Chandra Talpade Mohanty

“Under Western Eyes” Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles

I write this essay 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 essay to write, and I undertake it hesitantly and with humilityÑyet 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.

ÒUnder Western EyesÓ (1986) was not only my very first Òfeminist studiesÓ publication; it remains the one that marks my presence in the international feminist community.[1] I had barely completed my Ph.D. when I wrote this essay; I am now a professor of womenÕs studies. The ÒunderÓ of Western eyes is now much more an ÒinsideÓ in terms of my own location in the U.S. academy.[2] The site from which I wrote the essay consisted of a very vibrant, transnational womenÕs movement, while the site I write from today is quite different. With the increasing privatization and corporatization

This essay owes much to many years of conversation and collaboration with Zillah Eisenstein, Satya Mohanty, Jacqui Alexander, Lisa Lowe, Margo Okazawa-Rey, Beverly Guy-Sheftall, and Susan Sanchez-Casal. Thanks to Zillah, Satya, and Susan for their thoughtful responses to early drafts of this essay. Many thanks also to the generous feedback and critical engagement of students and faculty at the U.S. colleges and schools where I have presented these ideas.

[1] ÒUnder Western EyesÓ has enjoyed a remarkable life, being reprinted almost every year since 1986 when it first appeared in the left journal*Boundary 2*(1986). 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 womenÕs 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.

[2] Thanks to Zillah Eisenstein for this distinction.

of public life, it has become much harder to discern such a womenÕs movement from the United States (although womenÕs 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, womenÕs 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 inßuenced by the primary site I occupy as an educator and scholar. It is time to revisit ÒUnder Western Eyes,Ó 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-Þrst century, to ask the question: How would ÒUnder Western EyesÓÑthe Third World inside and outside the WestÑbe explored and analyzed 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 ÒUnder Western EyesÓ and my own travels through transnational feminist scholarship and networks, I begin with a summary of the central arguments of ÒUnder Western Eyes,Ó 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, Þrst, 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-Þrst 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 identiÞcation have changed since 1986? What has remained the same? I wish to begin a dialogue between the intentions, effects, and political choices that underwrote ÒUnder Western EyesÓ 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 ÒUnder Western EyesÓ to discover and articulate a critique of

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 reÞnes 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 ofeminirem85-0.1(emin5(m,nir)-10(ultimges1(femin5for)5(questio(f

read and utilized.[5] 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 Þrm belief in the importance of the particular in relation to the universalÑa belief in the local as specifying and illuminating the universal. My concerns drew attention to the dichotomies embraced and identiÞed with this universalized framework, the critique of Òwhite feminismÓ by women of color and the critique of ÒWestern feminismÓ 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 inßuential feminist scholarship and in the mainstream womenÕs 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

I Þnd 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

points out the differences between a ÒmulticulturalÓ understanding of nation (prevalent in the United States) and a call for a ÒbiculturalÓ 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, PaciÞc Islander. However, Maori women see multiculturalismÑalliances with Asian womenÑas undermining indigenous rights and biculturalism and prefer to ally themselves with Pakeha (white, Anglo-Celtic people [Mohanram 1999, 92Ð96]).

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 womenÕs 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 ÒWesternÓ and ÒThird World.Ó[11] But they become visible and even central to the deÞnition of One-Third/Two-Thirds Worldsbecause indigenous claims for sovereignty, their lifeways and environmental and spiritual practices, situate them as central to the deÞnition of social majority (Two-Thirds World). While a mere shift in conceptual terms is not a complete

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 phenomenonÑas is the simultaneous rollback of the gains made by race and ethnic studies departments in the 1970s and 1980s. WomenÕs studies is now a well-established Þeld of study with over eight hundred degree-granting programs and departments in the U.S. academy.[12] Feminist theory and feminist movements across national borders have matured substantially since the early 1980s, and there is now a greater visibility of transnational womenÕs 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 signiÞcance of transnational institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and governing bodies such as the European Union, not to mention forproÞt corporations. Of the worldÕs largest economies, Þfty-one happen to be corporations, not countries, and Amnesty International now reports on corporations as well as nations (Eisenstein 1998, 1). Also, the hegemony of neoliberalism, alongside the naturalization of capitalist values, inßuences the ability to make choices on oneÕs 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 Òinformational highwayÓ as well as the increasing militarization (and masculinization) of the globe, accompanied by the growth of the prison industrial complex in the United States, pose 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

[12] In fact, we now even have debates about the Òfuture of womenÕs studiesÓ and the Òimpossibility of womenÕs studies.Ó See the Web site ÒThe Future of WomenÕs StudiesÓ of the WomenÕs Studies Program of the University of Arizona, Tucson, 2000, at http://info-center.ccit.arizona.edu/˜ws/conference; and Brown 1997.

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.[13] Eurocentric analytic paradigms continue to ßourish, 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.

visible, to draw attention to what was left out of feminist theorizing, namely, the material complexity, reality, and agency of Third World womenÕs 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 womenÕs 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 womenÑpoor women of all colors in afßuent and neocolonial nations; women of the Third World/South or the Two-Thirds World. [14] 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 Òspecial interestÓ 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.

[14] See the works of Zillah Eisenstein, Maria Mies, Dorothy Smith, Cynthia Enloe, and Saskia Sassen (e.g., Eisenstein 1978, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2001; Mies 1982, 1986; Smith 1987; Enloe 1990, 1993; and Sassen 1991, 1996, 1998) for similar methodological approaches. An early, pioneering example of this perspective can be found in the ÒBlack FeministÓ statement by the Combahee River Collective in the early 1980s (1982).

the World Trade Organization since 1995.[17] 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 deÞnition of Western scientiÞc epistemologies as the only legitimate scientiÞc 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:

> Through 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. (Shiva, Gordon, and Wing 2000, 32)

The contrast between Western scientiÞc systems and indigenous epistemologies and systems of medicine is not the only issue here. It is the colonialist and corporate power to deÞne Western science, and the reliance on capitalist values of private property and proÞt, 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 scientiÞc 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 beneÞt of all, not owned privately, is the very opposite of the

[17] See Shiva et al. 1997. For a provocative argie d40.1(0)6.2(gie s268(is)igenoues)-35 notonis7.5

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.

ShivaÕs 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 Òreads upÓ 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 womenÕs work and knowledges anchored in the epistemological experiences of one of the most marginalized communities of women in the worldÑpoor, 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 proÞt-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 proÞt that is a basis for corporate interests. The obvious issue for a transnational feminism pertains to the visions of proÞt and justice embodied in these opposing analytic perspectives. The focus on proÞt 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 proÞt 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 Þnancial 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 worldÕs poor and the majority of the worldÕs refugees. Girls and women comprise almost 80 percent of displaced persons of the Third World/South in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Women do two-thirds of the worldÕs work and earn less than one-tenth of its income. Women own less than one-hundredth of the worldÕs property, while they are the hardest hit by the effects of war, domestic violence, and religious persecution. Feminist political theorist Zillah Eisenstein states that 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 redeÞned citizens as consumersÑand global markets replace the commitments to economic, sexual, and racial equality (Eisenstein 1998, esp. chap. 5).

It is especially on the bodies and lives of women and girls from the Third World/SouthÑthe Two-Thirds WorldÑthat 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

struggles of marginalized communities connects to larger antiglobalization struggles. Boggs suggests that Òplace 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 doesnÕt 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 health and safety of people and placesÓ (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 ShivaÕs 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 dimensionsÑand 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 girlsÕ and womenÕs lives, although I am committed to the lives of all exploited peoples. However, the speciÞcity of girlsÕ and womenÕs 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 reconÞgures 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 weÑfeminist scholars and teachersÑmust respond to the phenomenon of globalization as an urgent site for the recolonization of peoples, especially in the Two-Thirds World. Globalization colonizes womenÕs as well as menÕs 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 womenÕs 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

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 speciÞc sites where knowledge about globalization is produced. The Þrst site is a pedagogical one and involves an analysis of the various strategies being used to internationalize (or globalize) the womenÕs studies curriculum in U.S. colleges and universities.[18] I argue that this move to internationalize womenÕs studies curricula and the attendant pedagogies that ßow 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 ßowing 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 antiglobalization 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 Òinternationalizing Ó the womenÕs studies curriculum. The problem of Òthe (gendered) color lineÓ remains, but is more easily seen today as developments of transnational and global capital. While I choose to focus on womenÕs studies curricula, my arguments hold for curricula in any discipline or academic Þeld that seeks to internationalize or globalize its curriculum. I argue that the challenge for ÒinternationalizingÓ womenÕs studies is no different from the one involved in ÒracializingÓ womenÕs studies in the 1980s, for very similar politics of knowledge come into play here.[19]

So the question I want to foreground is the politics of knowledge in bridging the ÒlocalÓ and the ÒglobalÓ in womenÕs studies. How we teach the ÒnewÓ scholarship in womenÕs 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 storyÑor tell many stories.

[18] 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.

[19] While the initial push for ÒinternationalizationÓ of the curriculum in U.S. higher education came from the federal governmentÕs funding of area studies programs during the cold war, in the postÐcold-war period it is private foundations like the MacArthur, Rockefeller, and Ford foundations that have been instrumental in this endeavorÑespecially in relation to the womenÕs studies curriculum.

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,[20] I describe three pedagogical models used in ÒinternationalizingÓ the womenÕs 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 womenÕs agency, and of national identity, and each curricular model presents different stories and ways of crossing borders and building bridges. I suggest that a Òcomparative feminist studiesÓ or Òfeminist solidarityÓ 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 speciÞc context to construct a real notion of the universal and of democratization rather than colonization. It is through this model that we can put into practice the idea of Òcommon differencesÓ 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.[21] 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 womenÕs studies gaze. In other words, the Òadd women as global victims or powerful women and stirÓ perspective. This is a perspective in which the primary Euro-American unive8(lear)-tus remains untouched, and exampl
World/South cultures are used to supplement and ÒaddÓ to this
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 localdeÞned as self, Western) and the global (deÞned as other, non-Western, and transnational). Thus the local is always

[20] This work consists of participating in a numberreviews ve.i187.6(womenÕs)-181.3(s)-0.1(tudies)-150(pr)-6.3(ograms;)]TJ -2.668
workshops and conversations with feminist scholars and teachers over the last ten years.

[21] Er Shohat refers to this as the Òsponge/addiveapproach that extends U.S.-centered

grounded in nationalist assumptionsÑthe 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)Ñjust 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 conÞrms the sense of the Òevolved U.S./Euro feminist.Ó While there is now more consciousness about not using an Òadd and stirÓ method in teaching about race and U.S. women of color, this does not appear to be the case in ÒinternationalizingÓ womenÕs 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, womenÕs lives and struggles outside

categories located elsewhere. Distance from ÒhomeÓ is fundamental to the deÞnition 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 Òus and themÓ attitude, but unlike the tourist model, the explorer perspective can provide a deeper, more contextual understanding of feminist issues in discretely deÞned 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 deÞnition 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.[22]

In womenÕs studies curricula this pedagogical strategy is often seen as the most culturally sensitive way to ÒinternationalizeÓ the curriculum. For instance, entire courses on ÒWomen in Latin AmericaÓ or ÒThird World WomenÕs LiteratureÓ or ÒPostcolonial FeminismÓ are added on to the predominantly U.S.-based curriculum as a way to ÒglobalizeÓ the feminist knowledge 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.[23] The United States is not seen as part of Òarea studies,Ó 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 Òout there,Ó 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 Þelds, especially as they relate to the logic of global capitalism. In addition, as Ella Shohat argues, it is time to Òreimagine the study of regions and cultures in a way that transcends the conceptual borders inherent in the global cartography of the cold warÓ (2001, 1271). The Þeld of American studies is an interesting location to examine here, especially because of its more recent focus on U.S. imperialism. However, American studies rarely falls under the purview of Òarea studies.Ó

[22] For an incisive critique of cultural relativism and its epistemological underpinnings, see Mohanty 1997, chap. 5.

[23] It is also important to examine and be cautious about the latent nationalism of race and ethnic studies and of womenÕs and gay and lesbian studies in the United States.

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 racismÑas 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 Òworld culturesÓ 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 deÞned 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 womenÕs studies course isÑand it assumes both distance and proximity (speciÞc/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, coresponsibility, 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 Òadd and stirÓ and the relativist Òseparate but equalÓ (or different) perspective to the coimplication/solidarity one. This solidarity perspective requires understanding the historical and experiential speciÞcities and differences of womenÕs 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

its focus on mutuality and common interests, it requires one to formulate questions about connection and disconnection between activist womenÕs 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.[25] 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 speciÞc Òcommon differencesÓ as the basis for analysis and soli-

[25] See ÒBorderlands Radicalism,Ó in Dirlik 1994. See also the distinction between Òpostcolonial studiesÓ and Òpostcolonial thoughtÓ: 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 1998Ð99). I am using Ania LoombaÕs 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 (womenÕs studies) as well.

darity. 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.[26]

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 ÒtruthÓ but because they can destabilize received truths and locate debate in the complexities and contradictions of historical life.

hensive 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 womenÕs 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 ÒrealÓ 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 the 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 reÞgured 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.[29] 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 womenÑpoor, Third and Two-Thirds World, working-class, and immigrant/migrant womenÑare the preferred workers in these global, Òßexible Ó 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 Òmaid tradeÓ (Parreñas 2001) and in international sex traÞcking and tourism.[30] Many global cities now require and completely depend on the service and domestic labor of immigrant and migrant women. The proliferation of structural

---

one of the smartest, most accessible, and complex analyses of the color, class, and gender of globalization.

[29] 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 1998; Marchand and Runyan 2000; and Basu et al. 2001.

[30] See essays in Kempadoo and Doezema 1999 and Puar 2001.

adjustment policies around the world has reprivatized womenÕs 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

the former masculinized (13) and that this gendering naturalizes the hierarchies required for globalization to succeed. Charlotte Hooper (2000) identiÞes an emerging hegemonic Anglo-American masculinity through processes of global restructuringÑa masculinity that affects men and women workers in the global economy.[31] 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 ÒglobalizedÓ representations of women. Just as there is an Anglo-American masculinity produced in and by discourses of gloabalization,[32] 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 womenÕs 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 identiÞed 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

advocate, the revolutionary militant and the corporate bureaucratÑthere 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-Þrst century.[33]

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 Þve years have proven that one does not have to be a multinational corporation, controller of Þnancial capital, or transnational governing institution to cross national borders. These movements form an important site for examining the construction of transborder democratic citizenship. But Þrst 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, peopleÕs movements against the International Monetary Fund and World Bank for debt cancellation 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, indigenous rights, etc.) and the transformed U.S. labor movement of the 1990s also play a signiÞcant part in terms of the history of antiglobalization movements.[34]

While women are present as leaders and participants in most of these antiglobalization movements, a feminist agenda only emerges in the post-Beijing ÒwomenÕs rights as human rightsÓ movement and in some peace and environmental justice movements. In other words, while girls and

[33] There is also an emerging feminist scholarship that complicates these monolithic Òglobalized Ó representations of women. See Amy LindÕs work on Ecuadorian womenÕs organizations (2000); Aili Marie TrippÕs work on womenÕs social networks in Tanzania (2002); and Aihwa OngÕs (1987) and Kimberly Chang and L. H. M. LingÕs (2000) work on global restructuring in the Asia PaciÞc regions.

[34] 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

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 womenÕs movements, the earlier Òsisterhood is globalÓ form of internationalization of the womenÕs movement has now shifted into the Òhuman rightsÓ arena. This shift in language from ÒfeminismÓ to ÒwomenÕs rightsÓ can be called the mainstreaming of the feminist movementÑa (successful) attempt to raise the issue of violence against women onto 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 ShivaÕs analysis of the WTO and biopiracy from the epistemological place of Indian tribal and peasant women illustrates this claim, as does Grace Lee BoggsÕs notion of Òplace-based civic activismÓ (2000, 19). Similarly, in the anticorporate consumer movements and in the small farmer movements against agribusiness and the antisweatshop movements, it is womenÕs 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 womenÕs 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 Hooper (2000) and Marchand and Runyan (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 Þght against global capitalism, racialized gender is still an unmarked category. Racialized gender is signiÞcant in this instance because capitalism utilizes the raced and sexed bodies of women in its search for proÞt 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 non-hierarchy, 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 difÞcult 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-reßexive 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 worldÑto 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 Þxed. Our minds must be as ready to move as capital is, to trace its paths and to imagine alternative destinations.

References

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

Alcoff, Linda. 2000. ÒWhoÕs Afraid of Identity Politics?Ó In Moya and Hames-Garcia 2000, 312Ð44.

Alexander, M. Jacqui. Forthcoming. Pedagogies of Crossing. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

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

Basu, Amrita, Inderpal Grewal, Caren Kaplan, and Liisa Malkki, eds. 2001. ÒGlobalization and Gender,Ó special issue of Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, vol. 26, no. 4.

Bergeron, Suzanne. 2001. ÒPolitical Economy Discourses of Globalization and Feminist Politics.Ó Signs 26(4):983Ð1006.

Boggs, Grace Lee. 2000. ÒSchool Violence: A Question of Place.Ó Monthly Review 52(2):18Ð20.

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

Brecher, Jeremy, Tim Costello, and Brendan Smith. 2000. Globalization from Below: The Power of Solidarity. Cambridge, Mass.: South End.

Brown, Wendy. 1997. ÒThe Impossibility of WomenÕs Studies.Ó Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies 9(3):79Ð101.

Chang, Kimberly, and L. H. M. Ling. 2000. ÒGlobalization and Its Intimate Other: Filipina Domestic Workers in Hong Kong.Ó In Marchand and Runyan 2000, 27Ð43.

Combahee River Collective. 1982. ÒA Black Feminist Statement.Ó Reprinted in All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave, ed. Gloria T. Hull, Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith. Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press.

Davis, Angela, and Gina Dent. 2001. ÒPrison as a Border: A Conversation on Gender, Globalization, and Punishment.Ó Signs 26(4):1235Ð41.

Dei, George J. Sefa. 2000. ÒRethinking the Role of Indigenous Knowledges in the Academy.Ó International Journal of Inclusive Education 4(2):111Ð33.

Dirlik, Arif. 1994. After the Revolution: Waking to Global Capitalism. Hanover, N.H.: Wesleyan University Press.

ÑÑÑ. 1997. The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

ÑÑÑ. 1999. ÒPlace-Based Imagination: Globalism and the Politics of Place.Ó Review: A Journal of the Ferdinand Braudel Center for the Study of Economics, Historical Systems, and Civilizations 22(2):151Ð87.

Eisenstein, Zillah. 1978. Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Freedom. New York: Monthly Review.

ÑÑÑ. 1994. The Color of Gender: Reimagining Democracy. Berkeley: University of California Press.
ÑÑÑ. 1996. Hatreds: Racialized and Sexualized Con icts in the Twenty-First Century. New York: Routledge.
ÑÑÑ. 1998. Global Obscenities: Patriarchy, Capitalism, and the Lure of Cyberfantasy. New York: New York University Press.
ÑÑÑ. 2001. Manmade Breast Cancers. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
Enloe, Cynthia. 1990. Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics. Berkeley: University of California Press.
ÑÑÑ. 1993. The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Esteva, Gustavo, and Madhu Suri Prakash. 1998. Grassroots Post-modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures. London: Zed.
Felski, Rita. 1997. ÒThe Doxa of Difference.Ó Signs 23(1):1Ð21.
Fernandez-Kelly, Patricia, and Diane Wolf. 2001. ÒA Dialogue on Globalization.Ó Signs 26(4):1243Ð49.
Freeman, Carla. 2001. ÒIs Local : Global as Feminine : Masculine? Rethinking the Gender of Globalization.Ó Signs 26(4):1007Ð39.
ÒThe Future of WomenÕs Studies.Ó 2000. University of Arizona, Tuscon, WomenÕs Studies Department; available on-line at http://info-center.ccit.Arizona.edu/~ws/conference.html.
Grewal, Inderpal, and Caren Kaplan, eds. 1994. Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Guerrero, Marie Anna Jaimes. 1997. ÒCivil Rights versus Sovereignty: Native American Women in Life and Land Struggles.Ó In Alexander and Mohanty 1997, 101Ð25.
Hooper, Charlotte. 2000. ÒMasculinities in Transition: The Case of Globalization.Ó In Marchand and Runyan 2000, 59Ð73.
Kempadoo, Kamala. 1998. ÒIntroduction: Globalizing Sex WorkersÕ Rights.Ó In Kempadoo and Doezema 1998, 1Ð28.
Kempadoo, Kamala, and Jo Doezema, eds. 1998. Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Rede nition. New York: Routledge.
La Duke, Winona. 1999. All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life. Cambridge, Mass.: South End.
Lay, Mary M., Janice J. Monk, and Deborah Silverton Rosenfelt, eds. 2002. Encompassing Gender: Integrating International Studies and Women's Studies. New York: Feminist Press at the CUNY Press.
Lind, Amy. 2000. ÒNegotiating Boundaries: WomenÕs Organizations and the Politics of Restructuring in Ecuador.Ó In Marchand and Runyan 2000, 161Ð75.
Loomba, Ania. 1998Ð99. ÒPostcolonialism Ñor Postcolonial Studies.Ó Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies 1(1):39Ð42.
Lowe, Lisa. 1996. Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

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

Macdonald, Amie A. 2000. ÒRacial Authenticity and White Separatism: The Future of Racial Program Housing on College Campuses.Ó In Moya and Hames-Garcia 2000, 205Ð28.

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

Mies, Maria. 1982. The Lace Makers of Narsaspur: Indian Housewives Produce for the World Market. London: Zed.

ÑÑÑ. 1986. Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour. London: Zed.

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

Mohanram, Radhika. 1999.

Puar, Jasbir Kaur. 2001. ÒGlobal Circuits: Transnational Sexualities and Trinidad.Ó Signs26(4):1039Ð67.

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

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

Sassen, Saskia. 1991.The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo.Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

ÑÑÑ. 1996. ÒNew Employment Regimes in Cities: The Impact on Immigrant Workers.ÓJournal of Ethnic and Minority Studies(JEMS) 22(4):579Ð94.

ÑÑÑ. 1998. Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money.New York: New Press.

Shiva, Vandana, Rebecca Gordon, and Bob Wing. 2000. ÒGlobal Brahmanism: The Meaning of the WTO Protests: An Interview with Dr. Vandana Shiva.Ó ColorLines: Race, Color, Action3(2):30Ð32.

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

Shohat, Ella, ed. 1998.Talking Visions: Multicultural Feminism in Transnational Age. New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art.

ÑÑÑ. 2001. ÒArea Studies, Transnationalism, and the Feminist Production of Knowledge.ÓSigns26(4):1269Ð72.

Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. 1994.Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media.New York: Routledge.

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

Stone-Mediatore, Shari. Forthcoming.Reading across Borders.New York: Palgrave.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. 1993.From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Monroe, Maine: Common Courage.

Tripp, Aili Marie. 2002. ÒCombining Intercontinental Parenting and Research: Dilemmas and Strategies for Women.ÓSigns27(3):793Ð811.

Walby, Sylvia. 2000. ÒBeyond the Politics of Location: The Power of Argument.Ó Feminist Theory1(2):109Ð207.

Warhol, RobynKnowledge,