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 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" (1986) was not only my very first "feminist studies" 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 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.[2] 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

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] "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* (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 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.

[2] Thanks to Zillah Eisenstein for this distinction.

[*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 2002, vol. 28, no. 2]
0097-9740/2003/2802-0001$10.00

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 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 narrow 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."[3]

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 (1982) 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

[3] 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" (Mohanty 1986, 334). 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 essay.

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. (Walby 2000, 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.[4] Yet, this is often how the essay has been

[4] 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.

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 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

[5] Rita Felski's analysis of the essay (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.

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.[6] In fact, one reason to revisit "Under Western Eyes" at this time is my desire to point to this postmodernist appropriation.[7] 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 Michel 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 (1982) 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 "commonality," 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.[8] Now I find

[6] See, e.g., the reprinting and discussion of my work in Nicholson and Seidman 1995; Warhol and Herndal 1997; and Phillips 1998.

[7] 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.

[8] 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

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 "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.[9]

---

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.

[9] "The Local in the Global," in Dirlik 1997.

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.[10] 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

[10] 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.'"

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."[11] 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-Third World, but from the space and vision of, and in solidarity with, communities in struggle in the Two-Thirds World.

[11] I am not saying that native feminists consider capitalism irrelevant to their struggles (nor would Mohanram say this). The work of Marie Anna Jaimes Guerrero, Winona La Duke, and Huanani-Kay Trask 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.

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 departments 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.[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 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 (WTO) and governing bodies such as the European Union, not to mention 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 1998, 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 "informational 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, 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 "future of women's studies" and the "impossibility of women's studies." See the Web site "The Future of Women's Studies" of the Women's Studies Program of the University of Arizona, Tucson, 2000, at http://infocenter.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 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 distinction between "Western" and "Third World" feminist practices, and while I downplayed the commonalities between these two positions, my focus now is on what I have chosen to call an anticapitalist transnational feminist practice—and on the possibilities, indeed on the necessities, of cross-national 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

[13] See, e.g., the work of Aihwa Ong (1987); Saskia Sassen (1991, 1998); Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan (1994); Ella Shohat (1998, 2001, [with Robert Stam] 1994); Avtar Brah (1996); Lisa Lowe (1996, [with David Lloyd] 1997); Uma Narayan (1997); Lila Abu-Lughod (1998); Kamala Kempadoo (1998); Chela Sandoval (2000); Jacqui Alexander (forthcoming).

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.[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 "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.

[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 "Black Feminist" statement by the Combahee River Collective in the early 1980s (1982).

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.[15] 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 analyze 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 allows the kind of analysis of the power structure that has led to the many victories in environmental racism struggles.[16] 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

[15] See discussions of epistemic privilege in the essays by S. Mohanty (2000), Moya (2000), and Macdonald (2000) in Moya and Hames-Garcia 2000; see esp. 58–62, 80–87, and 211–12.

[16] Examples of women of color in the fight against environmental racism can be found in MELA (see Pardo 2001), the magazine *ColorLines,* and *Voces Unidas,* the newsletter of the South West Organizing project, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

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 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:

> 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 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

[17] See Shiva et al. 1997. For a provocative argument about indigeneous knowledges, see Dei 2000.

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 displaced persons of the Third World/South in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Women do two-thirds of the world's work and earn less than one-tenth of its income. 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 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 redefined citizens as consumers—and 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/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" (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 "place 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 health 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) the women's studies curriculum in U.S. colleges and universities.[18] 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 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 "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.[19]

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.

[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 "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.

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 "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 the 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.[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 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

[20] 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.

[21] 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.

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.[22]

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 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 "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 because of its more recent focus on U.S. imperialism. However, American studies rarely falls under the purview of "area studies."

[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 women's 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 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, 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 "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.[24]

I refer to this model as the feminist solidarity model because, besides

[24] 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.

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.[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 specific "common differences" as the basis for analysis and soli-

[25] See "Borderlands Radicalism," in Dirlik 1994. See also 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.

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 "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.[27] 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.[28] Instead of attempting a compre-

[26] 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 (1998, 2001), Susan Sanchez-Casal and Amie Macdonald (2002), and Jacqui Alexander (forthcoming).

[27] See, especially, the work of Satya Mohanty (1997, 2001), Linda Alcoff (2000), Paula Moya (2002), and Shari Stone-Mediatore (forthcoming).

[28] The epigraph to this section is taken from Eisenstein 1998, 161. This book remains

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 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 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 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.[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 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.[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 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.[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 "globalized" 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 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

[31] For similar arguments, see also Bergeron 2001 and Freeman 2001.

[32] 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.

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.[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 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 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 significant 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 "women's rights as human rights" 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 "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 Aihwa Ong's (1987) and Kimberly Chang and L. H. M. Ling's (2000) work on global restructuring in the Asia Pacific 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 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" can be called the mainstreaming of the feminist movement—a (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 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" (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 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 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 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 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.

References

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

Alcoff, Linda. 2000. "Who's Afraid of Identity Politics?" In Moya and Hames-Garcia 2000, 312–44.

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. "Globalization and Gender," special issue of *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* vol. 26, no. 4.

Bergeron, Suzanne. 2001. "Political Economy Discourses of Globalization and Feminist Politics." *Signs* 26(4):983–1006.

Boggs, Grace Lee. 2000. "School Violence: A Question of Place." *Monthly Review* 52(2):18–20.

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. "The Impossibility of Women's Studies." *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 9(3):79–101.

Chang, Kimberly, and L. H. M. Ling. 2000. "Globalization and Its Intimate Other: Filipina Domestic Workers in Hong Kong." In Marchand and Runyan 2000, 27–43.

Combahee River Collective. 1982. "A Black Feminist Statement." 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. "Prison as a Border: A Conversation on Gender, Globalization, and Punishment." *Signs* 26(4):1235–41.

Dei, George J. Sefa. 2000. "Rethinking the Role of Indigenous Knowledges in the Academy." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 4(2):111–33.

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

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

———. 1999. "Place-Based Imagination: Globalism and the Politics of Place." *Review: A Journal of the Ferdinand Braudel Center for the Study of Economics, Historical Systems, and Civilizations* 22(2):151–87.

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

———. 1994. *The Color of Gender: Reimagining Democracy.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. 1996. *Hatreds: Racialized and Sexualized Conflicts in the Twenty-First Century.* New York: Routledge.
———. 1998. *Global Obscenities: Patriarchy, Capitalism, and the Lure of Cyberfantasy.* New York: New York University Press.
———. 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.
———. 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. "The Doxa of Difference." *Signs* 23(1):1–21.
Fernández-Kelly, Patricia, and Diane Wolf. 2001. "A Dialogue on Globalization." *Signs* 26(4):1243–49.
Freeman, Carla. 2001. "Is Local : Global as Feminine : Masculine? Rethinking the Gender of Globalization." *Signs* 26(4):1007–39.
"The Future of Women's Studies." 2000. University of Arizona, Tuscon, Women's 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. "Civil Rights versus Sovereignty: Native American Women in Life and Land Struggles." In Alexander and Mohanty 1997, 101–25.
Hooper, Charlotte. 2000. "Masculinities in Transition: The Case of Globalization." In Marchand and Runyan 2000, 59–73.
Kempadoo, Kamala. 1998. "Introduction: Globalizing Sex Workers' Rights." In Kempadoo and Doezema 1998, 1–28.
Kempadoo, Kamala, and Jo Doezema, eds. 1998. *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition.* 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. "Negotiating Boundaries: Women's Organizations and the Politics of Restructuring in Ecuador." In Marchand and Runyan 2000, 161–75.
Loomba, Ania. 1998–99. "Postcolonialism—or Postcolonial Studies." *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 1(1):39–42.
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. "Racial Authenticity and White Separatism: The Future of Racial Program Housing on College Campuses." In Moya and Hames-Garcia 2000, 205–28.

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.

———. 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. *Black Body: Women, Colonialism, and Space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1986. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Boundary 2* 12(3):333–58.

Mohanty, Satya P. 1997. *Literary Theory and the Claims of History: Postmodernism, Objectivity, Multicultural Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

———. 2000. "The Epistemic Status of Cultural Identity: On *Beloved* and the Postcolonial Condition." In Moya and Hames-Garcia 2000, 29–66.

———. 2001. "Can Our Values Be Objective? On Ethics, Esthetics, and Progressive Politics." *New Literary History* 34(4):803–33.

Moya, Paula. 2000. "Postmodernism, 'Realism,' and the Politics of Identity: Cherríe Moraga and Chicana Feminism." In Moya and Hames-Garcia 2000, 47–101.

———. 2002. *Learning from Experience: Politics, Epistemology, and Chicana/o Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Moya, Paula, and Michael Roy 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.

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

Ong, Aihwa. 1987. *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline: Factory Women in Malaysia*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

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

Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. 2001. "Transgressing the Nation State: The Partial Citizenship and 'Imagined Global Community' of Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers." *Signs* 26(4):1129–54.

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

Puar, Jasbir Kaur. 2001. "Global Circuits: Transnational Sexualities and Trinidad." *Signs* 26(4):1039–67.

Sánchez-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.

———. 1996. "New Employment Regimes in Cities: The Impact on Immigrant Workers." *Journal of Ethnic and Minority Studies* (*JEMS*) 22(4):579–94.

———. 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. "Global Brahmanism: The Meaning of the WTO Protests: An Interview with Dr. Vandana Shiva." *ColorLines: Race, Color, Action* 3(2):30–32.

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.

———. 2001. "Area Studies, Transnationalism, and the Feminist Production of Knowledge." *Signs* 26(4):1269–72.

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. "Combining Intercontinental Parenting and Research: Dilemmas and Strategies for Women." *Signs* 27(3):793–811.

Walby, Sylvia. 2000. "Beyond the Politics of Location: The Power of Argument." *Feminist Theory* 1(2):109–207.

Warhol, Robyn, and Diane Price Herndal. 1997. *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Supplementary References

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

Anti-capitalism. 2001. Special issue of *Socialist Review,* vol. 28, nos. 3–4.

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

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

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

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

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

Jhabvala, Renana. 1994. "Self-Employed Women's Association: Organizing 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,* ed. Sheila Rowbotham and Swasti Mitter, 114–38. New York: Routledge.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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