot be subsumed within the analysis I offer so far. Native or indigenous women's struggles, which do not follow a postcolonial trajectory based on the inclusions and exclusions of processes of capitalist, racist, heterosexist, and nationalist domination, cannot be addressed easily under the purview of categories such as "Western" and "Third World."[12] But they become visible and even central to the definition of One-Third/Two-Thirds Worlds because indigenous claims for sovereignty, their lifeways and environmental and spiritual practices, situate them as central to the definition of "social majority" (Two-Thirds World). While a mere shift in conceptual terms is not a complete response to Mohanram's critique, I think it clarifies and addresses the limitations of my earlier use of "Western" and "Third World." Interestingly enough, while I would have identified myself as both Western and Third World—in all my complexities—in the context of "Under Western Eyes," in this new frame, I am clearly located within the One-Third World. Then again, now, as in my earlier writing, I straddle both categories. I am of the Two-Thirds World in the One-Third World. I am clearly a part of the social minority now, with all its privileges; however, my political choices, struggles, and vision for change place me alongside the Two-Thirds World. Thus, I am for the Two-Thirds World, but with the privileges of the One-Third World. I speak as a person situated in the One-Thirds World, but from the space and vision of, and in solidarity with, communities in struggle in the Two-Thirds World.

UNDER AND (INSIDE) WESTERN EYES:
AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

There have been a number of shifts in the political and economic landscapes of nations and communities of people in the last two decades. The intellectual maps of disciplines and areas of study in the U.S. academy have shifted as well during this time. The advent and institutional visibility of postcolonial studies for instance is a relatively recent phenomenon—as is the simultaneous rollback of the gains made by race and ethnic studies depart-

ments in the 1970s and 1980s. Women's studies is now a well-established field of study with over eight hundred degree-granting programs and departments in the U.S. academy.[13] Feminist theory and feminist movements across national borders have matured substantially since the early 1980s, and there is now a greater visibility of transnational women's struggles and movements, brought on in part by the United Nations world conferences on women held over the last two decades.

Economically and politically, the declining power of self-governance among certain poorer nations is matched by the rising significance of transnational institutions such as the World Trade Organization and governing bodies such as the European Union, not to mention the for-profit corporations. Of the world's largest economies, fifty-one happen to be corporations, not countries, and Amnesty International now reports on corporations as well as nations (Eisenstein 1998b, 1). Also, the hegemony of neoliberalism, alongside the naturalization of capitalist values, influences the ability to make choices on one's own behalf in the daily lives of economically marginalized as well as economically privileged communities around the globe.

The rise of religious fundamentalisms with their deeply masculinist and often racist rhetoric poses a huge challenge for feminist struggles around the world. Finally, the profoundly unequal "information highway" as well as the increasing militarization (and masculinization) of the globe, accompanied by the growth of the prison industrial complex in the United States, poses profound contradictions in the lives of communities of women and men in most parts of the world. I believe these political shifts to the right, accompanied by global capitalist hegemony, privatization, and increased religious, ethnic, and racial hatreds, pose very concrete challenges for feminists. In this context, I ask what would it mean to be attentive to the micropolitics of everyday life as well as to the larger processes that recolonize the culture and identities of people across the globe. How we think of the local in/of the global and vice versa without falling into colonizing or cultural relativist platitudes about difference is crucial in this intellectual and political landscape. And for me, this kind of thinking is tied to a revised race-and-gender-conscious historical materialism.

The politics of feminist cross-cultural scholarship from the vantage point of Third World/South feminist struggles remains a compelling site of analysis for me.[14] Eurocentric analytic paradigms continue to flourish, and I remain committed to reengaging in the struggles to criticize openly the effects

of discursive colonization on the lives and struggles of marginalized women. My central commitment is to build connections between feminist scholarship and political organizing. My own present-day analytic framework remains very similar to my earliest critique of Eurocentrism. However, I now see the politics and economics of capitalism as a far more urgent locus of struggle. I continue to hold to an analytic framework that is attentive to the micropolitics of everyday life as well as to the macropolitics of global economic and political processes. The link between political economy and culture remains crucial to any form of feminist theorizing—as it does for my work. It isn't the framework that has changed. It is just that global economic and political processes have become more brutal, exacerbating economic, racial, and gender inequalities, and thus they need to be demystified, reexamined, and theorized.

While my earlier focus was on the distinctions between "Western" and "Third World" feminist practices, and while I downplayed the commonalities between these two positions, my focus now, as must be evident in part 2 of this book, is on what I have chosen to call an anticapitalist transnational feminist practice—and on the possibilities, indeed on the necessities, of crossnational feminist solidarity and organizing against capitalism. While "Under Western Eyes" was located in the context of the critique of Western humanism and Eurocentrism and of white, Western feminism, a similar essay written now would need to be located in the context of the critique of global capitalism (on antiglobalization), the naturalization of the values of capital, and the unacknowledged power of cultural relativism in cross-cultural feminist scholarship and pedagogies.

"Under Western Eyes" sought to make the operations of discursive power visible, to draw attention to what was left out of feminist theorizing, namely, the material complexity, reality, and agency of Third World women's bodies and lives. This is in fact exactly the analytic strategy I now use to draw attention to what is unseen, undertheorized, and left out in the production of knowledge about globalization. While globalization has always been a part of capitalism, and capitalism is not a new phenomenon, at this time I believe the theory, critique, and activism around antiglobalization has to be a key focus for feminists. This does not mean that the patriarchal and racist relations and structures that accompany capitalism are any less problematic at this time, or that antiglobalization is a singular phenomenon. Along with many other

scholars and activists, I believe capital as it functions now depends on and exacerbates racist, patriarchal, and heterosexist relations of rule.

FEMINIST METHODOLOGIES: NEW DIRECTIONS

What kinds of feminist methodology and analytic strategy are useful in making power (and women's lives) visible in overtly nongendered, nonracialized discourses? The strategy discussed here is an example of how capitalism and its various relations of rule can be analyzed through a transnational, anticapitalist feminist critique, one that draws on historical materialism and centralizes racialized gender. This analysis begins from and is anchored in the place of the most marginalized communities of women—poor women of all colors in affluent and neocolonial nations; women of the Third World/South or the Two-Thirds World.[15] I believe that this experiential and analytic anchor in the lives of marginalized communities of women provides the most inclusive paradigm for thinking about social justice. This particularized viewing allows for a more concrete and expansive vision of universal justice.

This is the very opposite of "special interest" thinking. If we pay attention to and think from the space of some of the most disenfranchised communities of women in the world, we are most likely to envision a just and democratic society capable of treating all its citizens fairly. Conversely, if we begin our analysis from, and limit it to, the space of privileged communities, our visions of justice are more likely to be exclusionary because privilege nurtures blindness to those without the same privileges. Beginning from the lives and interests of marginalized communities of women, I am able to access and make the workings of power visible—to read up the ladder of privilege. It is more necessary to look upward—colonized peoples must know themselves and the colonizer. This particular marginalized location makes the politics of knowledge and the power investments that go along with it visible so that we can then engage in work to transform the use and abuse of power. The analysis draws on the notion of epistemic privilege as it is developed by feminist standpoint theorists (with their roots in the historical materialism of Marx and Lukacs) as well as postpositivist realists, who provide an analysis of experience, identity, and the epistemic effects of social location.[16] My view is thus a materialist and "realist" one and is antithetical to that of postmodernist relativism. I believe there are causal links between marginalized social locations and experiences and the ability of human agents to explain and ana-

lyze features of capitalist society. Methodologically, this analytic perspective is grounded in historical materialism. My claim is not that all marginalized locations yield crucial knowledge about power and inequity, but that within a tightly integrated capitalist system, the particular standpoint of poor indigenous and Third World/South women provides the most inclusive viewing of systemic power. In numerous cases of environmental racism, for instance, where the neighborhoods of poor communities of color are targeted as new sites for prisons and toxic dumps, it is no coincidence that poor black, Native American, and Latina women provide the leadership in the fight against corporate pollution. Three out of five Afro-Americans and Latinos live near toxic waste sites, and three of the five largest hazardous waste landfills are in communities with a population that is 80 percent people of color (Pardo 2001, 504–11). Thus, it is precisely their critical reflections on their everyday lives as poor women of color that allow the kind of analysis of the power structure that has led to the many victories in environmental racism struggles.[17] Herein lies a lesson for feminist analysis.

Feminist scientist Vandana Shiva, one of the most visible leaders of the antiglobalization movement, provides a similar and illuminating critique of the patents and intellectual property rights agreements sanctioned by the World Trade Organization (WTO) since 1995.[18] Along with others in the environmental and indigenous rights movements, she argues that the WTO sanctions biopiracy and engages in intellectual piracy by privileging the claims of corporate commercial interests, based on Western systems of knowledge in agriculture and medicine, to products and innovations derived from indigenous knowledge traditions. Thus, through the definition of Western scientific epistemologies as the only legitimate scientific system, the WTO is able to underwrite corporate patents to indigenous knowledge (as to the Neem tree in India) as their own intellectual property, protected through intellectual property rights agreements. As a result, the patenting of drugs derived from indigenous medicinal systems has now reached massive proportions. I quote Shiva:

[T]hrough patenting, indigenous knowledge is being pirated in the name of protecting knowledge and preventing piracy. The knowledge of our ancestors, of our peasants about seeds is being claimed as an invention of U.S. corporations and U.S. scientists and patented by them. The only reason something like that can work is because underlying it all is a racist framework that says the knowledge of the Third World and the knowledge of people of color is not knowledge. When that knowledge is taken by white men who have capital, suddenly creativity begins. . . . Patents are a replay of colonialism, which is now called globalization and free trade. (2000, 32)

The contrast between Western scientific systems and indigenous epistemologies and systems of medicine is not the only issue here. It is the colonialist and corporate power to define Western science, and the reliance on capitalist values of private property and profit, as the only normative system that results in the exercise of immense power. Thus indigenous knowledges, which are often communally generated and shared among tribal and peasant women for domestic, local, and public use, are subject to the ideologies of a corporate Western scientific paradigm where intellectual property rights can only be understood in possessive or privatized form. All innovations that happen to be collective, to have occurred over time in forests and farms, are appropriated or excluded. The idea of an intellectual commons where knowledge is collectively gathered and passed on for the benefit of all, not owned privately, is the very opposite of the notion of private property and ownership that is the basis for the WTO property rights agreements. Thus this idea of an intellectual commons among tribal and peasant women actually excludes them from ownership and facilitates corporate biopiracy.

Shiva's analysis of intellectual property rights, biopiracy, and globalization is made possible by its very location in the experiences and epistemologies of peasant and tribal women in India. Beginning from the practices and knowledges of indigenous women, she "reads up" the power structure, all the way to the policies and practices sanctioned by the WTO. This is a very clear example then of a transnational, anticapitalist feminist politics.

However, Shiva says less about gender than she could. She is after all talking in particular about women's work and knowledges anchored in the epistemological experiences of one of the most marginalized communities of women in the world—poor, tribal, and peasant women in India. This is a community of women made invisible and written out of national and international economic calculations. An analysis that pays attention to the everyday experiences of tribal women and the micropolitics of their ultimately anticapitalist struggles illuminates the macropolitics of global restructuring. It suggests the thorough embeddedness of the local and particular with the global and

universal, and it suggests the need to conceptualize questions of justice and equity in transborder terms. In other words, this mode of reading envisions a feminism without borders, in that it foregrounds the need for an analysis and vision of solidarity across the enforced privatized intellectual property borders of the WTO.

These particular examples offer the most inclusive paradigm for understanding the motivations and effects of globalization as it is crafted by the WTO. Of course, if we were to attempt the same analysis from the epistemological space of Western, corporate interests, it would be impossible to generate an analysis that values indigenous knowledge anchored in communal relationships rather than profit-based hierarchies. Thus, poor tribal and peasant women, their knowledges and interests, would be invisible in this analytic frame because the very idea of an intellectual commons falls outside the purview of privatized property and profit that is a basis for corporate interests. The obvious issue for a transnational feminism pertains to the visions of profit and justice embodied in these opposing analytic perspectives. The focus on profit versus justice illustrates my earlier point about social location and analytically inclusive methodologies. It is the social location of the tribal women as explicated by Shiva that allows this broad and inclusive focus on justice. Similarly, it is the social location and narrow self-interest of corporations that privatizes intellectual property rights in the name of profit for elites.

Shiva essentially offers a critique of the global privatization of indigenous knowledges. This is a story about the rise of transnational institutions such as the WTO, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund, of banking and financial institutions and cross-national governing bodies like the MAI (Multinational Agreement on Investments). The effects of these governing bodies on poor people around the world have been devastating. In fundamental ways, it is girls and women around the world, especially in the Third World/South, that bear the brunt of globalization. Poor women and girls are the hardest hit by the degradation of environmental conditions, wars, famines, privatization of services and deregulation of governments, the dismantling of welfare states, the restructuring of paid and unpaid work, increasing surveillance and incarceration in prisons, and so on. And this is why a feminism without and beyond borders is necessary to address the injustices of global capitalism.

Women and girls are still 70 percent of the world's poor and the majority of the world's refugees. Girls and women comprise almost 80 percent of dis-

placed persons of the Third World/South in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Women own less than one-hundredth of the world's property, while they are the hardest hit by the effects of war, domestic violence, and religious persecution. Feminist political theorist Zillah Eisenstein says that women do two-thirds of the world's work and earn less than one-tenth of its income. Global capital in racialized and sexualized guise destroys the public spaces of democracy, and quietly sucks power out of the once social/public spaces of nation-states. Corporate capitalism has redefined citizens as consumers—and global markets replace the commitments to economic, sexual, and racial equality (Eisenstein 1998b, esp. ch. 5).

It is especially on the bodies and lives of women and girls from the Third World/South—the Two-Thirds World—that global capitalism writes its script, and it is by paying attention to and theorizing the experiences of these communities of women and girls that we demystify capitalism as a system of debilitating sexism and racism and envision anticapitalist resistance. Thus any analysis of the effects of globalization needs to centralize the experiences and struggles of these particular communities of women and girls.

Drawing on Arif Dirlik's notion of "place consciousness as the radical other of global capitalism" (Dirlik 1999), Grace Lee Boggs makes an important argument for place-based civic activism that illustrates how centralizing the struggles of marginalized communities connects to larger antiglobalization struggles. Boggs suggests that "[p]lace consciousness . . . encourages us to come together around common, local experiences and organize around our hopes for the future of our communities and cities. While global capitalism doesn't give a damn about the people or the natural environment of any particular place because it can always move on to other people and other places, place-based civic activism is concerned about the heath and safety of people and places" (Boggs 2000, 19). Since women are central to the life of neighborhood and communities they assume leadership positions in these struggles. This is evident in the example of women of color in struggles against environmental racism in the United States, as well as in Shiva's example of tribal women in the struggle against deforestation and for an intellectual commons. It is then the lives, experiences, and struggles of girls and women of the Two-Thirds World that demystify capitalism in its racial and sexual dimensions—and that provide productive and necessary avenues of theorizing and enacting anticapitalist resistance.

I do not wish to leave this discussion of capitalism as a generalized site

without contextualizing its meaning in and through the lives it structures. Disproportionately, these are girls' and women's lives, although I am committed to the lives of all exploited peoples. However, the specificity of girls' and women's lives encompasses the others through their particularized and contextualized experiences. If these particular gendered, classed, and racialized realities of globalization are unseen and undertheorized, even the most radical critiques of globalization effectively render Third World/South women and girls as absent. Perhaps it is no longer simply an issue of Western eyes, but rather how the West is inside and continually reconfigures globally, racially, and in terms of gender. Without this recognition, a necessary link between feminist scholarship/analytic frames and organizing/activist projects is impossible. Faulty and inadequate analytic frames engender ineffective political action and strategizing for social transformation.

What does the above analysis suggest? That we—feminist scholars and teachers—must respond to the phenomenon of globalization as an urgent site for the recolonization of peoples, especially in the Two-Thirds World. Globalization colonizes women's as well as men's lives around the world, and we need an anti-imperialist, anticapitalist, and contextualized feminist project to expose and make visible the various, overlapping forms of subjugation of women's lives. Activists and scholars must also identify and reenvision forms of collective resistance that women, especially, in their different communities enact in their everyday lives. It is their particular exploitation at this time, their potential epistemic privilege, as well as their particular forms of solidarity that can be the basis for reimagining a liberatory politics for the start of this century.

Antiglobalization Struggles

Although the context for writing "Under Western Eyes" in the mid-1980s was a visible and activist women's movement, this radical movement no longer exists as such. Instead, I draw inspiration from a more distant, but significant, antiglobalization movement in the United States and around the world. Activists in these movements are often women, although the movement is not gender-focused. So I wish to redefine the project of decolonization, not reject it. It appears more complex to me today, given the newer developments of global capitalism. Given the complex interweaving of cultural forms, people of and from the Third World live not only under Western eyes but also within

them. This shift in my focus from "under Western eyes" to "under and inside" the hegemonic spaces of the One-Third World necessitates recrafting the project of decolonization.

My focus is thus no longer just the colonizing effects of Western feminist scholarship. This does not mean the problems I identified in the earlier essay do not occur now. But the phenomenon I addressed then has been more than adequately engaged by other feminist scholars. While feminists have been involved in the antiglobalization movement from the start, however, this has not been a major organizing locus for women's movements nationally in the West/North. It has, however, always been a locus of struggle for women of the Third World/South because of their location. Again, this contextual specificity should constitute the larger vision. Women of the Two-Thirds World have always organized against the devastations of globalized capital, just as they have always historically organized anticolonial and antiracist movements. In this sense they have always spoken for humanity as a whole.

I have tried to chart feminist sites for engaging globalization, rather than providing a comprehensive review of feminist work in this area. I hope this exploration makes my own political choices and decisions transparent and that it provides readers with a productive and provocative space to think and act creatively for feminist struggle. So today my query is slightly different although much the same as in 1986. I wish to better see the processes of corporate globalization and how and why they recolonize women's bodies and labor. We need to know the real and concrete effects of global restructuring on raced, classed, national, sexual bodies of women in the academy, in workplaces, streets, households, cyberspaces, neighborhoods, prisons, and social movements.

What does it mean to make antiglobalization a key factor for feminist theorizing and struggle? To illustrate my thinking about antiglobalization, let me focus on two specific sites where knowledge about globalization is produced. The first site is a pedagogical one and involves an analysis of the various strategies being used to internationalize (or globalize) [19] the women's studies curriculum in U.S. colleges and universities. I argue that this move to internationalize women's studies curricula and the attendant pedagogies that flow from this is one of the main ways we can track a discourse of global feminism in the United States. Other ways of tracking global feminist discourses include analyzing the documents and discussions flowing out of the Beijing United Nations conference on women, and of course popular television and

print media discourses on women around the world. The second site of anti-globalization scholarship I focus on is the emerging, notably ungendered and deracialized discourse on activism against globalization.

ANTIGLOBALIZATION PEDAGOGIES

Let me turn to the struggles over the dissemination of a feminist cross-cultural knowledge base through pedagogical strategies "internationalizing" the women's studies curriculum. The problem of "the (gendered) color line" remains, but is more easily seen today as developments of transnational and global capital. While I choose to focus on women's studies curricula, my arguments hold for curricula in any discipline or academic field that seeks to internationalize or globalize its curriculum. I argue that the challenge for "internationalizing" women's studies is no different from the one involved in "racializing" women's studies in the 1980s, for very similar politics of knowledge come into play here.[20]

So the question I want to foreground is the politics of knowledge in bridging the "local" and the "global" in women's studies. How we teach the "new" scholarship in women's studies is at least as important as the scholarship itself in the struggles over knowledge and citizenship in the U.S. academy. After all, the way we construct curricula and the pedagogies we use to put such curricula into practice tell a story—or tell many stories. It is the way we position historical narratives of experience in relation to each other, the way we theorize relationality as both historical and simultaneously singular and collective that determines how and what we learn when we cross cultural and experiential borders.

Drawing on my own work with U.S. feminist academic communities,[21] I describe three pedagogical models used in "internationalizing" the women's studies curriculum and analyze the politics of knowledge at work. Each of these perspectives is grounded in particular conceptions of the local and the global, of women's agency, and of national identity, and each curricular model presents different stories and ways of crossing borders and building bridges. I suggest that a "comparative feminist studies" or "feminist solidarity" model is the most useful and productive pedagogical strategy for feminist cross-cultural work. It is this particular model that provides a way to theorize a complex relational understanding of experience, location, and history such that feminist cross-cultural work moves through the specific context to construct a real notion of universal and of democratization rather than colonization.

It is through this model that we can put into practice the idea of "common differences" as the basis for deeper solidarity across differences and unequal power relations.

Feminist-as-Tourist Model. This curricular perspective could also be called the "feminist as international consumer" or, in less charitable terms, the "white women's burden or colonial discourse" model.[22] It involves a pedagogical strategy in which brief forays are made into non-Euro-American cultures, and particular sexist cultural practices addressed from an otherwise Eurocentric women's studies gaze. In other words, the "add women as global victims or powerful women and stir" perspective. This is a perspective in which the primary Euro-American narrative of the syllabus remains untouched, and examples from non-Western or Third World/South cultures are used to supplement and "add" to this narrative. The story here is quite old. The effects of this strategy are that students and teachers are left with a clear sense of the difference and distance between the local (defined as self, nation, and Western) and the global (defined as other, non-Western, and transnational). Thus the local is always grounded in nationalist assumptions—the United States or Western European nation-state provides a normative context. This strategy leaves power relations and hierarchies untouched since ideas about center and margin are reproduced along Eurocentric lines.

For example, in an introductory feminist studies course, one could include the obligatory day or week on dowry deaths in India, women workers in Nike factories in Indonesia, or precolonial matriarchies in West Africa, while leaving the fundamental identity of the Euro-American feminist on her way to liberation untouched. Thus Indonesian workers in Nike factories or dowry deaths in India stand in for the totality of women in these cultures. These women are not seen in their everyday lives (as Euro-American women are)—just in these stereotypical terms. Difference in the case of non-Euro-American women is thus congealed, not seen contextually with all of its contradictions. This pedagogical strategy for crossing cultural and geographical borders is based on a modernist paradigm, and the bridge between the local and the global becomes in fact a predominantly self-interested chasm. This perspective confirms the sense of the "evolved U.S./Euro feminist." While there is now more consciousness about not using an "add and stir" method in teaching about race and U.S. women of color, this does not appear to be the case in "internationalizing" women's studies. Experience in this context is assumed

to be static and frozen into U.S.- or Euro-centered categories. Since in this paradigm feminism is always/already constructed as Euro-American in origin and development, women's lives and struggles outside this geographical context only serve to confirm or contradict this originary feminist (master) narrative. This model is the pedagogical counterpart of the orientalizing and colonizing Western feminist scholarship of the past decades. In fact it may remain the predominant model at this time. Thus implicit in this pedagogical strategy is the crafting of the "Third World difference," the creation of monolithic images of Third World/South women. This contrasts with images of Euro-American women who are vital, changing, complex, and central subjects within such a curricular perspective.

Feminist-as-Explorer Model. This particular pedagogical perspective originates in area studies, where the "foreign" woman is the object and subject of knowledge and the larger intellectual project is entirely about countries other than the United States. Thus, here the local and the global are both defined as non-Euro-American. The focus on the international implies that it exists outside the U.S. nation-state. Women's, gender, and feminist issues are based on spatial/geographical and temporal/historical categories located elsewhere. Distance from "home" is fundamental to the definition of international in this framework. This strategy can result in students and teachers being left with a notion of difference and separateness, a sort of "us and them" attitude, but unlike the tourist model, the explorer perspective can provide a deeper, more contextual understanding of feminist issues in discretely defined geographical and cultural spaces. However, unless these discrete spaces are taught in relation to one another, the story told is usually a cultural relativist one, meaning that differences between cultures are discrete and relative with no real connection or common basis for evaluation. The local and the global are here collapsed into the international that by definition excludes the United States. If the dominant discourse is the discourse of cultural relativism, questions of power, agency, justice, and common criteria for critique and evaluation are silenced.[23]

In women's studies curricula this pedagogical strategy is often seen as the most culturally sensitive way to "internationalize" the curriculum. For instance, entire courses on "Women in Latin America" or "Third World Women's Literature" or "Postcolonial Feminism" are added on to the predominantly U.S.-based curriculum as a way to "globalize" the feminist knowl-

edge base. These courses can be quite sophisticated and complex studies, but they are viewed as entirely separate from the intellectual project of U.S. race and ethnic studies.[24] The United States is not seen as part of "area studies," as white is not a color when one speaks of people of color. This is probably related to the particular history of institutionalization of area studies in the U.S. academy and its ties to U.S. imperialism. Thus areas to be studied/conquered are "out there," never within the United States. The fact that area studies in U.S. academic settings were federally funded and conceived as having a political project in the service of U.S. geopolitical interests suggests the need to examine the contemporary interests of these fields, especially as they relate to the logic of global capitalism. In addition, as Ella Shohat argues, it is time to "reimagine the study of regions and cultures in a way that transcends the conceptual borders inherent in the global cartography of the cold war" (2001, 1271). The field of American studies is an interesting location to examine here, especially since its more recent focus on U.S. imperialism. However, American studies rarely falls under the purview of "area studies."

The problem with the feminist-as-explorer strategy is that globalization is an economic, political, and ideological phenomenon that actively brings the world and its various communities under connected and interdependent discursive and material regimes. The lives of women are connected and interdependent, albeit not the same, no matter which geographical area we happen to live in.

Separating area studies from race and ethnic studies thus leads to understanding or teaching about the global as a way of not addressing internal racism, capitalist hegemony, colonialism, and heterosexualization as central to processes of global domination, exploitation, and resistance. Global or international is thus understood apart from racism—as if racism were not central to processes of globalization and relations of rule at this time. An example of this pedagogical strategy in the context of the larger curriculum is the usual separation of "world cultures" courses from race and ethnic studies courses. Thus identifying the kinds of representations of (non-Euro-American) women mobilized by this pedagogical strategy, and the relation of these representations to implicit images of First World/North women are important foci for analysis. What kind of power is being exercised in this strategy? What kinds of ideas of agency and struggle are being consolidated? What are the potential effects of a kind of cultural relativism on our understandings of the differences and commonalities among communities of

women around the world? Thus the feminist-as-explorer model has its own problems, and I believe this is an inadequate way of building a feminist cross-cultural knowledge base because in the context of an interwoven world with clear directionalities of power and domination, cultural relativism serves as an apology for the exercise of power.

The Feminist Solidarity or Comparative Feminist Studies Model. This curricular strategy is based on the premise that the local and the global are not defined in terms of physical geography or territory but exist simultaneously and constitute each other. It is then the links, the relationships, between the local and the global that are foregrounded, and these links are conceptual, material, temporal, contextual, and so on. This framework assumes a comparative focus and analysis of the directionality of power no matter what the subject of the women's studies course is—and it assumes both distance and proximity (specific/universal) as its analytic strategy.

Differences and commonalities thus exist in relation and tension with each other in all contexts. What is emphasized are relations of mutuality, co-responsibility, and common interests, anchoring the idea of feminist solidarity. For example, within this model, one would not teach a U.S. women of color course with additions on Third World/South or white women, but a comparative course that shows the interconnectedness of the histories, experiences, and struggles of U.S. women of color, white women, and women from the Third World/South. By doing this kind of comparative teaching that is attentive to power, each historical experience illuminates the experiences of the others. Thus, the focus is not just on the intersections of race, class, gender, nation, and sexuality in different communities of women but on mutuality and coimplication, which suggests attentiveness to the interweaving of the histories of these communities. In addition the focus is simultaneously on individual and collective experiences of oppression and exploitation and of struggle and resistance.

Students potentially move away from the "add and stir" and the relativist "separate but equal" (or different) perspective to the coimplication/solidarity one. This solidarity perspective requires understanding the historical and experiential specificities and differences of women's lives as well as the historical and experiential connections between women from different national, racial, and cultural communities. Thus it suggests organizing syllabi around social and economic processes and histories of various communities

of women in particular substantive areas like sex work, militarization, environmental justice, the prison/industrial complex, and human rights, and looking for points of contact and connection as well as disjunctures. It is important to always foreground not just the connections of domination but those of struggle and resistance as well.

In the feminist solidarity model the One-Third/Two-Thirds paradigm makes sense. Rather than Western/Third World, or North/South, or local/global seen as oppositional and incommensurate categories, the One-Third/Two-Thirds differentiation allows for teaching and learning about points of connection and distance among and between communities of women marginalized and privileged along numerous local and global dimensions. Thus the very notion of inside/outside necessary to the distance between local/global is transformed through the use of a One-Third/Two-Thirds paradigm, as both categories must be understood as containing difference/similarities, inside/outside, and distance/proximity. Thus sex work, militarization, human rights, and so on can be framed in their multiple local and global dimensions using the One-Third/Two-Thirds, social minority/social majority paradigm. I am suggesting then that we look at the women's studies curriculum in its entirety and that we attempt to use a comparative feminist studies model wherever possible.[25]

I refer to this model as the feminist solidarity model because, besides its focus on mutuality and common interests, it requires one to formulate questions about connection and disconnection between activist women's movements around the world. Rather than formulating activism and agency in terms of discrete and disconnected cultures and nations, it allows us to frame agency and resistance across the borders of nation and culture. I think feminist pedagogy should not simply expose students to a particularized academic scholarship but that it should also envision the possibility of activism and struggle outside the academy. Political education through feminist pedagogy should teach active citizenship in such struggles for justice.

My recurring question is how pedagogies can supplement, consolidate, or resist the dominant logic of globalization. How do students learn about the inequities among women and men around the world? For instance, traditional liberal and liberal feminist pedagogies disallow historical and comparative thinking, radical feminist pedagogies often singularize gender, and Marxist pedagogy silences race and gender in its focus on capitalism. I look to create pedagogies that allow students to see the complexities, singularities, and

interconnections between communities of women such that power, privilege, agency, and dissent can be made visible and engaged with.

In an instructive critique of postcolonial studies and its institutional location, Arif Dirlik argues that the particular institutional history of postcolonial studies, as well as its conceptual emphases on the historical and local as against the systemic and the global, permit its assimilation into the logic of globalism.[26] While Dirlik somewhat overstates his argument, deradicalization and assimilation should concern those of us involved in the feminist project. Feminist pedagogies of internationalization need an adequate response to globalization. Both Eurocentric and cultural relativist (postmodernist) models of scholarship and teaching are easily assimilated within the logic of late capitalism because this is fundamentally a logic of seeming decentralization and accumulation of differences. What I call the comparative feminist studies/feminist solidarity model on the other hand potentially counters this logic by setting up a paradigm of historically and culturally specific "common differences" as the basis for analysis and solidarity. Feminist pedagogies of antiglobalization can tell alternate stories of difference, culture, power, and agency. They can begin to theorize experience, agency, and justice from a more cross-cultural lens.[27]

After almost two decades of teaching feminist studies in U.S. classrooms, it is clear to me that the way we theorize experience, culture, and subjectivity in relation to histories, institutional practice, and collective struggles determines the kind of stories we tell in the classroom. If these varied stories are to be taught such that students learn to democratize rather than colonize the experiences of different spatially and temporally located communities of women, neither a Eurocentric nor a cultural pluralist curricular practice will do. In fact narratives of historical experience are crucial to political thinking not because they present an unmediated version of the "truth" but because they can destabilize received truths and locate debate in the complexities and contradictions of historical life. It is in this context that postpositivist realist theorizations of experience, identity, and culture become useful in constructing curricular and pedagogical narratives that address as well as combat globalization.[28] These realist theorizations explicitly link a historical materialist understanding of social location to the theorization of epistemic privilege and the construction of social identity, thus suggesting the complexities of the narratives of marginalized peoples in terms of relationality rather than

separation. These are the kinds of stories we need to weave into a feminist solidarity pedagogical model.

ANTIGLOBALIZATION SCHOLARSHIP AND MOVEMENTS

Women's and girls' bodies determine democracy: free from violence and sexual abuse, free from malnutrition and environmental degradation, free to plan their families, free to not have families, free to choose their sexual lives and preferences. —Zillah Eisenstein, *Global Obscenities*, 1998

There is now an increasing and useful feminist scholarship critical of the practices and effects of globalization.[29] Instead of attempting a comprehensive review of this scholarship, I want to draw attention to some of the most useful kinds of issues it raises. Let me turn, then, to a feminist reading of antiglobalization movements and argue for a more intimate, closer alliance between women's movements, feminist pedagogy, cross-cultural feminist theorizing, and these ongoing anticapitalist movements.

I return to an earlier question: What are the concrete effects of global restructuring on the "real" raced, classed, national, sexual bodies of women in the academy, in workplaces, streets, households, cyberspaces, neighborhoods, prisons, and in social movements? And how do we recognize these gendered effects in movements against globalization? Some of the most complex analyses of the centrality of gender in understanding economic globalization attempt to link questions of subjectivity, agency, and identity with those of political economy and the state. This scholarship argues persuasively for a need to rethink patriarchies and hegemonic masculinities in relation to present-day globalization and nationalisms, and it also attempts to retheorize the gendered aspects of the refigured relations of the state, the market, and civil society by focusing on unexpected and unpredictable sites of resistance to the often devastating effects of global restructuring on women.[30] And it draws on a number of disciplinary paradigms and political perspectives in making the case for the centrality of gender in processes of global restructuring, arguing that the reorganization of gender is part of the global strategy of capitalism.

Women workers of particular caste/class, race, and economic status are necessary to the operation of the capitalist global economy. Women are not only the preferred candidates for particular jobs, but particular kinds

of women—poor, Third and Two-Thirds World, working-class, and immigrant/migrant women—are the preferred workers in these global, "flexible" temporary job markets. The documented increase in the migration of poor, One-Third/Two-Thirds World women in search of labor across national borders has led to a rise in the international "maid trade" (Parreñas 2001) and in international sex trafficking and tourism.[31] Many global cities now require and completely depend on the service and domestic labor of immigrant and migrant women. The proliferation of structural adjustment policies around the world has reprivatized women's labor by shifting the responsibility for social welfare from the state to the household and to women located there. The rise of religious fundamentalisms in conjunction with conservative nationalisms, which are also in part reactions to global capital and its cultural demands has led to the policing of women's bodies in the streets and in the workplaces.

Global capital also reaffirms the color line in its newly articulated class structure evident in the prisons in the One-Third World. The effects of globalization and deindustrialization on the prison industry in the One-Third World leads to a related policing of the bodies of poor, One-Third/Two-Thirds World, immigrant and migrant women behind the concrete spaces and bars of privatized prisons. Angela Davis and Gina Dent (2001) argue that the political economy of U.S. prisons, and the punishment industry in the West/North, brings the intersection of gender, race, colonialism, and capitalism into sharp focus. Just as the factories and workplaces of global corporations seek and discipline the labor of poor, Third World/South, immigrant/migrant women, the prisons of Europe and the United States incarcerate disproportionately large numbers of women of color, immigrants, and noncitizens of African, Asian, and Latin American descent.

Making gender and power visible in the processes of global restructuring demands looking at, naming, and seeing the particular raced, and classed communities of women from poor countries as they are constituted as workers in sexual, domestic, and service industries; as prisoners; and as household managers and nurturers. In contrast to this production of workers, Patricia Fernández-Kelly and Diane Wolf (2001, esp. 1248) focus on communities of black U.S. inner-city youth situated as "redundant" to the global economy. This redundancy is linked to their disproportionate representation in U.S. prisons. They argue that these young men, who are potential workers, are left out of the economic circuit, and this "absence of connections to a structure of opportunity" results in young African American men turning to dangerous and creative survival strategies while struggling to reinvent new forms of masculinity.

There is also increased feminist attention to the way discourses of globalization are themselves gendered and the way hegemonic masculinities are produced and mobilized in the service of global restructuring. Marianne Marchand and Anne Runyan (2000) discuss the gendered metaphors and symbolism in the language of globalization whereby particular actors and sectors are privileged over others: market over state, global over local, finance capital over manufacturing, finance ministries over social welfare, and consumers over citizens. They argue that the latter are feminized and the former masculinized (13) and that this gendering naturalizes the hierarchies required for globalization to succeed. Charlotte Hooper (2000) identifies an emerging hegemonic Anglo-American masculinity through processes of global restructuring—a masculinity that affects men and women workers in the global economy.[32] Hooper argues that this Anglo-American masculinity has dualistic tendencies, retaining the image of the aggressive frontier masculinity on the one hand, while drawing on more benign images of CEOs with (feminized) nonhierarchical management skills associated with teamwork and networking on the other.

While feminist scholarship is moving in important and useful directions in terms of a critique of global restructuring and the culture of globalization, I want to ask some of the same questions I posed in 1986 once again. In spite of the occasional exception, I think that much of present-day scholarship tends to reproduce particular "globalized" representations of women. Just as there is an Anglo-American masculinity produced in and by discourses of globalization,[33] it is important to ask what the corresponding femininities being produced are. Clearly there is the ubiquitous global teenage girl factory worker, the domestic worker, and the sex worker. There is also the migrant/immigrant service worker, the refugee, the victim of war crimes, the woman-of-color prisoner who happens to be a mother and drug user, the consumer-housewife, and so on. There is also the mother-of-the-nation / religious bearer of traditional culture and morality.

Although these representations of women correspond to real people, they also often stand in for the contradictions and complexities of women's lives

and roles. Certain images, such as that of the factory or sex worker, are often geographically located in the Third World/South, but many of the representations identified above are dispersed throughout the globe. Most refer to women of the Two-Thirds World, and some to women of the One-Third World. And a woman from the Two-Thirds World can live in the One-Third World. The point I am making here is that women are workers, mothers, or consumers in the global economy, but we are also all those things simultaneously. Singular and monolithic categorizations of women in discourses of globalization circumscribe ideas about experience, agency, and struggle. While there are other, relatively new images of women that also emerge in this discourse—the human rights worker or the NGO advocate, the revolutionary militant and the corporate bureaucrat—there is also a divide between false, overstated images of victimized and empowered womanhood, and they negate each other. We need to further explore how this divide plays itself out in terms of a social majority/minority, One-Third/Two-Thirds World characterization. The concern here is with whose agency is being colonized and who is privileged in these pedagogies and scholarship. These then are my new queries for the twenty-first century.[34]

Because social movements are crucial sites for the construction of knowledge, communities, and identities, it is very important for feminists to direct themselves toward them. The antiglobalization movements of the last five years have proven that one does not have to be a multinational corporation, controller of financial capital, or transnational governing institution to cross national borders. These movements form an important site for examining the construction of transborder democratic citizenship. But first a brief characterization of antiglobalization movements is in order.

Unlike the territorial anchors of the anticolonial movements of the early twentieth century, antiglobalization movements have numerous spatial and social origins. These include anticorporate environmental movements such as the Narmada Bachao Andolan in central India and movements against environmental racism in the U.S. Southwest, as well as the antiagribusiness small-farmer movements around the world. The 1960s consumer movements, people's movements against the IMF and World Bank for debt cancelation and against structural adjustment programs, and the antisweatshop student movements in Japan, Europe, and the United States are also a part of the origins of the antiglobalization movements. In addition, the identity-based social movements of the late twentieth century (feminist, civil rights, indige-

nous rights, etc.) and the transformed U.S. labor movement of the 1990s also play a significant part in terms of the history of antiglobalization movements.[35]

While women are present as leaders and participants in most of these antiglobalization movements, a feminist agenda only emerges in the post-Beijing "women's rights as human rights" movement and in some peace and environmental justice movements. In other words, while girls and women are central to the labor of global capital, antiglobalization work does not seem to draw on feminist analysis or strategies. Thus, while I have argued that feminists need to be anticapitalists, I would now argue that antiglobalization activists and theorists also need to be feminists. Gender is ignored as a category of analysis and a basis for organizing in most of the antiglobalization movements, and antiglobalization (and anticapitalist critique) does not appear to be central to feminist organizing projects, especially in the First World/North. In terms of women's movements, the earlier "sisterhood is global" form of internationalization of the women's movement has now shifted into the "human rights" arena. This shift in language from "feminism" to "women's rights" has been called the mainstreaming of the feminist movement—a successful attempt to raise the issue of violence against women on to the world stage.

If we look carefully at the focus of the antiglobalization movements, it is the bodies and labor of women and girls that constitute the heart of these struggles. For instance, in the environmental and ecological movements such as Chipko in India and indigenous movements against uranium mining and breast-milk contamination in the United States, women are not only among the leadership: their gendered and racialized bodies are the key to demystifying and combating the processes of recolonization put in place by corporate control of the environment. My earlier discussion of Vandana Shiva's analysis of the WTO and biopiracy from the epistemological place of Indian tribal and peasant women illustrates this claim, as does Grace Lee Boggs's notion of "place-based civic activism" (Boggs 2000, 19). Similarly, in the anticorporate consumer movements and in the small farmer movements against agribusiness and the antisweatshop movements, it is women's labor and their bodies that are most affected as workers, farmers, and consumers/household nurturers.

Women have been in leadership roles in some of the cross-border alliances against corporate injustice. Thus, making gender, and women's bodies and labor visible, and theorizing this visibility as a process of articulating a more

inclusive politics are crucial aspects of feminist anticapitalist critique. Beginning from the social location of poor women of color of the Two-Thirds World is an important, even crucial, place for feminist analysis; it is precisely the potential epistemic privilege of these communities of women that opens up the space for demystifying capitalism and for envisioning transborder social and economic justice.

The masculinization of the discourses of globalization analyzed by Marchand and Runyan (2000) and Hooper (2000) seems to be matched by the implicit masculinization of the discourses of antiglobalization movements. While much of the literature on antiglobalization movements marks the centrality of class and race and, at times, nation in the critique and fight against global capitalism, racialized gender is still an unmarked category. Racialized gender is significant in this instance because capitalism utilizes the raced and sexed bodies of women in its search for profit globally, and, as I argued earlier, it is often the experiences and struggles of poor women of color that allow the most inclusive analysis as well as politics in antiglobalization struggles.

On the other hand, many of the democratic practices and process-oriented aspects of feminism appear to be institutionalized into the decision-making processes of some of these movements. Thus the principles of nonhierarchy, democratic participation, and the notion of the personal being political all emerge in various ways in this antiglobal politics. Making gender and feminist agendas and projects explicit in such antiglobalization movements thus is a way of tracing a more accurate genealogy, as well as providing potentially more fertile ground for organizing. And of course, to articulate feminism within the framework of antiglobalization work is also to begin to challenge the unstated masculinism of this work. The critique and resistance to global capitalism, and uncovering of the naturalization of its masculinist and racist values, begin to build a transnational feminist practice.

A transnational feminist practice depends on building feminist solidarities across the divisions of place, identity, class, work, belief, and so on. In these very fragmented times it is both very difficult to build these alliances and also never more important to do so. Global capitalism both destroys the possibilities and also offers up new ones.

Feminist activist teachers must struggle with themselves and each other to open the world with all its complexity to their students. Given the new multiethnic racial student bodies, teachers must also learn from their students. The differences and borders of each of our identities connect us to each other, more than they sever. So the enterprise here is to forge informed, self-reflexive solidarities among ourselves.

I no longer live simply under the gaze of Western eyes. I also live inside it and negotiate it every day. I make my home in Ithaca, New York, but always as from Mumbai, India. My cross-race and cross-class work takes me to interconnected places and communities around the world—to a struggle contextualized by women of color and of the Third World, sometimes located in the Two-Thirds World, sometimes in the One-Third. So the borders here are not really fixed. Our minds must be as ready to move as capital is, to trace its paths and to imagine alternative destinations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbot, Sidney, and Barbara Love. 1972. *Sappho Was a Right-on Woman: A Liberated View of Lesbianism.* New York: Stein and Day.

Abdel-Malek, Anouar. 1981. *Social Dialectics: Nation and Revolution.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1998. *Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ahmed, Leila. 1992. *Women and Gender in Islam: Historical Roots of a Modern Debate.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

———, ed. 1988. *Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Alarcon, Norma. 1989. "The Theoretical Subject(s) of This Bridge Called My Back and Anglo-American Feminism." In *Chicana Criticism in a Social Context,* edited by H. Calderon and J. D. Saldivar. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Alcoff, Linda. 2000. "Who's Afraid of Identity Politics?" In *Reclaiming Identity: Realist Theory and the Predicament of Postmodernism,* edited by Paul M.L. Moya and Michael Hames-Garcia, 312–44. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Alexander, Jacqui M. 1991 "Redrafting Morality: The Postcolonial State and the Sexual Offenses Bill of Trinidad and Tobago." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism,* edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Alexander, Jacqui M., and Chandra Talpade Mohanty. 1997. *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures.* New York: Routledge.

Allen, Sheila. 1989. "Locating Homework in an Analysis of the Ideological and Material Constraints on Women's Paid Work." In *Homework: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Paid Labor at Home,* edited by Eileen Boris and Cynthia R. Daniels, 272–91. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

American Council on Education, Education Commission of the States. 1988. *One-Third of a Nation: A Report of the Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Amin, Samir. 1977. *Imperialism and Unequal Development.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Amos, Valerie, and Pratibha Parmar. 1984. "Challenging Imperial Feminism." *Feminist Review* 17: 3–19.

Amott, Teresa, and Julie A. Matthaei. 1991. *Race, Gender and Work: A Multicultural Economic History of Women in the United States.* Boston: South End Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* New York: Verso Books.

Anthias, F., and N. Yuval Davis. 1990. *Women and the State.* London: Macmillan.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza.* San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

———, ed. 1990. *Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color.* San Francisco: Aunt Lute Foundation.

Apple, Michael. 1979. *Ideology and the Curriculum.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Aronowitz, Stanley. 2000. *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Asian Women United of California, ed. 1989. *Making Waves: An Anthology of Writings by and about Asian American Women.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Bachu, Parminder. 1988. "Apni Marzi Kardhi, Home and Work: Sikh Women in Britain." In *Enterprising Women,* edited by Sallie Westwood and Parminder Bhachu, 76–102. New York: Routledge.

Bagguley, Paul, J. 1990. *Restructuring Place, Class and Gender.* London: Sage Publications.

Bambara, Toni Cade. 1984. "Salvation Is the Issue," In *Black Women Writers (1950–1980): A Critical Evaluation,* edited by Mari Evans, 41–47. New York: Anchor Books.

Baran, Paul A. 1962. *The Political Economy of Growth.* New York: New York Monthly Review Press.

Barnet, Richard J., and John Cavanagh. 1994. *Global Dreams: Imperial Corporations and the New World Order.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Barrett, M. 1991. *Women's Oppression Today.* U.K.: Verso Books.

Barrett, M., and Mary McIntosh. 1982. *The Anti-Social Family.* London: New Left Books.

Barroso, Carmen, and Christina Bruschini. 1991. "Building Politics from Personal Lives: Discussions on Sexuality among Poor Women in Brazil." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism,* edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Basu, Amrita, ed. 1995. *The Challenge of Local Feminisms: Women's Movements in Global Perspective.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Bendt, Ingela, and James Downing. 1982. *We Shall Return: Women in Palestine.* London: Zed Press.

Beneria, L., and C. Stimpson, eds. 1987. *Women, Households and the Economy.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Benjamin, Jessica. 1986. "A Desire of One's Own: Psychoanalytic Feminism and Intersubjective Space." In *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies,* edited by Teresa de Lauretis. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Berg, Elizabeth. 1982. "The Third Woman." *Diacritics* (summer): 11–20.

Berger, Andrea. 2001. "Institutional Policies and Practices: Results from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, Institution Survey." Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.

Bergeron, Suzanne. 2001. "Political Economy Discourses of Globalization and Feminist Politics." *Signs* Vol. 26, no. 4 (summer): 983–1006.

Berman, Edward. 1998. "The Entrepreneurial University: Macro and Micro Perspectives from the United States." In *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives,* edited by Jan Currie and Janice Newsom. London: Sage Publications.

Bernard, Jessie. 1987. *The Female World from a Global Perspective.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bernstein, Basil. 1975. *Class, Codes, and Control.* Vol. 3. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bhabha, Homi. 1983. "The Other Question—The Stereotype and Colonial Discourse." *Screen* 24, no. 6 (Nov.–Dec.): 18–26.

Bhabha, Jacqueline, et al. 1985. *Worlds Apart: Women under Immigration and Nationality Law.* London: Pluto Press.

Bhavnani, Kum-Kum, ed. 2001. *Feminism and "Race."* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bhavnani, Kum-Kum, and Margaret Coulson. 1986. "Transforming Socialist Feminism: the Challenge of Racism." *Feminist Review,* no. 81–92.

Blassingame, John W. 1979. *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South.* New York: Oxford University Press.

———, ed. 1973. *New Perspectives on Black Studies.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Boggs, Grace Lee. 2000. "A Question of Place." *Monthly Review* 52, no. 2 (June): 18–20.

Boris, Eileen, and Cynthia R. Daniels, eds. 1989. *Homework: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Paid Labor at Home.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Boserup, Ester. 1970. *Women's Role in Economic Development.* New York: St. Martin's Press; London: Allen and Unwin.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and J. C. Passeron. 1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture.* Translated by Richard Nice. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Bourne, Jenny. 1987. "Jewish Feminism and Identity Politics." *Race and Class* 29, 1–24.

Bradley, Harriet. 1989. *Men's Work, Women's Work.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Brah, Avtar. 1996. *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities.* London: Routledge.

Brecher, Jeremy. 1993. "The Hierarchy's New World Order—and Ours." In *Global Visions Beyond the New World Order,* edited by Jeremy S. Brecher et al. Boston: South End Press.

Brecher, Jeremy, Jim Costello, and Brendan Smith. 2000. *Globalization from Below: The Power of Solidarity.* Boston: South End Press.

Brodzki, Bella, and Celeste Schenk, eds. 1988. *Life/Lines: Theorizing Women's Autobiography.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Brown, Beverly. 1983. "Displacing the Difference: Review of Nature, Culture and Gender." *m/f* 8: 79–89.

Brown, Elsa Barkley. 1989. "African-American Women's Quilting: A Framework for

Conceptualizing and Teaching African-American Women's History." Signs 14, no. 4 (summer): 921–29.

Brown, Wendy. 1997. "The Impossibility of Women's Studies." differences 9, no. 3: 79–101.

Brownmiller, Susan. 1981. Pornography and Silence. New York: Harper and Row.

——. 1978. Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bryan, Beverly, et al. 1985. The Heart of the Race: Black Women's Lives in Britain. London: Virago.

Brydon, Lynne, and Sylvia Chant. 1989. Women in the Third World: Gender Issues in Rural and Urban Areas. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Bulkin, Elly, Minnie Bruce Pratt, and Barbara Smith. 1988. Yours in Struggle: Three Feminist Perspectives on Anti-Semitism and Racism. Ithaca: Firebrand Books.

Bunch, Charlotte, and Sandra Pollack, eds. 1983. Learning Our Way: Essays in Feminist Education. Trumansburg, N.Y.: Crossing Press.

Burton, Clare. 1985. Subordination: Feminism and Social Theory. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Butler, Johnnella E., ed. 2001. Color-Line to Borderlands: The Matrix of American Ethnic Studies. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Callaway, Helen. 1987. Gender, Culture, and Empire: European Women in Colonial Nigeria. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Chait, Richard, and Cathy Trower. 2001. "Professors at the Color Line." New York Times, 11 September.

Chang, Kimberly, and L.H.M. Long. 2000. "Globalization and Its Intimate Other: Filipina Domestic Workers in Hong Kong." In Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistances, edited by Marianne Runyan and Anne Runyan. New York: Routledge.

Charlton, Sue Ellen M., J. Everett, and Kathleen Staudt, eds. 1989. Women, the State, and Development. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chow, Rey. 1991. "Violence in the Other Country: China as Crisis, Spectacle, and Women." In Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism, edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Chowdhry, Prem. 1989. "Customs in a Peasant Economy: Women in Colonial Haryana." In Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History, edited by Kumkum Sangari and Sudesh Vaid, 302–36. New Delhi: Kali Press.

The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, The Nation. 2001–2002.

Cixous, Helene. 1981. "The Laugh of the Medusa" in New French Feminisms, edited by E. Marks and I. De Courtivron. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Clifford, James, and George Marcus, eds. 1986. Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Code, Lorraine. 2000. Encyclopedia of Feminist Theories. New York: Routledge.

Cohee, Gail E., et al, eds. 1998. The Feminist Teacher Anthology: Pedagogies and Classroom Strategies. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1991. Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment. New York: Routledge.

ColorLines. 2000. "Global Brahmanism: The Meaning of the WTO Protests—An Interview with Vandana Shiva." ColorLines 3, no. 2 (summer): 30–32.Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistances

Combahee River Collective. 1983. "A Black Feminist Statement." Reprinted in All the Women are White, All the Blacks are Men, But Some of Us are Brave, edited by Gloria Hull, Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith. Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press.

Connell, R. W. 1989. "The State, Gender, and Sexual Politics: Theory and Appraisal." Theory and Society 19: 507–44.

——. 1987. Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cowie, Elizabeth. 1978. "Woman as Sign." m/f 1: 49–63.

Currie, Jan. 1998. "Globalization Practices and the Professoriate in Anglo-Pacific and North American Universities." Comparative Education Review 42, no. 1 (Feb.): 15–30.

Currie, Jan, and Janice Newsom, eds. 1998. Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives. London: Sage Publications.

Cutrufelli, Maria Rosa. 1983. Women of Africa: Roots of Oppression. London: Zed Press.

Daly, Mary. 1978. Gyn/ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism. Boston: Beacon Press.

Davis, Angela. 1983. Women, Race and Class. Boston: Doubleday.

Davis, Angela, and Elizabeth Martinez. 1998. "Coalition Building Among People of Color: A Discussion with Angela Davis and Elizabeth Martinez." In The Angela Davis Reader, edited by Joy James. Boston: Blackwell.

Davis, Angela, and Gina Dent. 2001. "Prison as a Border: A Conversation on Gender, Globalization, and Punishment." Signs 26, no. 4 (summer): 1235–42.

Davis, Elizabeth. 1998. "Profile of CSUDH Employees as of October 30, 1998." California State University at Dominguez Hills.

Davis, Miranda. 1987. Third World/Second Sex, vol. 2. London: Zed Press.

——. 1983. Third World/Second Sex, vol. 1. London: Zed Press.

Dean, Jodi. 1996. Solidarity of Strangers: Feminism after Identity Politics. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Deardon, Ann, ed. 1975. Arab Women. Report no. 27. London: Minority Rights Group.

Dei, George, and J. Sefa. 2000. "Rethinking the Role of Indigenous Knowledges in the Academy." International Journal of Inclusive Education 4, no. 2: 111–32.

De Lauretis, Teresa. 1987. "Comparative Literature among the Disciplines: Politics." Unpublished manuscript. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

——. 1986. Feminist Studies/Critical Studies. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

——. 1984. Alice Doesn't: Feminism, Semiotics, Cinema. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. 1977. Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. New York: Viking.

DeRosa, Patti. 1987. Paper presented at annual conference of Society for International Education, Training, and Research, May 8–10.

Derrida, Jacques. 1974. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dirlik, Arif. 1999. "Place-Based Imagination: Globalism and the Politics of Place." In *Review, A Journal of the Ferdinand Braudel Center for the Study of Economics, Historical Systems, and Civilizations* 22, no. 2 (spring): 151–87.

———. 1997. *The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism*. Boulder: Westview Press.

———. 1994. *After the Revolution: Waking to Global Capitalism*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.

Dribble, Sandra. 1994. "Tijuanans Sue in L.A. after Their Maquiladora Is Closed." *San Diego Union-Tribune*, 16 December.

Eisenstein, Hester. 1983. *Contemporary Feminist Thought*. Boston: G. K. Hall.

Eisenstein, Zillah R. 2001. *Manmade Breast Cancers*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

———. 1998a. *The Female Body and the Law*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1998b. *Global Obscenities: Patriarchy, Capitalism, and the Lure of Cyberfantasy*. New York: New York University Press.

———. 1996. *Hatreds: Racialized and Sexualized Conflicts in the 21st Century*. New York: Routledge.

———. 1994. *The Color of Gender: Reimaging Democracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1990. "Feminism v. Neoconservative Jurisprudence: The Spring '89 Supreme Court." Unpublished manuscript. Ithaca, NY: Ithaca College.

———. 1984. *Feminism and Sexual Equality*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

———. 1981. *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism*. New York: Longman, 1981.

———. 1978, editor. *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Eldhom, Felicity, Olivia Harris, and Kate Young. 1977. "Conceptualising Women." *Critique of Anthropology Women's Issue*, no. 3: 101–103.

El Saadawi, Nawal, Fatima Mernissi, and Mallica Vajarathon. 1978. "A Critical Look at the Wellesley Conference." *Quest* 4, no. 2 (winter): 101–7.

Emspak, Frank. 1997. "Should Markets Govern." Unpublished manuscript. Madison, WI: School for Workers.

Enloe, Cynthia. 1993. *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1990. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Esteva, Gustavo, and Madhu Suri Prakash. 1998. *Grassroots Post-Modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures*. London: Zed Press.

Etienne, Mona, and Eleanor Leacock, eds. 1980. *Women and Colonization*. New York: Praeger.

Etzkowitz, Henry, Andrew Webster, and Peter Healey. 1998. *Capitalizing Knowledge: New Intersections of Industry and Academia*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fanon, Franz. 1970. *Black Skin White Masks*. London: Paladin.

———. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Feldman, Johnathan. 1989. *Universities in the Business of Repression: The Academic-Military-Industrial Complex in Central America*. Boston: South End Press.

Felski, Rita. 1997. "The Doxa of Difference." *Signs* 23, no. 1 (autumn): 1–21.

Feminist Review. Special issue: *Many Voices, One Chant: Black Feminist Perspectives*. Vol. 17 (autumn 1984)

Ferguson, Kathy E. 1984. *The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fernandez-Kelly, Maria Patricia. 1983. *For We Are Sold, I and My People: Women and Industry in Mexico's Frontier*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fernandez-Kelly, Maria Patricia, and Anna Garcia. 1989. "Hispanic Women and Homework: Women in the Informal Economy of Miami Los Angeles." In *Homework: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Paid Labor at Home*, edited by Eileen Boris and Cynthia R. Daniels, 165–82. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Fernandez-Kelly, Patricia, and Diane Wolf. 2001. "A Dialogue on Globalization." *Signs* 26, no. 4 (summer): 1007–39.

Fine, Michelle, Lois White, Linda C. Powell, and L. Mun Wong, eds. 1997. *Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Edited and translated by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon.

———. 1978. *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1: *An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Random House.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. 1988. *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press,.

Frankenberg, Ruth. 1997. *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

———. 1993. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. London: Routledge.

———, ed. 1997. *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Freeman, Carla. 2001. "Is Local:Global as Feminine:Masculine? Rethinking the Gender of Globalization." *Signs* 26, no. 4 (summer): 1007–38.

Freeman, Estelle. 2002. *No Turning Back: The History of Feminism and the Future of Women*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Freire, Paulo. 1973. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Seabury.

Freire, Paulo, and Donaldo Macedo. 1985. *Literacy: Reading the Word and the World*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey.

The Future of Women's Studies. 2000. Conference Procedings. Tuscon: University of

Arizona Women's Studies Department. <http://info-center.ccit.Arizona.edu/~ws/conference/conference.html>.

Gagliano, Felix V. 1992. "Globalization of the University." *NCA Quarterly* 67, no. 2 (fall): 325–34.

Genovese, Eugene. 1979. *From Rebellion to Revolution: Afro-American Slave Revolts in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press,.

Giddings, Paula. 1984. *When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America*. New York: William Morrow.

Gilliam, Angela. 1991. "Women's Equality and National Liberation." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gilligan, Carol. 1983. *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Gilroy, Paul. 1987. *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giroux, Henry. 1988. *Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey.

———. 1983. *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey.

Giroux, Henry, and Peter McLaren, eds. 1994. *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Giroux, Henry, and Kostas Myrsiades, eds. 2001. *Beyond the Corporate University: Culture and Pedagogy in the New Millennium*. New York: Rowan and Littlefield.

Gordon, Linda. 1986. "What's New in Women's History." In *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies*, edited by Teresa de Lauretis, 20–31. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections From Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wisehart.

Grewal, Inderpal, and Caren Kaplan, eds. 1994. *Scattered Hegemonies, Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Grewal, S., Jackie Kay, Liliane Landor, Gail Lewis, and Pratibha Parmar, eds. 1988. *Charting the Journey: Writings by Black and Third World Women*. London: Sheba Feminist Publishers.

Griffin, Susan. 1981. *Pornography and Silence*. New York: Harper and Row.

———. 1978. *Woman and Nature: The Roaring inside Her*. New York: Harper and Row.

Guerrero, Marie Anne Jaimes. 1997. "Civil Rights versus Sovereignty: Native American Women in Life and Land Struggles." In *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, edited by M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty. New York: Routledge.

Gunder-Frank, Andre. 1967. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Gutmann, Amy. 1987. *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hall, Jacquelyn Dowd. 1984. "The Mind That Burns in Each Body: Women, Rape, and Violence." *Southern Exposure* 12, no. 6 (Nov.–Dec.): 328–49.

Halliday, Fred. 1991. "Hidden from International Relations: Women and the International Arena." In *Gender and International Relations*, edited by Rebecca Grant and Kathleen Newland. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Haraway, Donna. 1985. "A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s." *Socialist Review* 80 (March–April): 65–108.

Harding, Sandra. 1986. *The Science Question in Feminism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Harding, Sandra, and Merrill B. Hintikka, eds. 1983. *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*. Boston: D. Reidel.

Harlow, Barbara. 1989. "Narrative in Prison: Stories from the Palestinian Intifada." *Modern Fiction Studies* 35, no. 1: 29–46.

Harris, Olivia. 1983. *Latin American Women*. Report no. 57. London: Minority Rights Group.

Hartsock, Nancy. 1983. *Money, Sex, and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Harvard Educational Review. 1988. Special issue: *On Racism and American Education*. Vol. 58, no. 3.

Heng, Geraldine, and Janadas Devan. 1992. "State Fatherhood: The Politics of Nationalism, Sexuality, and Race in Singapore." In *Nationalisms and Sexualities*, edited by Andrew Parker, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer, and Patricia Yaeger. New York: Routledge.

Henry, William H., III. 1990. "Beyond the Melting Pot." *Time Magazine*, 9 April.

Heyzer, Noeleen. 1986. *Working Women in South-East Asia: Development, Subordination and Emancipation*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Higginbotham, Elizabeth. 1983. "Laid Bare by the System: Work and Survival for Black and Hispanic Women." In *Class, Race and Sex: The Dynamics of Control*, edited by A. Swerdlow and H. Lessinger. Boston: G. K. Hall.

hooks, bell. 1988. *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*. Boston: South End Press.

———. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston: South End Press.

———. 1981. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. Boston: South End Press,.

Hooper, Charlotte. 2000. "Masculinities in Transition: The Case of Globalization." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*, ed. Marianne Marchand and Anne Runyan, 44–58. New York: Routledge.

———. 1998. "Masculinist Practices and Gender Politics: The Operation of Multiple Masculinities in International Relations." In *The "Man" Question in International Relations*, edited by M. Zalewski and J. Parpart. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hosken, Fran. 1981. "Female Genital Mutilation and Human Rights." *Feminist Issues* 1, no. 3: 3–24.

Hossfeld, Karen. 1993. "United States: Why Aren't High-Tech Workers Organised?" in *Common Interests: Women Organising in Global Electronics*, edited by Women Working Worldwide, 33–52. London: Tavistock.

———. 1990. "Their Logic against Them: Contradictions in Sex, Race, and Class

in the Silicon Valley." In *Women Workers and Global Restructuring*, edited by Kathryn Ward, 149–78. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Huggins, Nathan I. 1985. *American Studies*. Report to the Ford Foundation. July. New York: Ford Foundation.

Hurtado, Aida. 1989. "Relating to Privilege: Seduction and Rejection in the Subordination of White Women and Women of Color." *Signs* 14, no. 4 (summer): 833–55.

Huston, Perdita. 1979. *Third World Women Speak Out*. New York: Praeger.

Institute for Women, Law and Development. 1993. *Claiming Our Place: Working the Human Rights System to Women's Advantage*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Women, Law and Development.

Irigaray, Luce. 1981. "This Sex which is Not One," and "When the Goods Get Together." In *New French Feminisms*, edited by Elaine Marks and Isable de Courtivron. New York: Schoken Books.

ISIS. 1984. *Women in Development: A Resource Guide for Organization and Action*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Ismail, Rose. 1990. "Man, Woman, and Erroneous Thoughts." *New Sunday Times* (Kualalumpur), 20 May.

Jahan, Rounaq, and Hyoung Cho, eds. 1980. *Women in Asia*. Report #45. London: Minority Rights Group.

James, Joy, ed. 1998. *The Angela Davis Reader*. Boston: Blackwell.

Jardine, Alice. 1985. *Gynesis: Configurations of Woman and Modernity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Jayawardena, Kumari. 1995. *The White Woman's Other Burden: Western Women and South Asia during British Colonial Rule*. New York: Routledge.

———. 1986. *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World*. London: Zed Press.

Jayawardena, Kumari, and Malathi de Alwis, eds. 1996. *Embodied Violence: Communalising Women's Sexuality in South Asia*. New Delhi: Kali for Women.

Jeffery, Patricia. 1979. *Frogs in a Well: Indian Women in Purdah*. London: Zed Press.

Jhabvala, Renana. 1994. "Self-Employed Women's Association: Organising Women by Struggle and Development." In *Dignity and Daily Bread: New Forms of Economic Organizing among Poor Women in the Third World and the First*, edited by Sheila Rowbotham and Swasti Mitter, 114–38. New York: Routledge.

Jonasdottir, Anna G. 1988. "On the Concept of Interest, Women's Interests, and the Limitations of Interest Theory." In *The Political Interests of Gender*, edited by K. Jones and A.G. Jónasdóttir. London: Sage Publications.

Jones, Jacqueline. 1985. *Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work, and the Family from Slavery to the Present*. New York: Random House.

Jones, Kathleen, and Anna G. Jonasdottir, eds. 1988. *The Political Interests of Gender*. London: Sage Publications.

Jordan, June. 1981. *Civil Wars*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Joseph, Gloria, and Jill Lewis. 1981. *Common Differences: Conflicts in Black and White Feminist Perspectives*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Josephides, Sasha. 1988. "Honor, Family and Work: Greek Cypriot Women before and after Migration." In *Enterprising Women*, edited by Sallie Westwood and Parminder Bhachu, 34–57. New York: Routledge.

Kamuf, Peggy. 1982. "Replacing Feminist Criticism." *Diacritics* 12, no. 2: 42–47.

Kandityoti, Dentz. 1994. "Identity and Its Discontents Women and the Nation." In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Christman. New York: Columbia University Press.

———, ed. 1991. *Women, Islam and the State*. London: Macmillan.

Kannabiran, Vasantha, ed. 1989. *We Were Making History: Life Stories of Women in the Telangana Armed Struggle*. London: Zed Press.

Kaplan, Caren. 1986–87. "The Poetics of Displacement in Buenos Aires." *Discourse* 8: 94–102.

Karim, Wazir-jahan. 1983. "Malay Women's Movements: Leadership and Processes of Change." *International Social Science Journal* 35 no. 4: 791–831.

Katrak, Ketu. 1992. "Indian Nationalism, Gandhian 'Satyagraha' and Representations of Female Sexuality." In *Nationalisms and Sexualities*, edited by Andrew Parker, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer, and Patricia Yaeger. New York: Routledge.

Katz, Naomi, and David Kemnitzer. 1984. "Women and Work in the Silicon Valley." In *My Troubles Are Going to Have Trouble with Me: Everyday Trials and Triumphs of Women Workers*, edited by Karen Brodkin Sacks and D. Remy, 193–208. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

———. 1983. "Fast Forward: The Internationalization of the Silicon Valley." In *Women, Men, and the International Division of Labor*, edited by June Nash and M. P. Fernandez-Kelly, 273–331. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kempadoo, Kamala, and Jo Doezema, eds. 1999. *Global Sex Workers, Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*. London: Routledge.

Kim, Elaine H., and Lisa Lowe. 1997. *New Formations, New Questions: Asian American Studies*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

King, Katie. 1990. "Producing Sex, Theory and Culture: Gay/Straight ReMappings in Contemporary Feminism." In *Conflicts in Feminism*, edited by M. Hirsch and E. Fox-Keller. New York: Methuen.

———. 1986. "The Situation of Lesbianism as Feminism's Magical Sign: Contests for Meaning and the U.S. Women's Movement, 1968–1972." *Communication* 9: 65–91.

Kishwar, Madhu, and Ruth Vanita, eds. 1984. *In Search of Answers: Indian Women's Voices from Manushi*. London: Zed Press.

Kristeva, Julia. 1980. *Desire in Language*. New York: Columbia University Press.

La Duke, Winona. 1999. *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life*. Boston: South End Press.

Latin American and Caribbean Women's Collective. 1980. *Slaves of Slaves*. London: Zed Press.

Lay, Mary M., Janice Monk, and Deborah Silverton Rosenfelt, eds. 2002. *Encompassing*

Gender: Integrating International Studies and Women's Studies. New York: Feminist Press of City University of New York.

Lazreg, Marnia. 1988. "Feminism and Difference: The Perils of Writing as a Woman on Women in Algeria." *Feminist Issues* 14, no. 1 (spring): 81–107.

Leacock, E., and H. Safa, eds. 1986. *Women's Work: Development and the Division of Labor by Gender*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey.

Letelier, Isabel. 1985. *Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy Implications for Democracy in the Southern Cone*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Policy Studies.

Liddle, Joanna, and Rami Joshi. 1986. *Daughters of Independence: Gender, Caste and Class in India*. London: Zed Press.

Lind, Amy. 2000. "Negotiating Boundaries: Women's Organizations and the Politics of Restructuring in Equador." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistances*, edited by Marianne Marchand and Anne Runyan. New York: Routledge.

Lindsay, Beverley, ed. 1983. *Comparative Perspectives of Third World Women: The Impact of Race, Sex, and Class*. New York: Praeger.

Loomba, Ania. 1998–99. "Postcolonialism—or Postcolonial Studies." *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 1, no. 1: 39–42.

Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider*. Freedom, Calif.: Crossing Press.

———. 1981. "An Open Letter to Mary Daly." In *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, edited by Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa. New York: Kitchen Table Press.

Lowe, Lisa. 1996. *Immigrant Acts: on Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

———. 1994. *Globalization, Space, Difference*. Honolulu: East-West Center.

Lowe, Lisa, and David Lloyd. 1997. *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Lubiano, Wahneema, ed. 1998. *The House that Race Built*. New York: Vintage Books.

Lugones, Maria, and Elizabeth Spelman. 1983. "Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism, and the Demand for 'the Women's Voice,' " *Women's Studies International Forum* 6 (fall): 573–81.

MacKinnon, Catharine. 1989. *Towards a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Mahalingham, Ram, and Cameron McCarthy, eds. 2000. *Multicultural Curriculum: New Directories for Social Theory, Practice, and Policy*. New York: Routledge.

Mani, Lab. 1987. "Contentious Traditions: The Debate on SATI in Colonial India." *Cultural Critique* (fall): 119–56.

Marchand, Marianne, and Anne Runyan, eds. 2000. *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*. New York: Routledge.

Marcus, G., and M. Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marks, Elaine, and Isabel De Courtivron. 1981. *New French Feminisms: An Anthology*. New York: Schocken.

Martin, Biddy. 1988. "Lesbian Identity and Autobiographical Difference(s)." In

Life/Lines: Theorizing Women's Autobiography, edited by B. Brodzki and C. Schenck. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

———. 1982. "Feminism, Criticism, and Foucault." *New German Critique*, no. 27 (1982): 3–30.

Martinez, Elizabeth. 1988. *De Colores Means All of Us*. Boston: South End Press.

Mascia-Lees, F. E., et al. 1989. "The Postmodernist Turn in Anthropology: Cautions from a Feminist Perspective." *Signs* 15, no. 1 (autumn): 7–33.

McClintock, Anne, and Aamir Mufti. 1997. *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McLaren, Peter. 1997. *Revolutionary Multiculturalism: Pedagogies of Dissent for the New Millennium*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Memmi, Albert. 1965. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Menchu, Rigoberta. 1984. *I, Rigoberta Menchu: An Indian Woman in Guatemala*. London: Verso Books.

Mernissi, Fatima. 1992. *Islam and Democracy: Fear of the Modern World*. Reading, Mass.: Perseus Books.

Mies, Maria. 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labor*. London: Zed Press.

———. 1982. *The Lacemakers of Narsapur: Indian Housewives Produce for the World Market*. London: Zed Press.

Mies, Maria, and Vandana Shiva. 1993. *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Press.

Minces, Juliette. 1980. *The House of Obedience: Women in Arab Society*. London: Zed Press.

Minh-ha, Trinh T. 1989. *Women, Native, Other*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Minnich, Elizabeth. 1990. *Transforming Knowledge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Minnich, Elizabeth, et al., eds. 1988. *Reconstructing the Academy: Women's Education and Women's Studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mitter, Swasti. 1994. "On Organising Women in Causalized Work: A Global Overview." In *Dignity and Daily Bread: New Forms of Economic Organizing among Poor Women in the Third World and the First*, edited by Sheila Rowbotham and Swasti Mitter, 14–52. New York: Routledge.

Modares, Mina. 1981. "Women and Shiism in Iran." *m/f* 5–6: 61–82.

Moghadam, Valentine M. 1994. *Identity Politics and Women: Cultural Reassertions and Feminisms in International Perspective*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Mohanram, Radhika. 1999. *Black Body: Women, Colonialism, and Space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1991. "Cartographies of Struggle: Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

———. 1989–90. "On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s." *Cultural Critique* 14 (winter): 179–208.

————. 1987. "Feminist Encounters: Locating the Politics of Experience." *Copyright* 1 (fall): 30–44.

————. 1984. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Boundary 2* 12, no. 3 / 13, no. 1 (spring/fall): 338–358.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, and Satya P. Mohanty. 1990. "Contradictions of Colonialism." Review of Kumkum Sangari and Sudesh Vaid, eds., *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History. Women's Review of Books* (March): 19–21.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, eds. 1991 *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mohanty, Satya P. 2001. "Can Our Values Be Objective? On Ethics, Aesthetics, and Progressive Politics." *New Literary History* 34, no. 4: 803–33.

————. 1997. *Literary Theory and the Claims of History.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

————. 1995. "Colonial Legacies, Multicultural Futures: Relativism, Objectivity, and the Challenge of Otherness." *PMLA* 110 (Jan.): 108–17.

————. 1989a. "Kipling's Children and the Color Line." *Race and Class* 31, no. 1: 21–40.

————. 1989b. "Us and Them: On the Philosophical Bases of Political Criticism." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 2 (March): 1–31.

Momsen, Janet Henshall, and Janet G. Townsend. 1987. *Geography of Gender in the Third World.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Moore, Henrietta. 1988. *Feminism and Anthropology.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Moraga, Cherríe. 1984. *Loving in the War Years.* Boston: South End Press.

Moraga, Cherríe, and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 1981. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color.* Albany: Kitchen Table Press.

Morgan, Robin, ed. 1984. *Sisterhood Is Global: The International Women's Movement Anthology.* New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday; Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Moya, Paula. 1998. *Learning from Experience: Politics, Epistemology, and Chicana/o Identity.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Moya, Paula, and Michael R. Hames-Garcia, eds. 2000. *Reclaiming Identity: Realist Theory and the Predicament of Postmodernism.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Narayan, Uma. 1997. *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third-World Feminism.* New York: Routledge.

Nash, June, and Maria Patricia Fernandez-Kelly. 1983. *Women, Men and the International Division of Labor.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Nash, June, and Helen I. Safa, eds. 1980. *Sex and Class in Latin America: Women's Perspectives on Politics, Economics and the Family in the Third World.* South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey.

Nicholson, Linda, and Steven Seidman, eds. 1995. *Social Postmodernism: Beyond Identity Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noble, David. 2001. *The Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher Education.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

O'Hanlon, R. 1988. "Recovering the Subject: Subaltern Studies and Histories of Resistance in Colonial South Asia." *Modern Asian Studies* 22, no. 1: 189–224.

Okohiro, G. Y., ed. 1986. *In Resistance: Studies in African, Caribbean and AfroAmerican History.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Okri, Ben. 1995. *Astonishing the Gods.* London: Phoenix.

Omi, M., and H. Winant. 1986. *Racial Formation in the United States, from the 1960s to the 1980s.* New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Omvedt, Gail. 1980. *We Will Smash This Prison: Indian Women in Struggle.* London: Zed Press.

Ong, Aihwa. 1991. "The Gender and Labor Politics of Postmodernity." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 279–309.

————. 1987. *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline: Factory Women in Malaysia.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ortiz, Alicia Dujovne. 1986–87. "Buenos Aires (An Excerpt)." *Discourse* 8: 73–83.

Pala, Achola O. 1995. "Connecting across Cultures and Continents: Black Women Speak Out on Identity, Race, and Development." New York: United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM).

————. 1976. "African Women in Rural Development: Research Trends and Priorities." Washington, D.C.: Overseas Liaison Committee, American Council on Education.

Pardo, Mary. 2001. "Mexican-American Women Grassroots Community Activists: Mothers of East Los Angeles." In *Women's Lives: Multicultural Perspectives,* ed. Margo Okazawa-Rey and Gwyn Kirk, 504–11. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Parrenas, Rachel Salazar. 2001. "Transgressing the Nation-State: The Partial Citizenship and 'Imagined (Global) Community' of Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers." *Signs* 26, no. 4 (summer): 1129–54.

Pascoe, Peggy. 1990. "At the Crossroad of Culture." *Women's Review of Books* 7, no. 5 (Feb.): 22–23.

Peters, Julie, and Andrea Wolper, eds. 1995. *Women's Rights, Human Rights International Feminist Perspectives.* New York: Routledge.

Phillips, Anne. 1998. *Feminism and Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phizacklea, Annie. 1988. "Entrepreneurship, Ethnicity and Gender." In *Enterprising Women,* edited by Sallie Westwood and Parminder Bhachu, 20–33. New York: Routledge.

Popkin, Richard. 1974. "The Philosophical Bases of Modern Racism." *Journal of Operational Psychiatry* 5, no. 2: 24–36 .

Pratt, Minnie Bruce. 1988. "Identity: Skin Blood Heart." In *Yours in Struggle: Three Feminist Perspectives on Anti-Semitism and Racism,* by Elly Bulkin, Minnie Bruce Pratt, and Barbara Smith. Ithaca: Firebrand Books.

Prindle, Sue E. 1988. "Towards Prejudice Reduction: A Resource Document of Consultants, Audio/Visual Aids, and Providers of Workshops, Training and Seminars." Unpublished document. Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

Puar, Jasbir. 2001. "Global Circuits: Transnational Sexualities and Trinidad." *Signs* 26, no. 4 (summer): 1039–66.

Radical America. 1981. Special double issue. Vol. 15, nos. 1 and 2.

Readings, William. 1996. The University in Ruins. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Reagon, Bernice Johnson. 1983. "Coalition Politics: Turning the Century." In Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology, edited by Barbara Smith. New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press.

Reiter, Rayna, ed. 1975. Toward an Anthropology of Women. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Review of Radical Political Economics. 1991. Special issue: Women in the International Economy. Vol. 23, nos. 3–4 (fall–winter).

Reyes, Maria de la Luz, and John J. Halcon. 1988. "Racism in Academies: The Old Wolf Revisited." Harvard Educational Review 58, no. 3: 299–314.

Rich, Adrienne. 1986. Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose, 1979–1985. New York: W. W. Norton.

————. 1976. Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution. New York: W. W. Norton.

Robinson, Armstead, Craig C. Foster, and Donald H. Ogilvie, eds. 1969. Black Studies in the University: A Symposium. New York: Bantam.

Rollins, Judith. 1987. Between Women: Domestics and Their Employers. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Roman, Leslie, and Linda Eyre, eds. 1997. Dangerous Territories: Struggles for Difference and Equality in Education. New York: Routledge.

Rosa, Kumudhini. 1994. "The Conditions of Organisational Activities of Women in Free Trade Zones: Malaysia, Philippines and Sri Lanka, 1970–1990." In Dignity and Daily Bread: New Forms of Economic Organizing among Poor Women in the Third World and the First, edited by Sheila Rowbotham and Swasti Mitter, 73–99. New York: Routledge.

Rosaldo, M. Z. 1980. "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: Reflections on Feminism and Cross-Cultural Understanding." Signs 53, no. 3: 389–417.

Rowbotham, Sheila, and Swasti Mitter, eds. 1994. Dignity and Daily Bread: New Forms of Economic Organizing among Poor Women in the Third World and the First. New York: Routledge.

Sacks, Karen Brodkin, and D. Remy, eds. 1984. My Troubles Are Going to Have Trouble with Me: Everyday Triumphs of Working Women. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Sahgal, Gita, and Nira Yuval Davis, eds. 1992. Refusing Holy Orders: Women and Fundamentalism in Britain. London: Virago.

Said, Edward. 1979. Orientalism. New York: Vintage.

Sanchez, Rosaura. 1987. "Ethnicity, Ideology and Academia." The Americas Review 15, no. 1 (spring): 80–88.

Sanchez-Casal, Susan, and Amie Macdonald. 2002. Introduction. Twenty-First-Century Feminist Classrooms: Pedagogies of Difference and Identity. New York: Palgrave.

Sandoval, Chela. 2000. Methodology of the Oppressed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

————. 1991. "U.S. Third World: The Theory and Method of Oppositional Consciousness in the Postmodern World," Genders 10 (spring): 1–24.

————. 1983. "Women Respond to Racism: A Report on the National Women's Studies Association Conference, Storrs, Connecticut." Occasional Paper Series. Oakland, Calif.: Center for Third World Organizing, 1983.

Sangari, Kumkum. 2000. Politics of the Possible. New Delhi: Tulika.

Sangari, Kumkum, and Sudesh Vaid, eds. 1989. Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History. New Delhi: Kali Press.

Sassen, Saskia. 1998. "New Employment Regimes in Cities: The Impact on Immigrant Workers," Journal of Ethnic and Minority Studies 22, no. 4: 579–94.

————. 1991. The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

————. 1988. The Mobility of Labor and Capital. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schuster, Marilyn, and Susan Van Dyne. 1985. Women's Place in the Academy: Transforming the Liberal Arts Curriculum. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Allanheld.

Scott, Joan W. 1986. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." American Historical Review 91, no. 5: 1053–75.

Sen, Gib, and Caren Grown. 1987. Development Crises and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Sheftall, Beverly Guy. 1995. Women's Studies: A Retrospective. Report to the Ford Foundation. New York: Ford Foundation.

Shiva, Vandana. 1999. Betting on Biodiversity: Why Genetic Engineering Will Not Feed the Hungry or Save the Planet. New Delhi: Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Ecology.

————. 1994. Close to Home: Women Reconnect Ecology, Health, and Development Worldwide. London: Earthscan Publications. Originally published by Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Natural Resource Policy and distributed by New Delhi: Nataraj Publishers, 1993.

————. 1992. Biodiversity: Social and Ecological Perspectives. London: Zed Press; Penang: World Rainforest Movement.

————. 1989. Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, and Development. London: Zed Press, 1989.

Shiva, Vandana, A. H. Jafri, G. Bedi, and R. Holla-Bhar. 1997. The Enclosure and Recovery of the Commons: Biodiversity, Indigenous Knowledge and Intellectual Property Rights. New Delhi: Research Foundation for Science and Technology.

Shiva, Vandana, and Ingunn Moser. 1995. Biopolitics: A Feminist and Ecological Reader on Biotechnology. London: Zed Press; Penang: Third World Network.

Shiva, Vandana, Rebecca Gordon, and Bob Wing. 2000. "Global Brahminism: The Meaning of the WTO Protests: An Interview with Dr. Vandana Shiva," ColorLines, 3 (2): 30–32.

Shohat, Ella. 2001. "Area Studies, Transnationalism, and the Feminist Production of Knowledge." Signs 26, no. 4 (summer): 1269–72.

———. 2001. *Talking Visions: Multicultural Feminism in a Transnational Age.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. 1994. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media.* London: Routledge.

Sidhu, Gretchen. 2001. "Academy Blues." *Ms. Magazine* 9, no. 5 (Aug.–Sep.): 36–39.

Signs. 1989. Special issue: *Common Grounds and Crossroads: Race, Ethnicity and Class in Women's Lives.* Vol. 14, no. 4 (summer).

———. 1981. Special Issue: *Development and the Sexual Division of Labor.* Vol. 7, no. 2 (winter).

Sistren, with Honor Ford-Smith. 1987. *Lionhart Gal: Life Stories of Jamaican Women.* Toronto: Sister Vision Press.

Siu, Bobby. 1981. *Women of China: Imperialism and Women's Resistance, 1900–1949.* London: Zed Press.

Sivanandan, A. 1990. "All That Melts into Air Is Solid: The Hokum of the New Times." *Race and Class* 31, no. 3: 1–30.

———. 1985. "RAT and the Degradation of Black Struggle." *Race and Class* 26, no. 4 (spring): 1–34.

———. 1981. "Race, Class and Caste in South Africa: An Open Letter to No Sizwe." *Race and Class* 22, no. 3: 293–301.

Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry Leslie. 1997. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, Barbara, ed. 1983. *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology.* New York: Kitchen Table Press.

Smith, Dorothy. 1987. *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Smith, Joan. 1994. "The Creation of the World We Know: The World Economy and the Recreation of Gendered Identities." In *Identity Politics and Women: Cultural Reassertions and Feminisms in International Perspective,* edited by Valentine M. Moghadam, 27–41. Boulder: Westview Press.

Snitow, Ann, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson, eds. 1983. *Powers of Desire.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Socialist Review. 2001. Special issue: *Anti-Capitalism.* Vol. 28, nos. 3 and 4.

Soley, Lawrence C. 1995. *Leasing the Ivory Tower: The Corporate Takeover of Academia.* Boston: South End Press.

Sommer, Doris. 1988. "Not Just a Personal Story: Women's Testimonies and the Plural Self." In *Life/Lines: Theorizing Women's Autobiography,* edited by Bella Brodzki and Celeste Schenk, 107–30. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Spanos, William V. 1984. "Boundary 2 and the Polity of Interest: Humanism, the Center Elsewhere, and Power." *Boundary 2* 12, no. 3 / 13, no. 1 (spring–fall).

Spelman, Elizabeth. 1989. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Theory.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Spillers, Hortense. 1987. "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book." *Diacritics* 17, no. 2 (summer): 65–81.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1987. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics.* New York: Methuen.

———. 1982. "French Feminism in an International Frame." *Yale French Studies,* no. 62: 154–84.

Starr, Paul. 1987. "The Case for Skepticism." In *Prospects for Privatization,* edited by Steven Hanke, 124–37. New York: Academy of Political Science.

Stone-Mediatore, Shari. Forthcoming. *Reading Across Borders: Storytelling as Knowledge and Politics.* New York: Palgrave.

Strathern, Marilyn, and Carol McCormack, eds. 1980. *Nature, Culture and Gender.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sudarkasa, Niara. 1987. "Affirmative Action or Affirmation of Status Quo? Black Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education." *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin* (Feb.): 3–6.

Tabari, Azar. 1980. "The Enigma of the Veiled Iranian Women." *Feminist Review* 5: 19–32.

Tate, Jane. 1994. "Homework in West Yorkshire." In *Dignity and Daily Bread: New Forms of Economic Organizing among Poor Women in the Third World and the First,* edited by Sheila Rowbotham and Swasti Mitter, 114–38. New York: Routledge.

Thompson, Becky, and Sangeeta Tyagi, eds. 1993. *Beyond a Dream Deferred: Multicultural Education and the Politics of Excellence.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tinker, Irene, and Michelle Bo Bramsen, eds. 1972. *Women and World Development.* Washington, D.C.: Overseas Development Council.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. 1999. *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Tripp, Aili Marie. 2002. "Combining Intercontinental Parenting and Research: Dilemnas and Strategies for Women." *Signs* 27, no. 3: 793–811.

Urry, John. 1998. "Contemporary Transformations of Time and Space." In *The Globalization of Higher Education,* edited by Peter Scott. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Vance, Carole S. 1984. *Pleasure and Danger,* ed. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Volpe, Letti. 2001. "Feminism versus Multiculturism." *Columbia Law Review* 101: 1181–1218.

Walby, Sylvia. 2000. "Beyond the Politics of Location: The Power of Argument." In *Feminist Theory* 1, no. 2: 109–207.

———. 1990. *Theorizing Patriarchy.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 1985. *Patriarchy at Work.* Cambridge, Mass.: Polity Press.

Ward, Kathryn, ed. 1990. *Women Workers and Global Restructuring.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Warhol, Robyn, and Diane Price Herndal, eds. 1997. *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism.* New York: Routledge.

Waterman, Peter. 1998. *Globalization, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms.* London: Mansell Publishing.

Wekker, Gloria. 1997. "One Finger Does Not Drink Okra Soup. . . ." In *Feminist*

Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures, edited by M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty. New York: Routledge.

Wellesley Editorial Committee, ed. 1977. *Women and National Development: The Complexities of Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

West, Cornel. 1987. "Minority Discourse and the Pitfalls of Canon Formation." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 1, no. 1 (fall): 193–202.

Westwood, Sallie. 1988. "Workers and Wives: Continuities and Discontinuities in the Lives of Gujarati Women." In *Enterprising Women*, edited by Sallie Westwood and Parminder Bhachu, 103–31. New York: Routledge.

Westwood, Sallie, and Parminder Bhachu, eds. 1988. *Enterprising Women*. New York: Routledge.

Winant, Howard. 1990. "Postmodern Racial Politics: Difference and Inequality." *Socialist Review* 90, no. 1: 121–47.

Wittig, Monique. 1980. "The Straight Mind." *Feminist Issues* 1: 103–10.

Women, Immigration and Nationality Group. 1985. *Worlds Apart: Women under Immigration and Nationality Law*. London: Pluto Press.

Women of South Asian Descent Collective, ed. 1993. *Our Feet Walk the Sky: Writings by Women of the South Asian Diaspora*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Women Working Worldwide. 1993. *Common Interests*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Young, Kate, Carol Walkowitz, and Roslyn McCullagh, eds. 1981. *Of Marriage and the Market: Women's Subordination in International Perspective*. London: CASE Books.

INDEX

and political alternative to essentialist and postmodernist formulations of identity.

12 For instance, Fanon writes eloquently (in a clearly masculine language) about dreams of liberation: "The first thing which a native learns is to stay in his place, and not go beyond certain limits. This is why the dreams of the native are always of muscular prowess; his dreams are of action, and of aggression. I dream I am jumping, swimming, running, climbing; I dream that I burst out laughing, that I span a river in one stride, or that I am followed by a flood of motor-cars which never catch up with me" (1996, 40). The point is not that women do not or cannot dream of "muscular prowess" but rather that in the context of colonial practices of the emasculation of native men, muscular prowess gains a particularly masculine psychic weight.

13 See Alexander and Mohanty 1997, esp. xxxvi–xlii. For interesting and provocative discussions about anticapitalism, see Socialist Review 2001.

14 In discussing the centrality of decolonization to envisioning feminist democracy we argued thus: "In fact, feminist thinking, here, draws on and endorses socialist principles of collectivized relations of production and organization. It attempts to reenvision socialism as a part of feminist democracy with decolonization at its center. However, while feminist collectives struggle against hegemonic power structures at various levels, they are also marked by these very structures—it is these traces of the hegemonic which the practice of decolonization addresses" (Alexander and Mohanty 1997, xxxvi). We went on to analyze Gloria Wekker's essay on Afro-Suninamese women's critical agency to illustrate an important aspect of decolonization: "Wekker . . . explores what appears to be a different configuration of self, anchored in an 'alternative vision of female subjectivity and sexuality, based on West African principles' (Wekker, 339). Her analysis of Mati work in terms of alternative female relationships, ones that have simultaneous affectional, cultural, economic, social, spiritual, and obligational components, suggests a decolonized oppositional script for feminist struggle and for practices of governance. Decolonization involves both engagement with the everyday issues in our own lives so that we can make sense of the world in relation to hegemonic power, and engagement with collectivities that are premised on ideas of autonomy and self-determination, in other words, democratic practice. For the Creole working-class women Wekker speaks about, this is precisely the process engaged in. It creates what she calls a 'psychic economy of female subjectivity, (which) . . . induces working-class women to act individually and collectively in ways that counteract the assault of the hegemonic knowledge regime, which privileges men, the heterosexual contract, inequality and a generally unjust situation.' Here, the investment in the self (what Wekker calls "multiple self") is not necessarily an investment in mobility upward or in the maintenance of a masculinist, heterosexist, middle-class status quo" (Alexander and Mohanty 1997, xxxvii).

15 For interesting and provocative discussions about anti-capitalism, see the special issue "Anticapitalism" of the journal Socialist Review, 28:3, 2001. All chap-

ters in part 1 have been previously published in the same or somewhat different form. See Mohanty 1984, Mohanty 1991, Martin and Mohanty 1986, and Mohanty 1987. Chapters 6 and 8 are substantially revised from their earlier publication— see Mohanty 1989–90 and Mohanty 1997.

Chapter One. Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses

1 Terms such as "Third World" and "First World" are very problematic, both in suggesting oversimplified similarities between and among countries labeled thus and in implicitly reinforcing existing economic, cultural, and ideological hierarchies that are conjured up in using such terminology. I use the term "Third World" with full awareness of its problems, only because this is the terminology available to us at the moment. Throughout this book, then, I use the term critically.

2 I am indebted to Teresa de Lauretis for this particular formulation of the project of feminist theorizing. See especially her introduction to her book Alice Doesn't (1984).

3 This argument is similar to Homi Bhabha's definition of colonial discourse as strategically creating a space for a subject people through the production of knowledge and the exercise of power: "[C]olonial discourse is an apparatus of power, an apparatus that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial/cultural/historical differences. Its predominant strategic function is the creation of a space for a subject people through the production of knowledge in terms of which surveillance is exercised and a complex form of pleasure/unpleasure is incited. It (i.e., colonial discourse) seeks authorization for its strategies by the production of knowledge by coloniser and colonised which are stereotypical but antithetically evaluated" (Bhabha 1983, 23).

4 A number of documents and reports on the U.N. International Conferences on Women in Mexico City (1975) and Copenhagen (1980), as well as the 1976 Wellesley Conference on Women and Development, attest to this. El Saadawi, Mernissi, and Vajarathon (1978) characterize the Mexico City conference as "American-planned and organized," situating Third World participants as passive audiences. They focus especially on Western women's lack of self-consciousness about their implication in the effects of imperialism and racism, a lack revealed in their assumption of an "international sisterhood." Euro-American feminism that seeks to establish itself as the only legitimate feminism has been characterized as "imperial" by Amos and Parmar (1984, 3).

5 The Zed Press Women in the Third World series is unique in its conception. I focus on it because it is the only contemporary series I have found that assumes that women in the Third World are a legitimate and separate subject of study and research. Since 1985, when I wrote the bulk of this book, numerous new titles have appeared in the series. Thus Zed Press has come to occupy a rather privileged position in the dissemination and construction of discourses by and about Third World women. A number of the books in this series are excellent, especially those that deal directly with women's resistance struggles. In addition, Zed Press consistently publishes progressive feminist, antiracist, and anti-imperialist texts.

However, a number of the texts written by feminist sociologists, anthropologists, and journalists are symptomatic of the kind of Western feminist work on women in the Third World that concerns me. An analysis of a few of these works can serve as a representative point of entry into the discourse I am attempting to locate and define. My focus on these texts is therefore an attempt at an internal critique: I simply expect and demand more from this series. Needless to say, progressive publishing houses also carry their own authorizing signatures.

6 I have discussed this particular point in detail in a critique of Robin Morgan's construction of "women's herstory" in her introduction to *Sisterhood Is Global* (1984); (see Mohanty 1987, esp. 35–37).

7 Another example of this kind of analysis is Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* (1978). Daly's assumption in this text, that women as a group are sexually victimized, leads to her very problematic comparison of attitudes toward women witches and healers in the West, Chinese foot-binding, and the genital mutilation of women in Africa. According to Daly, women in Europe, China, and Africa constitute a homogeneous group as victims of male power. Not only does this labeling (of women as sexual victims) eradicate the specific historical and material realities and contradictions that lead to and perpetuate practices such as witch hunting and genital mutilation, but it also obliterates the differences, complexities, and heterogeneities of the lives of, for example, women of different classes, religions, and nations in Africa. As Audre Lorde (1984) has pointed out, women in Africa share a long tradition of healers and goddesses that perhaps binds them together more appropriately than their victim status. However, both Daly and Lorde fall prey to universalistic assumptions about "African women" (both negative and positive). What matters is the complex, historical range of power differences, commonalities, and resistances that exist among women in Africa and that construct African women as subjects of their own politics.

8 See Eldhom, Harris, and Young 1977 for a good discussion of the necessity to theorize male violence within specific societal frameworks, rather than assume it as a universal.

9 These views can also be found in differing degrees in collections such as Wellesley Editorial Committee 1977 and *Signs* 1981. For an excellent introduction to WID issues, see ISIS 1984. For a politically focused discussion of feminism and development and the stakes for poor Third World women, see Sen and Grown 1987.

10 See essays by Vanessa Maher, Diane Elson and Ruth Pearson, and Maila Stevens in Young, Walkowitz, and McCullagh 1981; and essays by Vivian Mob and Michele Mattelart in Nash and Safa 1980. For examples of excellent, self-conscious work by feminists writing about women in their own historical and geographical locations, see Lazreg 1988; Spivak's "A Literary Representation of the Subaltern: A Woman's Text from the Third World" (in Spivak 1987, 241–68); and Mani 1987.

11 Harris 1983. Other MRG reports include Deardon 1975 and Jahan and Cho 1980.

256 Notes

12 Zed Press published the following books: Jeffery 1979, Latin American and Caribbean Women's Collective 1980, Omvedt 1980, Minces 1980, Siu 1981, Bendt and Downing 1982, Cutrufelli 1983, Mies 1982, and Davis 1983.

13 For succinct discussions of Western radical and liberal feminisms, see Z. Eisenstein 1981 and H. Eisenstein 1983.

14 Amos and Parmar (1984) describe the cultural stereotypes present in Euro-American feminist thought: "The image is of the passive Asian woman subject to oppressive practices within the Asian family with an emphasis on wanting to 'help' Asian women liberate themselves from their role. Or there is the strong, dominant Afro-Caribbean woman, who despite her 'strength' is exploited by the 'sexism' which is seen as being a strong feature in relationships between Afro-Caribbean men and women" (9). These images illustrate the extent to which paternalism is an essential element of feminist thinking that incorporates the above stereotypes, a paternalism that can lead to the definition of priorities for women of color by Euro-American feminists.

15 I discuss the question of theorizing experience in Mohanty 1987 and Mohanty and Martin 1986.

16 This is one of Foucault's (1978, 1980) central points in his reconceptualization of the strategies and workings of power networks.

17 For an argument that demands a new conception of humanism in work on Third World women, see Lazreg 1988. While Lazreg's position might appear to be diametrically opposed to mine, I see it as a provocative and potentially positive extension of some of the implications that follow from my arguments. In criticizing the feminist rejection of humanism in the name of "essential Man," Lazreg points to what she calls an "essentialism of difference" within these very feminist projects. She asks: "To what extent can Western feminism dispense with an ethics of responsibility when writing about different women? The point is neither to subsume other women under one's own experience nor to uphold a separate truth for them. Rather, it is to allow them to be while recognizing that what they are is just as meaningful, valid, and comprehensible as what we are. . . . Indeed, when feminists essentially deny other women the humanity they claim for themselves, they dispense with any ethical constraint. They engage in the act of splitting the social universe into us and them, subject and objects" (99–100). This essay by Lazreg and an essay by Satya P. Mohanty (1989b) suggest positive directions for self-conscious cross-cultural analyses, analyses that move beyond the deconstructive to a fundamentally productive mode in designating overlapping areas for cross-cultural comparison. The latter essay calls not for a "humanism" but for a reconsideration of the question of the "human" in a posthumanist context. It argues that there is no necessary incompatibility between the deconstruction of Western humanism and such a positive elaboration of the human, and that such an elaboration is essential if contemporary political-critical discourse is to avoid the incoherencies and weaknesses of a relativist position.

257 Notes

Chapter Nine. "Under Western Eyes" Revisited:
Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles

1 This chapter in its present form owes much to many years of conversation and collaboration with Zillah Eisenstein, Satya Mohanty, Jacqui Alexander, Lisa Lowe, Margo Okazawa-Rey, and Beverly Guy-Sheftall. Thanks also to Sue Kim for her careful and critical reading of "Under Western Eyes." Zillah Eisenstein's friendship has been crucial in my writing this chapter; she was the first person to suggest I do so.

2 "Under Western Eyes" has enjoyed a remarkable life, being reprinted almost every year since 1986 when it first appeared in the left journal *Boundary 2*. The essay has been translated into German, Dutch, Chinese, Russian, Italian, Swedish, French, and Spanish. It has appeared in feminist, postcolonial, Third World, and cultural studies journals and anthologies and maintains a presence in women's studies, cultural studies, anthropology, ethnic studies, political science, education and sociology curricula. It has been widely cited, sometimes seriously engaged with, sometimes misread, and sometimes used as an enabling framework for cross-cultural feminist projects.

3 Thanks to Zillah Eisenstein for this distinction.

4 Here is how I defined "Western feminist" then: "Clearly Western feminist discourse and political practice is neither singular or homogeneous in its goals, interests, or analyses. However, it is possible to trace a coherence of effects resulting from the implicit assumption of 'the West' (in all its complexities and contradictions) as the primary referent in theory and praxis. My reference to 'Western feminism' is by no means intended to imply that it is a monolith. Rather, I am attempting to draw attention to the similar effects of various textual strategies used by writers which codify Others as non-Western and hence themselves as (implicitly) Western." I suggested then that while terms such as "First" and "Third World" were problematic in suggesting oversimplified similarities as well as flattening internal differences, I continued to use them because this was the terminology available to us then. I used the terms with full knowledge of their limitations, suggesting a critical and heuristic rather than nonquestioning use of the terms. I come back to these terms later in this chapter.

5 My use of the categories "Western" and "Third World" feminist shows that these are not embodied, geographically or spatially defined categories. Rather, they refer to political and analytic sites and methodologies used—just as a woman from the geographical Third World can be a Western feminist in orientation, a European feminist can use a Third World feminist analytic perspective.

6 Rita Felski's analysis of the essay (Felski 1997) illustrates this. While she initially reads the essay as skeptical of any large-scale social theory (against generalization), she then goes on to say that in another context, my "emphasis on particularity is modified by a recognition of the value of systemic analyses of global disparities" (10). I think Felski's reading actually identifies a vagueness in my essay. It is this point that I hope to illuminate now. A similar reading claims, "The very

structure against which Mohanty argues in 'Under Western Eyes'—a homogenized Third World and an equivalent First World—somehow remanifests itself in 'Cartographies of Struggle'" (Mohanram 1999, 91). Here I believe Radhika Mohanram conflates the call for specificity and particularity as working against the mapping of systemic global inequalities. Her other critique of this essay is more persuasive, and I take it up later.

7 See for instance the reprinting and discussion of my work in Nicholson and Seidman 1995, Phillips 1998, and Warhol and Herndal 1997; and Phillips 1998.

8 I have written with Jacqui Alexander about some of the effects of hegemonic postmodernism on feminist studies; see the introduction to Alexander and Mohanty 1997.

9 To further clarify my position—I am not against all postmodernist insights or analytic strategies. I have found many postmodernist texts useful in my work. I tend to use whatever methodologies, theories, and insights I find illuminating in relation to the questions I want to examine—Marxist, postmodernist, postpositivist realist, and so on. What I want to do here, however, is take responsibility for making explicit some of the political choices I made at that time—and to identify the discursive hegemony of postmodernist thinking in the U.S. academy, which I believe forms the primary institutional context in which "Under Western Eyes" is read.

10 Dirlik, "The Local in the Global," in Dirlik 1997.

11 Esteva and Prakash (1998, 16–17) define these categorizations thus: The "social minorities" are those groups in both the North and the South that share homogeneous ways of modern (Western) life all over the world. Usually, they adopt as their own the basic paradigms of modernity. They are also usually classified as the upper classes of every society and are immersed in economic society: the so-called formal sector. The "social majorities" have no regular access to most of the goods and services defining the average "standard of living" in the industrial countries. Their definitions of "a good life," shaped by their local traditions, reflect their capacities to flourish outside the "help" offered by "global forces." Implicitly or explicitly they neither "need" nor are dependent on the bundle of "goods" promised by these forces. They, therefore, share a common freedom in their rejection of "global forces."

12 I am not saying that native feminists consider capitalism irrelevant to their struggles (nor would Mohanram say this). The work of Winona La Duke, Haunani-Kay Trask, and Anna Marie James Guerrero offers very powerful critiques of capitalism and the effects of its structural violence in the lives of native communities. See Guerrero 1997; La Duke 1999; and Trask 1999.

13 In fact, we now even have debates about the "future of women's studies" and the "impossibility of women's studies." See the Web site "The Future of Women's Studies," Women's Studies Program, University of Arizona, 2000 at http://infocenter.ccit.arizona.edu/~ws/conference; and Brown 1997.

14 See, for instance, the work of Ella Shohat, Lisa Lowe, Aihwa Ong, Uma Narayan,

Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, Chela Sandoval, Avtar Brah, Lila Abu-Lughod, Jacqui Alexander, Kamala Kempadoo, and Saskia Sassen.

15 See the works of Maria Mies, Cynthia Enloe, Zillah Eisenstein, Saskia Sassen, and Dorothy Smith (for instance, those listed in the bibliography) for similar methodological approaches. An early, pioneering example of this perspective can be found in the "Black Feminist" statement by the Combahee River Collective in the early 1980s.

16 See discussions of epistemic privilege in the essays by Mohanty, Moya, and Macdonald in Moya and Hames-Garcia 2000.

17 Examples of women of color in the fight against environmental racism can be found in the organization Mothers of East Los Angeles (see Pardo 2001), the magazine ColorLines, and Voces Unidas, the newsletter of the SouthWest Organizing project, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

18 See Shiva, Jafri, Bedi, and Holla-Bhar 1997. For a provocative argument about indigenous knowledges, see Dei and Sefa 2000.

19 In what follows I use the terms "global capitalism," "global restructuring," and "globalization" interchangeably to refer to a process of corporate global economic, ideological, and cultural reorganization across the borders of nation-states.

20 While the initial push for "internationalization" of the curriculum in U.S. higher education came from the federal government's funding of area studies programs during the cold war, in the post–cold war period it is private foundations like the MacArthur, Rockefeller, and Ford foundations that have been instrumental in this endeavor—especially in relation to the women's studies curriculum.

21 This work consists of participating in a number of reviews of women's studies programs, reviewing essays, syllabi, and manuscripts on feminist pedagogy and curricula, and topical workshops and conversations with feminist scholars and teachers over the last ten years.

22 Ella Shohat refers to this as the "sponge/additive" approach that extends U.S.-centered paradigms to "others" and produces a "homogeneous feminist master narrative." See Shohat 2001, 1269–72.

23 For an incisive critique of cultural relativism and its epistemological underpinnings see Mohanty 1997, chapter 5.

24 It is also important to examine and be cautious about the latent nationalism of race and ethnic studies and of women's and gay and lesbian studies in the United States.

25 A new anthology contains some good examples of what I am referring to as a feminist solidarity or comparative feminist studies model. See Lay, Monk, and Rosenfelt 2002.

26 See Dirlik, "Borderlands Radicalism," in Dirlik 1994. See the distinction between "postcolonial studies" and "postcolonial thought": while postcolonial thought has much to say about questions of local and global economies, postcolonial studies has not always taken these questions on board (Loomba 1998–99). I am

using Ania Loomba's formulation here, but many progressive critics of postcolonial studies have made this basic point. It is an important distinction, and I think it can be argued in the case of feminist thought and feminist studies (women's studies) as well.

27 While I know no other work that conceptualizes this pedagogical strategy in the ways I am doing here, my work is very similar to that of scholars like Ella Shohat, Jacqui Alexander, Susan Sanchez-Casal, and Amie Macdonald.

28 See especially the work of Satya Mohanty, Paula Moya, Linda Alcoff, and Shari Stone-Mediatore.

29 The epigraph to this section is taken from Eisenstein 1998b, 161. This book remains one of the smartest, most accessible, and complex analyses of the color, class, and gender of globalization.

30 The literature on gender and globalization is vast, and I do not pretend to review it in any comprehensive way. I draw on three particular texts to critically summarize what I consider to be the most useful and provocative analyses of this area: Eisenstein 1998b; Marchand and Runyan 2000; and Basu et al. 2001.

31 See essays in Kempadoo and Doezema 1998; and Puar 2001.

32 For similar arguments, see also Bergeron 2001 and Freeman 2001.

33 Discourses of globalization include the proglobalization narratives of neoliberalism and privatization, but they also include antiglobalization discourses produced by progressives, feminists, and activists in the antiglobalization movement.

34 There is also an emerging feminist scholarship that complicates these monolithic "globalized" representations of women. See Amy Lind's work on Ecuadorian women's organizations (2000), Aili Marie Tripp's work on women's social networks in Tanzania (2002), and Kimberly Chang and L. H. M. Ling's (2000) and Aihwa Ong's work on global restructuring in the Asia Pacific regions (1987 and 1991).

35 This description is drawn from Brecher, Costello, and Smith 2000. Much of my analysis of antiglobalization movements is based on this text, and on material from magazines like ColorLines, Z Magazine, Monthly Review, and SWOP Newsletter.