ADVANCES IN GENDER RESEARCH
VOLUME 11

SUSTAINABLE FEMINISMS

SONITA SARKER

Editor

INTRODUCTION: SUSTAINABLE FEMINISMS

Sonita Sarker

SUSTAINABILITY, FEMINISMS, AND WOMEN'S MOVEMENTS

The significance of feminisms appears and disappears from where you stand. In the 20th century, feminisms of different contexts have been the very basis of struggles for equity and justice at the same as time as they have faced charges of illegitimacy or irrelevance. As in the last century, the current era can be read not as the histories of feminisms only but as chronicles of feminisms intertwined unevenly with other movements for social, political, and economic justice. In this sense, feminisms have disappeared or metamorphosed.[1] Both verbs signify either that many feminisms are not recognizable as some had known or interpreted them to exist, or that they have altered beyond familiar shapes to forms that have displaced or substituted them. These transformations have led to debates on purist and reconstituted versions; these disputes have, in fact, maintained the vitality of feminisms.[2]

This volume emerges in the context of the general dismissal of and backlash against feminisms, uncertainties about the force that feminisms can have, their disputed status among women engaged in liberation struggles, to name some important circumstances. In the next section, I describe the specific contexts from which this volume arose but focus, for the moment, on the general environments of its existence. Today, feminisms exist within

and against the conditions of militarism, neoliberalism, accelerated inequities, and neoimperial fundamentalist structures. Within the overlapping territories of feminisms, moreover, most women's movements contest the terminology (feminism and its related vocabularies) and their embeddedness in histories of colonialism. The rejection of the term in some contexts and partial acceptance in others lies behind the title that addresses both the issue of sustainability and the choice of the word "feminisms."[3] To expand upon the title phrase, then, in two ways: one, the collection brings into contact women's movements with feminist movements in their common focus on structural change that involves paradigmatic shifts in social, political, and cultural behavior; and two, these contestations create the situation for the discussion of sustainability itself.

We, the contributors, distinguish the kinds of feminisms and women's movements addressed in this volume from the many women's movements that have aligned with patriarchal and conservative movements.[4] Here, "feminism" is meant to include those efforts that have the following four features:

1. They continually seek to explore and represent aspects of history that have been obscured, in the belief that oppression, on the quotidian level, is structural rather than individual.
2. Their struggle for equal rights informs the goal of providing the right to choose, even extending this choice to the term "feminist."
3. They respect that theory is affected by action and vice versa.
4. Their actions are based on the premise that gender, race, class, sexuality, nationality, religion, and ability intersect to describe the place of subjects and the contexts of issues.[5]

In this volume, these various contentious conditions of feminisms and women's movements become germane to the discussion of sustainability. The latter word refers both to an issue that feminisms engage and a concept that affects their very lives; for example, sustainable development is an issue for feminisms in general but "sustainable feminisms" is the concept that inspires this collection of essays. Other connotations of the relationship between "sustainable" and "feminisms" are discussed in the section titled "Why Sustainability is Important." In the case of "feminisms," there are earlier chapters in its histories where they had already been unsustainable ideologically and contextually, that is, not accepted as a term descriptive of women's movements across the world that themselves related to the goals of feminisms but dissociated ideologically from them. "Sustainable," as readers in many circles will recognize, belongs to the realm of concern about the longer life of global resources, as in "sustainable development,"

"sustainable agriculture," etc. As these phrases exemplify, in the last two decades, the word has been most frequently used in discourses on the environment and ecology, industrial growth, human rights and needs, energy and food/water resources, governance and civil society, economics and scientific policies, to name a few.[6] The stance in these discussions is that feminisms and women's movements of various persuasions (can) counteract top-down mismanagement that has exploited resources and (can) bring about self-energizing and self-producing cycles of productivity.

This volume relates the word as it exists in an economic and material world to the symbolic realm of the life of movements, in order to address the life cycles and resources for movements themselves. Is feminism, then, a resource? Yes, in some ways, and no in others. Feminist and women's movements have contributed genealogies of understanding the reasons for both failures and successes of attempts at positive sociopolitical change. In their material and philosophical conditions, these genealogies provide maps for finding our own paths.[7] Both words, "sustainable" and "resources," invoke the quantitative and the material basis of struggle. This volume and the conference from which it emanated keep firmly in focus the epistemological challenges presented by feminist and women's movements separately and in convergence. The collection recognizes specially the range of genders/sexualities that it has not addressed but that are necessarily part of larger discussions.

SUSTAINING THE ACADEMY

This volume springs from conversations, separately and together, among activists and academics of various fields of work that are not just a matter of words. The title of the conference aimed to signify two elements in discussing how feminisms can become viable. In naming the event "Sustainable Feminisms: Enacting Theories, Envisioning Action, A Cross-Border Conference," the aim was to invite analyses of "the relationships between feminist theories and practices" as well as to initiate an opening of visible and invisible boundaries between realms of feminist work. The announcement of the conference continues on to say that it "engages participants to discuss how, whether and why such relationships can be sustained…and how sustainable forms of feminisms, through various generations, can tackle the needs of our times."[8]

To continue a little further with words and how they connect ideas, I offer one of the unseen stories in the staging of this event. The proposal for a 2-year grant (2002–2004) from the Women's and Gender Studies

Department (Macalester College) was submitted to the ''Emerging Leaders'' initiative of the Ford Foundation. The proposal itself was titled ''Academic Excellence through Civic Responsibility'' and it contained a larger set of programs in which the conference was one nodal point, titled ''Sustainable Feminisms.'' In the correlation of the three terms – the grant initiative, the proposal title, and the name of the conference – arises a conjunction that deserves some exploration. The proposal and the projects carried through in the 2 years all bore witness to the fact that community engagement becomes the nexus for both academic excellence and feminist praxis, symbolized particularly in the figures of emerging leaders.

These emerging leaders were the activists, organizers, students, community members, lobbyists, academics, and policy-makers who came together from diverse and mixed cultural and political backgrounds, for the two and half days of the conference. Some of the topics addressed in the open sessions were: Grassroots Initiatives, Transnational Partnerships, Women's Rights/Human Rights, Scholarship/Activism, The Classroom, Reproductive Rights, Law/Policy/Social Change, Third Wave, Family/Spouses, Arts/ Culture, Domestic Violence, and NGO Funding. The topics drew participants from various professions and approaches – there were approximately 80 presenters, 50 volunteers, and 170 attendees. The plenary sessions featured an advocate from a women's rights center, an activist in gay issues, academic analysts on sexuality, race, and globalization, and an administrator of campus diversity. The papers in this volume were selected with the intention to display one range of feminist theories and praxes where ''sustainability'' becomes a key term, and to exhibit a wide variety of writers who move at the crossroads of feminist philosophies and actions.

The location of the conference, the campus of Macalester College, emphasizes the position of liberal arts colleges in creating environments for the discussion of the relationship of academics of a particular kind to commitments for positive sociopolitical change. Liberal arts colleges have historically often instituted and been perceived as monastic shelters and ivory-tower exclusions of quotidian concerns. In the last two decades or so, the visage of such institutions has transformed to some extent to reflect the concern with social or civic engagement, in some quarters of academic life, that is expected of (and by some of) its graduates. The presence of ''academic excellence'' as a common goal of liberal arts colleges has been increasingly made simultaneous with the public declaration of civic engagement and social change as part of their mission.[9]

Women's Studies, as an academic component of women's and feminist struggles, holds a particular place in relation to both the role of liberal arts

colleges in addressing theory and praxis, and the institutionalization of women's movements into sustainable units within liberal arts colleges. The fact that an academic department was hosting the 2003 conference indicates to what extent institutions have a stake in addressing the question of sustainability, their own and that of the issue at hand. The department that received the grant had changed its name from Women's Studies to Women's and Gender Studies. The name-change signified the movements in and across the fields of study designated by it, and declared its own sustainability through this change, but also demonstrated an enduring concern of women's studies with women's and feminist movements at large.[10]

The academic institutional basis of the conference, in terms of both organization and resources, was bound to be a noticeable factor for the kinds of audiences and participants the event itself wanted to attract. From the onset, it was important to maintain the cross-section of organizers in involving more than faculty/academics, and to convey two goals at every step. The first was that the link between theory and praxis was a common concern with all groups of feminist workers, and not to be read as a link between academics who theorize and organizers who act. The second was that the academic institution was to be seen as a location conscious of itself as a sociocultural nodal point and not a position of power from which relationships were to be dictated.[11]

WHY SUSTAINABILITY IS IMPORTANT

The word "sustainable" implies imbalances of power and consumption of resources that have led to conditions that are not viable for the healthy existence of the common person. It also then indicates that large numbers of people have experienced the negative impact of these imbalances disproportionately and have been mobilizing into active participation in the protection of their own basic needs and rights. As indicated above, it is evident from the large and growing research and practice of sustainable life that the vocabulary emerges primarily in economic and political contexts, from agriculture to ecology, from production to consumption. Most analyses attempt to provide cause–effect schema of the respective damage done and the means of redress through which the future of resources and life can be secured. This goal characterizes many organizations and groups, from the Sustainable Development Initiative in St. Paul, Minnesota (a city from where I write today), to the transnational Seva Foundation, to the United Nations Division for Sustainable Development that has global reach. It also infuses the

missions of non-governmental groups across the world such as the Sustainable NGO Financing Project and Inforse-Asia, as well as those of numerous feminist and women-run organizations such as African Women's Development Fund, the Association for Women's Rights in Development, and Women's Environment and Development Organization, to name only a few.

Of such analyses, feminist ones often address prevailing adverse conditions explicitly, in order to offer solutions but also to deconstruct dominant paradigms, often evident in mission statements and policy initiatives as in those of the organizations mentioned above. Linked to such analyses but also building on them, this volume addresses the dominant philosophies from which both conditions and solutions stem. It proposes that concepts and bodies emerge in dialectical relationships to create the matrix of events. Hegemonic ideas about commerce, rights, consumption, and other issues of individual and group existence are read on the bodies of various subjects, and vice versa. Forms such as patriarchy, capitalism, racism, and heterosexuality are seen as intersecting and operating covertly and overtly in the very use of the word "sustainable," and, with varying effects, in the specific circumstances analyzed in the essays.

One implication of the word "sustainable" in this volume is the reference to widely adopted terms such as north and south, first and third worlds. The word is used most often to read the conditions in impoverished areas that are also frequently the outcome of over- or mal-development. The histories and consequences of (neo)colonial exploitation of peoples and resources certainly makes the word applicable to disadvantaged areas. However, the volume reflects upon the conditions in putatively more developed areas in analyzing how to improve "resource-management" such that self-producing life is engendered there as well, especially since the disproportionate consumption and waste of resources occurs in these parts. In other words, the word "sustainable" in this collection signifies the connectivity across worlds of inequality in civil societies that are linked, as first and third worlds are, historically and therefore ideologically.[12]

That connectivity is where the particular interpretation of "sustainable" meets the word "feminisms" in this volume. The essays collectively express the view that both sustainability and feminisms are bound together through their separate realms – that sustaining life (economically, resource-wise, and politically) in one part of the world has an impact on sustainability elsewhere, and also similarly that feminisms in one region are affected by similar and separate movements in other parts.

The fields in which sustainability meets feminisms in this volume are primarily those of civil societies. That is, in arenas in which discourses about

sustainability arise across majoritized and minoritized realms of action carrying political, social, and cultural impact. "Civil" in this context does not refer to its usual vernacular conflation with "civilized."[13] It refers instead to the concern with ideological environments in which resources are understood, interpreted, allocated, and distributed. Civil society, as related to and distinct from the market on the one hand and government on the other, includes issues of secularism and religion, culture, and social politics. Civil also means, in this volume, the quotidian lives of citizens who perceive themselves as operating non-politically.

All such forms of civil society overlap to create scenes in which these very subjects enact hegemonic and counter-hegemonic forms. This volume emphasizes that the issue of resistance through counter-hegemonic actions and principles means not just an attempt to counteract or break dominant forms; it means that counter-hegemonic forms are themselves informed by genealogies that, in turn, also seek to prevail as a new and dominant system (also see note 27 to this essay). For instance, as Hrycak's essay shows, women's movements in post-Soviet Ukraine act in opposition to prevailing patriarchal systems but are themselves in search of establishing their own system, in contradistinction to both these patriarchies and Western European feminist ideas.

So, while structural analyses abound in the realms of economic viability and politically (un)tenable contexts, this volume focuses on the culturally sustainable as an expression of the ideologically defensible and contested. It keeps in mind that sustainability is contingent – that elements tenable in one context are untenable in another, even as those contexts are connected; moreover, that duration and longevity are intended goals but ones that are compromised through the dialectics of change. Through economic and political histories of women's movements as they relate to each other, the tensions about cultural transplantation and uniqueness become ideological battlegrounds, as Stone's essay about Mayan mythology in industrial contexts demonstrates.

The overarching issue raised implicitly is whether feminisms are aiming to be sustainable. While the focus in this volume is about how feminisms are to be sustained through the unpredictable and rapid changes in the circuits of globalization and transnationalism, the question arises – is "sustainable" the vocabulary for the future? The preoccupation about how to maintain life with the resources we have currently can often translate into a hesitation to counteract dominant ideologies at their very foundations. Many of the essays in this volume, such as those by Kuppers and Ackerly, indicate that the inheritance of past women's movements are turned into present activism and that these are indications of future possibilities that may take forms that are quite different.

The term sustainability often implies that resistance to adverse circumstances will function within the status quo, that is, within the bounds of the conditions provided. Some feminisms that operate within nation-state narratives negotiate the resources that are either available or that become the object of struggle and demand. This work of re-distributing resources in order to make certain lives or projects sustainable does address a redistribution of rights and an attention to social justice. Such movements have often been guided by deep analyses of policies and programs, as Schmalzbauer and her co-authors show in their exposition of ''motherwork'' in Uganda, East Timor, and the Honduras. Sustainability also calls up the critique of the conditions, their underlying reasons, assumptions, and consequences. This follows what Paolo Freire (1970) calls ''*pedagogy of the oppressed*'' where the struggle looks beyond getting from prevailing systems.[14] This approach evaluates, as Bulbeck's essay does, the obstacles to just distribution inherent in epistemologies, that is, the assumptions and perspectives on which structures are constructed and their manifestation through guiding principles that position subjects in relation to each other.

This volume presents sustainability as a contingent mode of describing how feminist and women's efforts are continuing to operate in current conditions. As the last section in this introduction offers for consideration, sustainability can only be a term for a limited period of time because of its neocolonial connotations when applied to the purported task of ''preservation'' that, in many cases, means the segregation of indigenous communities and cultures that have presented challenges to dominant ideological forces. As the Narmada Bachao Andolan in India demonstrates, indigenous cultures that are perceived to be separate from, yet subservient to, industrial modernity, are in fact, linked to the latter's survival through the question of sustainability.[15] This example, like others of its kind across the world, also elucidates the idea that efforts to resist exploitation could or should work ultimately for more than mere sustainability. It could or should work rather toward a significant change in the conditions such that they not only sustain, but also sustain in order to flourish. I present below the sections into which the volume is organized.

SECTION I: INDIGENOUS-INDUSTRIAL SUSTAINABILITIES

In ''The Female Body: Practice and Metaphor across the Maya/'American' Continuum,'' Stone places international political economies in direct encounter

with Mayan cultural mythology, specifically over the metamorphosing body of the *nawal*. The positivist materialism of industrial modernity presents the dominant reading of history that has, to the outsider view, suppressed or marginalized all local genealogies. The shapes that these forces of history render visible only selectively are challenged by indigenous knowledges.[16] In other words, what colonial modernity presents as historical transformation, it places before us in visible, material forms (urbanization, deforestation, business enterprises, and other contexts). The shapeshifting stories destabilize the linear forms of the narratives of (neo)colonial modernity as well as present epistemologically resistant paths of the physical body that becomes, at times, animal and, at other times, immaterial. In both the metamorphosing landscapes and the individuals that inhabit them, *nawal* mythology generates a challenge to the quasi-permanently identified objects of industrial modernity. It implies, at the least, or exposes the very paradox of modernity – that change (the new) is constantly necessary to the narratives of progress on which it is built at the same time that modernity requires that fundamental elements be permanently inscribed (reason, will, consciousness, power).

The *nawal*, through its resistant narrative that is kept alive in the daily practices and beliefs of the indigenous, in the midst of modernization, is a historical subject that is aware of its gender-dimensions and its own modernity. Between and inside indigeneity as well as industrialism moves the shape-shifting *nawal* that sustains the radical alertness of agency and resistance through dialogical possibility, even through tales of misogynist violence. While indigenous women, identified as Mayan and/or Guatemalan, distance themselves from the word "feminist," their stance of remaining incompletely bound by their physical and political conditions correlates to two elements: a general feminist wish to remain "vigilant" and, as the author argues, the new inspiration for that resistant stance.

Mayan women maintain their roles as wives, mothers, and daughters through the changes that *nawal*-ism and transnational globalization create in their local and migrant lives. The traditional roles of women have been issues of turbulent debate, with strong arguments for and against its consequences for feminisms that aim to counter patriarchies at their very foundations.[17] Stone's as well as the next essay by Schmalzbauer et al. show that traditional roles enable not only survival but also the agency of community citizenship. In "Caring for Survival: Motherwork and Sustainable Feminisms," Schmalzbauer, Vadera, and Verghese demonstrate how, in extreme conditions of marginality, women maintain their presence as agents of change. The authors' fieldwork in Uganda, East Timor, and the Honduras

manifest the transnational landscape of women's agency, as Stone's did in the situations of Mayan women experiencing Anglo-American modernity. Both essays operate in the context of neocolonial modernity and the circulation of ideas, but also the movements of peoples in globalization, most often through enforced economic and other forms of disenfranchisement, dislocation, and dispossession.

Patricia Hill Collins's concept of "motherwork" serves to emphasize the gendered bodies and roles at stake in the circumstances in which indigenous, ethnicized women negotiate the turmoil created by industrializing, (neo)colonial modernity and survival in their known daily lives. "Caring for Survival" shows the range of sustainabilities even as it examines the nature of feminist activities. In terms of the former, the women in the three parts of the world that are linked through global political and social exigencies, demonstrate how they cope but also how their "coping" generates changes in the structural dynamics of gendered roles. In terms of the latter, feminist participation in countering economic migrancy, political emergency, and military repression is called upon to measure its principles of change in relation to those modeled by women whose motherhood is a primary and unavoidable function. The co-authorship of the essay, by an organizer of an aid program, a coordinator in a torture victim rehabilitation center, and an academic on related subjects bears out, in the background of this essay, the networking needed at the level of representation to reflect the connections between the actions on the ground.

SECTION II: NGO-IZATION OF SUSTAINABILITIES

Feminisms come into direct contact on the issue of women's bodies in the circuits of globalization, as discussed in the section "Sustainability, feminisms, and women's movements," as well as in the structural organizations of women as active citizens, as shown in the previous section and evident also in Section 2. Bulbeck, in "Hailing the 'Authentic Other': Constructing the Third World Woman as Aid Recipient in donor NGO agendas," discusses how the "virtuous" female recipient of aid is characterized variously by her greater economic productivity, her preference for peace over war, her commitment to family over self, and her greater level of oppression compared with her compatriot sisters. In discussions of such ideas, this section on the various structural organizations of transnational aid is linked to the indigenous-industrial nexus in Section 1 through the construction of traditional women's roles as it is projected upon the biologically female body.

Many transnational non-feminist as well as even some dominant feminist histories over the last few decades have sustained imaginaries of third world women as docile and eager subjects of neo-modernist narratives. Most recently, the Grameen Bank and its director received the Nobel Peace Prize for the development of small enterprises that are run largely by women.[18] In such instances, female subjects of modernity are cast not only as participants of progress but their stories are also presented as successes for Third World feminisms and women's movements. These model stories and subjects are based in the reconstitution of marginalized people who are now agents. However, the agents are desirable candidates, as Bulbeck indicates about third world women, because, as women, they play traditional roles of caregiving, peacemaking, and household management, not as citizens who are direct participants as architects of progressive social or parliamentary projects. Similarly, Hrycak indicates how neoliberal agendas thwart the purported goals of building civil societies in post-Soviet Ukraine, even as women are given aid to expand involvement in public life through their roles as mothers and wives. This latter rendering of the third world woman reinterprets feminism partially and hegemonically to show that economic viability is sufficiently indicative of women's development and greater citizenship. In other words, the success of economic projects that sponsor women, frequently foreign-funded, enables non-governmental organizations (and the nations across which they work) to argue that the goals advocated by feminists are not only being met but also sustained effectively.[19] Agathangelou and Spira's essay points out that these apparent successes that purportedly further feminist goals come at a cost, what they term "sacrifice," of larger, long-term principles.

Governmental co-optation and NGO-ization of women's rights and participation are thus defined and perceived more widely as meeting the goals of development narratives rather than as fulfilling or sustaining feminist goals. Media reports focus more heavily on the sources of funding and their directors than on the recipients who appear to be cut from one cloth (the eager, determined woman citizen). Most NGOs bring principles perceived as "western imports" into regions that have varying cultures of acceptance of those guiding philosophies. Bulbeck's essay as well as Hrycak's analysis in "From Global to Local Feminisms: Transnationalism, Foreign Aid and the Women's Movement in Ukraine" underscore two important elements – that women in "underdeveloped" regions of the world carry local gendered histories that approach these encounters warily; and that there are heterogeneous histories of women's activities in those local regions that create deep dimensions often ignored in NGO narratives.

Agathangelou and Spira's essay emphasizes that this elision of diversities and complexities amounts to an imminent death, in fact, the unsustainability of feminisms under such circumstances.

Hrycak's and Bulbeck's essays also underscore the dilemmas that transnational feminisms must engage in order to become vital factors in women's lives, in the global south and in post-socialist countries. One of the primary issues is the resistance to hegemonic principles of women's roles, rights, and responsibilities that are perceived as imported and imposed by foreign NGOs. In such instances, feminist principles are interpreted as part of the same package as (masculinist) economic and cultural policies endorsed by dominant nation-states. As Bulbeck notes about Brazil and China, and Hrycak about post-Soviet Ukraine, foreign NGOs often perform the most visible role in transferring or translating such principles (feminist or otherwise) and enacting outcomes that give them longer life, thus the NGO-ization of sustainable feminisms. The complication is three-fold at the least. One is that imported or exported feminisms themselves often split on the topic of whether their principles of action and implementation are explicitly feminist. The second is that local women's activities for rights are similarly divided, often as competition between what Hrycak terms "foundation feminists" and various groups of local women signified as "hybrid feminisms." The third is that all sides concerned have their own various investments in privileging the local as authentic as well as distinguishing between "imported" and "inherent."[20] As all the essays in this section emphasize, on the ground, beliefs in national histories, geopolitical relations, and class/race structures play crucial roles in creating as well as potentially bridging the divides that occur.

Agathangelou and Spira's essay draws out a particular problem that weaves through Hrycak's and Bulbeck's analyses – the element of concession or compromise that women's organizations face. The word "sacrifice" links cultural work to political effort and physical death (of martyrs, soldiers) and, in turn, to the life of concepts themselves that are cut short. In other words, to the frequently short life of feminist goals that are rendered unsustainable by the kinds of funding and other imperatives that Hrycak and Bulbeck address. In "Sacrifice, Abandonment, and Interventions for Sustainable Feminism(s): The Non-Profit Industrial Complex and Transbordered Substantive Democracy," Agathangelou and Spira explore Tomás Gutiérrez Alea's film *Fresa y Chocolate* (*Strawberry and Chocolate*) as a cultural text that is embedded in the political exigencies surrounding sustainable feminisms. Their essay addresses the possible life of long-term radical goals that facilitate a discernible shift away from neoliberal economies and toward significant social transformation.

All the essays in this section explicitly or implicitly point out that persistent dialogue and negotiation that recognizes the importance of both immediate (read, local) histories and universalized principles are the bases for securing feminist principles and intervening in the shifting priorities of foreign-funded donorship. They underscore that dominant feminisms particularly need to be aware of their location within neoliberal economies that emerge in hegemonic international relations. The implication in both Bulbeck's and Hrycak's essays is that NGOs function within a specific professionalized vocabulary that is founded in long-standing (neo)colonial histories about the docile third world women in need of aid. A dialogue, informed by the awareness of past histories and present contexts, is particularly crucial to avoid the sacrifice of which Agathangelou and Spira speak, and to facilitate productive relationships between donor and recipient NGOs. Most importantly, the recognition as well as the support of the potential and actual agency of local women's groups will obviate the occurrence of sacrifices of larger goals and create the platform for sustainable feminisms.

SECTION III: LINKING HANDS TO SUSTAIN

This section of the volume derives from the spirit of the preceding essays where possibilities for action are imagined or latent; it focuses on the actual enactments as well as theorizings of feminisms that sustain constructive critical activity. Both cultural work and political negotiations provide the ways for this activity that presents us with lively signs of the longer life of feminisms. Petra Kuppers, academic and artistic director of the Olimpias Performance Research Projects, presents cultural work about the intertwined forces of science and politics that conscripted the bodies of the marginalized. In her essay, "The Anarcha Project: Performing in the Medical Plantation," Kuppers presents the medicalization of a national narrative in which scientists use the body of the black woman as object for testing and establishing knowledge about race, sex, and citizenship. The argument implies that dominant feminisms, even as they resist hegemonic national narratives, also avail of objectification as a strategy that has eroded the grounds of greater understanding toward positive social change. The essays in the previous section remind us how feminisms as well as women's movements are born within and out of political, social, and economic conditions. In this section, the reconstructive projects expressing hope for

changes in our intellectual and social practices do not lose sight of the complexities embedded in the histories being addressed.

As Kuppers points out, even such reconstructions may attempt to create comprehensive and whole narratives that perform acts of containment rather than open up other possibilities. Her essay emphasizes that merely naming the problems or repeating ''what happened'' serves a limited task of remembrance. It states that it is more meaningful to explore the implications of renarrating and how that reconstructive act can reshape rather than repeat history. Moreover, her essay indicates how cultural work across fields becomes the avenue to analyze and re-present social problems such as health inequities and racial history. The nature of performance not only brings together dancers, disability culture researchers, academics, and theater artists but also compels all of them to enquire what would sustain a feminist interpretation without repeating the crises of containment in and of the past. One of the most important elements of the kind of restaging of history is the enunciation of the names of the women made invisible, as a way of naming a new narrative of sustainable research and knowledge. This strategy links but also distinguishes Kuppers's essay with the tactics posed by the essays in the previous sections – the naming of the invisible or marginalized by the narratives that purport to foreground their agency is transformed here into a renaming that breaks through the conscription.

The element that binds Kuppers's essay to Ackerly's analysis is the belief that the intersection of various fields is the primary means of sustaining new feminist possibilities, as a way of networking across inhospitable terrains of political normativity and anti-feminisms. Usually, one expects cultural work to be the place for creative possibilities against rifts experienced elsewhere. Ackerly, in ''Sustainable Networking: Collaboration for Women's Human Rights Activists, Scholars, and Donors,'' identifies a particular field for specific kinds of actors to sustain feminisms, as the title of her essay indicates. The author emphasizes, as does Bulbeck earlier in the volume, that movements intended to bring gender inequalities to light have been co-opted by mainstream neoliberal narratives. In these circumstances, women's efforts toward claiming human rights are continually affected by forces that are not conducive to feminist goals. For example, ''gender mainstreaming'' has sought to reaffirm traditional gender roles that maintain political and other inequities; this requires that feminist activists, scholars, and donors remain even more vigilant about the negative implications and positive possibilities that feminisms can encounter.[21] The alertness that these situations require recalls Kuppers's cautionary note about ensuring that new stories not repeat the imperatives of dominant narratives.

Ackerly's essay acknowledges that the institutional locations of scholars, activists, and donors are positions that enable as well as disable possible alliances on the shared issue of women's human rights. Attendant to location is the aspect of professionalization that is unequally experienced by these diverse sectors of feminist activity – its varying degrees affect the nature of discourses and the manner of translating them across related but different fields of activity. Even as Ackerly's essay notes the factors that create advantages and disadvantages, it also points out that partnerships are the mode in which to think of feminist activity for it to be sustainable.

RETROSPECTIVE

This introduction and this volume demonstrate the relevance of the word "sustainable" to various situations in particular and to feminisms of certain kinds. But what is the impact of the concept of sustainability on such feminist projects? While it may seem to work against the very premise of this book that relies on the valency of the word, the following contemplation poses a reminder, in the spirit of the feminist principle of self-reflexivity, for us to remain aware of the vocabularies we use so that we remain accountable to their implications and consequences.[22] In asking what the word "sustainable" implies about our past, ongoing, and future projects, this section of the introduction reflects on the adoption of terms by various women's and feminist groups as indicative of their relationships to hegemonic structures in the context of past and late modernities.

Most feminisms, as far as they can be categorized, have tussled with this dilemma of a word that potentially circumscribes their spheres of influence and effect. Liberal feminisms that operate in obedience with nationalist imperatives would agree with dominant (neo)liberal policies about containing movements that want to be self-sufficient, by using the word "sustainable" to keep projects within control.[23] Radical feminisms would interpret the word as a case for keeping projects for self-sufficiency out of the control of masculinist states. Minoritized feminisms of other kinds would use "sustainable" to wrestle with dominant politics and ensure that the basic needs of their communities are met or that larger heritages are kept alive through strategic practice, as the essays by Stone, Schmalzbauer et al., and Kuppers demonstrate.

It is at this point that both discourses of sustainability and feminisms, separately and together, encounter not just the long-term life of actions projected through the word but the longer life of the word "sustainability"

itself. To what extent does the word as a descriptor, in fact, harness the momentum of resistant projects so that they stay locked in battle with hegemonic structures rather than seek a condition beyond them? Are minoritized movements burdened with a task to make current conditions work in their favor or are they in search, through this burden, of a shift in the nature of social and political environments? This volume presents both these goals as sometimes intertwined and, on occasion, separated. For instance, Bulbeck's essay shows how women's movements that operate within given conditions are determined to a great degree by historical legacies of images of the "third world woman." The outcome of the reification of such a symbol is a restructuring of society, in the short term, while the hope for transformation beyond stereotypes remains for the long term. This deferral of significant change is implied in what Agathangelou and Spira term "sacrifice," a notion that is also in the backdrop of Hrycak's essay.

What does the word, as adopted widely by various women's and feminist movements, imply about subjects, individual, and collective? As Ackerly's essay explores, the various actors in sociopolitical projects are often pitted against each other where survival rather than radical transformation becomes the goal. Professionalized arenas of feminist participation, such as the ones delineated in her essay, shows that policy-makers, activists, scholars, and donors that are potentially bound in the same projects are also circumscribed by the imperatives of remaining "sustainable" in their respective environments. In these contexts, the word comes to signify an immediate need for various collectives to survive with and negotiate the terms that are already laid down.

Many such sectors of feminist or women's activity also certainly strive to use the prevailing hegemonic conditions as a platform for creating new contexts that are distinctly different in function and epistemology. There is, in this volume, a demonstration of the emerging impetus of significant, not superficial, change, an indication of getting beyond the hidden limits presented by the word "sustainable" that have developed out of dominant discourses. This observation, implicit in many analyses, becomes explicit in Stone's essay about weaving traditional mythologies into modernist discourses. This weaving is not a way of regressing into a past that can never be recovered, but into a future that is beyond the dictates of modernity, yet is not as an attempt to bypass them. "Sustainability" here implies that there is an effort to imagine a space that contests oppressive circumstances that cannot benefit but a few, but also attempts to surpass the present domination effected through neocolonizing knowledges.

Just as collectives, by juxtaposition (Ackerly, Schmalzbauer et al., Hrycak) or by nature (Stone, Kuppers), have encountered or adopted the concept

of "sustainability," the word has had a significant impact on the current visualization of the individual. Within various feminisms and women's movements, there are considerable resurrections or vestiges of the liberal individual who is retrieved as a subject who already owns, or should have, agency and will. These attributes are read as residing within the subject and therefore needing only cultivation, or as transcendental principles that survive, regardless of circumstances, and are not contingent upon context. This persists even in the most trenchant resistant anti-globalization and transnationalist of feminisms, and certainly in nationalist and neoliberal forms. Discourses about sustainability, dominant or otherwise, continue to refer to an already-constructed and essentialized subject with specific criteria of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, religion, and nation attached to it.[24] This subject's basic needs and wants constitute the platform from which to conduct analyses about resources and policies. All the essays in this volume conduct their discussion about such a subject but also raise the issue of how the assumptions about such a subject limit respective projects to the perimeters prescribed by the use of the word "sustainable."

What does the word say about feminist and women's reckoning with power as practiced by dominating ideologies and their own conceptualization of the same? The instrumentalist positivism of the word "sustainable" has dictated the nature of conversations in diverse fields of feminist and non-feminist activity. Certainly, participation toward positive sociopolitical change requires a considerable attention to the material bases of struggle, survival, and sustainability. As many counter-hegemonic resistances have also realized, practical strategies that have long-term impact are founded on visions of fundamental change. Such resistances have also acknowledged that strategies can alter based on the metamorphosing contexts. The histories of many projects have shown that the movements of the minoritized to make their lives sustainable has resulted in cooptation into prevailing ideologies and their discourses – of Singaporean women's movements into nationalist missions, of North American racial and economic justice movements into nationalist as well as hegemonic religious discourses, to name two instances.[25] It must be acknowledged that these minoritized movements have made inroads into the sociocultural imaginaries in their particular locations, for example, in the reformulation of women's roles in the public sphere, and of the poor or otherwise disenfranchised as agents of change. In other words, efforts to redistribute power have indeed resulted in significant shifts in balances of gender-roles and conceptualizations of gender.

However, the issue that remains before feminist and women's movements today is posed implicitly by this volume – what do our current philosophies

of power demonstrate about our goals? Ecofeminist philosophies have radicalized the conceptualization of power by changing the terms from the domination explicit in "power over" to the sharing and dynamic tensions of "power with."[26] This reframing has sought to re-envision the agency of those who were perceived only as marginalized or oppressed, to shift the imagination of hierarchies into networks where actions have consequences for all. Yet, the issue of power returns again in the projects of sustainability, as this volume presents, for feminisms and women's movements and projects themselves. It returns in two ways: firstly, have the re-definitions of power enabled the breaking away from hegemonic constructs in which "sustainability" is described in particular ways or have they, instead, compelled our obedience to those forms of discourses that anchor the word? Secondly, have these new forms of conceiving of power generated the momentum for feminisms to launch a new order of things?

This volume demonstrates the conditions within which feminisms arise and to which their workings of power remain bound. This is not to say that such feminisms are imprisoned but to state that, in fact, those are the materially tangible forms in which feminisms themselves are formed. By their very condition, however, they compel the imagination to grapple with the possibility that feminisms, if carried through to their ultimate and various intentions, will need to transition from their historically counter-hegemonic status to the very foundation of reconfigured societies. That is, to move from resisting power to conducting it, in all its forms.[27] In such scenarios – where feminisms have yet to propose their own configuration of structures in which they retain and control the dynamics of power – sustainability will be rendered unnecessary since it currently arises from states of exploitation, abuse, and crises, as an extra-ordinary, even utopian condition. Sustainability will become rather a guiding principle through which resources are managed and controlled through feminist strategies of justified use, preservation, distributable profit, based on long-term goals. This volume looks currently at times in which questions of sustainability arise and ahead at times when the word will become the basis and not an exception.

NOTES

1. Debates about the status of feminisms have come from women acknowledged as feminist foremothers themselves, not just ideological opponents. See Virginia Woolf's (1938) record of it in *Three Guineas* (England), Simone de Beauvoir (1952) in

The Second Sex (France), Bessie Head (published posthumously in 1990) in *A Woman Alone* (Zimbabwe/South Africa), and Shashi Deshpande's (2001) more recent commentary in "No Man is an Island" (India). Even as there are local and national feminist organizations that explicitly proclaim their politics in their titles, there are also national groups that include women and that oppose any feminist platform; for example, the Feminist Majority Foundation and American Family Association, respectively, in the United States.

2. To name just a few examples, see Alexander-Floyd and Simien (2006), Farrell (2006), Groenhout (2002), Herr (2004), Jacob and Licona (2005), Kinser (2004), Parisi (2002), and Purvis (2004).

3. The very word "feminism" has been disputed and reclaimed. Generations of women have disagreed over the "original" definitions and intentions of liberal, third world, all the "waves," transnational, and other forms. The transplantation of feminisms from one context to another has raised issues of authenticity and relativism, such as those that inform the issues of immigration, cultural practices (child marriage, the veil, female genital cutting, etc.), and political agency. See Bulbeck (2005), Elshtain (1995), Fuszara (2000), Goldfarb (1997), hooks (1994), Jamal (2005), Kashani-Sabet (2005), Tohidi (2002), and Zucker (2004).

4. For conservative women's movements, see Bacchetta and Power (2002), Benowitz (2002), Deutchmann and Ellison (2004), Power (2002), and Sarkar and Butalia (1996).

5. Intersectionality has been widely understood as a methodological priority for contemporary feminisms. See Deckha (2005), Gandhi and Shah (2006), Harding and Norberg (2005), Hirschmann (2003), Mahalingam and Leu (2005), McCall (2005), Phoenix (2006), Rohrer (2004), Wiegman (2000), and Yuval-Davis (2006).

6. Examples of the use of "sustainable" as a focus for research, feminist or otherwise, are too numerous to name comprehensively, especially since its prominence in the last 15 years. For a few recent examples of the contexts for the use of the word in relation to women's interests, see Anderson (2004), De Bruijn, van Halsema, and van den Hombergh (1997), Carr (2000), Kohlstedt and Longino (1997), Puntenney (2000), Reddy (2003), and Walter (2001).

7. For the convergence and divergence of postmodernisms and feminisms, see Maiguashca (2005). In seeking genealogies of feminisms, one of the strongest oppositions has been posed to postmodernism. See Atherton and Bolland (2002) for delineating a separation between feminisms and postmodernisms, and Nicholson (1990) and Marchand and Parpart (1995) for contentions as well as mergers between them.

8. Call for Papers, Sustainable Feminisms Conference, Macalester College, 2002.

9. The turn from a traditional liberal arts academic setting that was conceived or perceived as a reclusive world of meditation upon world affairs to at least a partially involved realm of academic excellence through commitment to social service and leadership is a significant trend in the last two decades. See Schall (2006), Icard, Spearmon, and Curry-Jackson (1996), and Johnson and O'Grady (2006).

10. The history of Women's Studies at Macalester College since 1995, which includes two name changes, is formed within the global movements towards, and disputes about, the institutionalization of Women's Studies. The two name changes have been from Women's Studies to Women's and Gender Studies in 1995, and to

Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies in 2005. For some discussions about these issues, see Bart and Bentz (1999), Bock (2000–2001), Britton (2006), Shircliffe (2000), Wiegman (2002), and Widerberg (2006).

11. The relationship between theory and praxis has been a subject in feminist discourses especially since the institutionalization of Women's Studies as an academic discipline. See Agha-Jaffar (2000), Burman (2003), Kerr (1998), Kimmich (1999), Nettles and Patton (2000), and Tonn (2004).

12. Sustainability raises questions of global connectivity and mutual impact or commonly felt consequences that are no longer geographically separable. Universal ideological constructs such as modernization, nation-state identities, empire, and transnationalism have given rise to reconceptualization of borders and identities, evident in terminology such as Global South, Two-Thirds World, and Fourth World.

13. "Civil society" refers to the political concept that is distinct from but related to other concepts such as the market and government. The history of this concept stretches back to the 16th century in Western Europe political philosophy. In this long global history, discourse as a means of enacting civil society is a basis; it is separate from contemporary allusions to civility, civil discourse, and civilized discourse. The latter formations often mistakenly conflate the idea of polite conversation with the political unit of "civil society."

14. See *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* for a fuller discussion of civic and political participation from the ground up as a means to more meaningful democratic structures.

15. See Baviskar (2004), De Sousa Santos and Rodriguez-Garavito (2005), Fisher (1995), Gandhi (2003), and Roy (2001).

16. There are numerous sources of indigenous epistemologies that could be juxtaposed more frequently with more dominant, mainstream, or other feminisms that have received more attention. For indigenous feminisms, see Haenn and Wilk (2006), Mihesuah (2003), Montoya, Frazier, and Hurtig (2002), Narayan and Harding (2000), Phiri and Nadar (2006), and Sanford and Angel-Ajani (2006). Prominent individual "native" women such as Winona LaDuke, Wangari Maathai, and Rigoberta Menchú have brought attention to indigenous knowledges through their prominence in global political and social contexts.

17. For other readings of Mayan women in history and politics, see Carey (2006), Faust, Anderson, and Frazier (2004), and Ortiz (2001).

18. See Grameen Bank's mission statement on www.grameen-info.org/bank. See critiques of this reification of the iconic third world woman in Cameron and Gibson-Graham (2003), Coyle (2003), Htun (2002), Mindry (2001), Mohanty, Russo, and Torres (1991), and Steans and Ahmadi (2005).

19. As the World Bank website (www.worldbank.org) demonstrates, "gender" usually implies women. The numerous documents on various projects involving gender convey the economic results, not any political redefinitions of the status of third world women.

20. The various claims from all corners of feminisms and women's movements about cultural difference and heritage, about what is intrinsic and extrinsic, has led to debates about cultural relativism and authenticity. These debates have involved delineations of imperialist and indigenous feminisms. See Brems (1997), Code (1998),

Hirschmann (1998), Krishnadas (2006), Liao (2006), Macdonald (2006), Shildrick (2003), Wilson (2004), and Winter (1994).

21. For examples of how ''gender mainstreaming'' operates in some specific contexts, see Fellmeth (2000), Kabeer (2003), Moser (1999), and Walby (2005). There is a vast literature on the intentions, effects, and consequences of this policy in various circumstances, ranging from rural development to legal and economic principles to new (post)national formations such as the European Union.

22. Reflexivity has a long history in philosophy and cultural practices, and is not exclusive to some feminist practices. In feminist discourse, however, (self)reflexivity is related to positionality and, through it, to ethical responsibility in practice. See, for instance, Adkins (2004), Ahmed (2000), Campbell (2004), Lentin (1993), Lohan (2000), Moss and Matwychuk (2000), Nagar and Ali (2003), and Wilkinson and Kitzinger (1995).

23. As many third world feminists and women's movements have pointed out, dominant feminisms can often reinforce hegemonic nationalist discourses and policies. See Jelin (2000), Randriamaro (2003), and Worth (2002).

24. The status of the a priori individual subject has been a subject of much debate among various kinds of feminisms. Most materialist, radical, and socialist feminist philosophies, separately and in their overlap, have argued with postmodern (post-structural, deconstructionist) feminisms about the threat to feminist projects in the entire range of contexts from hyper-industrialized through to under-developed situations.

25. For the two kinds of instances referred to, see Heng (1997) for Singaporean contexts, and Dubriwny (2005) and Warters and DeLorenzo Denison (2002) for American ones.

26. See Foucault (1980), Sawicki (1991), and Diamond and Quinby (1988). Also see Jabri (2004) and Jaquette (2003) for post-Cold War roles for feminisms, as examples of changing structures that require reconceptualizations of power.

27. The premise of the understanding of hegemonies in this introduction is based on Antonio Gramsci's theories on the subject. Contrary to popular interpretations, hegemonies are systems of thinking that replace older forms of the same; in this sense, counter-hegemonic movements (presumed as ''good'' by the minoritized) do not constitute the permanent end of hegemonies (presumed as ''bad'' by the minoritized). Gramsci comments on the inevitable settling of ossified systems into bureaucratic organizations that betray the vital spirit of change. See Gramsci (1971).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Adkins, L. (2004). Passing on feminism. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *11*(4), 427–444.

Agha-Jaffar, T. (2000). From theory to praxis in women's studies: Guest-speakers and service learning as pedagogy. *Feminist Teacher*, *13*(1), 1–11.

Ahmed, S. (2000). *Transformations: Thinking through feminism*. New York: Routledge.

Alexander-Floyd, N., & Simien, E. M. (2006). Revisiting 'what's in a name? *Frontiers*, 27(1), 67–89.

Anderson, A. (2004). *Women and sustainable agriculture: Interviews with 14 agents of change*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., Inc.

Atherton, C. R., & Bolland, K. (2002). Postmodernism: A dangerous illusion for social work. *International Social Work*, *45*(4), 421–434.

Bacchetta, P., & Power, M. (2002). *Right-wing women: From conservatives to extremists around the world*. New York: Routledge.

Bart, P., & Bentz, P. (1999). In sisterhood? Women's studies and activism. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, *27*(3–4), 257–268.

Baviskar, A. (2004). *In the belly of the river: Tribal conflicts over development in the Narmada Valley*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Benowitz, J. M. (2002). *Days of discontent: American women and right-wing politics, 1933–1945*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Bock, U. (2000–2001). The institutionalization of women's studies at German universities at the end of the century. *European Education*, *32*(4), 14–33.

Brems, E. (1997). Enemies or allies? Feminism and cultural relativism as dissident voices in human rights discourse. *Human Rights Quarterly*, *19*(1), 136–164.

Britton, H. (2006). Organising against gender violence in South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, *32*(1), 145–163.

Bulbeck, C. (2005). 'Women are exploited way too often': Feminist rhetorics at the end of equality. *Australian Feminist Studies*, *20*(46), 65–76.

Burman, E. (2003). Narratives of challenging research: Stirring tales of politics and practice. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *6*(2), 101–120.

Cameron, J., & Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2003). Feminising the economy: Metaphors, strategies, politics. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, *10*(2), 145–158.

Campbell, K. (2004). The promise of feminist reflexivities: Developing Donna Haraway's project for feminist science studies. *Hypatia*, *19*(1), 162–182.

Carey, D., Jr. (2006). *Engendering Mayan history: Kaqchikel women as agents and conduits of the past, 1875–1950*. New York: Routledge.

Carr, G. (Ed.) (2000). *New essays in ecofeminist literary criticism*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP.

Code, L. (1998). Hot to think globally: Stretching the limits of imagination. *Hypatia*, *13*(2), 173–186.

Coyle, A. (2003). Fragmented feminisms: Women's organizations and citizenship in 'transition' in Poland. *Gender and Development*, *11*(3), 57–65.

De Beauvoir, S. (1952). *The second sex*. In: H. M. Parshley (Transl. and Ed.). New York: Knopf.

De Bruijn, M., van Halsema, I., & van den Hombergh, H. (Eds). (1997). *Gender and land use: Diversity in environmental practices*. Amsterdam: Thela Publishers.

De Sousa Santos, B., & Rodriguez-Garavito, C. A. (2005). *Law and globalization from below: Towards a cosmopolitan legality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Deckha, M. (2005). Is culture taboo? Feminism, intersectionality, and culture talk in law. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, *16*(1), 14–53.

Deshpande, S. (2001). *No man is an island. The Times of India,* 23 April, 1992.

Deutchmann, I., & Ellison, A. (2004). When feminists don't fit. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 6(1), 29–52.

Diamond, I., & Quinby, L. (1988). *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on resistance.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Dubriwny, T. N. (2005). First ladies and feminism: Laura Bush as advocate for women's and children's rights. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 28(1), 84–114.

Elshtain, J. B. (1995). Exporting feminism. *Journal of International Affairs*, 48(2), 541–559.

Farrell, G. (2006). Beneath the suffrage narrative. *Canadian Review of American Studies*, 36(1), 45–65.

Faust, B. B., Anderson, E. N., & Frazier, J. G. (2004). *Rights, resources, culture, and conservation in the land of the Maya.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Fellmeth, A. X. (2000). Feminism and international law: Theory, methodology, and substantive reform. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 22(3), 658–733.

Fisher, W. F. (Ed.) (1995). *Toward sustainable development? Struggling over India's Narmada River.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977.* In: Colin Gordon (Transl. and Ed.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* In: Myra Bergman Ramos (Transl.). New York: Continuum.

Fuszara, M. (2000). Feminism, the new millennium, and ourselves: A Polish view. *Signs*, 25(4), 1069–1076.

Gandhi, A. (2003). Developing compliance and resistance: The state, transnational social movements and tribal peoples contesting India's Narmada Project. *Global Networks*, 3(4), 481–496.

Gandhi, N., & Shah, N. (2006). Inter movement dialogues: Breaking barriers, building bridges. *Development*, 49(1), 72–76.

Goldfarb, J. (1997). Why is there no feminism after communism? *Social Research*, 64(2), 235–257.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* In: Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (Transl. and Eds). New York: International Publishers.

Groenhout, R. (2002). Essentialist challenges to liberal feminism. *Social Theory and Practice*, 28(1), 51–75.

Haenn, N., & Wilk, R. R. (2006). *The environment in anthropology: A reader in ecology, culture, and sustainable living.* New York: New York University Press.

Harding, S., & Norberg, K. (2005). New feminist approaches to social science methodologies: An introduction. *Signs*, 30(4), 2009–2015.

Head, B. (1990). In: C. Mackenzie (Ed.), *A woman alone: Autobiographical writings.* Oxford: Heinemann.

Heng, G. (1997). 'A great way to fly': Nationalism, the state and the varieties of third-world feminism. In: J. Alexander & C. Mohanty (Eds), *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, and democratic futures* (pp. 30–45). New York: Routledge.

Herr, R. S. (2004). A third world feminist defense of multiculturalism. *Social Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 73–103.

Hirschmann, N. (2003). Intersectionality before intersectionality was cool: The importance of class to feminist interpretations of Locke. Conference paper – American political science association, annual meeting, pp. 1–42.

Hirschmann, N. (1998). Western feminism, eastern veiling, and the question of free agency. *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical and Democratic Theory*, *5*(3), 345–368.

hooks, b. (1994). Black students who reject feminism. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *40*(45), A44.

Htun, M. (2002). Puzzles of women's rights in Brazil. *Social Research*, *69*(3), 733–751.

Icard, L. D., Spearmon, M., & Curry-Jackson, A. (1996). BSW programs in black colleges: Building on the strengths of tradition. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *32*(2), 227–236.

Jabri, V. (2004). Feminist ethics and hegemonic global politics. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, *29*(3), 265–284.

Jacob, K., & Licona, A. (2005). Writing the waves: A dialogue on the tools, tactics, and tensions of feminisms and feminist practices over time and place. *NWSA Journal*, *17*(1), 197–205.

Jamal, A. (2005). Transnational feminism as critical practice. *Meridians*, *5*(2), 57–82.

Jaquette, J. (2003). Feminism and the challenges of the 'post-cold war' world. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *5*(3), 331–354.

Jelin, E. (2000). Towards a global environmental citizenship? *Citizenship Studies*, 4(1), 47–63.

Johnson, B. T., & O'Grady, C. R. (Eds). (2006). The spirit of service: Exploring faith, service, and social justice in higher education. Bolton, MA: Anker Publications.

Kabeer, N. (2003). *Gender mainstreaming in poverty eradication and the millennium development resource*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Kashani-Sabet, F. (2005). Patriotic womanhood: The culture of feminism in modern Iran, 1900–1941. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, *32*(1), 29–46.

Kerr, A. E. (1998). Toward a feminist natural science: Linking theory and practice. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *21*(1), 95–110.

Kimmich, A. (1999). 'I found hope' or reflections on theory–practice pedagogy. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, *27*(3/4), 59–70.

Kinser, A. (2004). Negotiating spaces for/through third wave feminism. *NWSA*, *16*(3), 124–153.

Kohlstedt, S. G., & Longino, H. (Eds). (1997). *Women, gender, and science: New directions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Krishnadas, J. (2006). The sexual subaltern in conversations 'somewhere in between': Law and the old politics of colonialism. *Feminist Legal Studies*, *14*(1), 53–77.

Lentin, R. (1993). Feminist research methodologies – a separate paradigm? Notes for a debate. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, *3*, 119–139.

Liao, H.-A. (2006). Toward an epistemology of participatory communication: A feminist perspective. *Howard Journal of Communications*, *17*(2), 101–118.

Lohan, M. (2000). Constructive tensions in feminist technology studies. *Social Studies of Science*, *30*(6), 895–916.

Macdonald, M. (2006). Muslim women and the veil. *Feminist Media Studies*, *6*(1), 7–23.

Mahalingam, R., & Leu, J. (2005). Culture, essentialism, immigration and representations of gender. *Theory and Psychology*, *15*(6), 839–860.

Maiguashca, B. (2005). Theorizing knowledge from women's political practices. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *7*(2), 207–232.

Marchand, M., & Parpart, J. (Eds). (1995). *Feminism/postmodernism/development*. London, New York: Routledge.

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs*, *30*(3), 1771–1800.

Mihesuah, D. A. (2003). *Indigenous American women: Decolonization, empowerment, activism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Mindry, D. (2001). Nongovernmental organizations, 'grassroots,' and the politics of virtue. *Signs*, *26*(4), 1187–1212.

Mohanty, C. T., Russo, A., & Torres, L. (1991). *Third world women and the politics of feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Montoya, R., Frazier, L., & Hurtig, J. (2002). *Gender's place: Feminist anthropologies of Latin America*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moser, C. (1999). *Mainstreaming gender and development in the World Bank: Progress and recommendations*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Moss, P., & Matwychuk, M. L. (2000). Beyond speaking as an 'As A' and stating the 'etc.': Engaging a Praxis of difference. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies*, *21*(3), 82–104.

Nagar, R., & Ali, F. (2003). Collaboration across borders: Moving beyond positionality. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, *24*(3), 356–373.

Narayan, U., & Harding, U., (Eds). (2000). Decentering the center: Philosophy for a multi-cultural, postcolonial, and feminist world, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Nettles, K. D., & Patton, V. K. (2000). Seen but not heard: The racial gap between feminist discourse and practice. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies*, *21*(3), 64–82.

Nicholson, L. (Ed.) (1990). *Feminism/postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.

Ortiz, T. (2001). *Never again a world without us: Voices of Mayan women in Chiapas, Mexico*. Washington, DC: EPICA.

Parisi, L. (2002). Feminist praxis and women's human rights. *Journal of Human Rights*, *1*(4), 571–585.

Phiri, I. A., & Nadar, S. (Eds). (2006). *African women, religion, and health*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Phoenix, A. (Ed.) (2006). Editorial: Intersectionality. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3), 187–192.

Power, M. (2002). *Right-wing women in Chile: Feminine power and the struggle against Allende, 1964–1973*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP.

Puntenney, D. (2000). *A guide to building sustainable organization from the inside out*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.

Purvis, J. (2004). Grrrls and women together in the third wave: embracing the challenges of intergenerational feminism(s). *NWSA*, *16*(3), 93–123.

Randriamaro, Z. (2003). African women challenging neo-liberal economic orthodoxy: The conception and mission of the GERA programme. *Gender and Development*, *11*(1), 44–52.

Reddy, G. (2003). *Farming performance of farm women: Key to sustainable agriculture*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Co.

Rohrer, J. (2004). Toward a full-inclusion feminism: A feminist deployment of disability analysis. Conference papers – Western political science association, annual meeting, pp. 1–33.

Roy, A. (2001). *Power politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Sanford, V., & Angel-Ajani, A. (2006). *Engaged observer: Anthropology, advocacy, and activism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Sarkar, T., & Butalia, U. (1996). *Women and right-wing movements: Indian experiences*. London, New Jersey: Zed Books.

Sawicki, J. (1991). *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, power, and the body*. New York: Routledge.

Schall, J. (2006). Liberal education and 'social justice'. *Liberal Education*, *92*(4), 44–47.

Shildrick, M. (2003). Relative responsibilities. *Women*, *14*(2), 182–194.

Shircliffe, B. J. (2000). Feminist reflections on university activism through women's studies at a state university: Narratives of promise, compromise, and powerlessness. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies*, *21*(3), 38–60.

Steans, J., & Ahmadi, V. (2005). Negotiating the politics of gender and rights: Some reflections on the status of women's human rights at 'Beijing Plus Ten'. *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations*, *19*(3), 227–245.

Tohidi, N. (2002). The global–local intersection of feminism in muslim societies: The cases of Iran and Azerbaijan. *Social Research*, *69*(3), 851–887.

Tonn, M. B. (2004). Fighting feminism: Exploring triumphs and obstacles in feminist politics and scholarship. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *27*(3), 377–395.

Walby, S. (2005). Introduction: Comparative gender mainstreaming in a global era. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *12*(1), 41–60.

Walter, L. (Ed.) (2001). *Women's rights: A global view*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Warters, T. A., & DeLorenzo Denison, L. (2002). Laura Bush: The first post-feminist first lady? Conference papers – American political science association, annual meeting, pp. 1–22.

Widerberg, K. (2006). Disciplinization of gender studies. Old questions, new answers? Nordic strategies in the European context. *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, *14*(2), 131–140.

Wiegman, R. (2000). Feminism's apocalyptic futures. *New Literary History*, *31*(4), 805–826.

Wiegman, R. (2002). Academic feminism against itself. *NWSA Journal*, *14*(2), 1–20.

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (1995). *Feminism and discourse: Psychological perspectives*. London: Sage.

Wilson, E. (2004). Feminism today. *Hecate*, *30*(1), 212–221.

Winter, B. (1994). Women, the law, and cultural relativism in France: The case of excision. *Signs*, *19*(4), 939–975.

Woolf, V. (1938). *Three guineas*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Worth, O. (2002). The Janus-like character of counter-hegemony: Progressive and nationalist responses to liberalism. *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations*, *16*(3), 297–315.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Intersectionality and feminist politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *13*(3), 193–209.

Zucker, A. (2004). Disavowing social identities: What it means when women say 'I'm not a feminist, but…'. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *28*(4), 423–435.

THE FEMALE BODY: PRACTICE AND METAPHOR ACROSS THE MAYA-'AMERICAN' CONTINUUM

Janferie Stone

Rigoberta Menchú, the K'iche' Maya woman who received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1992, devotes a chapter of her book, *Me llamo Rigoberta Menchü y así me nació la conciencia*,[1] to the concept of the *nahual [nawal]*, the protective spirit (often an animal) born with every child. Many Mayan speakers call this protective spirit a *tonal* or *ch'ulel*, a co-essence bound to the child on the day of birth in the Sacred Calendar. *Nawalism* encompasses the ability to shape-change into another kind of being, thereby accessing knowledge beyond human perception, connected to the land and the ancestors. Shape shifting carries a negative connotation for the individual exercising excessive power for personal gain within society, according to Vera and to Victor Montejo. While Menchú emphasizes the connection between individuals and natural forces, she ties this belief to the hidden identities through which the Maya people have preserved their culture (Menchú, 1984, pp. 18–20). Differing from the space-time axes used in modernity to delineate history, her cosmo-vision plays on cultural processes that repeat on different scales, from the individual to the societal, building within a spiral, so each completion accrues to what has come before.

The presence on the world stage of a female spokesperson such as Menchú, signals the emergence not only of concepts of *nawalism* but also of

the obscured power of Maya women. Female dominance in the domestic sphere constitutes an everyday given, but historically their symbolic power swells in public arenas when socio-political change is imminent (Gossen & Leventhal, 1993). The Guatemalan pattern is an instance where public manifestations of women's power marked waves of anti-colonial activism, drawing on Maya mythology and tales of transformation sustained in oral culture since the Conquest (*ibid*.). Archbishop Samuel Ruiz of Chiapas remarked, ''A myth is a way of reflecting ''abstractly'' about things,''[2] laying out individual paths in society. While Menchú, as a public figure, may merge Western frames with Mayan ones, many Maya women speak in the mutable metaphors of tales. Their narratives weave complexes of gender, violence, and socio-political action.

The Spanish title of Menchú's book emphasizes coming into consciousness, but Maya peoples did not become historical subjects intervening in making their worlds because of Catholic Action circles or the tutelage of university revolutionaries. Maya rituals and oral culture show societies cognizant of effective action within historical flows.[3] They know their deeds have made the world they inhabit, despite centuries of colonization. This history does not insist upon continuity from an ancient past as much as it proposes an engagement with appearances, interacting through ritual, dramas, songs, and tales. While these perpetuate bodily, mental, and spiritual stances, they also give players the possibility to transcend what has been previously known. Menchú's book stands as the preeminent instance of the *testimonio* genre in which the voices of the disenfranchised are rendered through conversations with a Western other. In writing, the author appears singular but actually (as in nawalism) clothed in layers: as individual, all Maya people, and the translator, opening windows between worlds. During the 1980s, Menchú's account of the genocidal policies of the Guatemalan state accomplished what indigenous peoples have called the book's ''heart-work'' (Hernandez-Avila, personal communication, 2003; Marcos, 2005, p. 91). Revealing previously submerged feminine power to the world, Menchú asked what could become real, and in this reality be accessible to consciousness and change. The work created in an interview between two women and the subsequent debate of its flaws,[4] opened a space for radical transformation and world making. The continued emergence of such spaces of dialogic possibility creates the conditions for feminisms that sustain and transform the world.

While feminists around the globe have celebrated such a prominent figure of female agency as Menchú, they have remained ambivalent about many of the modes in which indigenous discourse emerges. They have framed the narratives of indigenous women within the *testimonio* discourse, or have

described traditional tales "as the way those we work with talk," proceeding to subsume specifics in developing theory pertinent to Western techno-societies. At times, conscious of the power differential, they presented the words and abstained from interpolation or assignment of meaning. Menchú and Maya women in general remain wary of being classified as feminists, seeing the term as counterproductive to work that must be done within their cultures, in mutual apprenticeship with men (Menchú, 1984, pp. 220–226; Vera, interview, 1992). Nevertheless, feminist activists draw knowledge from fields of engagement that can illuminate strategies for Maya peoples, especially women, amidst the local phenomena and experience of globalization. Feminisms address the larger oppressions, while allowing the gifts of creative cultural systems to emerge in consonance. Traditional symbols and discourse genres have the rhetorical force to pose problems, describe contention in non-accusatory terms, and empower conflict resolution. Of note in the Guatemalan experience is the emergence of Maya spirituality, which opens paths for healing, cultural revitalization, and political flex after the civil war. Assessing the impact of indigenous spirituality on female socio-political activism opens discussions of feminisms to non-Euro-American epistemologies.

Tales of *nawales* are instrumental in this process, revealing ancient belief systems, which employ metaphors to show power shifting in a ground encompassing land and society. Analyzing versions within their historical contexts and against frameworks of feminism opens a mutual discussion that sustains Maya-cultural strengths and illuminates potential courses and practices of engagement for feminist theory.[5] Sketches of layered meanings illustrate the vitality and specificity of the tale genre for a range of situations. On one level *nawal* tales portray domestic violence and the subjugation of women. Yet consideration of ideal Maya gender interaction reveals a metaphorical inversion that creates social and political agency for women. The Maya insist that amid genocidal violence they used the *nawal* metaphor to bring abstract descriptions of players into the public arena, without incurring additional danger for the community. The historical trajectory casts such tales and the appearance of prominent women in the public arena as signs of the rising force of change, through Pan-Maya political agency. This Maya historical model suggests the possibility for realigning feminist historiography, taking feminist movements not as spent waves but as depositions, accruing in life-changing practices. The intersection of Maya spiritual-political movements and feminisms, suggests the kind of spaces where feminists, attentive to the nuances of utterances, can, with Maya women do the "heart-work" (Marcos, 2005) that shifts reality in a world that continues to be dominated by violence.

SETTING THE TALE

In 1992, a Kaq'chikel woman, Vera, told a tale of shapeshifting and dreams to me and the woman with whom she was staying while teaching weaving classes in Northern California. Laughingly, we were exploring the question of power between man and woman. Asked why she, a young woman, was the first to leave her town, Santa Catarina, to travel to North America, she cited a "lineage of power" back to her grandparents that turns on gender and reproductive roles. The following is a synopsis:

> The Nawal (Shapechanging) Wife
>
> Her grandfather had first a bad wife. This wife had no children. She was a woman who went out into the night and ran wild as a lion. The husband grew to be afraid and suspicious, even though she gave him something to make him sleep as if he were dead. One night he awoke anyway; his wife was not beside him. He went out of the house, taking his machete. *He waits and he waits, and then it is big, crying* "aieee" … "aieee" *in the night and it is coming close, it is coming closer and he slashes with his machete, he slashes his machete and she dies.* He knew and yet did not "know" that it was his wife. The head of the animal, which was now human, uttered words. She did not finally die until she was returned to the house of her father the next day.

While many nawal tales end with the disappearance of the animal other, Vera's tale proceeded. Her grandfather needed a wife "to make tortillas" and establish a family. Unacceptable as a suitor in his own town, he traveled in dream to find "the good wife" in the next town. Although this woman was married and had children, he entered her dreams. By describing the course of events that would occur when she awoke, he affected her return to her father's house where he could come to claim her. Utterance itself was the moving force of change. Ultimately, Vera recounted the family lineage that came from this union. While she emphasized the power and "house" of her grandfather, her account extolled the spaces of emotional and spiritual power handed from grandmother to mother to herself, the final woman in the line. Nawal or dreamer, women of power represent a larger social body, engaging lineage and change.

GENDER ROLES AND VIOLENCE – FROM MYTH TO REALITY AND BACK

Vera's tale describes the balance of power between woman and man deemed necessary for the reproduction of family and culture. It contrasts the first

wife as an asocial being, wild with power, with the second wife who was a worthy partner to engender the house of the grandfather. Such tales seem to function to control the social power of women, setting a template to confine their labor to the domestic sphere and entail their bodies in the reproductive strategies of a male hierarchy. This reading resonates with one of the primary tenets of the feminist movement in the 1970s, the universality of male domination, rationalized by constructing the female as weaker and biologically closer to nature (Ortner, 1996). Lois Paul, presenting fieldwork conducted in San Pedro la Laguna on Lake Atitlán during the 1950s, delineates social control of women's fertility and division of labor by gender as two axes of sexual negotiation and gender domination (Paul, 1974). Her account of strictly divided worlds, men in the public sphere, women in the house, and of control of information about sexuality and reproduction, accords with Vera's testimony in the 1990s. This suggests a continuity of modeled gender roles, maintained by metaphorical and actual violence over decades. One level of interaction between feminist activism and the tale is to understand that it records actual incidents where males, challenged by emergent female power, perceived women as *nawals*, and justified violent actions through such culturally significant symbols. Victor Perera records an event in Santiago Atitlán, in 1989 (Perera, 1993, p. 185), when a young woman was killed in the *milpa* (cornfield) of her neighbor. The man claimed (with community support) that he had killed not a woman but her *nawal*, a dog, stealing food in a time of war.

This incident suggests that reading tales as female–male contention does not address the socio-political contexts in which they are told, the historical lines they constitute, or the world-making, the conditions of perception that they accomplish. Such questions focus on the personal and social imaginary of Maya peoples, tied to key concepts of history and memory. Specific instances play against societal norms and historical patterns. On a personal level, Vera linked the everyday and practiced with the highly charged, the violent, and the ritualized. This suggests that tales establish a pattern that encourages a life course along proven and approved of paths to personal power. How then to explain the anomaly presented by the actions of a daughter of this house as Vera moved outside the boundaries described in the tale? Thus, a woman's role is rendered complex, suggesting social currents that are obscure to cultural outsiders. Vera's narrative, set up a logical inconsistency with the world of enactment, creating a space where inversions of the privileged values of female constancy and domesticity, once ruptured, encourage alternate modes of female social agency that may prove adaptive for both individual and society.

Tradition provides the warp against which daily life is woven. Maya communities practice rituals to sustain the cosmos as they interact with the land, whatever their religious affiliation. Mythical origins, such as those enunciated in the *Popul Vuh*, the K'iche' book of creation, or the legend of *El Q'anil* in Jakaltenango (Montejo, 2001), are not necessarily widespread knowledge among Christianized communities. In the *Popul Vuh*, the original Creators, First Mother and First Father, by thought and word, initiated the separation of the waters and the land (Christensen, 2003, pp. 59–75). While the names of progenitors in Mayan languages chart gender and re-productive attributes, reading across multiple ethnographies suggests that they do not evoke polar, static positions, but a complex duality in constant flow, female to male, allowing for differentiated interactions of sexuality and power through a life course (Marcos, 2005, pp. 88–91). Vera asserted that men and women are equal, their powers balanced. She found questions framed by feminist rhetoric at odds with this familial sense of identity and community, where women and men walk the path of life together. While she would not phrase it so, her views accord with those of the Third World women who point to the roots of feminist theory in Western notions of the self, subjectivity and interiority, and thus assert that individualism cuts across social bonds and cultural strategies that have given communities cohesion and strength over centuries of exploitation (Spivak, 1988; Mohanty, 2003). In Guatemala, individualism, rooted in Protestant Christianity, undermines indigenous Mayan spirituality, bringing an enervating cultural homogeneity to the modern landscape. Attention to individual and nuclear family-centered labor production contends with Maya communal traditions.

Maya worldview ascribes dignity to house-holding and the ideal female-male interaction. Vera's tale reaches into the heart of a power exchange, the sexual and gender politics arising from the ability of women to give birth. The roles of women and men in such tales depict lineage as an exchange of blood that results in the division of domestic and public spheres of influence. Ideologically, if not in practice, this exchange acknowledges and valorizes women's power. If circumscribed space stands metaphorically for circumscribed time, the female ''house'' may be seen as the fertile period of a woman's life. The couple develops house-holding skills and the partners exchange labor investments. By middle age, the couple may together achieve status as community progenitors (Vera, Interview, 1992; Ajpub, 1998; Ujpán, 2001). There is high potential for social status, dignity, and unified communal action through balancing gender roles. The ideal is an abstrac-tion slowing change in society. Nation building, indeed global forces, in

tandem with an accelerating technological pace, find agents citing a conserving ideal to establish continuity in the midst of personal and societal upheaval. Through *nawal* tales, the body of a woman becomes a metonymic representation of the community and its holdings in the land, in which women seem essential to cultural continuity through their roles as child bearers and primary socializers of children in Mayan languages (Warren, 1998, p. 108). While the ideal woman–man bond creates a holding space in the realm of the tale, life-practices engage with the daily conditions of relationship and production. The *nawal* tale represents a flow of power between women and men and the growth of social agency for each individual. Given disparities between Western and Maya cultural histories, how might narration, enactment, and gendered bodies interact in symbolic space to reconfigure the course and effects of violence within the highly charged, destructive arenas of state oppression?

TALES AND METAPHOR IN A TIME OF GENOCIDE

In the years between Paul's description of the lives of women in San Pedro la Laguna and my contact with Vera, there have been cataclysmic events in Guatemala, stemming from rule by a landed oligarchy and the deadly legacy of the cold war. During *la violencia*, 440 communities of Mayan speakers were eliminated and tens of thousands of citizens were killed (Montejo, 1999, p. 4). Many anthropologists with extended engagements in Maya communities were unable to maintain contact during the violence. When Kay Warren returned to San Andrés in the late 1980s, she noted that Trixanos, although educated and politically engaged, were telling tales that she came to call "Peel off flesh; Come back on." Trixanos insisted, "This really happened, Kay. My niece saw a woman who was transforming herself" (Warren, 1998, p. 101). Features of the stories were constant. A woman drugs her husband while she changes into an animal and goes off into the night. The deceived husband resolves to be an "assassin of the flesh" by salting her human skin. Returning, the wife is unable to re-clothe herself in her human flesh and disappears in her animal form. Warren's talebearers suggested that these narratives were one way to speak about the trauma of *la violencia*. They were practices of unity in communities wracked by betrayal. While relations within and between communities were of concern, individuals also addressed fear and existential doubt about the limits of their resistance to pain and torture. If, to live, one betrayed others, she or he would ultimately betray a self constructed within a communal whole

(Warren, 1998, pp. 101–104). Exchanging tales, the community used motifs to abstract a problem, making it symbolically open-ended, so that each auditor could arrive at a solution for her/himself. The *nawal* motif became the transforming portal, framing commitment to continuity, working against the disintegration of the community. The commentary of Maya peoples on the meaning of shapeshifter narratives portrays their anguish when every aspect of life, whether ideal or practiced, might be destroyed. In the aftermath of violence Maya writers, breaking silence through testimony and poetry, described the conditions experienced by tens of thousands (Gonzáles, 2000). Against this landscape of rupture, and with the knowledge that women traditionally undertake preparation of bodies for burial, themes of flesh, coverings, spirits, and continuity accrue symbolic weight. Given the killing grounds and mass graves of *la violencia*, the disappearing body of the shapeshifting wife becomes a potent motif.

TIME LINES ENACTED

Gary Gossen, engaging the implications of seasonal rituals for the Tzotzil Maya, notes that the initial primacy of the female is dominant everywhere in the semiotics, psychology, and biology of Maya human experience (Gossen & Leventhal, 1993). He suggests that the insistence on male dominance is a symbolic inversion, responding to a reality in which childhood and adult life for males begin in the female locus of the household. While routinely obscured, the power of women symbolically stabilizes the transitional and terminal phases of the life cycle within the domestic sphere, kin networks, and immediate community. Studying the historical pattern, he notes that female symbolic power emerges in the public political sphere when change on a larger scale is imminent. In popular accounts of historical events, if the protagonists fail to achieve a new political order, they do not die; transformed by their efforts, they shapeshift into their *nawales*. Disappearing into the land, they feed a body of resistance to the dominant order, a reserve that gathers depth and resolution with each successive rising. In the 1980s, the appearance of the female spokesperson, Menchú, on the international scene and the telling of *nawal* tales, signaled a surge of force that aligned with the historical cycle of resistance, of male political and military engagement, and finally of change. Storytelling was in itself a ritual movement to work balance, to harness the power of the uncontrollable blood sacrifice that was taking place, and to effect the structural changes that had to occur in its wake. This movement of history from individual action to social engagement, and the

pace and process of change, suggests a time line that holds promise for reconfiguring the history of feminism as successive cycles of engagement that accrue in depth, appearing and receding, yet sustaining the actors involved through practice. Following the Maya case after the 1996 Peace Accords suggests how spirituality, gender parity, and activism interact.

WOMEN HOLDING PLACES IN CIRCUITS OF EXCHANGE

With the signing of the Peace Accords, has female labor and symbolic power been returned to its domestic sphere? Spiritual and political activisms have intersected in configurations that begin to delineate a Maya feminism. The extent of the upheaval and the prominence of figures, such as Menchú, suggest further conversions of the metaphor of *nawalism*. Thousands of Mayas fled to Mexico, North America, and far-flung locations in the world (Gonzáles, 2000; Montejo, 1999). In projects of identity, they replicate *costumbres* as they struggle to establish niches in wage labor economies. Many undertake long-denied educational opportunities. The remembered homeland, symbolized by women in *traje* (traditional dress) becomes a unifying symbol. Poet Calixta Xiquin speaks to her sense of loss, dislocation, and isolation while exiled in California (Xiquín, 2002). Serving as a spokesperson for displaced Mayas and as passionate critic of the Guatemalan regime's massacres, she felt unable to make the American public aware of her people's plight because ''in the United States people are so inclined toward individualism and materialism'' (Molesky-Poz, 1999, p. 126). Despite the danger, Xiquin realized her calling was in Guatemala and returned in 1987 to train with a K'iche' woman *ajq'ij*, a day-keeper. Asked about the upwelling of Maya spirituality since the 1990s, she states that the religion of the grandmother-fathers had never died, but had been hidden from outsiders, echoing Menchú's words (Perera, 1993, p. 333). As Maya spirituality emerged in the aftermath of violence, it recuperated the term *nawalism*. *Ajq'ij* Vilma Poz recounts: ''[Nawalism] wasn't like it is now … we had to go secretly at night or before dawn so the people didn't see us'' (Molesky-Poz, 1999, p. 86). While the *ajq'ijab* (plural) say that women always practiced *costumbres*, Molesky-Poz's study underlines that many more undertake the work now and they do so in the fertile phase of their lives, practicing sustained periods of abstinence (as do the men) in order to train (pp. 192–194). The need to heal society overcomes objections that families once raised to the postponement of women's reproductive roles.

Young women echo the determination of Menchú to work spiritually and politically in both domestic and public spheres.

A central part of Maya spiritual training engages the transformation processes exemplified in tales of Nawalism – involving radical ruptures with the appearance of reality, shifting the shared meanings of symbols, and creating spaces of possibility for change. These practices constitute a living sign of the different worldviews held by Maya women, consonant with the practices of their feminist counterparts in other societies. Globalization polarizes labor and cultural production and Maya women work in reconfigured ways with crucial issues of land, nature, and population movements. They negotiate spirituality and neo-capitalist modernities, again trading off labor with men. They seek appropriate Maya responses to the challenges presented by legacy of the Civil war in the violent eruptions despite the growth of the Pan-Maya movement.

It is possible for even a casual observer to note the change in Maya public life from the 1970s and 1980s to the present, with the relative absence of men and greater preponderance of women in ceremony and small businesses (Capozza, 1999). Many men were killed during la violencia. Maria Luz-Garcia, working with women's collectives in the Ixil triangle, has documented the number of households headed by women after their husbands' disappearances. Disclaiming "authorship" of their testimonies, these women use the first person plural to express their lived experience as a collective women's effort (Luz-Garcia, 2002). Rosalina Tuyuc, coordinator of a group representing the interests of widows, heads a campaign against continued army conscription. She addresses the strain on indigenous communities from continued militarization, masked by the rhetoric of democratization tied to international aid (Tuyuc, 1997). Gender parity requires the physical engagement of both sexes in their communities.

The travels of young men (predominantly) within transnational labor circuits constitute another demographic factor. The Maya population cannot support itself on available land or compete against international trade agreements that undermine subsistence agriculture. With little industrial development, economic viability lies in export crops, such as coffee, local market economies, tourism, or in migrations, such as that undertaken by Vera. As young men migrate within the country for agricultural work or for much longer periods of time to North America, new power systems are created around remittances. Recent ethnographies suggest that as towns transform from male-controlled compounds to female-dominated households, the wives (or their daughters) are less willing to cede power with the reappearance of the male patriarch from the labor circuit (Capozza, 1999; Ehlers, 1990; Gledhill, 2000).

Women such as Calixta and my talebearer, Vera, return to Guatemala after extended periods in the outside world, carrying concepts shaped by education both within and against the values of Western society, including feminist discourse. They build networks of contacts whose questions help them to define which elements of their society they wish to sustain. They realign their bodies within the paths of labor, making reproductive choices, but defining their life-works through traditional teachings. As the Pan-Maya movement gains political and economic power, women take public stands, especially about educational and health policies. Maya societies cannot ignore the legacies of colonial interactions that have infused daily practices and perceptions, often resulting in the abuse that *Nawal* stories seem to excuse by representing powerful women as being ''outside'' of societal control. Addressing incidents such as that described by Perera, Maya women insist that they will work within their spiritual communities to create dialogue and practices that address domestic violence in culturally effective ways (Nayap-Pot, 1997). A feminism informed by close attention to the discourse of tales encourages culturally relevant working spaces.

As communities establish themselves across transnational labor markets, symbols of the body and its service function in new ways. The female body continues to be a conduit for familial and community voices, not merely a private corpus. It is a vessel for power, not weakness. Metaphorically, Maya women enunciate values that foreground caring for the generations, respecting the teachings of the elders, and raising children in a world that has a *nawal*, a spiritual existence linked to nature. Analysis of tales, including feminist frameworks, increases their potency, widens the historical context, and translates such metaphors for Western understanding. Understanding that the female body is in some situations the generative point for resistance, a historical model of stages and actions emerges.

Undertaking a multi-layered analysis, engaged feminists come to acknowledge that those with whom they work express structurally complex ideas via tales. With this understanding women can craft joint presentations and open spaces for change that are sustainable in word and action. It was the discrepancy between Vera's words and her life course that signaled the possibility of inversions of the tale account and openings for individual action within several societies. Here lies the essence of a narrative transformation that inverts surface readings of the metaphors of violence, troubles easy attributions of gender power and agency, and asks what kind of individuals it takes to envision and make new worlds. Similar questions become crucial in opening spaces of possibility for creating culturally adaptive, sustainable feminisms.

NOTES

1. *I Rigoberta Menchú, an Indian Woman in Guatemala*.
2. http://www.docfilm.com/mexfilms/di/Indiantheology.htm
3. See Anderson's documentary *Sacred Games*, Anderson (1988), Gossen (1984) for Maya beliefs and, León-Portilla (1988), and Marcos on Nahua beliefs that human actions may provoke or prevent cataclysms (Marcos, 2002, p. 374).
4. The controversy, initiated by David Stoll (1993) centered on competing evidence that brought the details of Menchú's text into question. Heated debate ensued, answered in part (Gossen, 1999) by the examination of the role of epic literature in cultural and political transformation.
5. Waller explores such theories through the frame of chaos and the work of Argentinean Lugones, to enunciate the necessity for speaking and writing projects that recognize difference and voice (Waller, 2005, pp. 126–127).

REFERENCES

Ajpub', W. (1998). Language experiences of a Mayan speaker. In: S. Garzon & R. McKenna Brown (Eds), *Life of our language: Kaqchikel Maya maintenance, shift, and revitalization*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Anderson, T. (1988). *Sacred games*. Zeno Production Company. The State Government of Chiapas, Mexico, and the people of San Juan Chamula, Berkeley: University of California Extension Media Center.

Capozza, K. (1999). Horizon on-line magazine. August edition. http://www.horizonmag.org/5/todossantos.asp

Christensen, A. (2003). *Popul Vuh: The sacred book of the Maya*. New York: O Books.

Ehlers, T. (1990). *Silent looms: Women and production in a Guatemalan town*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Gledhill, J. (2000). *Neoliberalism, transnationalization and rural poverty: A case study of Michoacán, Mexico*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Gonzáles, G. (2000). *Return of the Maya*. Rancho Palos Verdes, CA: Yax Te' Foundation.

Gossen, G. H. (1984). *Chamulas in the world of the Sun: Time and space in a Maya oral tradition*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Gossen, G. H. (1999). Rigoberta Menchú and her epic narrative. *Latin American Perspectives*, *26*(6), 64–99.

Gossen, G. H., & Leventhal, R. (1993). The topography of ancient Maya religious pluralism: A dialogue with the present. In: J. Sabloff & J. Henderson (Eds), *Lowland Maya civilization in the eighth century A.D* (pp. 185–217). Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.

León-Portilla, M. (1988). *Time and reality in the thought of the Maya*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Luz-Garcia, M. (2002). Bajo la montaña: women's stories of la violencia. *Foundation for endangered languages manifesto*, *155*, 141.

Marcos, S. (2002). Gender, bodies and cosmos in Mesoamerica. In: K. Saunders (Ed.), *Feminist post-development thought: Rethinking modernity, post-colonialism & representation* (pp. 313–329). London: Zed.

Marcos, S. (2005). The borders within: The indigenous women's movement and feminism in Mexico. In: M. Waller & S. Marcos (Eds), *Dialogue and difference: Feminisms challenge globalization* (pp. 81–112). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Menchú, R. (1984). *I, Rigoberta Menchú, an Indian woman in Guatemala*. London: Verso.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Molesky-Poz, J. (1999). *Dissertation: The public emergence of Maya spirituality in Guatemala*. Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union.

Montejo, V. (1999). *Voices from exile: Violence and survival in modern Maya history*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Montejo, V. (2001). *El Q'anil: Man of lightning*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Nayap-Pot, D. (1997). The social role of Maya women. In: G. Cook (Ed.), *Crosscurrents in indigenous spirituality* (pp. 101–112). New York: E. J. Brill.

Ortner, S. (1996). *Making gender: The politics and erotics of culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Paul, L. (1974). The mastery of work and the mystery of sex in a Guatemalan village. In: M. Z. Rosaldo & L. Lamphere (Eds), *Woman, culture and society* (pp. 281–300). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Perera, V. (1993). *Unfinished conquest: The Guatemalan tragedy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In: C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Stoll, D. (1993). *Between two armies in the ixil towns of Guatemala*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Tuyuc, R. (1997). Political aspects of Guatemalan reality: Mayan widows speak out. In: G. Cook (Ed.), *Crosscurrents in indigenous spirituality* (pp. 101–112). New York: E. J. Brill.

Ujpán, B. I. (2001). *Joseño: Another Mayan voice speaks from Guatemala*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Waller, M. (2005) "One voice kills both our voices" In: M. Waller & S. Marcos (Eds), *Dialogue and difference: Feminisms challenge globalization* (pp. 113–142). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Warren, K. (1998). *Indigenous movements and their critics: Pan-Maya activism in Guatemala*. Princeton: Princeton University Press Warren.

Xiquín, C. (2002). *Tejiendo los sucesos en el tiempo*. Rancho Palos Verdes, CA: Yax'Te Press.

CARING FOR SURVIVAL: MOTHERWORK AND SUSTAINABLE FEMINISMS

Leah Schmalzbauer, Alice Verghese and Meenu Vadera

INTRODUCTION

The structure and functioning of poor families have been deeply changed by processes of globalization. The concentration of capital in core areas of the world economy, for example, has spurred massive migrations, as many poor families in the Global South are faced with the decision of sinking further into poverty together or sending a member North in search of survival wages (Sassen, 1998). In places in the Global South where migration is not a viable response to economic crisis, families find other creative ways to make do (Moser, 1993). Compounding poverty, political instability in many areas threatens family safety and health (Lentin, 1997; Davies, 1994). In all situations of marginality and vulnerability, family survival and well-being depend on creative means of survival. This survival is often gendered.

Patricia Hill Collins (1994) names this critical survival work motherwork, suggesting that it is poor women who are most often charged with ensuring the basic survival of their children and community. Indeed, the basic tasks of feeding, protecting, and nurturing are crucial to maintaining stability within fragile families and communities (Landolt & Da, 2005). Motherwork

is an essential pillar of globalization that supports and enables flows of
capital and labor (Schmalzbauer, 2004), and manages or heals wounds from
war, strife, and inequality.

In this chapter, we offer a grounded, global analysis of motherwork
focusing on the survival strategies and struggles of women who are charged
with ensuring their families' safety and well-being in extreme situations of
marginality. We draw specifically from the experiences of poor women in
Uganda who are denied ownership of land; of women in East Timor who
support families in the context of war and torture; and of Honduran
immigrant women in the United States (US) who endure economic exploi-
tation in order to send money ''home'' to support their children. In all three
situations, global economic and political processes have led to the break-
down of community and family structures, thus necessitating the imple-
mentation of coping strategies, which are gendered. Women surviving in
the margins suffer political, economic, and physical victimization while
simultaneously exerting their agency as mothers and protectorates.

METHODS AND BACKGROUND: CROSSING BORDERS

We draw the data for this chapter from our diverse fieldwork. Alice
consolidates her observations from numerous field visits and survey data that
she gathered while working with the International Rehabilitation Council for
Torture Victims (IRCT) in East Timor. Meenu builds her analysis from
participatory action and life histories she collected during her work with
Action Aid in Uganda. And Leah draws her data from participatory action,
interpretive focus groups, and in-depth interviews she did with transnational
migrants in the US and Honduras. Although our methodologies differ,
crossing borders of academia and the non-governmental sector, and also
those of policy, activism, and scholarship, we work from a shared under-
standing of the complex construction of gender. Indeed, gender is constructed
and understood differently depending on the context in which it is lived and
the methodology by which it is explored. For example, women in East Timor
construct their identities and motherwork strategies in response to the threat
of physical violence, while economic and political oppression is at the heart
of gendered survival struggles in Uganda and Honduras. Yet motherwork, in
service to family and community, connects the women in all three locations.

While this chapter highlights the depth and breadth of gender inequality
in the world system, it is not a chapter about women as victims. We feel it is

not helpful to essentialize women as either a unitary victim group or as more peace-oriented or passive than men (Enloe, 1989; Davies, 1994). We encourage instead that women be seen in their many roles, not only as victims, but also as agents. While we assert that patriarchy is indeed endemic and integral to social formations with regard to the distribution of material resources and power, we take guidance from Mohanty (1991) who asserted that power cannot be neatly locked into a binary opposing structure of possessing power (male) versus being powerless (female). In this current moment of global capitalism, the reproduction of the international division of labor on the local level has created a mosaic of stratification and struggle that defies rigid separations between First World/Third World and between race, class, and gender (Mohanty, 2003). It is in this context that we analyze motherwork as a means of maintaining families and communities.

Gender inequities in burden and responsibility relate directly to the challenges of sustaining feminist theorizing, practices, and activities that are rooted in an ethos of social justice. Although few women in our research would identify as feminist, their struggles embody what we feel to be the soul of sustainable feminisms. Here, we attempt to construct a bridge between the theoretical constructions of feminism and local actions and struggles, which help sustain feminism globally.

MOTHERWORK AND THE GENDERING OF SURVIVAL

Motherwork entails finding creative means to ensure the survival of children and community (Collins, 1994). It may involve informal economic activity (Chant, 1994), working more than one job (Dodson, 1998; Edin & Lein, 1996), negotiating community and kin networks to assist with childcare (Stack & Burton, 1994; Schmalzbauer, 2005), or protecting children from violence (Davies, 1994). Poverty and instability caused by global economic restructuring, namely the removal of government subsidies on basic goods and the introduction of user fees for social services in the Global South and welfare cuts for the poor in the North, has meant that it is most often poor women who bear the responsibility so that their families' basic needs are met (Edin & Lein, 1996; Dodson, 1998; Elson, 1991; Chant, 1994).

Militarism and neo-colonial conflict also have a strong gendered character (Lentin, 1997). Yet an analysis of the intimate relationship between international military actions and gender relations is missing in most military accounts (Enloe, 1989). Women daily step in to fill the void in basic

needs and care left by the State and multi-lateral institutions during times of organized violence and war. As well, they step in to protect and nurture those impacted by war or torture. Yet this carework is not remunerated and seldom even acknowledged (Elson, 1991).

Acknowledging motherwork as a pillar of economic and political struggle that occurs across borders of North and South, public and private, and work and family strengthens feminist discourse and practice. It draws our attention to the very root of human struggle, the homes and communities where suffering and resistance happen side by side. Indeed, we believe that a feminist analysis grounded in strategies of survival can lead to effective plans for social change and the creation of sustainable feminisms.

WOMEN AND THE STRUGGLE FOR LAND IN UGANDA

The Current Situation

Uganda is predominantly an agrarian economy with a large majority of its population still deriving their primary sustenance from agriculture. While women work in agriculture, they have no right over the product of their labor. For over two decades, Uganda has been following export led growth policies as dictated by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF); land has thus become a commodity for sale in the market. This marks a major policy shift, as traditionally land has been a resource collectively owned by communities and tribes with most decision-making power resting in the hands of men. Although there have been diverse land tenure systems, none of them have encouraged individual ownership over land. However, the Land Act of 1998, amended in 2003, made allowances for land to be treated as private property. Increasingly, this has meant large agricultural lands are being turned into commercial plantations, mostly owned by foreigners. Thus, over the years, there has been a consequent weakening of the traditional land tenure systems, while gendered hierarchies remain deeply entrenched.

This is the context in which motherwork in Uganda occurs. Women organize diverse subsistence agricultural strategies to ensure that their families' basic needs are met, while struggling with the ravages of war and AIDS, and with little protection. Indeed, they face the constant risk of being thrown off the very land they have nurtured.

   This risk is exacerbated by polygamy, which is sanctioned by law in Uganda. A small increase in a family's resources often means that they bring in a new wife to the neglect of the first wife and her children. Death of the head of family, often due to AIDS, commonly leads to the widow and her children being thrown off the land by relatives of the deceased.

Problems/Debates

Women are contributing a large part of their productive and reproductive labor to maintaining their families. Yet, this labor is not recognized and not paid. As a result, most women, despite working all their life, find themselves dependent or destitute in their old age. With no right to land ownership, and with few entitlements within marriage, a woman's identity tends to be reduced to that of a wife or a mother. Women are therefore ignored in the macro policy processes that define rights and entitlements.

   The Ugandan government has opposed women's co-ownership of land, suggesting that it would lead to marriages based on property and not love (see www.wougnet.org). There are some political leaders who even argue that land co-ownership would incite women to murder their husbands in order to acquire land. The government further contends that women's co-ownership of land may paralyze property expansion by slowing decision-making.

   Domestic violence in Uganda is another related and deeply endemic problem. Critics of the government stance assert that co-ownership of land could help lower the incidence of violence by encouraging marriages based on serious commitment to sharing family resources. The Domestic Relations Act, promoted by the Ugandan women's movement, draws restrictions around polygamy, such that the rights and entitlements of women are respected within marriage. However, there continues to be deep resistance to this from religious lobbies and from the State itself. Thus, women continue to struggle with violence both in and outside their homes.

Policy Implications

Gender equality in land access and control is a prerequisite for agricultural modernization and economic development. Evidence collected from Action Aid and the Uganda Land Alliance indicates that insecure land rights result in women withholding their labor from cash crop production. In some cases, women abandon agricultural production for petty trade or to engage in casual labor where they control the income. Hence, there is a reduction in agricultural production. Indeed, women are known to be better and more

reliable entrepreneurs, who also keep the interests of family as a priority. Security of tenure for women would make land a more productive resource for families, facilitating motherwork and enhancing overall family and community well being.

Land has become a commodity for trade, the power lying with those who own the land, the majority men. It is therefore imperative to institute mechanisms that protect the rights of women and children from losing their means of sustenance. While international development players, such as the World Bank and IMF, stress the importance of economic growth, they often ignore the rights of the poor, men and women alike. These include the right to labor, the right to own the returns from labor, and the right to decide on utilization of resources. This imbalance in entitlements and rights has meant that women remain in the margins, their voices unheard, lacking control of resources, and thus performing motherwork under conditions of extreme adversity.

HONDURAN IMMIGRATION AND MOTHERWORK

Current Situation: Balancing Work and Care in the Midst of Poverty

Honduras is one of the poorest countries in the western hemisphere (United Nations Human Development Report, 2003). Unemployment is high, wages are low, and the nation's social safety net has been withered by economic austerity measures imposed by the World Bank, IMF, and Honduran government. Compounding this endemic poverty, in 1998 Hurricane Mitch struck Honduras causing major, perhaps, irreparable damage to its already weak economy and infrastructure. According to the Honduran federal government, Hurricane Mitch killed 7,000 Hondurans, injured many more, and caused approximately $3 billion in damage (United States Geological Survey, 2003). It destroyed many of Honduras' plantations, motivating multinational fruit companies to close production sites. Many Hondurans lost their jobs, and rural urban migration, already in play, was exacerbated.

Because of the weak state of the Honduran economy, it is common that families with the means to support migration send their member(s) with the highest wage-earning potential to the US with the hope that they will be able to remit their surplus earnings. According to the Inter-American Development Bank (2001), Honduran migrants to the US remit a total of $500 million/year, which is more than what Honduras earns from the export of bananas, coffee, or seafood.

Honduras' poverty has placed an added burden on Honduran women, as they traditionally have provided the motherwork that supports families (Schmalzbauer, 2005). When women migrate, they commonly rely on other women to care for the children they must leave behind. At the same time they struggle to nurture their children from afar as they work to send home wages (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2001; Parreñas, 2005). In the US, immigrant women face the emotional burden of separation from their families and home country, as well as the economic and physical insecurities that come from working in low paying, insecure jobs (Hondagneu-Sotelo & Avila 1997; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2001; Schmalzbauer, 2005).

Problems/Debates

Transnational mothers, whose families are split between their home and host countries, are unique in that they must try to balance work and family across borders with limited resources, unstable jobs, and precarious legal status. Thus, they accompany their work in the US with long-distance care in the form of remitting money and making regular phone calls. Low wages and lack of access to public support make it all the more difficult for immigrant women to secure their families' basic needs.

In addition to the material struggles surrounding the responsibilities of care, transnational mothers bear the emotional pain of separation from their children. For Hondurans who are undocumented, reunification by legal means in the US is impossible. The other option for reunification, to arrange for one's children to cross the border without legal papers, is dangerous and expensive. Undocumented adults reported having spent around $6,000 to get from Honduras to Boston, US. The trip for children is even more expensive. Most Hondurans, who did cross without papers, do not want their children to experience the brutality of the crossing. Thus, undocumented mothers often go years without seeing their children. Yet, they know that separation is the only means of securing their children's material well-being.

Low wages, unstable work environments, and barriers to family reunification are wearing on transnational families. While immigrants perform labor essential to the functioning of the global economy, they lack rights and protection, living in a culture of fear in which deportation is a constant threat (Schmalzbauer, 2005). At the time of this writing, House bill HR 4437 threatens to criminalize all undocumented immigrants in the US. This would result in massive deportations and imprisonment for millions of poor undocumented immigrants in the US and obvious hardship for their families.

Policy Implications

Bridging macro-structural analyses of immigration patterns with micro-level analyses that take into account lived experiences of migration would highlight the burden born by poor transnational mothers. Gender and the household are the essential guiding units of this work (Mahler & Pessar, 2003). In the day-to-day lives of immigrants, the micro and the macro are intimately connected in a feedback loop of agency and structure; poverty and instability in Honduras are directly connected to migration and to the daily survival strategies employed by transnational families.

Social justice for immigrants, especially for female immigrants, challenges feminists to acknowledge the complex ways that women's liberation and oppression are entwined. Many immigrants have left their own children to perform motherwork as nannies for middle class and wealthy families in the US. This poses a moral challenge to white, middle and upper class men and women, who hire immigrant women to take over their own double shift. Feminists, especially those in positions of privilege, would do well to take notice of the entanglement of race, class, and gender hierarchies, and the many levels in which this entanglement expresses itself in the lived experiences of immigrant women (Romero, 1992; Pessar, 1999; Chang, 2000).

Finally, legislating family reunification as a protected human right would support the emotional and economic struggles of immigrant women. Activists, scholars, and practitioners together could provide a powerful voice advocating the right of all women to be able to be with their children. If the economic conditions of a country are such that migration is the only survival strategy available, then it makes sense that those who immigrate be considered economic refugees with the same rights and privileges given to political refugees.

MOTHERWORK IN THE FACE OF WAR AND TORTURE IN EAST TIMOR

Current Situation

East Timor's population suffered repression and violence during 24 years of Indonesian occupation. After a surge in militia-related violence in September 1999, a nationwide survey done by IRCT on the psychosocial profile and needs of the population revealed a highly traumatized population; 96.6% had experienced at least one form of trauma, while the average

Timorese reported experiencing around six types of trauma. Torture, defined as any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for obtaining information, punishment, or for the purpose of intimidation and coercion, appeared to be widespread. More than half of the population experienced at least one form of torture.

Research also revealed that torture and its effects are gendered. This is true in terms of type of victimization as well as the survival mechanisms invoked in the face of torture and violence. Women in East Timor are commonly charged with protecting vulnerable community members physically while nurturing them through psychological trauma. Adding further challenge to their motherwork is the fact that those doing the protecting and the nurturing are often victims themselves. Despite the critical role they play as victims and protectors, women's accounts of trauma and torture have been largely absent in the formulation of rehabilitation services. This has led to the further invisibility and marginalization of women in all spheres – theory, treatment, legal redress, and economic reparation.There are two reasons as to why this has occurred.

Legal and Definition Obstacles

When torture is raised as a human rights issue, it seldom deals with women. Because women are commonly tortured to punish their male partners or husbands, human rights advocates do not recognize the physical and psychic torture of women as part of the process of torturing the male. Female torture acts remain invisible because those who interpret torture/ trauma have by and large not been the survivor populations themselves. They specifically have not thought about what torture means in terms of gender. Women are now beginning to take on the task of transforming torture and trauma literature to reflect their experience and perspectives.

Gender Bias in Medical Practice

Another contributing factor to the invisibility of women in torture rehabilitation is the gender bias in medical practice and the delivery of torture treatment services. Most research continues to be carried out within the biomedical tradition with little attention paid to social factors. As a result, the findings are often inadequate for formulating gender-sensitive policies. Further, statistics, even if disaggregated by sex, often do not take into account socio-economic status, class, race, or age. As a result, strategies and services are applied to women when they have only been tested on men. Culturally based explanations are treated as exotica while biomedical explanations are regarded as examples of science (Singer, 1990, p. 179).

Under international law, victims of torture are entitled to reparation, which includes restitution, compensation, rehabilitation (medical, psychological, social, legal, economical), and guarantee of non-repetition. Yet, what works in theory does not necessarily work in practice. As a result of the legal bias in torture rehabilitation services, women are denied the support they need to engage in the motherwork that supports families and communities. They are also commonly left without support for their own healing. Thus, unless the major perceptual gaps in interpreting torture are remedied, women and their families will continue to suffer.

Yet, despite the obstacles before them, women are resisting. Owing to the large numbers who require rehabilitation in East Timor, and also due to the chronic shortage of medical professionals, innovative community approaches to healing, including psychosocial services, are challenging the obstacles posed by traditional, individual biomedical biases. These treatment modalities provide the room for women to express and address their experiences of torture.

Problems/Debates

For women, grieving the death of a loved one is often compounded by having to support the family with inadequate resources and the constant threat of violence. Many women lost their houses, livestock, and their vehicles during the Indonesian occupation. Loss of property for women represents a threat to family survival. Because of their responsibility for motherwork, a threat to the domestic sphere constitutes a threat to self and identity. In addition to their domestic duties, women must often take on roles previously reserved for men, particularly in the area of agriculture and informal trade.

Whereas women are saddled with an imbalanced responsibility for the survival of their families, evidence from IRCT shows that small changes in the traditional gender division of labor may be occurring as more women participate in the labor market and surviving men by necessity take on more domestic work. Also, women's critical role in supporting their families economically and emotionally may result in an increase in their sense of self-worth, altering their sense of what it means to be a woman-autonomous and capable rather than the vulnerable dependents of men (El-Bushra, 2000).

Yet, often accompanying women's newfound empowerment is psychological tension stemming from an increased burden of responsibility. This tension is exacerbated by cultural prescriptions that reject women who have moved out of traditional roles. Loss of power for men has led to an increase

in alcohol abuse, which arguably further alienates women (El-Bushra, 2000). Indeed, war can threaten men's sense of masculinity; when men are unable to protect their wives, daughters, sisters, and mothers from acts of violence (Sideris, 2000). War can leave men with either an eroded sense of manhood or a militarized masculine identity, legitimizing violence as a way of maintaining power and control. Whether these men re-assert their manhood in the private sphere, may have implications for gender specific violence and ongoing trauma within the surviving populations (Sideris, 2000).

Policy Implications

While rehabilitation may address the destructive outcomes of war/conflict, it is seldom tuned in to the social hierarchies that perpetuate the abuse of women and children. While wars may create unique issues that are shaped by the particular culture or time, they often simply exaggerate or build on the ordinary problems women face in their responsibility for motherwork. Effective rehabilitation approaches would stress the reconstruction of a social order that upholds justice and peace for both men and women. For women, an absence of war does not necessarily translate to peace. And the need for their motherwork never ceases. The people of East Timor are in need of an alternative rehabilitation framework based on a representative survivors' understanding of the world, a system in which the individual and the social/legal, the mind and the body are not rigidly separated.

As suggested above, the situation in East Timor has the potential to degender motherwork. Yet, threatened masculinity is a barrier to this occurring. Those working to devise legal and medical approaches to rehabilitation face material barriers and cultural barriers; both can wear down individual agency and psyches, sparking resistance to treatments. Feminisms that are tuned in to the physical and psychological aspects of torture, and especially to the way they are gendered, are essential to devising effective rehabilitation programs.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

The examples in this paper indicate immense challenges to gender equality that have been exacerbated by political and economic processes of globalization. They remind us that despite many United Nations workshops, international agreements, and global protests, many societies, often with external mandate, stubbornly cling to policies, practices, and laws that marginalize women. This

marginalization is not based on gender alone. Intersections of race, class, and sexuality can compound or lessen women's vulnerability (Collins, 1994; Mohanty, 2003). As such, it is important that feminists do not try to fit women into simple boxes, but instead analyze and confront women's marginalization in the complex context in which it is produced (Mohanty, 2003).

Women are not only victims; they are also agents. In situations of war, poverty, and migration, it is most often women who are charged with the survival of their families and communities, what we term motherwork. And yet, we find there to be a troubling distance between much feminist theory and the experience of women engaged in this survival work. This distance puts feminists in a tempting position to speak for women instead of letting them speak for themselves. Succumbing to this danger means feminists, not unlike many policy makers and leaders, may gloss over the complexities of women's agency in their assertions of what is best (Youngs, 2006). This risk prompts a specific challenge to feminists to work and theorize in solidarity with women who are holding together poor families and vulnerable communities (Williams & Lykes, 2003). Heeding this challenge will likely take us out of our comfort zones, guiding us away from traditional conferences and strategy sessions that draw together pools of "experts" to gatherings that are led by the voices and experiences of the most marginalized.

The analysis that stems from our fieldwork also encourages us to build feminisms on an intersectional framework of sectors and disciplines. It is common that academics, activists, and policy makers formulate separate analytical definitions and operational applications without seeking cross-linkages (Moser & Clark, 2001). This minimizes effectiveness and constrains the ability for an in-depth understanding of issues. We propose that professionals pool their expertise, working across borders of academia, the non-governmental sector, and grassroots groups to create theory and political strategies that sprout from the margins.

REFERENCES

Chang, G. (2000). Disposable nannies: Women's work and the politics of Latina immigration. *Radical America*, 26(2), 5–20.

Chant, S. (1994). Women and poverty in urban Latin America: Mexican and Costa Rican experiences. In: M. Fatima (Ed.), *Poverty in the 1990s: The responses of urbanization*. Tours, France: UNESCO.

Collins, P. H. (1994). Shifting the center: Race, class and feminist theorizing about motherhood. In: E. N. Glenn, G. Chang & L. R. Forcey (Eds), *Mothering: Ideology, experience, and agency*. New York: Routledge.

Davies, M. (1994). *Women and violence*. London: Zed Books.

Dodson, L. (1998). *Don't call us out of name: The untold lives of women and girls in poor America*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Edin, K., & Lein, L. (1996). *Making ends meet: How single mothers survive welfare and low-wage work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

El-Bushra (2000). Transforming conflict: Some thoughts on gendered understanding of conflict processes. In: Jacobs, Jacobson & Marchbank (Eds), *States of conflict, gender, violence and resistance*. London: Zed Books.

Elson, D. (1991). Male Bias in macro-economics: The case of structural adjustment. In: D. Elson (Ed.), *Male bias in the development process*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Enloe, C. (1989). *Making feminist sense of international politics: Bananas, beaches and bases*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2001). *Domestica: Immigrant workers cleaning and caring in the shadow of affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P., & Avila, E. (1997). I'm here, but I'm there: The meanings of Latina transnational motherhood. *Gender and Society*, *II*(5), 548–569.

Landolt, P., & Da, W. (2005). The spatially ruptured practices of migrant families: A comparison of immigrants from El Salvador and the People's Republic of China. *Current Sociology*, *53*, 625–653.

Lentin, R. (1997). (En)gendering genocides. In: R. Lentin (Ed.), *Gender and catastrophe*. New York: Zed Books.

Mahler, S., & Pessar, P. (2003). Transnational migration: Bringing gender in. *International Migration Review*, *37*, 787–811.

Mohanty, C. (1991). Introduction: Cartographies of struggle: Third world women. In: C. Mohanty, A. Russo & L. Torres (Eds), *Third world women and the politics of feminism*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Mohanty, C. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Moser, C. (1993). *Gender planning and development: Theory, practice and training*. New York: Routledge.

Moser, C., & Clark, F. (2001). *Victims, perpetrators or actors?: Gender, armed conflict and political violence*. New York: Zed Books.

Parreñas, R. (2005). *Children of global migration: Transnational families and gender woes*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pessar, P. (1999). The role of gender, households, and social networks in the migration process: A review and appraisal. In: C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz & J. DeWind (Eds), *The handbook of international migration: The American experience*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Romero, M. (1992). *Maid in the USA*. New York: Routledge.

Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: The New Press.

Schmalzbauer, L. (2004). Searching for wages and mothering from afar: The case of Honduran transnational families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 1317–1331.

Schmalzbauer, L. (2005). *Striving and surviving: A daily life analysis of Honduran transnational families*. New York: Routledge.

Sideris (2000). Rape in war and peace: Some thoughts on social context and gender roles. *Agenda*, *43*, 41–45.

Singer (1990). Reinventing medical anthropology: Toward a critical realignment. *Social Science Medicine*, *30*, 179–187.

Stack, C., & Burton, L. (1994). Kinscripts: Reflections on family, generation and culture. In:
    E. N. Glenn, G. Chang & L. R. Forcey (Eds), *Mothering: Ideology, experience and
    agency*. New York: Routledge.
United Nations Human Development Report (2003). *Millenium development goals: A compact
    among nations to end human poverty*. New York: United Nations.
United States Geological Survey. (2003). http://mitchnts1.cr.usgs.gov/index.html
Williams, J., & Lykes, B. (2003). Bridging theory and practice: Using reflexive cycles in feminist
    participatory action research. *Feminism and Psychology*, *13*, 287–294.
Youngs, G. (2006). Feminist international relations in the age of the war on terror. *International
    Feminist Journal of Politics*, *8*, 3–18.

HAILING THE "AUTHENTIC OTHER": CONSTRUCTING THE THIRD WORLD WOMAN AS AID RECIPIENT IN DONOR NGO AGENDAS

Chilla Bulbeck

INTRODUCTION

The discourse of the "poor oppressed other woman" has been reinvigorated by the conservative turn in international politics. Thus, the Bush administration's deployment of her to justify the war in Afghanistan has been roundly criticized by feminist theorists (Braidotti, 2005; Youngs, 2006, p. 9). In this light, this chapter's criticism of another figure of "the third world woman", the apparently more positive "super heroine" of women's liberation (see Ram, 1991) or worthy recipient of development might seem churlish and misplaced. However, the super heroine of development is also constrained by and assimilated within the dominant discourses of emancipation and development (as Mohanty, 1991, so famously argued): women are "objectified as beneficiaries and victims" (Youngs, 2006, p. 9).

As Mohanty (1991) argued, Western feminists of dominant ethnicities participate in this objectification and marginalization of "the third world

women". It is not unusual for Western commentators to conflate "international" feminism with "American" feminism, claiming the global influence of the latter: "American feminist leaders have often used their influence on behalf of women everywhere". Troutner and Smith (2004, pp. 18–19) make this claim even as they note the "powerful backlash" against feminism in the US and admit that "the core agenda of the U.S. women's movement has very little resonance in the developing world". This chapter asks how feminists of the global north might take account of this "powerful backlash", when acting through nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), might work for sustainable feminisms despite the inequalities that characterize our relationships with women of the global south and the "historically created patriarchal context(s)" (Youngs, 2006, p. 3), most recently expressed in neo-liberalism and U.S. hegemony in international relations that constrain revolutionary desires.

My critique of neo-liberal agendas for development is not intended to deride the women working in NGOs and international institutions in the global north and global south. They believe, with good justification, that women are better-off with full stomachs than without, with running water than without, even with access to many capitalist commodities than without. Nor do I seek to berate feminists of the global north for their interventions in speaking for or in conversation with women of the global south. Rather, my purpose is to explore some of the unintended consequences of Western feminist development agendas.

I argue that the third world woman is constructed as a "worthy" recipient of aid because of her "essential" feminine characteristics: committed to her children and therefore an effective agent of economic development, peace loving and therefore a suitable partner in the transition to democracy, prudent with environmental resources. Should she demonstrate a lack of worthiness, she ceases to deserve the support of Western NGOs. Global Western feminists as aid donors also have presumptions of "worthiness", although the focus may be more on issues – for example, sex trafficking or reproductive autonomy – and appropriate organizational forms – for example, grassroots women's organizations sustained by volunteers – rather than on a notion of ideal womanhood. This chapter concludes with the prospects for a constantly rebalancing act, based on an understanding that "the third world woman" is entitled to aid and other support because she is an equal human being rather than a worthy woman. But such equality does not make her an identical human being to women of the West – she will have her own agenda, and it will not always be "feminist" in Western terms.

A caveat is necessary. Although the examples will normally concern feminists in the nations of the "north" delivering aid to female recipients in the

nations of the ''south'', the terms ''global north'' and ''global south'' are used, in recognition of the fact that wealth and poverty, advanced industrialism and underdevelopment do not lie in neatly divided geographical hemispheres. The third and first worlds denote an historical political subordination and neocolonial economic dominance, but in a situation of rapid global change, for example, as middle classes blossom in China and India and as the working poor expand in the USA and Australia (e.g. see Alexander & Mohanty, 1997).

WOMEN AS SUPER-HEROES OF DEVELOPMENT

> Grass-roots women are not miracle workers, and, like middle-class women, they need to study and understand a situation before they can work effectively in it. The fact that someone is, by birth, ''grass-roots'' does not necessarily make them more understanding of the causes of poverty, or what will change them. It does not give them a keener sense of justice or how to deal with others. It does not necessarily make them more effective at their jobs. (Ford-Smith, 1997, p. 257)

The narrative of development discourse has shifted from the modernization approach of the 1950s and 1960s, to the basic needs approach in the 1970s, to sustainable development and empowerment in the 1980s and 1990s (Desai, 2002, p. 26). Over the same period, a persistent feminist critique of male-oriented development programs has borne some fruits. It might almost be argued that in some quarters, such as the World Bank, women in ''developing'' countries are now viewed as more worthy objects of aid than their men-folk: as better producers, due to their greater efficiency in contributing to economic development; as better parents, due to their selflessness in passing income on to other members of the family; as better citizens, in their desire for peace over war and opposition to corruption; as better ecologists and preservers of the environment, rather than its rapists. While problematic, as this chapter analyses, this construction of the ''virtuous woman'' as the object of development is also a remarkable achievement, given that a scant three decades ago, Ester Boserup (1970) astounded the international aid community with her claims concerning women's central role in third world economies and societies.

On the other hand, the feminist critique of the masculinist foundational logic for development has been far less successful, so that we might summarize the present situation as development apartheid. The International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organisation, the United Nations Security Council and other global organizations centrally committed to pursuing

a neo-liberal capitalist agenda are not controlled by women and are not committing their aid or policies to the desires of women for security, peace or sustainability. The third world woman is exhorted to throw her body and labor against the growing inequalities of capitalist globalization, declining government welfare forced through structural adjustment policies, and the spreading demands for good (read Western liberal democratic) governance (Chua et al., 2000, p. 82). Yet she is included only at the margins of the economy: although holding society together she is still not worthy of more than a subsistent income for her work.

In the World Bank's (2001) report, *Engendering Development: Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources, and Voice*, while adhering to a neo-classical economics market model, tempered as necessary by government or NGO intervention in the case of ''market failure'' or ''externalities'', the authors make a case for women as the main targets of development assistance. Given its cleavage to neo-classical economics, this report, written by ''rational'' academics for ''rational'' policy-makers to effect change in societies comprising ''rational'' actors, blames ''ignorance'' and not ''social customs'' as the main culprit causing women's inequality. Thus mothers' illiteracy and lack of schooling directly disadvantages their young children, for example, concerning health-promoting behavior such as the immunization of their infants; women use their income more beneficially for the ''household'' than do men; more equal participation of women in public life and extended women's rights ''are associated with cleaner business and … better governance'' (King & Mason, 2001, pp. 8, 9, 12, 231, 253).

Because a commitment to ''gender equality'' will foster economic growth, the former can be described as ''a core *development* issue – a development objective in its own right'' (italics mine, in King & Mason, 2001, p. 1). A virtuous circle is established: gender equality contributing to development, which contributes to gender equality (King & Mason, 2001, pp. 181–183). The World Bank has finally heard Ester Boserup's 1970 claim. *Woman's Role in Economic Development* highlighted the productive work of women in the informal sector, criticized development knowledge production as based on masculinist assumptions, but also accepted the neo-classical belief that women, like men, were ''atomized self-interested individuals acting rationally in the pursuit of greater material wealth'' (Ramamurthy, 2000, p. 242). Given this, the development discourse was never going to be a cozy home for women to make their claims, containing, as it did, too many presumptions and values that work against the realities of the most disadvantaged. The oppositional voices always risked either co-optation or marginalization.

Women are wooed by the World Bank because they are seen as more economically productive than men, work harder and are being more innovative with more humble resources. Women's income is invested in increasing the human capital of their children, rather than being squandered on alcohol and cigarettes. However, a fetishization of the grassroots woman (Ford-Smith, 1997, p. 247) involves a presumption that the more "traditional" she is, the more deserving of aid she is, without interrogating how she comes by this "privileged insight into development processes" (Saunders, 2002, p. 13; see also Mindry, 2001). The grassroots woman is assumed to carefully and cannily use resources, "making something from nothing" or "taking a lemon and making lemonade". Indeed, "poor women are constructed as super-beings who are inherently capable of overcoming the entire weight of development single-handedly … why should anyone ask men, the state, unions, or international bodies to interfere?" (Poster & Salime, 2002, p. 200).

Apart from the essentialist aspect of this stereotype, women must also be self-sacrificing to deserve development aid. In a sense, development is still not for women, but for others. The "exponential growth" in micro finance institutions means that there are perhaps 600 million poor households with access to micro credit (Remenyi, 2002, p. 40). However, an analysis of the Grameen Bank borrowers' activities suggests that almost half the money is not invested as specified, but is used instead for men's activities like purchasing fishing nets (Osmani, 1998), or for purchasing dowry items for daughters (Rozario, 2002, p. 69). In the very realization of success, some programs actually expose women to danger from men who feel entitled to the new resources or angry at women's increased independence. For example, "fatwas" in Bangladesh are issued against village women who receive resources from NGOs, as a protest against the altered balance of gender power (Shehabuddin, 1999, pp. 1012, 1019).

Micro credit schemes thus fail to challenge the gendered inequalities of power, even when they attempt to do so. Women who increase their financial obligations may not have time for the associated literacy and human rights classes. While women might have better access to informal sector work, loans for such work holds women in more insecure and less well-rewarded occupations (Poster & Salime, 2002, pp. 196, 212; see also Weber, 2002, p. 60).

Just as micro credit schemes expand women's work, it is also argued that "making and building peace has been added to "women's work" in African nations such as Uganda, Zimbabwe, Namibia (Pankhurst, 2002, p. 131) and in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Helms, 2003). However, and again echoing the

women in economic development scenario, women are confined to the margins of conflict settlement. They are not called on to broker or mediate settlements of large-scale conflicts, but rather to pick up the pieces after the war is over (Pankhurst, 2002, p. 131). In post-war Bosnia-Herzegovina, women are constructed as virtuous peace-loving women, less liable to political corruption. Men are constructed as war-mongering nationalists, who nevertheless maintain formal political power. Women are thus asked to work for peace from a marginalized position, using indirect authority and based on their role as nurturers, wives, and mothers. Women's International Non-government Organisations (INGOs) and NGOs participate in these constructions, sometimes because they also endorse such stereotypes, at other times to increase their chances of securing funding. As donor NGOs give money for ethnic reconciliation, rather than for women's human rights and gender equality projects, and there is widespread endorsement by both Bosnian men and women of women's nurturing roles, even recipient NGOs with feminist sensibilities find it hard to resist this construction of their role (Helms, 2003, p. 27).

In her analysis of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Helms suggests that feminist NGOs and activists are aware of the disabling impact of essentialist stereotypes of nurturing femininity on women's involvement in post-war reconstruction. She also suggests that if there were more feminist funding, directed to gender equality projects, feminist NGOs would have more room to pursue goals based on the diversity of women's desires and capabilities. The next section suggests that funding through feminist NGOs also constrains how activists in the recipient countries may act. Critics argue that NGOs staffed and funded by feminists of the global north impose a Western feminist agenda on aid recipients in the global south, prioritizing projects and activities that are not always considered the most pressing by activists and grassroots women in the aid-receiving countries.

FEMINIST NGOs IN THE GLOBAL NORTH AND SOUTH

[The NGO] label is a *claim-bearing* label. In its most common use, it claims that the organization is "doing good for the development of others". The label has a moral component. Precisely because it is doing good, the organization can make a bid to access funding and public representation. (Hilhorst, 2003, p. 7)

Generally, NGOs have a good press, in many people's eyes a better press than either governments or corporations. According to the World Bank, "[w]here public institutions have failed to protect women against gender-related violence, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) have stepped into the breach" (King & Mason, 2001, p. 104). Following United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM's) innovation in the late 1970s "of making NGOs the executing agents of funded projects" at a time when most UN agencies worked through UN institutions or national governments (Jain, 2005, p. 128), the last two decades have seen a rapid expansion of NGOs, particularly in newly democratized countries, such as Mongolia and Indonesia as well as the post-reform communist countries of Vietnam and China. Many of these were and are women-led and women-oriented NGOs (Liu, 2001, p. 149).

However, the relationship between donor and recipient NGOs is not without its troubles. The relationship is necessarily founded on inequality of resources and often echoes the inequality of imperialism. My particular concern in this section are the "relationships of unequal conceptual exchange", as Mary John puts it, relationships in which the north's "all-embracing, universal" approach confirms itself against the periphery's "exotic and specific" solutions (Thayer, 2000, pp. 207, 228–229). This section outlines the difficulties of translating Western feminist agendas into the third world feminist agendas, using the example of China.

Critics claim that donor feminist NGOs deform the women's movement agenda in recipient countries by exporting feminist issues that are appropriate in the global north but less relevant in the global south. The results of research in the West are used as justifications for activism in India, without undertaking any indigenous research to assess their relevance to India. Madhu Kishwar (1990, pp. 6–7) contrasts activism around reproductive technologies, shelters for battered women, and the hole in the ozone layer with the fact that most Indians do not have clean water (see also Khan, 2004, p. 92 for the tension between "professional" fulfillment of funding organisations' accountability requirements and selfless unpaid activism in Pakistan). Over time, the Brazilian feminist group, SOS Corpo, adapted their enthusiastic response to the Boston Women's Health Book Collective *Our Bodies, Our Selves*, to the Brazilian context. They translated body politics into citizenship claims by women against an oppressive state. By contrast, 30 years later, the Boston Women's Health Collective had learnt nothing from SOS Corpo or any of the many organizations around the world inspired by their book, continuing to attack medicine rather than seeking to reform the state (Thayer, 2000).

Furthermore, it is argued that NGOs are the favored recipients of funds, feminist donors eschewing organizations tainted by their large size or connections with the government (Western feminists being largely unaware of the extent to which their own histories involved working with their governments rather than always against them: see Vickers, 2006). Because of a nostalgia for "autonomous, bottom-up" (Zhang, 2001, p. 162), women's liberation movement groups evincing "enthusiasm, commitment, and democratic decision-making" (Jaschok, Milwertz, & Hsiung, 2001, p. 14), it is assumed, without always being tested or evaluated, that volunteers are preferable to paid workers because of their "zeal for doing women's work" (Wesoky, 2002, pp. 178–182; see also Mindry, 2001, p. 1197), that democratic decision making is superior to hierarchical administration, that small NGOs are popular and flexible and represent "only the interests of their constituency" (Zhang, 2001, p. 162). This "essentialized" and unexamined discourse fails to recognize that many NGOs are hybrid entities (for example, combining income earning with advocacy) and that independence from the state might bring with it dependence on something else, for example, donor NGO agendas (Zhang, 2001, p. 164).

As a result of this bias, popular well-connected women's organizations, for example, political party-affiliated, union-affiliated, church-based or government-connected federations may be by-passed for small-scale but appropriately "feminist" NGOs (Wesoky, 2002, pp. 178–182; see also Zhang, 2001, p. 172). In the former Soviet Union, church-based and other well-networked organizations are sometimes avoided by donor NGOs who support small human rights groups, even if they have few members and are poorly positioned to influence the local political system (Hrycak, 2006 and this volume for Ukraine; McMahon, 2002, pp. 41–50 for Poland and Hungary). Donor agencies, such as UNDP and USAID, form partnerships with NGOs staffed by "foundation feminists" educated in the "women's rights" language of Western feminism, and whose goals are to introduce laws to support women's rights or gender equity education curricula. These groups often have few ties with existing networks and grassroots organizations, whose discourse is "post-socialist", "maternalist", or "traditionalist" (Hrycak, 2006, p. 71). As a result, Western-funded NGOs use a language that is alien to clients and delegitimizes their understanding of their own issues (Hrycak, 2006, pp. 86–87, 97). Magdalena Vanya (2006, pp. 171–175) similarly suggests of the "The Fifth Woman" campaign against domestic violence that Western funders demanded that Slovakian feminist groups move from loose relations to a formal organizational structure, frame the issue in terms of human rights, and rely primarily on the media to

spread the message. As a result, laws were changed, but not attitudes (and behaviors); the complex feminist understanding was deformed into a simple message and became target-driven by measurable goals. As one Chinese activist put it, the Ford Foundation ''has a large influence among women's groups but a small influence in society'' (Wesoky, 2002, p. 150).

The Chinese aid scenario has witnessed a dramatic reorientation of women's activism away from tight Communist Party control to significant dependence on international economic support. Since the late 1970s, NGOs have become both a possibility, with the opening up of China to international influences, and a necessity, with the retreat of the state from almost all aspects of people's lives, leaving many in need of alternative assistance (Liu, 2001, p. 146; Wesoky, 2002, p. 159). There are now about 6,400 women's associations or recreational clubs listed under the All-China Women's Federation (ACWF or *Fulian*), compared with only the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) of China and the Women Personnel Section of the trade union before the Cultural Revolution (Liu, 2001, p. 149). The ACWF has a dual and contradictory role, being both a government institution accountable to the state and a federation of women's organizations accountable to women. In order to gain access to international aid funding and reduce its reliance on the government, *Fulian* was, in 1994, declared to be the largest NGO in China (Jaschok et al., 2001, p. 10; Croll, 2001, p. 35). Some commentators see the ACWF as an umbrella organization offering protection to the burgeoning informal and more vulnerable new social organizations. Others see it as regulating women's NGO activities. Indeed, the ACWF has a range of relations with other organizations, sometimes experienced as enabling and sometimes as restrictive, while membership of the ACWF and NGOs often overlaps. Members of both concentrate on ''being strategic'' to bypass and transcend a matrix of tensions and boundaries, both within China and beyond (Jaschok et al., 2001, p. 13; see also Hrycak, 2006, pp. 86–87, 97 who argues that authoritarian GONGOS (government-organized NGOs) have been founded in Ukraine to tap international aid, often saying the right things in terms of donor discourse but not doing them).

In a Ford Foundation-sponsored workshop, the impact of donor funding on shaping the feminist agenda was ''an issue that turned up again and again'' (Jaschok et al., 2001, p. 5). The Ford Foundation's ''woman-centered'' approach, so it is claimed, has promoted engagement with issues like domestic violence, homosexuality, prostitution, sexual harassment, women's studies and women's reproductive rights (Wesoky, 2002, pp. 150, 202, 224, 227). The Ford Foundation's rights-based reproductive health

agenda is criticized by some recipient organizations as reflecting Western notions of individualism, informed consent and choice, one activist claiming that these values are "very far from those of ordinary Chinese women" (Wesoky, 2002, p. 207). Other Chinese commentators welcome the opportunities for innovation and transformation that come from international exchange, some activists using the slogan, *jiegui*, by which they seek to "connect the rails" of the Chinese and the international women's movements (Gao Xiaoxian in Jaschok et al., 2001, p. 14; Wesoky, 2002, p. 161).

Also attempting to connect the rails, the Wisconsin Coordinating Council on Nicaragua, despite 10 years of working in solidarity with a Nicaraguan feminist NGO and a Nicaraguan church-based organization against President Reagan, found that it was unable to "reverse the North-to-South flow of ideas and development strategies" circumscribed "by the very power imbalances they were attempting to undo" (Weber, 2002, pp. 62, 47). With the best will in the world, it is hard to shift the patterns of structural inequality more than a little – but the will is an essential ingredient for international sustainable feminisms.

Border Crossings to Create Sustainable Feminisms

> it is critical that western feminists begin to "dislocate" feminism as static and western-born. Instead, they should begin to see feminism moving among women, across borders and oceans, and through historical time and contexts, leaving footprints on the eras and locations it touches. (Charania, 2000, p. 161)

The "development" of which King and Mason speak, covers micro finance schemes, education vouchers, immunization programs, but the authors provide no analysis of the gender impacts of large-scale projects, such as hydroelectricity schemes, or northern governments' military aid to developing countries. By implication, there are two kinds of development: his and hers. Small-scale gendered development is for women and large-scale development continues to be administered largely by men, in both donor and recipient institutions, although its gendered impact goes largely unexamined, despite Boserup and all the feminist writers and activists in development who have succeeded her. Gender is still marginalized, even in development practice (Ramamurthy, 2000, p. 243). Thus, I am certainly not arguing for less aid shaped by a feminist agenda, but rather for more discussion of how "international" feminists can shape sustainable feminisms:

appropriate strategies which shift women's agendas further into the centers of power and resource allocation.

I am also not arguing that aid recipients lack no agency: the critique of Western feminist agendas offered by the Chinese commentators discussed above suggests otherwise (see also Chua et al's, 2000 deployment of culture to signal the inter-relationship between production and reproduction and to make visible women's agency). Nor am I arguing that northern feminist NGOs have no right to influence the aid agenda through selecting the projects they fund. If being feminist means anything, donors will not allocate aid impartially to women as war-mongers and women as peace-makers, or activists suppressing women's rights and those advocating for their extension. But in deciding who are the war-mongers and who the peace-makers, donors must listen carefully to the experiences and wishes of those in the field, both those tilling the field and their local spokespersons. Aid donors should test their own assumptions against the desires and dreams of those for whom the aid is intended. Should aid only go to selfless mothers who invest in children rather than those who buy "trinkets" for themselves? Only to women who never default on their tiny loans, rather than those who demand their rights to an equal command of the nation's resources for their own advancement? If human fulfillment is understood as a human right (e.g. see Nussbaum's, 2000, much-discussed framework), women should not be required to be especially selfless or virtuous to be worthy aid recipients.

While the notion of women's equal human rights is unexceptional, if rarely honored, its corollary of equal human duties is a more difficult concept (e.g. see Spivak's, 2005, p. 102 calls for "inscribing collective responsibility as right"), particularly for feminists raised in the liberal tradition which imagines actors as rational independent agents. However, it is through the notion of our duties, perhaps, that feminists of the global north might be more attuned to unequal relations of connection based on colonial and imperial histories (Alexander & Mohanty, 1997, pp. xxiii, xxiv). Partnerships between large and small donors and/or NGOs are still hard to develop (Ackerly, this volume), although there are signs of change. Four essays in the collection by Naples and Desai (2002, p. 35) note that cross-national alliances may be more or less egalitarian, depending on the circumstances. Factors include the extent to which local networks reflect the feminist orientation of donor agencies, donor agency willingness to work with plugged-in NGOs even if they do not promote a feminist approach; whether or not organizations connect women who are similarly situated in

terms of class or race, the extent of self-conscious attempts by donor NGOs to work against structural inequalities by listening to the voices of women in the recipient NGOs.

In discussing her experiences with NGOs in the Philippines, Hilhorst (2003, pp. 219, 223) describes feminist advisors to NGOs as interface experts, their role being to master languages and knowledges prevailing in different domains and to link domains that, at best, only partially overlap. NGO leaders are brokers of meaning, translating events and discourses to produce ideal stories for different contexts. Similarly, Sonia Alvarez (2004, p. 140) denies the claims from *feministas autónomas* that NGOs are "professionalized feminism" with "indecent relations with the state". Instead she notes the hybrid identity of many NGOs, grappling with contradictions condemned by *autónomas* so that they can tactically maneuver within the constraints of bureaucratic demands and neoliberal rationales, uncovering opportunity structures to achieve their own goals but accepting compromises when only these are possible.

A language of "tactics", "strategies" and "compromises" suggests that sustainable feminisms emerge in their doing, in "performing activism" and as donors and recipients create "identity on their own terms" (Sowards & Rinegar, 2006, p. 65). Western feminist activists are no more miracle workers than the third world women are virtuous. We are all subject to weaknesses, prejudices, limited information and forces beyond our control. The process by which aid donors listen carefully to the expressed needs of aid recipients, tailoring their projects in the process, will always be provisional and endlessly revised in the light of experience and outcomes. Even armed with knowledge of the unintended consequences of feminist discourses and a commitment to respectful listening, there are enormous difficulties in achieving feminist outcomes in any masculinist conjuncture. But the promise is sustainable feminisms: that we might learn something, not only about others but also about ourselves.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Alexander, M. J., & Mohanty, C. T. (1997). Introduction: Genealogies, legacies, movements. In: M. J. Alexander & C. T. Mohanty (Eds), *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures* (pp. xii–xiii). New York: Routledge.

Alvarez, S. E. (2004). Advocating feminism: The Latin American feminist NGO "boom". In: L. Ricciutelli, et al. (Eds), *Feminist politics, activism and vision: Local and global challenges* (pp. 122–148). London: Zed Books.

Boserup, E. (1970). *Women's role in economic development*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Braidotti, R. (2005). A critical cartography of feminist post-postmodernism. *Australian Feminist Studies*, *20*(47), 169–180.

Charania, M. (2000). Bifurcation: Personal identity and larger feminisms. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, *6*, 148–163.

Chua, P., Bhavnani, K.-K., & Foran, J. (2000). Women, culture, development: A new paradigm for development studies? *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 23*, 820–841.

Croll, E. (2001). New spaces, new voices: Women organizing in twentieth-century China. In: P.-C. Hsiung, M. Jaschok, C. Milwertz & R. Chan (Eds), *Chinese women organizing: Cadres, feminists, Muslims, queers* (pp. 25–40). Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Desai, M. (2002). Transnational solidarity: Women's agency, structural adjustment, and globalization. In: N. A. Naples & M. Desai (Eds), *Women's activism and globalization: Linking local struggles and transnational politics* (pp. 15–33). New York: Routledge.

Ford-Smith, H. (1997). Ring ding in a tight corner: Sistren, collective democracy, and the organization of cultural production. In: M. J. Alexander & C. T. Mohanty (Eds), *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures* (pp. 227–259). New York: Routledge.

Helms, E. (2003). Women as agents of ethnic reconciliation? Women's NGOs and international intervention in postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *26*, 15–33.

Hilhorst, D. (2003). *The real world of NGOs: Discourses, diversity and development*. London: Zed Books.

Hrycak, A. (2006). Foundation feminism and the articulation of hybrid feminisms in post-socialist Ukraine. *East European Politics and Societies*, *20*, 69–100.

Jain, D. (2005). *Women, development, and the UN: A sixty-year quest for equality and justice*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jaschok, M., Milwertz, C., & Hsiung, P.-C. (2001). Introduction. In: P.-C. Hsiung, et al. (Eds), *Chinese women organizing: Cadres, feminists, Muslims, queers* (pp. 3–24). Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Khan, N. S. (2004). Up against the state: The women's movement in Pakistan and its implications for the global women's movement. In: L. Ricciutelli, et al. (Eds), *Feminist politics, activism and vision: Local and global challenges* (pp. 86–99). London: Zed Books.

King, E.M., & Mason, A.D. (with the assistance of Basu, A., Tan, T. L., Montenegro, C. E., & Wang, L.). (2001). *Engendering development: Through gender equality in rights, resources, and voice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kishwar, M. (1990). Why I do not call myself a feminist. *Manushi*, *61*, 2–8.

Liu, B. (2001). The All China Women's Federation and women's NGOs. In: P. C. Hsiung, et al. (Eds), *Chinese women organizing: cadres, feminists, Muslims, queers* (pp. 141–158). Oxford: Berg Publishers.

McMahon, P. C. (2002). Women's NGOs in Poland and Hungary. In: S. E. Mendelson & J. K. Glenn (Eds), *The power and limits of NGOs* (pp. 29–35). New York: Columbia University Press.

Mindry, D. (2001). Nongovernmental organizations, "grassroots," and the politics of virtue. *Signs*, *26*, 1187–1211.

Mohanty, C. T. (1991). Under western eyes. In: C. T. Mohanty, et al. (Eds), *Third World Women and the politics of feminism* (pp. 51–80). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Naples, N. A., & Desai, M. (2002). Women's local and translocal responses: An introduction to the chapters. In: N. A. Naples & M. Desai (Eds), *Women's activism and globalization: Linking local struggles and transnational politics* (pp. 34–41). New York: Routledge.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2000). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Osmani, L. N. K. (1998). Impact of credit on the relative well-being of women: Evidence from the Grameen Bank. *IDS Bulletin*, *29*(4), 30–38.

Pankhurst, D. (2002). Making a difference? The inclusion of gender into institutional conflict management policies. In: M. Braig & S. Wölte (Eds), *Common ground or mutual exclusion? Women's movements and international relations* (pp. 129–135). London: Zed Books.

Poster, W., & Salime, Z. (2002). The limits of microcredit: Transnational feminism and USAID activities in the United States and Morocco. In: N. A. Naples & M. Desai (Eds), *Women's activism and globalization: Linking local struggles and transnational politics* (pp. 189–219). New York: Routledge.

Ram, K. (1991). "First" and "Third World" feminisms: A new perspective? *Asian Studies Review, 15*, 1991, 91–96.

Ramamurthy, P. (2000). Indexing alternatives: Feminist development studies and global political economy. *Feminist Theory*, *1*, 239–256.

Remenyi, J. (2002). Microfinance best practice: Ten parameters of success for development NGOs. *Development Bulletin*, *57*, 40–44.

Rozario, S. (2002). Grameen Bank-style microcredit: Impact on dowry and women's solidarity. *Development Bulletin*, *57*, 67–70.

Saunders, K. (2002). Introduction: Towards deconstructive post-development criticism. In: K. Saunders (Ed.), *Feminist post-development thought: Rethinking modernity, post-colonialism and representation* (pp. 1–38). London: Zed Books.

Shehabuddin, E. (1999). Contesting the Illicit: Gender and the politics of fatwas in Bangladesh. *Signs*, *24*, 1011–1021.

Sowards, S., & Rinegar, V. (2006). Reconceptualizing rhetorical activism in contemporary feminist contexts. *The Howard Journal of Communication*, *17*, 57–74.

Spivak, G. (2005). Planetarity. In: G. Spivak (Ed.), *Death of a discipline* (pp. 71–102). New York: Columbia University Press.

Thayer, M. (2000). Travelling feminisms: From embodied women to gendered citizenship. In: M. Buraway, J. A. Blum, S. George, Z. Gille, T. Gowan, L. Haney, M. Klawiter, S. H. Lopez, S. Ó. Riain & M. Thayer (Eds), *Global ethnography: Forces, connections and imaginations in a Postmodern world* (pp. 203–233). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Troutner, J. L., & Smith, P. H. (2004). Introduction: Empowering women: agency, structure and comparative perspective. In: P. H. Smith, et al. (Eds), *Promises of empowerment: Women in Asia and Latin America* (pp. 1–30). Rowman: Lanham.

Vanya, M. (2006). Marketing social change after communism: The case of domestic violence in Slovakia. In: V. Demos & M. T. Segal (Eds), *Gender and the local-global nexus: Theory, research and action advances in gender research* (Vol. 10, pp. 163–194). Oxford: Elsevier.

Vickers, J. (2006). Bringing nations in. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 8, 84–109.

Weber, C. (2002). Women to women: Dissident citizen diplomacy in Nicaragua. In: N. A. Naples & M. Desai (Eds), *Women's activism and globalization: Linking local struggles and transnational politics* (pp. 45–63). New York: Routledge.

Wesoky, S. R. (2002). *Chinese feminism faces globalization*. New York: Routledge.

Youngs, G. (2006). Feminist international relations in the age of war on terror. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 8, 3–18.

Zhang, N. (2001). Searching for ''authentic'' NGOs: The NGO discourse and women's organizations in China. In: P.-C. Hsiung, et al. (Eds), *Chinese women organizing: Cadres, feminists, Muslims, queers* (pp. 159–179). Oxford: Berg Publishers.

FROM GLOBAL TO LOCAL FEMINISMS: TRANSNATIONALISM, FOREIGN AID AND THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT IN UKRAINE

Alexandra Hrycak

Mention of transnational feminism has grown increasingly frequent in discussions of how to mitigate the effects of globalization on women and other groups. Underlying these discussions is agreement that globalization has posed new political challenges for women throughout the world (Hobson & Lister, 2002). There is also much hope expressed that feminist transnational campaigns have the potential to unite women and other groups around a common agenda (Brenner, 2003; Evans, 2005). And yet questions have also been raised about a side of transnationalism that is often ignored: what happens to nascent local movements when transnational forms of feminism are transplanted across the globe (Alvarez, 2000; Gal, 2003).

Concerns regarding the local impact of transnational feminism have already sparked considerable debate and research about issues of sustainability that are squarely at the center of the current volume and are discussed in several other contributions. In key respects, claims regarding transnational feminism echo earlier calls to build "global sisterhood" (Morgan, 1984). These raised concerns regarding the relevance of feminism as it is commonly understood in the West to local movements elsewhere in

the world (Mohanty, 2003). Studies that examine women's activism within a comparative context have found that "feminists, particularly from the industrialized Western world, have been apt to make sweeping generalizations about commonalities among women across globe. Such generalizations aggravate tensions not only along north-south lines but also along other lines of cleavage, including class, race, and sexual orientation (Basu, 1995, p. 19)." Furthermore, examinations of the impact of funding patterns have also demonstrated that far from uniting feminist NGOs and local grassroots activists around a common agenda, transnational activism has increased stratification among women's groups. Divisions result because of competition for resources that are provided mainly by the United Nations (UN) and by government foreign aid programs and foundations located in wealthy countries. These international donors typically prefer to fund groups with specific organizational characteristics, such as feminist NGOs that operate as "gender experts" and view local community groups as their clients (Alvarez, 2000; Brenner, 2003; Naples & Desai, 2002).

These issues are most fruitfully approached in a specific context (Basu, 2000; Basu & McGrory, 1995). The relationships between global and local forms of women's mobilization are extremely complex and difficult to untangle. Careful ethnographic studies that follow activists as they move across borders are a fruitful starting point (Burawoy, 2000). The following analysis builds on ethnographic work and interviews I conducted from 1998 until 2005 with foreign and domestic participants in Ukrainian transnational advocacy projects. In Washington, DC I interviewed the staff of projects that are funded by the US government and that manage democracy aid to Ukraine. I interviewed the founders, advisors, and staff of the largest of the partnerships concerned with women's rights that are funded by the US government in the former Soviet Union. I focused on how my interviewees became involved in US funded assistance to women's NGOs in Ukraine, what were their goals and methods of work, and who were their local partners. I then explored the same themes in interviews with over 60 local women's organizations in three Ukrainian cities. I also served as an election observer, attended meetings, protest rallies, conferences and other public events, reviewed one foreign-funded organization's grant records, read mission statements, final reports and analyses of women's activism, and had informal conversations on a regular basis with recipients of various forms of foreign aid.

My aim was to understand the consequences of over a decade of extensive foreign feminist involvement in post-communist women's movements. Post-communist countries such as Ukraine provide an opportunity to examine

the effects on local movements of a new type of transnational feminist activism. It evolved since the end of the Cold War and operates through Western programs that provide foreign aid to countries undergoing a transition from communist party rule. The primary goal of these programs is to integrate post-communist countries into global markets (Wedel, 1998). However, in response to pressure from advocates of democratization, foreign donors also introduced "civil society" projects. These projects employed transnational advocates to help expand citizen involvement in public life, increase public influence in policymaking, and strengthen civil society (Carothers, 1999; Sampson, 1996). Generally, studies have found that these aims have not been achieved (Abramson, 1999; Hemment, 2004; Henderson, 2003; Hrycak, 2002; Mendelson & Glenn, 2002). Indeed, in certain key respects, foreign intervention seems to have hurt, rather than helped, the development of civil society as a whole (Hrycak, 2005a, 2006; Mendelson & Glenn, 2002). My own interviews confirmed that participants agreed that foreign programs had raised important new issues. However, nearly all were disappointed with their outcomes and felt that donors and transnational advocates had not fulfilled their promises to assist in the development of Ukraine's women's movement.

Below, I use foreign aid to women's organizations in Ukraine as a site for exploring why Western donors as well as the transnational advocates and feminist activists they employ have not succeeded in fostering sustainable post-Soviet women's movements. I will argue that foreign aid has created opportunities for the invention of viable local "hybrid feminisms" – new forms of feminism that are localized and hence potentially more sustainable, than the forms of feminism that were introduced by foreign advocates. However, as I show below, the structure of foreign aid programs has also undermined local groups. Funding rivalries and frequent shifts in donor priorities have deepened divisions between organizations and prevented them from working together.

The next section examines the main debates about the impact that transnational activism has on local activism. I then explore how foreign and local feminists have viewed the women's movement in Ukraine. After this, I present the central patterns I discovered of the impact foreign assistance has had on the women's movement in Ukraine. In subsequent sections, I will provide a series of examples that demonstrate typical patterns of diffusion of local and foreign feminism. In order to protect the participants in my research from negative sanctions against them or their organizations by foreign funders or their staff, I avoid personal and organizational identifiers and present general patterns.

GLOBALIZATION, TRANSNATIONAL FEMINISM AND LOCAL MOVEMENTS

Three main claims have generally been made regarding the beneficial impact of increased global integration on local women's movements. First, increased global integration is said to create opportunities for local movements to participate in international conferences and partnerships with international organizations (Gray, Kittilson, & Sandholtz, 2006; Sassen, 1998, pp. 96–97). Second, it is said to help local movements participate in transnational networks that work together on global issues such as trafficking or domestic violence and are able to exert pressure both on transnational organizations such as the UN and the European Union and on national states to adopt policies that support norms of equality for women (Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Moghadam, 2000). Third, it is argued that both these forms of cross-border contact create opportunities for learning feminist framing strategies that focus on gender equality and freedom of choice and are superior to local forms of activism that are organized around motherhood or ''parochial'' identities (Sassen, 1998).

Researchers exploring the impact of transnational NGOs have come to the conclusion that these new forms of activist sponsorship are not as uniformly beneficial throughout the world as general discussions of globalization often claim (for a review, see Smith, Chatfield, & Pagnucco, 1997a). They have found that just as in the past, new transnational forms of activism tend to originate in wealthier countries (Smith & Wiest, 2005). The set of issues, norms, and master frames that dominate global campaigns reflects this geography of activism (Smith, 2002). In their examination of several major types of transnational advocacy, Keck and Sikkink (1998) conclude that transnational campaigns that are successful tend to be coordinated by transnational advocacy networks that focus on a small number of target issues that reflect the interests of Western sympathizers. Transnational activism thus typically overlooks numerous groups that fail to frame their grievances in terms of recognizably Western causes.

What is more, transnational activism alone cannot help struggling local groups to become a powerful movement. Local challengers need to develop strong local mobilizing structures and collective action frames with local resonance. Smith, Pagnucco and Chatfield examined a wide variety of transnational social movement organizations and concluded that their local impact is conditioned by ''preexisting mobilizing structures, the political opportunities inherent in national, intergovernmental, and nongovernmental contexts, and by strategies to mobilize resources to act'' (Smith, Pagnucco, &

Chatfield, 1997b, p. 60). Ironically, however, transnational mobilization can inadvertently weaken the potential of nascent grassroots movements by (1) encouraging the adoption of collective action frames that are ill suited to local contexts, thus isolating local groups from the populations they serve, (2) increasing competition among similar groups for foreign funding, and (3) discouraging local groups from engaging in local politics and encouraging them instead to devote themselves to the causes and concerns of activists and sympathizers abroad (Tarrow, 1998, 2005).

FEMINISM AND THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT IN UKRAINE

Tens of thousands of women became active in public life during the tumultuous final years of Soviet rule. Several different kinds of women's associations formed in Ukraine after it declared its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991. They were showing promising signs of developing into a movement that would help women develop political power (for an overview, see Hrycak (2001)). These new groups attracted women who were, and remain, deeply engaged in local public life. They pursued issues that have strong resonance with local understandings of public problems. Their aims included the revival of religious and national traditions as well as expanding the involvement of women in public life, in particular, to reform the state's treatment of children and families (Pavlychko, 1992, 1997).

The women's movement that emerged from these activities constructed a new collective identity for women as activist-mothers. The movement's discourse was not based on Western feminist ideas about emancipating women from patriarchal power. Instead, it was based on a nationalist discourse of "empowered motherhood" that focused on a mythic guardian of the hearth, the *Berehynia* (Kis', 2003; Zhurzhenko, 2001). The movement used this discourse for framing women's activism mainly around issues of nation building and children's well-being.

Foreign and local feminist scholars viewed this new identity very differently. Foreign feminist scholars considered it to be deeply patriarchal (Molyneux, 1994; Rubchak, 2001). Yet, local feminists argued that this new identity was a potential resource for involving women in public life. This is because it resonated with the understandings of women's roles that emerged locally in opposition to the official state socialist gender project (Kis', 2003; Zhurzhenko, 2001).

Some local feminists also saw this new collective identity as a potential resource for the development of a localized feminism. Zhurzhenko, for example, described the myth of empowered motherhood as "ambivalent." She showed that it spurred productive debates among local feminists. These helped them shift away from viewing feminism as an "imported, western-centered" phenomenon and moved them closer toward constructing a "Ukrainian feminism" that had local relevance (Zhurzhenko, 2001, p. 1).

Indeed, local feminist scholars' engagement with the origins of women's activism in Ukraine has stimulated interest in local women's groups and advocates that fought for women's equality prior to Soviet rule (Smolyar, 1998, 1999). Scholars argue that despite post-Soviet stereotypes that claim that feminism is impossible in Ukraine, these earlier groups indeed gave rise to a specifically "Ukrainian feminism" (in Ukrainian, *Ukrainskyi feminizm*) (Khoma, 2000, pp. 23, 26). They view these groups and activists as proof that "feminism existed not only as a western European or American phenomenon, but that Ukrainian feminism carried out in national culture a no less important role in opening up theoretical discourse and creating a new type of Ukrainian woman, the woman-citizen, and creating the conditions for fundamental changes in the spiritual identity of the Ukrainian world of the twentieth century (Zborovs'ka & Il'nyts'ka, 1999, p. 20)."

FOREIGN AID AND THE UKRAINIAN WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

This emergent women's movement might have been expected to flourish in subsequent years. It possessed many of the resources theorists believe are most critical to collective action: organizations, networks of activists mobilized around a distinct set of issues, and a common collective identity. It also had attracted local sympathizers who believed that feminist activism could be viewed as a local tradition rather than a foreign imposition. All that it lacked was funding, and this is what numerous transnational and international organizations seemed to offer local women's organizations in post-communist countries.

All foreign donors agreed that women's organizations were key components of civil society and were crucial to democratization. Relative to other groups active in civil society, women's organizations received a great deal of grant support from foreign donors. Projects to develop women's organizations received generous grants from all major civil society projects in the countries of the former Soviet Union. The funders that invested the most

resources into women's projects in Ukraine were the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the International Renaissance Foundation, the UN Development Program, the European Union's Technical Aid to the Commonwealth of Independent States program, and the Canadian International Development Agency (Hrycak, 2006; Sydorenko, 2001a). These foreign funders created many opportunities for local scholars and advocates to travel abroad. They also focused on financing the development of NGOs and NGO networks. Many projects provided small grants and training through transnational ''partnerships'' that paired local groups with a foreign advocacy group or nonprofit organization that introduced them to model programs and strategies for fostering gender equality, combating trafficking, fighting domestic violence, or fostering women's economic empowerment (Hrycak, 2002, 2006).

Foreign funding resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of organizations devoted to women's issues throughout the former Soviet Union. In Ukraine, the number of women's organizations registered with the state increased from 5 in 1991 to well over 1,200 in 2001 (Sydorenko, 2001b). Foreign funding helped aid the establishment of promising new types of organizations such as gender studies centers, battered women shelters, and microcredit projects. It made possible numerous seminars, conferences, and publications assessing the status of women in Ukraine and setting domestic agendas. More broadly, foreign programs raised awareness of transnational campaigns to raise women's issues. These have influenced Ukrainian policy-makers and resulted in the passage of laws to prevent domestic violence (2002) and ensure equal rights (2005), state projects to combat trafficking and assist victims of trafficking (2003), and a national plan to promote gender equality (2001–2005).

Despite these impressive achievements, serious problems plague the women's movement in Ukraine. Polls suggest that very few Ukrainian citizens know about the existence of women's organizations, most do not trust them, and only an insignificant number has ever participated in their activities (Smolyar, 2001). This may be the result of lingering distrust toward the official women's organizations of the Soviet era. The public's attitudes also may stem from the fact that the post-Soviet women's organizations with the greatest media exposure are based in local political machines that use women's groups during elections to distribute semi-legal ''gifts'' to senior citizens, needy families, and other vulnerable populations in exchange for their votes (Hrycak, 2005a).

But the public's lack of understanding and trust also reflects problems with the kind of activism that foreign projects have fostered. Foreign

funding is the major source of employment and resources among women's organizations in Ukraine today (Sydorenko, 2001a). The women's organizations that work most closely with foreign donors and transnational advocacy networks are small, professionalized, and elite groups that are modeled after Western NGOs. Foreign funders prefer to work with professionalized organizations because they deem them the most efficient and effective intermediaries for transmitting crucial foreign resources aimed at empowering women at the grassroots or community levels (Hrycak, 2006). Yet these organizations have nearly all failed to generate sustainable forms of activism that can coalesce into a broader movement that mobilizes grassroots women. Indeed, most professionalized organizations do little outreach work with the populations they "represent." They are oriented more toward networking with foreign advocates and spend a good portion of their time searching for funding from Western donors and participating in training exchanges with Western countries.

FOUNDATION FEMINISM

In the following sections, I will examine illustrations of the practices and assumptions that have served to complicate the outcomes of encounters between the Ukrainian women's movement, foreign funders, and transnational women's rights advocates. My focus will be on an elite group of transnational organizers I call the "foundation feminists" (Hrycak, 2006). Foundation feminists work for foreign foundations and women's rights programs. Most are US or Canadian citizens. A small number are expatriates, typically children of Ukrainian refugees who fled the Soviet Union during World War II. Only a few are "local" women who were born and grew up in the Soviet Union.

The foundation feminists work on projects that are integrated into foreign aid programs. These programs are designed and operated mainly by development agencies that in the past specialized in running development programs in "Third World" countries. Their programs to promote women's issues in post-communist countries were designed and administered by the same staff and initially used the same program materials as they employed in their development work elsewhere in the world (Kupryashkina, 2000). Later they switched to include staff and materials used to work with disadvantaged populations in their countries of origin. These staffing and programming practices result in a mismatch between the models these organizations employ and the local models that are embraced by activists in Ukraine (interview, US reproductive health NGO, December 8, 1998).

Career pressures encourage foundation feminists to promote the models that are prevalent in international development work. One illustration of how this in practice complicates their aims to strengthen local activism is provided by their projects to empower grassroots groups. Foreign donors expect staff to implement projects that are global and meet their industry standards. They reward employees who are able to carry out these projects on the ground. This in practice means that projects to "promote grassroots groups" are designed without any input from the local groups they intend to assist. Indeed, it is a great irony that foundation feminists I interviewed and observed generally believe they were working with groups they considered "very grass-roots" (interview, US women's rights advocate, December 11, 1998; interview, director of US grassroots development project, November 10, 2001). Yet, they in practice funded a small elite of professional groups created to carry out foreign donor projects. Foreign program staff looked down on and never funded the local groups that most resemble ideal-typical grassroots actors. Rather than viewing local grassroots actors' understandings of women's issues – which have strong public resonance – as a resource for mobilizing, development program culture condemns them as local "traditions" that deter progress toward gender equality.

Foreign women's rights activists' lack of sympathy for local women's activism was evident to many of those I interviewed. This attitude alienated broader networks of activists. The impression that foreign women's rights advocates had no real interest in local women's activism or the issues it raised, of course, prevented recruitment of groups and potential leaders with experience in public life and protest.

LOCALIZING FOUNDATION FEMINISM

To address the poor fit between foreign and local understandings of women's issues, some foreign programs recruit local activists to work for and adapt their programs. This is why a foreign program hired "Anna." Anna was active in a local women's association that formed within the independence movement. She recalls that before she was hired by USAID's women's rights program, US trainers worked through translators and were unfamiliar with local political life (interview, March 22, 2001). The issues and tactics they encouraged Ukrainian women to adopt were drawn from foreign contexts and had little applicability to local women's real concerns. She recalled her experience of seminars the League of Women Voters sponsored in Kyiv:

> I remember we were sitting at [an empowerment training]. The League of Women Voters had brought a woman to talk to us. We were upset because [independence movement

activist and member of parliament] Khmara had been arrested yet another time, and we had just come from a protest at the prison, and here she is telling us about how they convinced their local government to change how children's dental plans were paid for through insurance. We sat there thinking, "what insurance, what is she talking about?" We didn't have those problems.

For Anna and other seminar participants, there was no reason for them to fight for changes in children's dental insurance plans. The government in Ukraine claims to provide all citizens with free medical and dental care although in practice severe shortages of medicine often necessitate that patients supply their own drugs and other materials. But foreign advocates who parachuted in for two days to conduct a seminar in Ukraine typically possessed no knowledge of local conditions and made little effort to elicit discussions of what those attending their seminars considered to be the real local issues.

In response to such concerns, USAID projects hired local trainers like Anna to staff their programs. Local trainers lead sessions that resemble the seminars to handle issues of diversity and multiculturalism that are products of a veritable industry in the United States (Abramson, 1999; Hrycak, 2006). Critics fault such seminars for their banal assumption that trust can be built through performances in which participants confess their prejudices and give voice to their experiences (Mohanty, 2003). Indeed, such an individualized and psychologized response does not address local criticism of foreign programs. But foreign projects rarely incorporate effective mechanisms for using local input from the groups they serve.

HYBRID FEMINISTS

Foundation feminists have unleashed complex and contradictory pressures. But foreign projects that are funded for several years (rather than a few weeks, as is commonly the case) do become more locally oriented. These projects have played a positive role in facilitating the development of what I call "hybrid feminism" (Hrycak, 2006). As I show below, hybrid feminisms integrate local and foreign models of activism (Hrycak, 2002, 2006; Pavlychko, 1992, 1997; Phillips, 2000). Hybrid feminists do not typically work for development projects. They are often former leaders of the women's associations that emerged from the independence movement. Later they were trained in Western women's rights activism through foreign foundation programs. As a result, they are able to speak in both foreign and local activist idioms. They have greatly expanded the appeal of women's

rights activism in Ukraine by articulating foreign women's rights claims with those of national revival and by demonstrating how families and children can benefit from gender equality. This tiny but influential cadre of local converts has reframed the type of feminism foreign programs employ. They borrowed from Western feminism to develop local action frames that have a better fit for local understandings of women's issues.

Most hybrid feminists prefer not to use the term ''feminism'' in their work. They incorporate elements of the foreign models that Western actors promote into local models of women's activism that employ the myth of empowered motherhood. The result is a less individualistic form of activism that closely resembles what Karen Offen refers to as ''relational feminism'' (Offen, 2000). Typically, these newly crafted action frames speak of ''equal opportunity,'' ''gender parity,'' and ''self respect'' but avoid the term feminism itself. In practice, hybrid feminists also frequently employ maternalist discourse and many tend to place priority on improving opportunities for families, children, and young people. Two new issues that foreign programs raised have achieved considerable attention among local groups: the prevention of domestic violence (Hrycak, 2005b; Rudneva, 1999) and the need for gender quotas to increase women's representation in parliament (*Stanovyshche Zhinok v Ukraini: Realii ta Perspektyvy*, 2004).

Such reframing activities greatly helped recruitment to a women's rights network that USAID funded in Ukraine in the 1990s. Nearly all Ukrainian groups that joined this network trace their support for women's rights to the work of talented local organizers, initially active in the national independence movement, who were recruited to work for US foundations and women's rights projects in the mid-1990s (Hrycak, 2002). Once on the staff, they redefined Western women's rights seminars in terms of local concerns, translated program materials from English and Russian into the Ukrainian language, and adapted examples of Ukrainian women feminists drawn from émigré Ukrainian women's journals published abroad. These adaptations helped persuade broader-based networks of women that foreign women's rights activism was open to their issues and concerns. They improved the success of this women's rights organizing project.

Through participation in the activities of foreign programs that have become more locally oriented, various groups have altered their understandings of women's issues and roles. Women who established small mutual aid organizations have developed new self-understandings and an enhanced sense of confidence (Phillips, 2000). The ''nationalist'' women's associations that fought for independence from the Soviet Union (whose leaders asserted prior to Ukraine's independence that ''they must first

liberate the nation'' before undertaking an effort to liberate women (Rubchak, 1996, p. 317)) also started to speak of ''their own kind of feminism'' (''nash feminizm'') (interview, March, 2001).

Most early converts to feminism in Ukraine were Russian speakers who were distant from the independence movement. They at first regarded the ''Ukrainian nationalists'' who were recruited to foreign women's programs with suspicion and claimed that they were opportunists who were attracted to the movement by the comfortable work conditions and monetary rewards that professional foreign program employees enjoy. But as time has passed, these Russian speakers have also entered into a dialogue with both foreign feminism and local hybrid feminism and have refashioned their identities and style of activism to reflect their own localization of feminism. In all these ways, the localization of feminism have made it easier to build broader support for women's rights among women with various kinds of commitments to reforming Ukraine.

The broader population still does not embrace foreign activists' concerns. And indeed, most women involved in public life are still wary of ''feminism.'' However, the hybrid feminists have helped to build the cultural foundations for a sustainable local feminist tradition that demonstrates that what had seemed to be an alien Western or Soviet ideology has relevance to women in Ukraine. They started the process of frame bridging and alignment that broadened support for women's rights activism among national independence activists, making it more likely that the women's rights movement will succeed in the future. The result can be seen in the increasing prevalence of the phrases ''women's equal rights'' and ''equality of opportunity'' alongside the other demands expressed by various civic groups, even the ''nationalist'' women's organizations that emerged from the independence movement.

THE IRONIES OF FOREIGN FUNDING

Transnational activism in practice not only spreads ideas about emancipation, it also acts as a channel for cross-border resource transfers that may seem small by Western standards. However, seed grants of one to two thousand dollars are significant infusions of resources in a country where the collapse of the economy has resulted in a catastrophic decline in living standards. Civic groups typically cannot find local funding for their organizations and look to foreign programs for support.

Yet common practices often undermine the ability of foreign programs to adequately fund the local groups they promise to assist. One illustration is

provided by donor expectations that lead foreign programs to encourage the formation of numerous new organizations rather than work to strengthen those that exist. USAID expects the projects that it funds to meet quarterly performance targets. For projects to develop local NGOs, these typically include establishing a certain number of new groups in a given reporting period and funding a certain number of projects per grant competition. According to one local employee of a USAID women's rights project, "when we wrote reports, and gave [performance] indicators that USAID uses to determine whether a program is successful or not, one of the indicators of success was when we came to a place that had no women's organizations [and] after we gave trainings with our initiative group, they started a civic organization (interview, March 22, 2001). As an incentive to help new groups, NGO development projects typically offered to help new groups apply for quarterly "in house" small grant competitions. With each passing quarter, however, there were more and more local groups competing for the same pot of money and making demands on the resources of the project. Although USAID could later report that there are now tens of thousand of advocacy NGOs devoted to issues such as women's equality, minority rights, and so forth, the competitive structure of NGO develop-ment programs meant that these groups rarely worked together.

Indeed, most new groups that form through NGO development projects rarely win grants in competition against experienced groups with reputa-tions. For example, four young women formed a reproductive health group in 1997 after encouragement from a USAID women's rights NGO project (interview, April 12, 2001). They developed and conducted basic lectures on women's reproductive health. They soon found that there was a local demand for their lectures, but without a grant from a foreign foundation they could not afford the rent on the room where they held lectures, the traveling costs involved in giving lectures in other cities, or the costs of publishing their advice booklets. Discouraged by the time and energy needed to look for funding, the group dissolved. Even though they had found a local public interested in their group's advice, their lack of success with foreign granting agencies proved too discouraging. "We had developed quite a number of public lectures and we also gave consultations. But now that is all over, at least for the time being, because right now everyone is just struggling so much …. Maybe later on we'll be able to do something again." Such stories were common among fledgling new women's groups that were started with foreign encouragement but were unable to win foreign grants.

Frequent shifts in donor funding priorities have also undermined initially effective foreign projects. USAID's shifting priorities have had the strongest

impact. Once USAID priorities changed, many other foreign donors followed suit. In the mid-1990s USAID determined that a healthy number of women's NGOs exist in Ukraine. Since then, there is no longer sufficient funding for women's NGO development projects. To continue their work, foreign NGO development programs were compelled to reorient the aim of their women's rights initiatives to win other USAID grants. Most shifted from the development of women's rights advocacy NGOs to projects on the next hot button issue, the prevention of trafficking in women. Rather than aid the development of women's advocacy groups, foreign projects now strove to fund social service NGOs, credit unions, or small business incubators. Local organizations were forced to continually reinvent themselves accordingly. As one woman activist put it: "We are very dependent on funding sources. The program that has the dollars is the one that gives the orders. That is why an organization will try to find a way, if it is concerned with children, and there is an ecological program, to also think "what can I do with ecology?" In my opinion, this very much obscures their activities. The organization becomes too thinly spread out, because it has to be concerned with everything, and it can forget its mission, for which it was created. If it was created to help get women on their feet, then help them, and don't try to work on environmental issues" (interview, May 22, 2001).

Program shifts have increased divisions even in the large Eastern Ukrainian city that received by far the most foreign funding and encouragement. Early funding opportunities prior to the mid-1990s facilitated coalition building among local women's NGOs (interview, May 22, 2001). The city's gender studies center was the first formed in Ukraine. It attracted generous foreign grants and dozens of local recruits to feminism and women's rights activism. But later it lost most of its local support as the result of squabbles over foreign grants and foreign travel opportunities. The sense of local solidarity that existed during the early 1990s, years when grants were plentiful and few women's groups competed for them, died. This solidarity has been eroded as some groups have accumulated considerable funding by working on issues donors raise, while others that remain focused on local issues have been left behind. As one local women's activist told me, "On paper, [our city] has over fifty registered women's organizations. But many exist only on paper, a few work from grant to grant, and only a few are continuously active" (interview, May 13, 2001). She and others attribute the prevalence of "paper organizations" and deep divisions among women's initiatives in this locale to shifting donor priorities and increasing competition for grants.

CONCLUSION

General discussions claim that new global processes that help spread transnational feminism should also strengthen grassroots movements. Why, then, are local participants in the women's movement so disappointed with the impact of transnational feminist activism and foreign aid? In Ukraine, increasing contact with transnational women's rights advocates has weakened the local women's movement by introducing tendencies that previous studies of transnationalism have found to weaken grassroots mobilization: encouraging the adoption of collective action frames that are ill suited to local contexts, increasing competition among similar groups for foreign funding, and encouraging local groups to devote themselves to the causes and concerns of foreign donors.

Foreign aid programs, in particular, projects that USAID sponsored, have not provided a strong basis for sustainable grassroots feminism. At first, this was because foreign donors set their own priorities, introduced global models that were a poor match for local conditions, and employed women's rights advocates that possessed no local knowledge or experience. But over time, many local women's NGOs were formed around a hybrid feminist agenda that blended some of the issues these transnational advocates raised with local concerns regarding the well-being of children and families. The result has increased local support for the prevention of domestic violence and for increasing the representation of women in parliament. However, foreign program practices undermined these hybrid feminist efforts by distributing resources in ways that rewarded only those few groups that worked professionally with donors. They did not adequately fund the numerous local organizations and coalitions they formed. Thus, promising new hybrid feminism campaigns failed to get off the ground. Most hybrid feminist organizations did not develop the capacity for sustainable activities and very few participate together in political campaigns today.

The future sustainability of feminism in Ukraine will depend upon building on the potential of hybrid feminists. It is crucial to create local sources of financial support that are long term (lasting several years) and are designed with genuine local input. Hybrid feminists have accomplished important work by adapting foreign activism frames to local issues. However, to build on their work it is important to create stronger local foundations for sharing resources and encouraging cooperative activities to avoid the fate of early coalitions of feminists that dissolved under the pressure of grant competitions and shifting donor priorities.

What does the Ukrainian case suggest are the conditions that might foster sustainable women's movements in the future in post-communist countries? My research suggests that foreign advocates should encourage the invention of "hybrid feminisms" that blend Western and locally produced action frames. In Ukraine, such frame bridging helped to demonstrate the local relevance of new transnational issues such as the prevention of domestic violence to local networks of non-feminist women in Ukraine. However, the future strength of the localized feminisms that result will also depend upon successful engagement of local feminists in domestic politics. Foreign aid providers and the women's rights advocates they employed assumed after the Soviet Union's collapse that progress toward women's empowerment depended principally on the development of feminist-inspired women's rights initiatives. These eventually led in Ukraine to the establishment of numerous hybrid feminist women's organizations. While these groups have helped to raise new issues such as domestic violence and the need to increase the political representation of women, this new wave of women's rights activism has been unable to develop sufficient domestic leverage to pressure the state and government to follow through on addressing these issues. Further research is needed to determine which local strategies will help local advocates of women's rights to improve their alliances with decision-makers in politics and government in their home countries. In the end, all politics is local, and this is true even in an age of increased globalization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Abramson, D. (1999). A critical look at NGOs and civil society as means to an end in Uzbekistan. *Human Organization*, *58*(3), 240–250.

Alvarez, S. E. (2000). Translating the global: Effects of transnational organizing on local feminist discourses and practices in Latin America. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism*, *1*(1), 29–67.

Basu, A. (1995). Introduction. In: A. Basu & C. E. McGrory (Eds), *The challenge of local feminisms: Women's movements in global perspective* (pp. 1–21). Boulder: Westview Press.

Basu, A. (2000). Globalization of the local/localization of the global: Mapping transnational women's movements. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism*, *1*(1), 68–84.

Basu, A., & McGrory, C. E. (Eds). (1995). *The challenge of local feminisms: Women's movements in global perspective*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Brenner, J. (2003). Transnational feminism and the struggle for global justice [electronic version]. *New Politics*, *9*(2), http://www.wpunj.edu/newpol/issue34/brenne34.htm

Burawoy, M. (2000). Introduction. In: M. Burawoy, J. A. Blum, S. George, Z. Gille, M. Thayer, T. Gowan, L. Haney, M. Klawiter, S. H. Lopez & S. Riain (Eds), *Global ethnography: Forces, connections, and imaginations in a postmodern world* (pp. 1–39). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Carothers, T. (1999). *Aiding democracy abroad: The learning curve*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Evans, P. (2005). Counter-hegemonic globalization: Transnational social movements in the contemporary global political economy. In: A. M. H. M. S. Thomas Janoski (Ed.), *The handbook of political sociology* (pp. 655–670). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gal, S. (2003). Movements of feminism: The circulation of discourses about women. In: B. Hobson (Ed.), *Recognition struggles and social movements: Contested identities, power and agency* (pp. 93–119). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gray, M. M., Kittilson, M. C., & Sandholtz, W. (2006). Women and globalization: A study of 180 countries, 1975–2000. *International Organization*, *60*(2), 293–333.

Hemment, J. (2004). The riddle of the third sector: Civil society, international aid, and NGOs in Russia. *Anthropological Quarterly*, *77*(2), 215–241.

Henderson, S. (2003). *Building democracy in contemporary Russia: Western support for grassroots organizations*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hobson, B., & Lister, R. (2002). Citizenship. In: J. Lewis, B. Hobson & B. Siim (Eds), *Contested concepts in gender and social politics* (pp. 23–54). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Hrycak, A. (2001). The dilemmas of civic revival: Ukrainian women since independence. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, *26*(1–2), 135–158.

Hrycak, A. (2002). From mothers' rights to equal rights: Post-Soviet grassroots women's associations. In: N. Naples & M. K. Desai (Eds), *Women's community activism and globalization: Linking the local and global for social change* (pp. 64–82). New York: Routledge.

Hrycak, A. (2005a). Coping with chaos: Gender and politics in a fragmented state. *Problems of Post-Communism*, *52*(5), 69–81.

Hrycak, A. (2005b). Finding a common language: Foundation feminism and the politicization of domestic violence in Ukraine. Paper presented at the 37th national convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies.

Hrycak, A. (2006). Foundation feminism and the articulation of hybrid feminisms in post-socialist Ukraine. *East European Politics and Societies*, *20*(1), 69–100.

Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Khoma, T. (2000). Chy buv feminizm v Ukraini? *Yi*, *17*, 21–27.

Kis', O. (2003). Modeli konstruiuvannia gendernoi identychnosti v suchasnii UKRAINI. *Yi*, *27*, 37–58.

Kupryashkina, S. (2000). Ukraine: End of the NGO dream. *Give & take*, from www.isar.org/isar/archive/GT/GTkupryashkina.html

Mendelson, S. E., & Glenn, J. K. (Eds). (2002). *The power and limits of NGOs: A critical look at building democracy in Eastern Europe and Eurasia*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Moghadam, V. M. (2000). Transnational feminist networks – collective action in an era of globalization. *International Sociology*, *15*(1), 57–85.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Molyneux, M. (1994). Women's rights and the international context – some reflections on the postcommunist states. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, *23*(2), 287–313.

Morgan, R. (Ed.) (1984). *Sisterhood is global: The international women's movement anthology*. Garden City, New York: Anchor.

Naples, N.A., & Desai, M. (Eds). (2002). *Women's activism and globalization: Linking local struggles and transnational politics*. New York: Routledge.

Offen, K. M. (2000). *European feminisms, 1700–1950: A political history*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pavlychko, S. (1992). Between feminism and nationalism: New women's groups in the Ukraine. In: M. Buckley (Ed.), *Perestroika and Soviet women* (pp. 82–96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pavlychko, S. (1997). Progress on hold: The conservative faces of women in Ukraine. In: M. Buckley (Ed.), *Post-Soviet women: From the Baltic to Central Asia* (pp. 219–234). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Phillips, S. C. (2000). NGOs in Ukraine: The makings of a ''Women's Space''? *Anthropology of East Europe Review*, *18*(2), 23–29.

Rubchak, M. (1996). Christian virgin or pagan goddess. In: R. Marsh (Ed.), *Women in Russia and Ukraine* (pp. 315–330). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubchak, M. (2001). In search of a model: Evolution of a feminist consciousness in Ukraine and Russia. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *8*(2), 149–160.

Rudneva, O. (Ed.) (1999). *Problemy nasyl'stva v sim'i: Pravovi ta sotsial'ni aspekty*. Kharkiv: Pravo.

Sampson, S. (1996). The social life of projects: Importing civil society to Albania. In: C. Hann & E. Dunn (Eds), *Civil society: Rethinking Western models* (pp. 120–138). London: Routledge.

Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and its discontents: Essays on the new mobility of people and money*. New York: New Press.

Smith, J. G. (2002). Bridging global divides? Strategic framing and solidarity in transnational social movement organizations. *International Sociology*, *17*(4), 505–528.

Smith, J. G., Chatfield, C., & Pagnucco, R. (Eds). (1997). *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state*, (1st ed.). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Smith, J. G., Pagnucco, R., & Chatfield, C. (1997). Transnational social movements and world politics: Theoretical framework. In: J. G. Smith, C. Chatfield & R. Pagnucco (Eds), *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state* (pp. 59–77). Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Smith, J. G., & Wiest, D. (2005). The uneven geography of global civic society: National and global influences on transnational association. *Social Forces, 84*(2), 621–652.

Smolyar, L. (1998). *Mynule zarady maibut'n'oho: Zhinochyi rukh Naddniprians'koi Ukrainy II polovyny XIX–pochatok XX stolittia. Storinky istorii.* Odessa, Ukraine: Astroprint.

Smolyar, L. (Ed.) (1999). *Zhinochi studii v Ukraini: Zhinka v istori ta siohodni.* Odessa: Astroprint.

Smolyar, L. (2001). The women's movement as a factor of gender equality and democracy in Ukrainian society. In: O. Sydorenko (Ed.), *Zhinochi orhanizatsii Ukrainy. Ukrainian women's non-profit organizations* (pp. 27–44). Kyiv: Innovation and Development Center.

Stanovyshche zhinok v Ukraini: Realii ta perspektyvy. (2004). Kyiv: Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy, Komitet z pytan' prav liudyny, natsional'nykh menshyn i mizhnatsional'nykh vidnosyn, prohrama rozvytku OON.

Sydorenko, O. (2001a). Zhinochi orhanizatsii Ukrainy: Tendentsii stanovlennia. In: O. Sydorenko (Ed.), *Zhinochi orhanizatsii Ukrainy: Dovidnyk* (pp. 45–52). Kyiv: Tsentr innovatsii ta rozvytku.

Sydorenko, O. (Ed.) (2001b). *Zhinochi orhanizatsii Ukrainy: Dovidnyk.* Kyiv: Tsentr inovatsii ta rozvytku.

Tarrow, S. G. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tarrow, S. G. (2005). *The new transnational activism.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wedel, J. R. (1998). *Collision and collusion: The strange case of Western aid to Eastern Europe, 1989–1998* (1st ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Zborovs'ka, N., & Il'nyts'ka, M. (1999). *Feministychni rozdumy na karnavali mertvykh potsilunkakh.* Lviv: Tsentr humanitarnykh doslidzhen' L'vivs'koho natsional'noho universyteta.

Zhurzhenko, T. (2001). *Ukrainian feminism(s): Between nationalist myth and anti-nationalist critique.* International World Bank Working Paper, Vienna.

SACRIFICE, ABANDONMENT, AND INTERVENTIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE FEMINISM(S): THE NON-PROFIT INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX AND TRANSBORDER SUBSTANTIVE DEMOCRACY

Anna M. Agathangelou and Tamara L. Spira

1. INTRODUCTION

As triumphantly announced in journals and magazines, a la Fukuyama, late capitalism and its contingent logic of neoliberalism (ostensibly) reigns supreme, exploiting each site it encounters with precision. According to this fantasy of capitalism's seamless and ultimate triumph, domination is produced as inevitable, social struggle and revolution, a utopian dream. Yet, what many have seen since the 1990s is that this narrative requires military mobilizations of different kinds (i.e., "the war on terror" has become of late the reason thousands are being killed daily in Afghanistan and Iraq).

Simultaneously, feminist "leftist" politics, as manifested in what are often dichotomized as political theory and social movements have struggled under the weight of similar contradictions and tensions.[1] We, as both political

theorists and workers in academia and in NGOs,[2] find ourselves caught in a very difficult bind: concede to the structural contradictions of the more and more militarized and corporatized movements, or, facing ever dwindling resources, abandon projects of community struggle altogether (or at least seduce ourselves into a notion that this is possible). Within these different sites, mobilizations of religious values and convergences of secularism with neoconservative normative political reasons have brought to the fore the idea of sacrifice, which has become a central component of theoretical investigations into violence and the foundations of political authority (Brown, 2006). In addition, feminists and theorists in postcolonial contexts (including racially, sexually, and class marginalized communities within the United States, such as the indigenous women's movements) have been engaged in a series of critiques about the sacrifices embedded in rationalist and teleological Revolutionary projects, revealing the problematic inherent in the implicit violence upon and/or sacrifices on racially and sexually othered bodies whose annihilation is required for "advancement" of militant radical politics (Mbembe, 2002, 2003; Smith, 2005; Abdulhadi, 2003).

Moreover, themes of sacrifice have emerged prominently within leftist and feminist political discourses of the contemporary moment. For example, in the wake of sexual and racialized torture at Abu Ghraib as but one embodiment of global war, intensified attention has been paid to the spectacularization of sexual violence as an apparatus of imperial (re)assertions of global dominance (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004; Agathangelou & Killian, 2006; Agathangelou, 2005). These terrifying themes of racialized, sexualized torture, and subjugation proliferate widely, fueling obsessions with violence in collective psychic landscapes and popular imaginaries. Reflected not only in political economic shifts, but also in the production of knowledge that come to inform "leftist" and feminist discourses on world politics, the current moment and the "War on Terror" has led to the generation of many theorizations including feminist ones on the war (Young, 2006), trauma, and loss (Butler, 2004; Ayotte & Husain, 2005; Jaggar, 2003; Razack, 2004; Eng & Kazanjian, 2004; INCITE, 2007; RAWA). Central to such narratives as they emerge textually and in the civil society in feminist movements as we develop, lie epistemes and critiques of such epistemes of sacrificial forms of responsibility. Prominently circulating figures of sacrifice, for example, include sacrifice of revolutionary martyr, sacrifice of so-called suicide bombers, sacrifice of US soldiers, sacrifice of immigrants, people of color, prisoners, and the poor for the (re)militarization of borders in the name of so-called "security" for the US and other dominant nation-states, sacrifice of funding for the social welfare of the majority of peoples and toward the

military industrial complex (Agathangelou, 2004a, 2004b), sacrifice of liberal democracy (Brown, 2006). As such, *sacrifice* becomes a prevailing logic, dichotomously producing a landscape of political intelligibilities and political possibility. Within this polarity, one is forced to either uncritically accept the violences of contradictory movements, or abandon the project of revolution altogether.

In this paper, we engage the book's theme – "sustainable feminism(s)" – to look at the epistemological frameworks produced to respond to these dramatic changes that are taking place globally, both in terms of geopolitical transformation and the aforementioned emerging social movements, including non-profit and NGO organizing. More specifically, we take up the logic(s) of sacrifice as it/they problematically manifest(s) in often-unrecognized ways to tacitly limit the scope of political imaginaries and possibilities for projects of sustainable anti-colonial substantive and democratic feminist social transformation. Substantive democratic feminist movements here refer to those struggles and interventions that disrupt production of "things" for the market and also the ways and methods the production of surplus value is appropriated by global capital either through "legal means" or through war (Agathangelou, 2006). Many NGOs as social movements, albeit contradictorily, intervene to disrupt the racial and sexual politics of these expropriations (Agathangelou, 2004a, 2004b; Cotter, 2001) and attempts to justify the new global war with the accruement of democracy and freedom in the North (i.e., the United States, Western Europe, and Japan) rather than in the South (i.e., Eurasia and Africa). It is our goal to dislodge assumptions of sacrifice as they simultaneously manifest in variegated forms within discourses and political practices in different sites, including social movements.

Several questions act as backdrops to the writing of this paper: how do feminists work together towards countering the colonizing practices embodied in these contradictory processes and practices of re-territorialization by late capitalism? What kinds of discourses animate social relations manifested in these emerging struggles for global justice? What kinds of protests and "strategies for taking power," and governing do people from different geographical sites deem more crucial towards the forging of an anti-capitalist, more just and less violent vision, and why? What happens when people of unequal power find themselves working together?

In what follows, we respond by drawing from a few articulated and circulating theories of feminist nonprofit (FNPOS) and non-governmental organizations within Cyprus and the United States, as well as the work of several prominently circulating theorists within the Western academy and

powerful centers of formal knowledge production (Achille Mbembe, and Georgio Agamben) around questions of restructuring and change. We begin, however, with *Fresa y Chocolate*, a Cuban film on revolution that poses a powerful critique of the sexual and (implicitly) racialized sacrifices of revolution. We argue that this film offers a context in which we can launch a vigilant critique of the gendered, racialized, and sexualized sacrifices of Marxist nationalist revolution as it was articulated in spaces such as Cuba and simultaneously leave open the space for ongoing engagement with projects of political transformation. We argue that this critique disrupts more contemporary theorizations of sacrifice, such as Agamben's, which unwittingly reproduces epistemes of sacrifice through an advancement of the abandonment of revolutionary projects altogether. Finally, we bring in the work of Mbembe and feminist NGOs to move toward a theorization for juxtapositional praxes for transbordered, sustainable feminisms, and substantive democracy.

2. EPISTEMOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODS

Before moving to our analysis, we first foreground some of the epistemological ideas, which frame our arguments. First, we wish to politicize our choice of reading seemingly disparate texts: as we argue and attempt to embody throughout this paper, as feminists concerned with challenging neoliberal capitalism's major strategies of (re)colonization (e.g., restructuring of social relations to ensure corporatization and militarization of all social life, expropriation of labor, and subjects' bodies; methods of fear; convergences with neo-fundamentalism(s)), no longer are singular strategies for radical social change productive or even possible. Moreover, local/global, academic/activist, theory/practice binaries that posit one as the site of genuine change advance precisely by making possible (and invisible simultaneously) the sacrificial logics we wish to disrupt. We thus attempt at a juxtapositional reading practice as part and parcel of praxes of transbordered solidarities that disrupt narratives of change that simultaneously consign revolutionary projects to the temporal past or the realm of fantasy, which, within this episteme, cordons the realm of fantasy to impossibility. Secondly, we would specify the broader context of liberatory and revolutionary social and political movements in which all these texts were produced. While definitively incongruous and rife with tensions and contradictions, the political climates of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s that

incubated the production of both literary and filmic texts as well as the NGOs in 1990s we examine, were characterized by dreams as part and parcel of lived moments of the third world solidarity, decolonization, non-alignment, and Marxist-socialist internationalism and triumph. Within this historical and political framework, and particularly given recent exigencies posed by globalization (Agathangelou, 2006) it becomes productive, crucial even as we elaborate in the final section, to read multiple sites juxtaposi-tionally to both take seriously accountability and political solidarity and refuse to participate in the continual foreclosure of possibilities of collective social transformation embedded in easy elisions into the sacrificial logics with which we are concerned.

3. *FRESA Y CHOCOLATE* AND THE RACIALIZED, SEXUALIZED "SACRIFICES" OF REVOLUTION

Tomás Guttiérrez Alea's film *Fresa y Chocolate* offers a very useful frame-work for our examination of the work of sacrifice as it intersects with questions of sexuality, race, and the ostensible "victories" of the political authority of imperial global capitalism that leaves in its wake revolutionary dreams of social transformation. In what follows, we present a postcolonial feminist reading (Agathangelou, 2003; Agathangelou, 2004a, 2004c; Agathangelou, 2005; Alexander & Mohanty, 1997; Alexander, 2006), which unsettles this dichotomy by centralizing the sexual and racial contradictions of revolution *as central* to ongoing praxis, as critical engagement.

This dynamic can most easily be gleaned in the relationship between the two main characters, Diego and David who, from the onset, are presented as figurations of seemingly dichotomous poles: David, a young, working class student embodies "ideological," un-flexible dogma that (mis)interprets revolution as a heteromasculinist endeavor, while Diego, a gay artist, from higher class and "mixed" racial origins is constructed as a renegade threat-ening the state's stronghold on narratives of the revolution. Presented as dichotomous subjects embodying (anti)revolutionary aesthetic flare which is coded as "queer" and staunch orthodoxy premised upon the abnegation of pleasure, Diego and David respectively embody familiar binary categoriza-tions between simplistic readings of queer theory and Marxism, neo-liberal poststructuralist celebrations of desire and scientific developmental logics of historical materialism.

For example, the production of David as (literally) without "pleasure" and hence a "more serious" revolutionary is foregrounded before the film

credits start rolling. As the film opens to the sound of music forlorn and yearning, David brings his girlfriend Vivian to a seedy hotel in Havana. As she stares disapprovingly around the sparse room, she is clearly not impressed with its dingy hole-filled walls and the neon lights shining in through the window. With an upset look on her face and tone in her voice, Vivian's obvious disapproval with the shabby room manifests in her sexual ambivalence as she begins kissing David and then pulls away. This sequence repeats multiple times. Ultimately, Vivian begins to cry, declaring that "all (David) is interested is in sex, like all men." In response, David pledges his "love" with the proclamation that "I am interested in you, not sex. I'll prove it to you. I won't touch you until the day we are married, in a five-star hotel. Come on, get your clothes, let's go." This bold proclamation ends the back and forth struggles, as David rapidly reaches for his clothes. As he delivers these lines, Vivian's previous pout turns to shock and the scene abruptly cuts into the next, and the musical overture switches to cars honking to the tune "here comes the bride."

In this second scene, Vivian emerges out of a car in a dress and veil to a festive crowd at her wedding. Quickly, what was previously constructed as her "innocence" or sexual purity is challenged, as it is revealed that she is marrying another man, she later unabashedly admits, for his money. From the crowd at the court wedding, David's face appears and as his eyes meet hers just as she signs the paperwork, making his attempt to seduce her into an official failure. This quickly cuts into the next scene where David, sits in a bar drinking to the musical lyrics: *mi tormento triste estoy sin tu amor que robó mi corazon/my torment, sad I am without your love that stole my heart.* Thus, in these three first scenes the narrative, the storyline and the music neatly cohere to produce David as a subject of lack and (heterosexual) fidelity whose noble promise toward the woman he loves has been betrayed, leaving him "sad" with a "stole (n) heart," as signified by the familiar image of the rejected and the forlorn drinking alone. Within this construction, it is pleasure that resides on the side of wealth as embodied through Vivian as the feminized figure of romantic betrayal. For, it is Vivian who has elected to marry into wealth who represents sexual emotional fulfillment, while David is left to drink alone.

It is notable that several issues as they relate to a conversation of sacrifice emerge. First, these opening scenes encode everyday struggles of sexual, racial, and class negotiations, which do not, of course, simply go away in the site of "revolutionary Cuba." Rather, the film itself opens with sexual and class conflict. As both a representation mediated through social and psychic structures, and as a text produced within the historical political context of

revolutionary Cuba, problematic notions of class and sexuality prevail in contradictory ways. Moreover, the film works to create affective sympathies with David who, sad and dejected, is "victim" to his own failed seduction due to his class background. As Vivian's priorities of financial affluence mock her earlier critique that "all men care about is sex," served as a pretext for sexual rejection.

If Vivian symbolizes romantic betrayal, Diego, who appears carrying bright yellow sunflowers, quickly enters the narrative as a symbol of revolutionary betrayal. Gutiérrez Alea deploys similar filmic techniques as with David in order to introduce Diego as his antithesis, as the two meet at Coppelia's over ice cream. Spotting David with a look of delight in his eyes, Diego swoons in, inviting himself to sit at the table of David, who quickly places the magazine he was reading in between them, as to create a barrier separating the two. Diego's affective stance is embodied in his first gleeful line as he indulges in a bowl of strawberry ice cream: "I couldn't resist the temptation. I love Strawberries," he flirtatiously says. With a look of playful desire twinkling in his eyes, he turns back to his dish of ice cream: "It's the only thing they still make well in our country. Soon they will export it and for us water and sugar … Oooh, a strawberry, today is my lucky day. I am finding marvels!" Affect, questions about sexualities, pleasure, desires, production, states, and nations mark this intervention, as revolutions are all marked with these aspects even when the socialist state wants to sacrifice all of these in the name of Revolution. Yet, the film moves to critique this narrowly punctuated and problematic understanding of the struggle and production of revolutionary states and subjects. Diego critiques the revolutionary state's ejection of "decadence," a critique that forebodes his own fate within the storyline. Ice cream and dairy are significant as few of the national products that could be readily produced even amidst economic blockade, thus acquired nationalist value. More so, the struggles of revolution entail more than sad, lonely and pleasure-less day, embodied quite clearly in David's stern and serious posture but also contestations about sexual relations. Indeed, the revolution is also about sex, contrary, to the mainstream understanding of it as a hetero-masculine struggle, as embodied by David in the film.

It is notable how the polarization of Diego and David under the rubric of contested Cuban national masculinity is mediated through the simultaneities of gender, religious/nonreligious, race, class, urban/rural dichotomies, as well as sexuality. While sexuality can be read as the obvious site for the negotiation of what we have provisionally named these dichotomies of "pleasure" and "politics," art and science, embedded within these

contestations are struggles over race, nation, state, geography, class and their interconnections/tensions with each other. For example, it is significant how representations of Afro-Cubans form the backdrop for the narrative. As figures who appear as Santeria practitioners, or bodies walking down the crowded streets, black subjects fall out of the national body politic or main artery of the story line. When understood through problematic chromatic gradation, David as the son of peasants from the country is much "darker", than Diego whose artistic jet-setting taste in tea, China porcelain and opera, according to a liberal reading of narrative, would place him in a metro-politan cultural class of consumers of a particular status of Eurocentric art and aesthetics. This paradox thus constructs Diego's sexual positionality and accompanying subjectivity as excessive to the "real class" subject of the state and its works toward the forging of a socialist revolution, while David's racial positioning threatens to expose its racial contradictions. Within this knot of power problematics (and particularly as this film is picked up for global distribution) Guttiérrez Alea's white, queer, upper class versus black, revolutionary, masculine polarities threaten to slip into neo-liberal narratives of open market "tolerance" and pleas for individualized freedom, as the narrative progresses and their friendship develops.

Yet, as we shall argue, the film intervenes and articulates a more nuanced understanding/disruption of revolutionary struggle. It challenges "sacrific-ing" those subjects who decide not to give up part of their "liberty" in order to receive what the advantages may be of a mutually constituted commu-nity. Of course, Diego is struggling and in his everyday life challenges con-formity, which is one of the most desirable elements of political authority, revolutionary and otherwise. In this duality of revolutionary and capitalist, the person who existed before the social (revolutionary) contract haunts the margins of this constituted community. The resurrection of the revolution-ary subject depends on the sacrifice of the "old" subject. This subject has to be traded-off again and again all in the name of a statism (i.e., being effec-tive instead of accountable to the demos), a society of revolution. Indeed, in this film Diego turns into the revolution's scapegoat. The vestiges of lib-eralism, free market (i.e., production of art and its sale; decadence of sex-uality), accordingly, capitalism he summons must be killed off. Indeed, the film ends with Diego's fleeing Cuba, hence enabling the abdication of any accountability to the state as a site of struggle for the transformation of social relations that would benefit all Cubans, even those subjects whose sole existence disrupts the "seemingly smooth" revolutionary struggle.

This episteme seems to be at work in aforementioned processes of NGOization in the North and the South, in the capitalist and the socialist

states, albeit with different contradictions, depending whether lasting and viable structural forms have been developed.[3]

Starting in the 1990s, with neoliberal restructurings, many states redirected their resources from the social welfare of its people and to the welfare of corporations to ensure investments. Many resources were redirected to address the corporations' demands for investing in certain sites. Both in the North and the South states pushed the taking care of social welfare as well as the transformation of social conflicts emerging from structural asymmetries on what came to emerge as non-profit organizations from the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Many of the social movements pushed to sustain their own struggles on the agenda and, yet, with much difficulty since most states pushed for a de-politicization of social problems (Brown, 2006, p. 704). In the drive to appeal to a large number of citizens as well as to a large number of private and ''non-state'' capitalist funding structures, NGOs have been pushed to draw on the logic of the market in their everyday practices in order to ensure funding either from the state or regional powers, such as the European Union or large funding organizations such as the Global Fund for Women, and the Ford Foundation. Yet, in the process of trying to secure funding, many of these movements and indeed the many non-profit organizations that sprung (with many professionals as its leaders) under increased pressure, ended up stripping down complex social struggles into digestible, rationalized ''issue areas.'' This is significant insofar as ostensibly non-state ''civil society'' becomes and is presented now as a primary site of social struggle (as if it is was not before such a site). However, subservient to the market itself, NGOs/civil society is placed in a position to concede to market logics which push more and more to understand social problems (i.e., lack of social welfare; investment in militarization of the state; gender and racial inequalities) as ''individual problems with market solutions'' (Brown, 2006, p. 704) in order to procure funding. These logics silence nuances of power and, more pertinently, cordon off racial, sexual contradictions from the domain of both the state, the market, and the other institutions of power such as the family.

In one organization in the United States dealing with family violence, a non-profit worker recounted a story about being told that she needed to present a ''seamless response to violence'' to potential donors. This ''seamlessness'' included omissions of the problematic racial politics of an anti-domestic violence campaign, as well as the classed hierarchies of the organization itself. She replied: ''What about violence is seamless? What about blood and pain can look so neat? This kind of thinking is crazy-making!''[4] This comment embodies an epistemology that challenges the one

that argues that the civil society is an "equal opportunity struggle" and desires to sustain that struggles against violence are nuanced and historically based. These epistemological and intervening contestations make visible the many struggles that ensue our social relations, either the site of the state and/or the site of the civil society and more specifically, the non-profit organizations' contestations and strategies toward forging sustainable (Shambos, 1999) movements that draw on collective intelligibilities rather than those of the market. On the one hand, we see that the non-profit sector's move towards the professionalization of social change work is not as easily unfolding. It is contested daily even when it encodes similar logics and gestures of positing racial, class, sexual, and gendered contradictions as outside the purview of what is articulated as the prioritized project of social change. Similarly, the contestations about "seamless violence" are interventions to expose that the narrowing multi-layered complex social relations of power and political authority depend on the sacrifice of Revolutionary work and the bodies of those who do the work as well as those bodies that find themselves in the line of death.[5]

Heeding to the same logic, in Cyprus, the larger structures of exploitation and violence are reduced into statist politics and cultural conflicts. Nationalist politics emphasized that the Cyprus problem was an ethnic issue since 1963, which stalled women's mobilization toward emancipation and the healing process of women from the traumas and violations of the war (Agathangelou & Killian, 2002), as well as gloss over the dramatic changes that have been taking place in the North and the South of Cyprus since the early 1990s as the states moved to restructure themselves and social relations by responding to global capital. On both sides the dominant, aggressive, owning class/"macho" politics pushed women into the margins of social hierarchy even when socioeconomic conditions demanded women's active participation in the market. During interviews, younger educated women from the North and the South stated that both governments were colluding with the economic powers of the island to preserve the "status quo" rather than working towards transforming the conditions to respond to peoples' basic needs such as health care, employment, and racialized labor exploitations. Many of us chose the "strategy of waiting for better times" (i.e., when the political leadership worked toward a solution of the Cyprus problem) postponing our life plans and future prospects (interview with Hocaoglou). Further, interviewees complicated the epistemology of nationalism and conflict by arguing that the Cyprus problem is not "merely a cultural issue."[6] Intervening to articulate an epistemology that desires to disrupt nationalism as a project of enemy production, "us" and "them" and

rather a project that responds to the communities' interests, such as health and other welfare issues, women like Sofroniou who work with the Global Change Institute argue that the Cyprus problem has to be articulated differently and the state's role in reorganizing social relations requires a change of interests: "as long as we talk about the Cyprus problem as a cultural issue without addressing that race is a class question we are missing the politics of economics. Both states are interested in sustaining the "status quo" because it enables them and their people in the market to ensure more investments by foreign capital" (interview with Sofroniou) rather than an interest in the health of all subjects living and working in Cyprus beyond whether they are "legal" citizens or not. "Indeed, many of the migrant female workers are extensively contributing to the production of our communities called Cyprus and yet, they are daily facing violence and even death at times" (Sofroniou, 2006). Hocaoglou (interview, 2003) argued that citizens have to recognize their own role/agency in constituting social relations in order to be able to articulate an alternative democratic and less violent project: "We want to see the Cypriot society reach a new awareness level so that they would practice and demand peace, change, and democracy."

Both Sofroniou and Hocaoglou bring to the fore the ways class-divided societies draw upon different discourses, to make invisible the exploitation and the violence inherent within them and their institutions. For example, as Sofroniou narrates both states, despite their structural asymmetry, are still interested in sustaining the "status quo" and draw upon epistemologies of classed gendered racism to do so. In the process, they make invisible the ways they sustain the class-racialized-sexualized-divided society in place. Simultaneously, both of these women bring another important issue to the fore: the tactical practices in a justice movement which itself is comprised of people of economic inequality. Sofroniou is really adamant in stating that it is important to expose these social inequalities especially in strategizing toward taking power that is un-democratic and forging a justice movement. Another woman who wants to remain anonymous and works in a feminist NGO in Cyprus, which addresses issues of working class violence, stated the following:

> Many of us of all genders in Cyprus, are now actively participating in creating organizations to put forward an alternative agenda to the nationalist-racist-capitalist one. However, our contradictions emerging from our positionalities in the social context do not go away in the process of coming together to constitute a political alternative movement. Our politics can be the "terrain of combat" to determine the leadership of a national/global popular movement. Our politics as feminists is the critiquing of "common sense" and altering it by making the existing contradictions visible.

In critiquing the production of "seamless" solutions to the "seamless" problems, women through these NGOs, move to disrupt the market logic and articulate a vision that compels more people to become conscious of their political passivity. However, in the process of doing so, and since they need resources, they find themselves in a dilemma. How do they incite interest in people toward shaping their own lives and the larger context that we live in with very few resources? As one interviewee said, "Often times the activism we do is not supported at all because we cannot reach foundations yet. For a variety of reasons the activism we do is not supported, so we have to find other jobs." However, this may not always be an option within the present historical moment, particularly for low-income and working-class people who live from pay-check to pay-check. Additionally, reaching foundations creates a structural power relation that impacts the work and can compromise our ability to respond to the community instead of the funders. Another interviewee in the US explained how foundations required her to quantify and measure the impact of her work in "'concrete' and 'practical ways' … that had little to do with what our communities really need … so for example, I am out on the street corner handing out condoms, so I can say I spent four hours giving 25 condoms to youth, instead of addressing the deeper reasons … that may cause them to have unprotected sex with HIV."[7]

Similarly, this logic of choice can be read in sites that are working toward the forging of socialist social relations, albeit contradictorily. In *Strawberry and Chocolate*, David's transformation from being incredibly homophobic to "accepting" of Diego's "difference" could be read in line with neoliberal anti-socialist logics that render revolution and dictatorship as commensurable in favor of free-market or liberal "choice" and "diversity." However, a closer reading of transformations within both Diego and David disrupt both this polarization and the neoliberal assumptions embedded in the narrative of capitalism as "tolerance". The way global capitalism has appropriated these struggles and begins to commodify and privatize them, works similarly in the case of social movements through many non-profit organizations as we have said above. For instance, an interviewee in Cyprus challenges this epistemology of commodification and privatization of social struggles and problems, and intervenes to argue about the importance of the work non-profit organizations are engaging in, albeit contradictorily, and yet crucial, toward disrupting neoliberal restructuring projects: "I think NGOs are in the dilemma to find the balance between cooperation and confrontation in their work with the Governments … the governments/Bodies should show/ express a real interest to combat efficient racism … . Respect the ideas/ positions and proposals made by the NGOs … Grant access to the NGOs to

relevant/all information data/institutions where immigrants and immigrants' interests are dealt or affected … Provide substantial financial support to the NGOs without conditions that affect their positions' independency (http://www.icare.to/InterConference/opinion.html). Polycarpou, the director of ISAG (Immigrant Support Action Group) intervenes to disrupt the traditional understanding that the state is the most critical social relation in developing a structure of social welfare. Yet, he still argues for the state playing a crucial role in providing resources and access to knowledge about migration, and yet he calls for complete independency of the NGO work/civil society from the state. This call is useful within a context where complete unanimity/separation of public from the private context does not exist. Simultaneously, this call for a balance between cooperation and critique is a call for one of the major tenets of liberal democracy to be respected and followed: openness and criticism "for the rule of the demos by the demos" (Brown, 2006, p. 710; Vickers, 2006). Yet, this call for openness and state financial support, though indispensable properties and principles of liberal democracy, do not prevent inequalities stemming from the capitalist economic context of such political systems. Moreover, this call makes invisible this crucial contradiction between the principle of equality and inequality in neo-liberal-democracy within the larger forces of capitalism and its institutions such as the market, the military, and now another awakened supplementary institution, religion. Moreover, this call seems to be presuming the sacrifice of the labor of many in order to sustain a clear separation between state and civil society. This intervention leaves intact what the violences that this separation of state and civil society depend on rather than, offering a sharp and necessary critique of the racial and sexual sacrifices of a particular narrative of change and revolution, as the film, albeit problematically, does. Polycarpou seems to be intervening in making a constitutional demand/claim for governance; a "rule of demos" has to be produced by the demos and yet, simultaneously presumes an abandonment of social revolution all in the name of the independence of the NGOs. One may wonder: for what purpose? How does such independence necessarily contribute to moving beyond what we think he attributes the state with, the logic of the market (i.e., with entrepreneurial, managerial, and authoritarian functions)? If this intervention is to "sacrifice" the state's interventions in the name of the NGOs' independence, then one may ask: how does sacrifice (i.e., as a protest here) once more become a dominant and indeed, a major component of political authority in the contemporary moment (i.e., neoliberal restructurings; the global war on terror; if you are not with us you are against us" (Agathangelou, 2007)).

4. THE SILENT SACRIFICES FOR CONTEMPORARY EPISTEMES OF ABANDONMENT

The intervention made by ISAG in Cyprus to disrupt the state as the crucial actor of generating conditions for the social welfare of all members of society, including those migrants that are currently producing either surplus value through their work in farms and factories or through their domestic and sex labor subjects for the new neoliberal projects make apparent this relation of sacrifice and abandonment (Agathangelou, 2006). There is this move to sacrifice "the state" and also abandon the project of revolutionary work by the state by arguing against its model of migration (as a regulatory project) without accounting for the conditions that enable such production. The critique/intervention seem to centralize the social relations that are created between migrants and the state as if these relations are not part and parcel of a larger movement to generate violence against those who are not members of neoliberal regimes (i.e., the European Union).

> A major factor is Cyprus's migration model [regulation], creates an almost feudal dependency, since it places migrants in a vulnerable position when faced with exploitation and renders them powerless in claiming their rights. This leads to discrimination, especially regarding domestic workers, and to violations of their work contract (hours of work, rest time, denial of pro-pre health care, living conditions, etc.) (www.united.non-profit.nl/pages/rep03mrt.htm#CYP)

This call for criticism, though crucial, does not necessarily allow us to carefully examine whether the existing relations among working, middle and upper classes, "people of color" and "whites," and various racialized groups allow formally recognized rights to be actually realized. The formal recognition and enunciation of certain rights is of little value if they cannot be exercised in everyday practice. Additionally, such calls by NGOs collude with epistemes of neoliberal structures within the European Union and institutions that fund them. Such funders demand that their whole mandate be "localized" and their assessment of freedom and security made on the basis of liberties that are tangible, and capable of being achieved within the realms of both state and civil society. Simultaneously, this freedom to exercise criticism against the state does not necessarily challenge our understandings of liberal democratic freedom and its contingent securities: massive number of individuals in the European societies are restricted (i.e., abandoned as peoples with rights and access to resources) systematically from participating actively in political and social life because they are not citizens. They are also facing violence daily and even their death either through their

employers or through their attempts to cross borders for a better job and a better life (Agathangelou, 2004a, 2004b, 2006). They are workers but not citizens. These workers are exploited and their lives and bodies violated daily, yet local NGOs focus on human rights to address these violations. Inequalities based on class, nation, sex, and race substantially hinder the extent to which these NGOs can claim that all individuals are free and equal and they share the same human rights.

As we have already suggested, *Strawberry and Chocolate* explicitly raises sexual and national issues and implicitly the racial and classed logics of sacrifice as well. By showing the painful consequences and injustices inherent in a Diego-less Cuba, marginalized Afro-bodies, or a heterosexual socialism, Guttiérez Alea critiques that the production of a revolutionary project that ignores sexual and other aspects of political struggle, including the time after time marginalization and exclusion of people is, at best, not the answer to social feminist transformation. He thus breaks ground to unsettle the assumed moral economies of homophobic and masculinist narratives of revolution.

Agamben picks this idea of sacrifice and critique of liberal sovereign state formation in his book *Homo Sacer*, to nuance the relationship of political modern authority by articulating a very interesting, and yet, problematic relationship between sacrifice and abandonment. Agamben is a contemporary Italian philosopher who similarly to others (Bataille, 1989; Sorel, 1908) attempts to deal with one of the most pressing problems we face today: sovereign violence. Against, major theorists such as Battaille (1989) and Sorel (1908), Agamben does not purport sacrifice to be the solution to the problem of violence and chaos in the society. In *Homo Sacer*, Agamben argues that at the heart of political theory there is a metaphysical problem going back to the classical era, which articulated that to be considered truly "human" requires our engagement in a specific version of politics.

> Politics is thus set over and above "bare life," a status in which we are not even human. According to Agamben in order for the "human" to know himself it requires him to demonstrate and produce the inhuman. For Agamben, this represents not a sacrifice but a ban, one that serves as the originary act of political sovereignty (Agamben, 1998, p. 153).

Agamben's major intervention, epistemologically, is that we pay a price to be included in what comes to be constituted as a democratic community, that is, the "regime of the brothers". Agamben argues that this process is not a sacrificial one but rather one of abandonment. Drawing on Nancy's work, Agamben theorizes the space within which power is applied as one of

exception where law abandons this field that is "a putting a band, where the band is an order, a prescription, a decree, a permission, and the power that holds these freely at his disposal." Agamben argues that what is captured in this ban is bare life of the *homo sacer*, that is the living dead, who can be killed but not sacrificed. Similarly, this idea seems to be centralized in the global relations of war at this historical moment (i.e., Bush's argument that the terrorists are evil and should be hunted. The law does not apply to them once they are captured. An example is the Guantanamo Bay captives). This political logic presumes that "democracy is equated with the existence of formal rights, especially private property rights; with the market; and with voting … . 'Neoliberalism also calculates that the use-value of civil liberties is consumed in the enjoyment of private autonomy … civil liberties are set aside in the pursuit of a national moral project or whenever private auto-nomy is judged imperiled by issues of security'" (Brown, 2006, pp. 703–704). This same logic seems to be also informing some of the NGO movements especially those on trafficking as well as migration. Many movements would try to articulate a definition of legality when it comes down to deciding whether they can support a particular subject or not (Agathangelou, 2006). This form of abandonment is represented in the figure of *homo sacer* who becomes sacrificed by his "father" or rather here "unconditionally subjected to a power of death" in order to be included as a citizen through his capture and ascension to the law of the father (e.g., here the state). Neither political bios nor natural zoe, but sacred life is the zone of indistinction in which zoe and bios constitute each other in including and excluding each other (p. 90).

> This submission of the citizen to the law which is "being in force without significance" (Agamben, 1998, p. 51) is one emptied of its moral significance "which is nevertheless in force as such" (Agamben, 1998, p. 51).

Citing Kant, Agamben argues that this democratic citizenship's relationship to the formal law is what found the democratic human rights' state. "How can we hope to 'open' if the door is already open? How can we hope to enter-the-open …? In the open, there is, things are there, one does not enter there …. We can enter there only there where we can open. The already-open immobilizes. The man from the country cannot enter, because entering into what is already open is ontologically impossible" (p. 49). When the priest in the Trial summarizes the essence of the court in the formula "The court wants nothing from you. It receives you when you come, it lets you go when you go," it is the originary structure of the nomos that he states" (Agamben, 1998, p. 50). Thus, this Kafka story reminds us that the citizen-subject is waiting for the decision of the gatekeeper to enter the kingdom of

God/that, which makes the laws of the kingdom. The price of assent is inscribed on the citizen-subject's body that is "wasted" while waiting at the door of the gatekeeper. This story as told to us through Agamben is one that marks the story of change of life into a project of governance and of course, for Agamben, this change marks the "biopolitical turn of modernity" (Agamben, 1998, p. 153) which now can penetrate to control and sexually discipline many bodies (i.e., many are the conversations around the issue of who is a moral and legitimate subject in several of the NGO movements in Cyprus). It is important to note here that a global supplementary religious logic converges with the logics of globalism and its contingent neoliberal project(s). Similarly to what Brown argues, and we agree with her, "a religiously interpellated populace, and an increasingly blurred line between religious and political culture, and between theological and political discourse, facilitates the reception of the de-democratizing forces of neoconservatism and neoliberalism" (2006, p. 706). Even tensions between different kinds of workers draw on this neoliberal/neofundamentalism logic:[8] "at least we are not prostitutes and we are domestic workers"; "we came here legally through the consent of our state".

   Agamben moves in a different way from Foucault to argue that human rights is one way through which the human life is being brought to the realm of biopolitics and indeed, complicit in the production of the legitimacy of the state. Bare life "enters into the structure of the state and even becomes the earthly foundation of the state's legitimacy and sovereignty" (Agamben, 1998, p. 127). However, as Agamben explains this move enables the ghostly presence of bare life in the biopolity of the liberal state:

> Declarations of rights represent the originary figure of the inscription of the natural life in the juridico-political order of the nation-state… . At the same time, however, the very natural life that, inaugurating the biopolitics of modernity, is placed at the foundation of the order vanishes into the figure of the citizen, in whom rights are "preserved" (according to the second article: "The goal of every political association is the preservation of the natural and indefensible rights of man").

Of course, this process, which depends on the relation of subject to sovereign in the modern state, Agamben tells us, is not a story about sacrifice since the relation between subject and sovereign is premised on the body of *homo sacer*. The act of genocide of the camps were not acts of sacrifice, but rather acts of efficient administrative killings vested with no religious significance. The epistemologies about the state, the body, and the law as proposed by Agamben seem to be also the ideas prevalent in the different organizations, such as human rights organizations on HIV/AIDS and poverty movements which end up being more about how to access medicines or

how to limit imports from poor countries till they "develop" to respond to the violations of the human rights of their workers (Kennedy, 2002, p. 101). This crystallization of the neoliberal logic of invisibilized sacrifice becomes significant when non-profit organizations apply for funding to support their interventions in the society. Many of them draw on the legality of those they serve and thus, those that have either been forced structurally or even through their impresarios or other organizations by issuing them "fake" passports and papers are easily abandoned in the discussion as they are not within the realm of the liberal law (Agathangelou, 2006).

This critique that emerges out of Agamben regarding the limitations that human rights and other movements' organizations have is also a problematique that emerges from his episteme. In his attempts to argue that the formation of the liberal state and the citizen depend not on sacrifice but rather the presumption and the killing of bare life than its sacrifice, Agamben himself does not escape the logics of sacrifice. His episteme remains centralized in that logic: what is being sacrificed, we argue are the "adulterous wives and daughters and servants" and the laborers of the market all of whom are subject to a different kind of power, a power that efficiently and profitably kills. These are the bodies upon which any kind of life becomes predicated. This logic dominates also the non-profit industrial complex which itself many times may presume the liberal subject and its ability to demand its rights from the state/law. One salient example of this, contemporarily, is the prioritization and legitimization of transnational movements that appeal to formal human rights frameworks, a move which implicitly serves to de-legitimize social movements challenging the liberal rights' framework.[9] This tension, for example, has been theorized by Sonia Alvarez within Latin American feminist and autonomous feminist movements and by Ximena Bedregal, known as the "mother" of autonomous feminism in Mexico.[10] Central to this critique is that the rights framework implicitly re-orders social protest in rationalized terms. "As such," claims Bedregal "the organization proves to be so useful to the large international powers and their new strategies of globalization and division of the world, 'global efficiency for global influence.'"[11] Here, Bedregal critiques the liberal reading that a social movement's political agenda and selfhood could re-main independent of the funding structures, which themselves heed to prevailing ideologies of "global efficiency" and profits for their own sustenance. It is important to note that this does not imply that a rights' perspective cannot at moments be strategic and useful as a starting point for social change. It is and it has been used by many organizations (i.e., Canadian indigenous movements making claims to the United Nations about

territoriality issues, work against the prison industrial complex in the United States and the Welfare rights organizations utilizing an economic human rights framework to challenge the US's own contradictory claim on a rights' framework). Nor does this silence the contradictions, always already present in NGOs' and funding organizations' asymmetrical relationships to the "global influences" of which Bedregal is (rightfully) wary. Rather what feminists such as Bedregal critique are the implicit disciplinary moves that serve to deligitimize articulations of social protest that fall outside of and challenge these linear parameters of the individual and liberal rights bearing subject. For example, many organizations and movements with creative political praxes challenging this construction of the liberal and rational subject as the only epistemological possibility struggle to sustain themselves daily. One such organization, emerging out of Bedregal's context is La Marcha Lésbica, originally organized in Mexico City through a collaboration of several groups.[12] Among the demands called for in their declaration of demands are an end to war "en nuestro nombre" in reference to wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, respect for indigenous peoples' demands, a renunciation of NAFTA and other neoliberal accords, and an investigation and resolution of the situation of murdered women in Ciudad Juarez and other towns in Mexico and Guatemala. Articulating what might conventionally be cordoned off as economic (NAFTA), political (war in Eurasia), or cultural (indigenous communities) "issues" as inextricably bound with a feminist lesbian and queer politics, La Marcha is, thus, one example of countless communities who challenge liberal frameworks of "rights" which would demand a hierarchy and separation of "lesbian," "working class," or "political" issues from one another.[13] Juxtaposing these struggles next to each other may open up a different space for articulating and/or intervening toward the sustainability of feminist movements. We understand "sustainable feminism(s) as those social relations and processes, including epistemological work, that foster, form, and renew substantive democratic communities and spaces as resources of life rather than violence and exploitation" (Agathangelou, 2006). Such juxtaposition may move us beyond Agamben's critique of the moral underpinnings of sacrifice that require the punishment of the wife of the baron (Agamben, 1998, p. 108).

"What is important," Agamben argues is that transformation happens on the bed of the sovereign. Here, the sacrifice of the woman is not as crucial in the production of "what is important." Needless to say that this production of the story, of the relation of the father to the son, becomes central, but not without its contingent economies of deaths and violences, upon which its emergence/erection depends. These economies of colonization as well as the

sacrifices of the bodies of women and slaves are exactly what are needed to enable such an ''important'' production. These sacrifices are taken for granted and thus, never engaged as disruptive sites of production (e.g., how are these bodies related to the formation/relation of the father and the son? How do these bodies disrupt the relation of human rights, which focus mostly on the political management of control even at its most radical streams?) What if we saw bodies as central to the production of the political project of liberal democracies as well as projects of the left? What if we saw organizing, including writing, as epistemology made flesh (Agathangelou, 2007)? What if we saw the struggles of transformation beyond what neo-liberalism has pushed for through its different ''left'' and ''feminist'' projects as individualizing, privatizing, particularizing, and converging with the moves of neoliberalism to ''disconnect and internalize local ecologies and communities from wider struggles and political ambitions'' (Albo, 2006, p. 359)?

5. DISRUPTING SINGULAR AND PRIVATIZED TELEOLOGIES OF THE REVOLUTION: TOWARDS A JUXTAPOSITIONAL, TRANSBORDERED METHOD

It is within this context of *sacrifice in the name of non-sacrifice* that we locate a recent (re)emergence of feminist and ''left'' critiques of protests, strategies, and revolution through analytics of sacrifice. For example, Mbembe in his *African Modes of Self Writing*, critiques precisely the moral economies endowed in the fetishization of revolutionary sacrifice. Concerned with the violence and bloodshed that has emerged out of this moral economy within the African contexts of Marxist and nationalist social protest, Mbembe tries to dislodge both the imperial Enlightenment thematics and Judeo-Christian underpinnings of Marxist, nationalist, and nativist narratives of ''politics of a sacrificial process'' (p. 252). His move is extremely pertinent for our articulation of a sustainable feminist movement. Within the contemporary moment and global context when current discussions of ''good'' and ''evil'' (e.g., where the rational ''immorality'' of the market converges with the ''morality'' of fundamentalism(s)) frame a sacrificial politics of the War on Terror, Mbembe's intervention helps to pave epistemological possibilities that do not draw upon such problematic and limited logics. Mbembe first roots this discussion in a deconstruction of victim/tormenter binaries that have under-written imperial imaginaries. More precisely, Mbembe traces figures of History's ''diabolical couple'' from Hegelian slave/master

dialectics to how "the neurosis of victimization" has been picked up in radical discourses of African selfhood as victimization (*ibid.*).

Rather than critiquing this on the grounds of morality, Mbembe is concerned with the limited political and epistemological options enabled through this telos. For, within this simple dialectic, the only answer is compulsion towards an intensification of crisis, which has, too often, required mass violence and bloodshed. As he historically situates this and elaborates in the production of African politics as a "sacramental practice": "as such, politics required the total surrender of the individual to a utopian future and to the hope of collective resurrection that, in turn required the destruction of every thing that stood opposed to it. Embedded within this conception of politics, as pain and sacrifice was an entrenched belief in the redemptive function of violence (p. 251)." Here, Mbembe shows how teleological Western Marxism(s) and religious imagery work to affectively draw the African as revolutionary subject into the seductive promise of redemption through destruction of the enemy. The teleology of change Mbembe thus critiques, is one inscribed within a dialectic constructed through the interplay of a set of dichotomously constructed theses and antitheses: the individual and the collective, the hero and the enemy, the colonized and the colonizer, pain and joy, ecstatic redemption. As these terms confront one another and the oppressed seizes the means of violence to overcome the oppressor, transformation towards a new future becomes reality. Rooted in the mandate to violence, this future can only be realized at the cost of death. As Mbembe continues, within this narrative the ultimate moral decision becomes equated with "An offering of one's life on the public altar of revolution" (*ibid.*). Moreover, violence becomes the sole means of acquiring this moral virtue, as an overwhelming and almost dizzying power is vested in the cataclysmic moment when death is "unleashed." The seduction towards crisis – be it the moment of revolutionary struggle, or the moment of crucifixion as salvation – is invoked as a desire for release from the "leash" of colonial subjugation and gives way to the fetishization of violence and the practice of murder. While this dialectic as a model for transformation thus holds out the lure of utopia and collectivity, it can only be realized through the compulsion toward obligatory violence. Realization as a Subject of History and Revolutionary possibility remain trapped in the teleological path towards a narrowly constrained and singularly articulated future.

This critique nearly 30 years later, picks up on the further development of the obligatory violences and echoes Guttiérez Alea's critique in the context of Cuban socialist revolution and brings us back to our looming question: must the critique of political imaginaries that have centralized sacrificial violence

as crucial for Revolutionary projects be used to de-legitimize work for feminist revolutionary transformation all together? How are feminists interested in anti-capitalist de-colonization to contend with the crises borne when the gendered, sexualized, and racialized violences of radical transformation have been dredged to the surface? Are there other, more creative ways to simultaneously challenge gendered, racial, and sexual sacrifices in state and other institutional relations of revolution and the dominant logics of abandonment, which we have argued, are generated from similar epistemes?

6. BEYOND THE NON-PROFIT INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX: TRANSBORDER FEMINIST PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

It is here that we wish to return to our original claim that such logics of sacrifice and abandonment need not over-determine all intelligibilities and possibilities for social change. Feminist theorizations and struggles, as articulated through the work of "left" theorists, and also the work of NGOs cannot be easily dismissed as fantasy (i.e., unrealistic) or joke. While often rife with contradictions, as we have argued, this need not be reason to concede to logics of abandoment. These are the interventions that are made daily to disrupt the dominant politico-economic articulations of sexist, racist, and heterosexist middle and upper class capitalists.

Paying attention to the labors of feminism in our analysis would also require that we put into practice a politics of solidarity that seriously engages the context in which critiques of professionalization of social movements through NGOs were made. For example, in INCITE's critique of the "non-profit-industrial-complex," a critique of the corporatization of social struggle is made in the name of the production of more critical praxes, not an abandonment of the projects of social change all together. As they articulate the questions:

> How did politics shape the birth of the non-profit model? How does 501(c)(3) status allow the state to co-opt political movements? Activists or careerists? How do we fund the movement outside this complex? (INCITE, 2007)

Here, it is crucial to note that these questions are asked not to dismiss the dire need of collective organizing. Rather, these questions serve to scrutinize the broader political economic shifts that have been accommodated by a move towards the professionalization of NGOs. By raising issues about co-optation of social movements by the state (and market we would add) and

alternative funding strategies, this text works to (re)open the space to imagine feminist social movements that are working toward the production of a "demos for the demos", of a social collective life that is accountable to itself and to the communities it finds itself in (legally or illegally). In order to read these interventions, it is also critical to locate these sites of violence/intervention within a larger context of transnational social relations. How did the interviewees locate their work within a global context?

Papadopoulou, who is both a member of the feminist bi-communal organization *Hands Across the Divide* in Cyprus and of ISAG, talked about how ISAG's activities are twofold: linking the local with the global movement in order to "combat xenophobia and racism in Cyprus and internationally, in co-operation with other organizations" (ISAG leaflet) through concrete work. Papadopoulou nuances how their activities and epistemologies act as resources toward their disruption of dominant violent epistemes of neoliberalism and its contingent violences as well as the articulation of "recessive" projects of social transformation:

> Peace is a prerequisite for anything else, and it is not only the absence of war. It is a *condition* Change will emerge through criticism, by campaigning, and also by *doing a lot of concrete work …* Look at ISAG *… we are not philanthropists. We reject the idea of philanthropy and charity. Also, civil society is a changing environment, it cannot be but just that because we have to respond to change very quickly, to needs in different ways; we cannot be rigid and of course we have to provide an educative role as well …* ISAG definitely is trying to change conditions (cited in Agathangelou, 2003, interview with Papadopoulou).

Papadopoulou articulates a substantive understanding of peace by arguing that it is a "condition" and also moves to say that feminist work is not philanthropic/charitable work. Rather, it is concrete action or "praxis" towards articulating transformative feminist projects to the current racist system. Another feminist stated that the difficulty with changing and putting forward an alternative is the identification of "fissures" in the current dominant capitalist system. It is difficult because, as Sofroniou put it, "at times we cannot assess accurately the connections among what is going on globally, what is going on in our country and how those relations affect us and our organizing." She argued that the movements in the civil society could be effective and transformative when disruptions are made of the dominant territorial/sovereign nation-states, and also articulations of connections with other movements in other communities, that is, with other organizations working towards transforming the neoliberal capitalist system or the "socialist system for the rich" (McClaren & Farahmandpur, 2000, p. 25). Sofroniou articulates another strategy of taking power into the hands of the majority in Cyprus,

> What needs to happen for social change is not a mere movement. The movement has to have a vision to challenge and confront the corporate global system, which benefits the 10% of the world at the expense of the 90%. We need to move beyond incrementalism as the only choice for change … . True expression of the individual can only happen when the system does not rob her of her resources by distributing them to the ones who already have accumulated many resources. A conscious debate around the meaning of civil society is part of the ideological ''war,'' if you will. Talking about individual oppression and human rights of women without locating them in a larger vision that challenges corporate militant globalization is once again incremental change which ends up supporting some women at the expense of millions. For me, feminism can contribute towards peace once it has identified the methods, affective and otherwise, by which the society has forced all of us to internalize its class, gender, and class contradictions (cited in Agathangelou, 2003).

Sofroniou's words bring to the fore that opening the windows to feminist substantive democracy and peace requires for all of us a move beyond liberal values and an ability for us to connect the work we do as feminists and activists with theory, self, and a larger global justice movement which we have to produce.

In the US, NGO workers emphasized that processes of violence/sacrifices (e.g., risks) of constituting the projects of fundamentalist neoliberalism(s).

> In the last ten or fifteen years, more women are part of the global diaspora because they also have to look for better jobs to help their families. And then in terms of globalization, where the resources are put is not towards ameliorating those conditions, but further exacerbating those conditions towards the trafficking of women and selling and enslaving them[14]

These interventions, as made above through NGO workers are crucial at this moment when ''risk'' and ''vulnerability'' are being picked up by the most dominant nation-states in the world and corporate power to support their violent racialized and gendered projects worldwide. As feminists interested in sustainable movements, we are asking: what is the political utility of these discourses of ''risk,'' and ''vulnerability'' without locating them in relationship to violence inside and outside the United States as it attempts to constitute itself as the most dominant military and economic power in the world? How do we tell these histories, while still retaining the radical contradictory subjectivities that are not sustained in notions of insular contexts (NGOs, communities, nation states etc.)? These are critical questions in the crafting of a sustainable feminist and transformative movement.

A staff member of an organization that supports low-income queer youth of color in Massachusetts was also very explicit about the contradictions brought to the fore in the construction of NGOs as insular sites. She told us how much she felt ''overwhelmed just by the localized world'' that she could

not take in the news and often felt isolated in her work. "I just didn't feel very globally connected to anything. And I never have. I've never felt like a "global citizen." However, in the next moment, she started talking about how many of the youth with whom she works feel the need to hide that English is not their first language, because they felt the need to prioritize an identity as gay over that of being an immigrant. Rather than blaming the youth for these contradictions, she located this dynamic within larger complex, transnational politics, colonialism, and racism. She concluded by turning to us and saying "So it is always global, I guess."

In forging transborder participation that is sustainable as a larger feminist movement, feminist NGOs are faced with internal challenges, such as the problems of economic/class tensions, equal voice, reflective dialogue (Kurland & Egan, 1996), militaries, conflicts, neo-fundamentalism(s), and civic discourses. Fighting against militarized corporate globalization, we want our voices to be heard, but our interactions are as fraught with inequalities and class conflicts as the societies we want to transform. Our very presence as multidimensional subjects in all our complexities and contradictions are many times absorbed into (neo)liberal ideologies that silence critiques of nationalism, capitalism, and colonialism, when we fail to build collective spaces for reflection and action. If we truly want to challenge and constitute liberation movements that "open[s] up windows – spaces for non-corporate culture" (Klein, 2002), we need to engage in praxis (theory as practice, action as theory, and self-reflection) with a clear vision of the normative political goals in the struggle for the creation of such alternative(s). We began this paper, asking how social inequalities become reconstituted, and perhaps more importantly, how they can be challenged when actors from various locations come together to challenge corporate globalization and its contingent sacrifices: violence and death. It is only through engagement with one another and through the juxtaposition of our stories and struggles that we can come to see our actions, cross context, as collective, and utilize these tensions to move towards accountability to each other in the use and drawing on resources to enable our production of social relations.

NOTES

1. By "NGOization" we refer to transformations such as the intensifying reliance of movements upon increasingly privatized, corporate funding structures, and subsequent compartmentalization of revolutionary projects into discreet and competing "issues." This analysis derives from our experiences, as well as the theorizations of feminists and particularly feminists of color in Latin America (INCITE! Women of

Color Against Violence; Sonia Alvarez, Ximena Bedregal; La Marcha Lésbica), and the countries, such as Egypt and Afganistan (i.e., Rawa). Within the US context, the organization INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence has termed similar contradictions ''the non-profit-industrial-complex.''

2. Agathangelou is the co-director of the Global Change Institute in Nicosia, Cyprus that deals with issues of global war, racial and sexual struggles, migration(s), and health. Moreover, she has been an active member in the women's bi-communal movement in Cyprus and has also worked with organizations, which addressed issues of trafficking and sexual violence in Houston and Toronto. Spira has been involved in social struggles around issues of racial, sexual, and economic justice, militarization of the US/Mexico border and prisons as a community and labor organizer, a service provider and policy advocate, and the coordinator of a statewide youth social-justice organization in Massachusetts. She is currently involved in collective struggles against mass incarceration, with focus on the racialized, sexualized, and gendered violences reproduced through the prison-industrial-complex in California and its surrounding economies of war, transnationally. She has also been employed by a funding agency that supports feminist organizations globally.

3. See Vickers (2006) for a detailed analysis of the relation of gender and nations.

4. Anonymous interviewee, Family Violence Prevention Fund, August 12, 2003, San Francisco, CA.

5. This move towards heightened professionalization is prevalent within the United States, as is evident through networks such as the Young Nonprofit Professional Network (http://www.ynpn.org) and Compaspoint Services whose mission is ''to provide nonprofit training, consulting, and research organizations through a broad range of services (such as) management tools, concepts, and strategies necessary to shape change in ... communities.'' (http://www.compasspoint.org). While the emergence of infrastructures created to support non-profit organizations can serve the purpose of providing financial sustainability, these infrastructures bring with them discourses of ''efficiency'' and practices to manage the very act of social protest(s).

6. See Youngs (2006) for an insightful analytic regarding ideologies, religion, and conflict.

7. Anonymous interviewee, Boston, MA, July 6, 2003.

8. We are not arguing here that many of these workers were not religious and were just merely informed by the neoliberal/neofundamentalist logic, but rather as state restructures feminist as well as other, including religious forces, surge back into public and political life.

9. For a good example of human rights funding priorities and categories constructed to frame issues from a funding perspective, please see http://www.globalfundforwomen.org

10. For a great example of Alvarez's careful and nuanced analyses of the NGOization of Latin American feminisms and the ensuant tensions, please see Alvarez (1998a). ''Latin American Feminisms 'Go Global': Trends of the 1990s and Challenges for the New Millenium.'' In Cultures of Politics/Politics of Cultures: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements, edited by Sonia E. Alvarez (1998b), Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Also see, Alvarez, ''Advocating Feminisms: the Latin American NGO 'boom''' (www.antenna.nl/~waterman/alvarez2.htm).

11. Ximena Bedregal (1996). "The Feminist Movement and Financial Independence," *CAFRA News*, Jan/Dec.

12. Much of our knowledge derives from Spira's work at the Global Fund For Women and is hence implicated in the same power struggles critiqued above by Bedregal.

13. For a full transcript of these demands, please see http://www.marchalesbica.org.mx/documento.html. Please note, that all translations here were made by the authors.

14. Interview with an anonymous member of Family Violence Prevention Fund, San Francisco, August 21, 2003.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Abdulhadi, R. (2003). Where is home? fragmented lives, border crossings, and the politics of exile. *Radical History Review*, *86*(Spring), 89–101.

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press.

Agathangelou, A. M. (2003). Envisioning a feminist global society: Cypriot women, civil society and social change. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *5*(2), 290–299.

Agathangelou, A. M. (2004a). *The global political economy of sex: Violence, desire, and insecurity in Mediterranean nation-states*. Palgrave.

Agathangelou, A. M. (2004b). Gender, race, militarization, and economic restructuring in Former Yugoslavia and the US-Mexico border. In: D. Aguilar & A. E. Lascamana (Eds), *Women and globalization* (pp. 347–386). New York: Humanity Press.

Agathangelou, A. M. (2004c). What is to be done: Globalization and social equity. *Journal of Public Affairs Education on Social Equity and Public Affairs Education*, *10*(2), 155–158, edited by Samuel L. Myers, Jr. and Susan Gooden.

Agathangelou, A. M. (2005). Perpetual peace or perpetual war: A postcolonial feminist analysis of international knowledge production about the ethics of (dis)order. In: R. Christie & E. Dauphinee (Eds), *The ethics of building peace in international relations: Selected proceedings of the 12th annual conference of the centre for international and security studies*.

Agathangelou, A. M. (2006). Colonizing desires: Bodies for sale, exploitation and insecurity in the desire industries. *Cyprus Review*, *18*(2), 37–73.

Agathangelou, A. M., & Killian, K. D. (2002). In the wake of 1974: Psychological well being and post-traumatic stress in Greek Cypriot refugee families. *Cyprus Review*, *14*, 10–42.

Agathangelou, A. M., & Ling, L. H. M. (2004). Power, borders, security, wealth: Lessons of violence and desire from September 11. *International Studies Quarterly*, *48*(3), 517–538.

Agathangelou, A. M., & Killian, K. D. (2006). Epistemologies of peace: Poetics, globalization, and the social justice movement. *Globalizations*, *3*(4), 459–483.

Agathangelou, A. M. (2007). A transbordered feminist critique of the epistemologies of militarized neoliberalism: Solidarities and practices toward substantive democracy. Invited Presentation at International Studies Association, Chicago, March 2.

Albo, G. (2006). The limits of eco-localism: Scale, strategy, socialism. *Socialist Register: Coming to Terms with Nature*, 337–363.

Alexander, M. J. (2006). *Pedagogies of crossing: Meditations on feminism, sexual politics, and the sacred*. Durham NC: Duke UP.

Alexander, M. J., & Mohanty, C. T. (1997). Introduction: Genealogies, legacies, movements. In: M. J. Alexander & C. T. Mohanty (Eds), *Feminist geneaologies, colonial legacies, democratic futures*. New York: Routledge.

Alvarez, S. E. (1998a). Latin American feminisms 'go global': Trends of the 1990s and challenges for the new millennium. In: S. E. Alvarez, E. Dagnino & A. Escobar (Eds), *Cultures of politics/politics of cultures: Re-visioning Latin American social movements*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Alvarez, S. E. (1998b). Advocating feminisms: The Latin American NGO 'boom' (www.antenna.nl/~waterman/alvarez2.htm).

Ayotte, K. J., & Husain, M. E. (2005). Securing Afghan women: Neocolonialism, epistemic violence, and the rhetoric of the veil. *NWSA Journal*, *17*(3), 112–133.

Bataille, G. (1989). *Theory of religion*. New York: Zone Books.

Bedregal, X. (1996). The feminist movement and financial independence, *CAFRA News*, Jan/Dec.

Brown, W. (2006). American nightmare: Neoliberalism, neoconservatism, and de-democratization. *Political Theory*, *34*(6), 690–714.

Butler. J. (2004). *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. Verso. *Cheriet, B. 1996. Gender, civil society and citizenship in Algeria.* Middle East Report, Volume 0, Issue 198, pp. 22–26.

Cotter, J. (2001). The class regimen of contemporary feminism. *Red Critique*, *8*, 1–22.

Eng, D. L., Kazanjian, D. (Eds). (2004). Loss: The politics of mourning. University of California Press.

Guttierez, A. T. (dir.) (1994). *Fresa y Chocolate*. Instituto Cubano del Arte e Industrias Cinematográficos (ICAIC).

INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence. (2007). *The revolution will not be funded beyond the non-profit industrial complex*. Boston, South End Press (forthcoming).

Jaggar, A. M. (2003). Responding to the evil of terrorism. *Hypatia*, *18*(1), 175–182.

Kennedy, D. (2002). The international human rights movement: Part of the problem? *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, *15*(101), 101–125.

Klein, N. (2002). *Fences and windows: Dispatches from the frontlines of the globalization debate*. USA: Picador.

Kurland, N. B., & Egan, T. D. (1996). Engendering democratic participation via the Net: Access, voice and dialogue. *The Information Society*, *12*, 387–406.

Mbembe, A. (2002). African modes of self-writing. *Public Culture*, *36*, 239–273.

Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. In: M. Libby (Trans.), *Public Culture* (Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 11–40).

McClaren, P. & Farahmandpur, R. (2000). Reconsidering Marx in post-marxist times: A requiem for postmodernism? *Research News and Comment*, April, pp. 25–33.

Razack, S. (2004). *Dark threats and white knights: The Somalia affair, peacekeeping and the new imperialism*. University of Toronto Press.

Revolutionary association of the women of Afghanistan (RAWA). http://www.rawa.org/index.php. Accessed January 13, 2006.

Shambos, S. (1999). Statement by the representative of Cyprus to the 2nd committee. Ms. Salina Shambos on agenda item 99 © Sustainable development and international economic cooperation: Women in development, October 29, 1999. Available at: http://kypros.org/UN/salina.htm. Accessed January 2, 2003.

Smith, A. (2005). *Conquest. Sexual violence and American Indian genocide*. Boston: South End Press.

Sorel, G. (1908). *The Dreyfusian revolution*. http://www.marxists.org/archive/sorel/1908/dreyfus-revolution.htm. Accessed January 10, 2006.

Vickers, J. (2006). Bringing nations in: Some methodological and conceptual issues in connecting feminisms with nationhood and nationalisms. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *8*(1), 84–109.

Young, G. (2006). Feminist international relations in the age of war on terror: Ideologies, religions, and conflict. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *8*(1), 1–13.

THE ANARCHA PROJECT: PERFORMING IN THE MEDICAL PLANTATION

Petra Kuppers

I am talking about this: A young white doctor in Montgomery, Alabama, in the 1840s developed operative procedures to close vaginal fistulas, that is, tears in vaginal tissue (caused by prolonged labor, or by inexpert use of forceps). Fistulas cause constant leakage of urine and, if the fistula affects the rectal canal, fecal matter. The doctor developed his methods through extensive experiments executed on the bodies of a number of un-anesthetized black slave women. He operated on at least one of these women over 30 times.

Reader, do you not come up short, arrested, even against these deliberately flat and unemotional sentences about 'what happened'? The 'objectivity' of the medical, the scientific way of knowing, sets an object – something to look at, diagnose, categorize. But I ask you, as I write, to resist the distance of the objectification. What kind of writing, what performances of words in the realm of medical history can object objectification and undo the distances both archives and language itself places between us? This is the horizon on which this contribution teeters – and teeters precariously.

The archival record, authored by the very doctor whose practices are so problematic, has given up three names: Anarcha, Lucy, and Betsey. These are three of the women at the slave clinic in Montgomery, Alabama. The

doctor operating on them was James Marion Sims, the inventor of the Sims speculum.

> Each time we as future healthcare providers pick up a speculum we should think of Anarcha and the unimaginable sacrifice that she was forced to make for the development of this commonly-used tool. Let us never forget. (Alexandria C. Lynch, http://www.nathanielturner.com/anarchas_story.htm (last accessed March, 2007))

Let us never forget. Black medical student Alexandria Lynch voices her anger at the forgetting of the black women across whose bodies US medicine was advanced. But remembering, honoring, and ethical witnessing are problematic and difficult and collapse too eagerly into containing narrative.

How can I talk about what it is that we should not forget? Already, 'naming' makes complex my task of writing: the three names and title of Dr. James Marion Sims, together with the 'father of gynecology' label given to him, outweigh Anarcha, Lucy, and Betsey, the first names of the three women we know, with many others lost to history, their names unrecorded, their offspring unknown, their lineage diffuse. These women were slaves and the subject of multiple experimental operations. To merely repeat 'what happened', what gynecological operations they went through in the rural town of Montgomery, Alabama in the 1840s, without anesthesia, and why, with medical labels and time-lines codified and sanctioned by the medical archive, is already to perform the victim narrative for Anarcha and her fellows in that make-shift hospital. So at this point, I have to think about the responsibilities of historical work and of the power of naming. Sims himself is the only source about Anarcha's life. He wrote an autobiography, published posthumously (by a few months) by his son in 1880. Earlier, he also published much about his discovery of a cure for fistula, and his work at the slave hospital, in a monograph, as well as in numerous talks he gave once he became a fashionable doctor (working on white women) in New York, and on his European tours. Sims, who was friends with P. T. Barnum, knew how to present himself, and the word 'dandy' appears in the literature surrounding him. Against this onslaught of words celebrating his work, where is the space to remember Anarcha and the others? In black popular cultural historian Janell Hobson's work on the discourses of black women's beauty, Anarcha's name is indexed – and Sims' isn't. What some might deem an oversight from a historian's perspective might be an act of assertion, a counter-history, a remembering differently. Performer and health educator Terri Kapsalis, who provides one of the most in-depth and critical account of Sims' work in her cultural study of the speculum, also dreams of difference for Anarcha and the others: she asks about their husbands,

partners, children, loved ones, and about the space outside the hospital (Kapsalis, 1997, p. 40). This desire, to remember differently, also fuels what I unfold here: but the movement of my narrative becomes constrained and arrested every time I begin it, since the medical narrative surrounding Anarcha is so strong, the doctor's agency so well documented and remembered, and her agency only dreamed about. Stop, start, side-track: these are the performative politics of spatial parsing I use as I have to rethink my academic writing, refusing a linear logic, and yet needing to be clear, and to speak, respectfully, in difference. And so I invite others to join me, unfold my language and fold it into others, blend and trace influences in words, in names, in stances. And we perform together, walk streets together, find spaces together, celebrate our community, of black culture and disability culture activists, even if we cannot uncritically celebrate Anarcha, Lucy, and Betsey, or the fact that we were able to find out about them and call them into our respective histories: crip culture, black culture, US culture. But working as activists and artists in our shared culture today, we can use creative means to address ongoing health inequalities and the ongoing effects of history on our lives. Thus we can sustain ourselves, in our feminism. And we can acknowledge the edges of what we can do, achieve, bring into presence, the scars in our knowledge, the places that do not sustain.

Theatre and dance artists Anita Gonzalez, one of the founders of the Urban Bush Women, the premier black woman's dance collective in the US, and Carrie Sandahl, disability culture researcher and theatre artist, joined me in Montgomery, Alabama, where we began to collaborate on a performance piece, The Anarcha Project: Sims and the Medical Plantation, which we are touring throughout 2007 and 2008.

In the following performance texts from this show, themes of the medical, the different knowledge holders and their power differential, women's voices, medical labels, exclusions and inclusions appear transformed, and worked on with and through the stories of local people, different voices of students and teachers who deal with issues of racism and health care. The performance pieces are part of an Open Source text: not copyrighted, but given to be taken up, transformed, sustaining an ongoing dialogue of a shared marketplace of ideas, a commons that acknowledges its divisions. The scenes reflect our own embodied experience of the visit in Montgomery, and at another place, not 30 minutes drive from the site of the slave hospital on Perry Street – Tuskegee University, the historical black college founded by Booker T. Washington, a place of a pride and elation that was much easier for us to stomach than the civic pride of the statue to Sims infront of the Montgomery Capitol, and the proud mention of his name in the recreated Doctor's House in

Alabama Old Town. Nowhere in these public monuments and plaques did the names of Anarcha, Lucy, and Betsey appear.

Tuskegee is the site of the Biomedical Archive held there since President Clinton's apology for the outrage of the Syphilis Project, where poor black men of Macon County acted as unwitting experimental subjects into the 1970s. The history of Anarcha, and of the men of Tuskegee, provides the fertile grounds for our dance and theatre work, and the visceral responses to history's presence structure our performance.

The experimental performance texts are excerpts from our work, and they use different voices, rhythms, spoken word, and poetry conventions. As we tour this material to different places, the script is filled with different voices: what you get here are sounds from our work in Montgomery. Play with your breath as you read them, and see if you remember Anarcha.

THE ANARCHA PROJECT: J. MARION SIMS AND THE MEDICAL PLANTATION

Conceived by The Olimpias and Art Boundaries Unlimited

Creative Commons 2006 Petra Kuppers, Anita Gonzalez, Carrie Sandahl and Tabitha Chester, gratefully acknowledging input by community members

Excerpts from Show Material

This is an Open Source text, which means that it is a structure that needs to be filled with your voices, texts and bodies. It is held in a creative commons: you may use it as you wish, all we ask for is acknowledgement of the shared journey.

Cast Note: Cast Numbers, Positions or Characters are not fixed. Three+ people can perform these acts of remembrance and analysis.

Scene: Years Passing… (Photo 1).

To Bear (*sung by all members of cast*)
We all have our crosses to bear
And our little dresses to wear

Photo 1.   Three Women.

Heaven lasts always
but no man has ever seen
(*The song continues, half-hummed, handheld, circle-held, hugging middles,
rocking backwards and forth, holding on.*) (Photo 2)

(*Projection/Narration, intersected by images of Montgomery, Alabama,
and other Sims statues in NYC, South Carolina, other Alabama towns, and
images of slave life in the 1840s and 50s*)
   1846: Montgomery doctor J. Marion Sims pays to build a hospital
with 16 beds in his backyard. He was setting out to find an operative
cure for women's fistula, openings between the bladder and the vaginal
or rectal region, often caused by prolonged childbirth – a relatively
common condition that made women incontinent.

Photo 2.   The Site of the Slave Hospital, Now a Car Park.

Sims asked plantation owners to provide him with subjects, slave women. In the following 3 years, Sims worked on up to 11 patients at a time.

We only know 3 names: ANARCHA, BETSEY and LUCY. Sims tells in his biography that he operated on ANARCHA more than 30 times. He did not use anesthesia for the operations on their vaginas, but he used opium to aid with recovery. His development of the speculum made him the first modern doctor to actually look at and into women's vaginas.

We know nothing about the women, about whether they were cured, where they went, when they died. Later, Sims used the methods and instruments he developed to become the celebrated and well-traveled 'father of gynecology'.

Scene: This is not about Sims
The SIMS Song (excerpt)

Solo Voice	*Chorus (rest of cast)*

There's a SIMS monument.
In Montgomery. Right here

I just start laughing
I just shudder and clench   **Marion Sims**
                                                   The father of gynecology.

Speculating with the Speculum
Why would you want to talk about that,
write about that, think about that.

                                                   The shudder and the arrest.
He's a rural doctor with an inspiration.
He has an aspiration
He finds exaltation in the demonstration
Of experimentation   [Exhalation]
                                                   The shudder and the arrest.

His medical theatres have become macabre.
Wooden cabins Glass dildos. Cut vaginal walls.
Black slave women like me
For experimentation

Betsey and Lucy and … Anarcha
Black woman

I want to imagine her as a resistor, but I don't
think so. Most Alabama folks know how not
to be resistors. After all, where could you go.
Can't run.
Can't move.

's in the silence of no talk.   No
in the fear to speak.   No
one remembers.   No
action,   No
reparations.   No
one cares.   No
                                                   No
                                                   Marion Sims
                                                   The father of gynecology.

The pewter spoon speculum

Finding the Fistula
Finding the origin of
The vaginal tear
The Stink that makes
An outcast,
A freak crip
A Nazi non-human T4
NWL—Not worth living

Scene: Perspectives/Fantasies/Fetishes of History (Photo 3)

> (*Projection combined with images*)
> It takes less than 30 minutes to travel from the site of the hospital in Montgomery, on Perry Street, to Tuskegee, the site of the Syphilis Study where poor black men were left untreated and uninformed in a government-sponsored health experiment.

(*Sound Poem, while stage action: one performer creates an arrangement of two cots, a desk, a book, a chair, [if stage permits:] wet blankets, a few moving bodies. Each arrangement of the hospital is held, then dissolves and someone else guides the furniture and bodies into new fantasies of what it might have been like. Tensions: furniture dragging on the floor, get in the way*)

Blot
Blot
Blot
Spreading
Dripping
Spreading
Searing
Pinching
Shushing
Stitching
Blot
Blot
Blot

Photo 3.   Two Women, One on Bed.

Pulling
Shushing
Shushing
Haze

Scene: Hunting Shadows (Photo 4)
(Movement Sequence, with choreography based on tracing one's own shadow on the ground, intersecting with other shadows, meetings, encounters, whisperings into body hollows. [if stage permits:] wet stains from dripping blankets create holes in the moving coverage of the stage)

Photo 4.   Shadow Dancing.

Projection: Shadow/Texture Sequence
Sound: Humming
Scene: Rituals
(The song words are both sung, and also projection in the shape of a cross.
Stage action: a circle dance emerging from a hospital cot, combining Afro-
Christian and Yoruba material)

The Blood
The blood
Wash in the Blood
Of Jesus Christ
The Blood that drips
From me can never be washed all that clean
Ask the Lord and he shall make you white as doves
My help comes from the lord
He shall provide all my strength
If I ask

Scene: Healing Garden Fantasy
(light change,
projection: gardens, quilts, patterns, images of gardens in performance
location, window sill life, and other comforts of making a home)
Dance Sequence

Scene: To Feel No Pain
(This scene changes with local voices, workshop participants, who deliver
spoken word directly to the audience.
To the side: one performer wrings out wet blankets over buckets, again and
again)

> (*Projection, also intersected with other images, including emergency*
> *room waiting areas and other contemporary medical scenes*)
> "The question of anesthesia is also broached. Sensation in the upper
> vagina, especially in areas that have been rendered fibrotic from chronic
> infection, are substantially less sensate than, for example, the skin.
> Therefore, the manipulation of the fistulae would not have produced
> the same type of discomfort as an incision made through a fistula
> that exited through the dermis" (O'Leary, 2004, *Journal of Southern*
> *Medicine*, 427).

To Feel no Pain
Something about eating potato chips and feeling no pain because after all black people have a disease where they don't feel pain. They just experience it: which is somehow different from white people feeling pain and really suffering through it.

So when Black people have diarrhea or diabetes or just plain amputations. Or get their teeth pulled out with forceps, they don't really feel it. They just add it onto the rest of their experiences of slavery and rape so that they can have great survival stories. And songs like (sing) "Up from a past rooted in pain, I rise."

I am really happy to hear they have a name for this affliction. Dysaesthesia Aethiopis. And that it is a disease. Dysaesthesia Aethiopis. It sounds just like a blues song or a spiritual chant, nice and (aesthetic)/(anesthetic) because it alleviates the afflictions of living. And this is what I would need to pretend to forget the pains of the past as I move through the pains of the future. Because I am definitely looking forward to experiencing Katrina and AIDS and the criminal system, and even the hypocrisy of black middle class backlash in a state of Dysaesthesia Aethiopis.

To Feel No Pain
Montgomery will not give up her secrets easily.
Pouring rain
Whitewashes the shotgun shack.
Good old boys celebrate her fruits with their music.

Are we asking her to betray the secrets of a patient,
Prying pewter spoon
spoons history where she feels no pain.
A collective dysaethesia aethiopis obscures memory.

Her crooked finger dangles the key (Photo 5),
Drawing us near.
Gossip in the town
the stain spreads revealing as it obscures.

Hush in the blanket.
Eating bits of straw,
Unravel the threads in the candlelight
The candle drips wax and casts shadows on the wall.

Photo 5. Keys.

To Feel no Pain
I know a woman who lives in a shelter.
She is a domestic violence survivor.
She knows being beaten.
She knows running away.
She knows staying.
She knows shame.
Not to be believed, told what to do, counting her bills.
She knows.
She knows the repetition of the fist on her face, the boot in the gut, the
money that she needs, her children need, the roof, the tile of the bathroom
floor.
And she tells me:
I know I should take it.
Take it like a woman, rooted in pain.
Do not give in to the shame.

Rise from the pain.
Makes me strong.
I know.
'Dyaesthesia aethiopis' – black people feel no pain.
That's what racist science knew, without shame,
and they use the pain to perpetuate the institution,
the corporation, the factory machine of slavery.
Black people can work in this heat.
They can take malaria, the scratch of the mosquito bite, the bite of the whip.
The scientists knew, no shame.
And knowledge infects, infiltrates, mutates, survives, incorporates, draws
the line.
Cancerous, white shapeless cells sucking blood.
Infection, defection, inflection: the case of pain is declinated, put through its
paces, the Latin phrase infecting the rule of the plantation.
The slaveholders know no pain, no shame.
They knew what to say.
They knew that the cotton dress they wore on their Scarlet skin was made by
people, people I say,
people who knew no pain, who knew that the fist and the boot knew them,
and would know them again.
Sims cut
took the cut
knowing what they all knew,
the public secret of pain: no pain, no shame, and lots of gain.
Scarlet lives in a shelter now,
knowledge has reached the last line,
the last entry in the family tree of blood relations,
blood vessels,
blood vassals,
bowing to the people who know blood:
the scientist, the foot in the boot, the man infiltrated by the shame of
slavery.
Sitting for hours in the emergency room, the last line of health care for the
uninsured, the pain, the shame, no gain, no money ….
The pain is a sore, a fester of bites, a plantation souvenir,
remembering the infection of the US of A,
the reaction of the US of eugenics,
the perfection of Nazi science,
of knowing the blood.

Blood speaks and sings,
behind black skin, white skin:
of diabetes, HIV, arthritis, of sickle-cell and of
a tension, a tension, a tension that pushes, and throbs.
To know the blood is to make the money, to feed the industry, no shame,
the medical plantation,
the corporation,
the amalgamation of Pfizer, Bayer, Bristol-Mayers.

Scene: Ending
(in this scene, song and movement merge into a touching, a farewell, a letting go)

To Bear *(sung by all members of cast)*
We all have our crosses to bear
And our little dresses to wear
Heaven lasts always
but no man has ever seen

REFERENCE

Kapsalis, T. (1997). *Public privates: Performing gynecology from both ends of the speculum.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

SUSTAINABLE NETWORKING: COLLABORATION FOR WOMEN'S HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVISTS, SCHOLARS, AND DONORS

Brooke Ackerly

INTRODUCTION

What sustains feminism across the range of shared and invisible interests, experiences, and geopolitical struggles that make us usefully discuss "sustainable feminisms"? The same things that sustain feminists. One of these is networking with other feminists. As evidenced by the participation in the conference that led to this volume, feminists are sustained not by similarities or differences but by networking and collaboration with one another. How can we make our networks more sustaining of feminisms?

This chapter emerges out of five years of action research with women's human rights organizations and participant observation of transnational feminist networks at venues of transnational dialogue. Why women's organizations and not just women in human rights organizations? Because as Clark and collaborators argue, women's organizations are the heart of the transnational women's movement (Clark, Sprenger, VaneKlasen, & Durán, 2006; cf. Ferree & Tripp, 2006; cf. Hawkesworth, 2006).

This chapter shares part of my findings: lessons about *how* to network and collaborate so that the needs and concerns of all parties are shared between the parties. I argue that in order to sustain our feminisms, activists, academics, and donors need to work together to develop linkages, cooperation, ethical partnerships, and new institutions.[1] After a brief (and admittedly oversimplifying) exposition of their differences, I describe these four opportunities for networking and collaboration. These insights are shared as work in progress in two senses. This research is still underway *and* women's human rights activism is in transition (Alvarez, 1999; Clark et al., 2006; Hawkesworth, 2006; Moghadam, 2005). The changing global and local political and funding environments will likely continue to change the *relationships* among scholars, activists, and donors.

For example, ''gender mainstreaming,'' originally a strategy for integrating women's rights issues into local, national, and global policy considerations, has influenced the funding for women's human rights work in disturbing ways. Rather than centering the concern about gendered power as feminists had hoped, mainstreaming has functioned to de-center concerns about gender inequality (Clark et al., 2006; Goetz, forthcoming; Lewis, 2006). In this changing environment, feminist donors and feminists within mainstream donor organizations are increasingly marginalized and in need of sustaining partnerships with activists and academics. This chapter lays out a landscape of concerns to which activists, academics, and donors of women's human rights might be attentive as we reform and sustain our networks.

Women's human rights feminists can be sustained by appreciating women's human rights activism, scholarship, and donor initiatives as confluent. Each provides the context of the other's impact by influencing their opportunities and choices, in part by being each other's (potential) dialogue partners. Feminism has always been a theory and a practice of social change and education. Activism and scholarship have always been part of much feminist practice and theory. They do not constitute a division of labor, but rather interrelated projects (Collins, [1990] 1991; Harding & Norberg, 2005; MacKinnon, 2006; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 2002; Peck & Mink, 1998; Sandoval, 2000; Smith, 1999).[2] In the area of women's human rights, the Association for Women's Rights and Development (AWID) and Development Alternatives for Women in a New Era (DAWN) are just two of many networks that bring activism and scholarship together with an eye toward influencing public policy (e.g. Sen & Grown, 1987). Many donors have supported such partnerships, for example United Nations Research Instituted for Social Development. However, professionalization and competition for

funding are forces that separate activists and academics. Consequently, the scholar-activist-donor collaboration is a multi-faceted and multi-sited relationship among actors who themselves move among locations including academe, research institutes, non-government organizations (NGOs), international NGOs, international organizations, national governments, local governments, and associations.

At the end of the 20th century, UN-centered organizing was important for transnationalizing feminists. For example, leading up to the Vienna Conference on human rights, the Center for Women's Global Leadership organized a women's human rights tribunal. Through careful organization that facilitated their public testimony at the parallel NGO Forum, women became the *voice* and not just the *face* of women's human rights violations (1993). Likewise, in the book that Amrita Basu prepared anticipating the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, *The Challenge of Local Feminisms*, women from around the world offer the *analysis*, and not just the *voice*, of local feminism (Basu & McGrory, 1995). As feminists assess where we are against the Platform for Action generated by the Beijing process and assess whether the Millennium Development Goals process will improve women's human rights in this millennium, the need for *localized* gender analysis and sustainable feminist collaboration are evident.

The insights in this chapter come primarily from 21st century meetings of grassroots and transnationalizing feminist activists, scholars, and donors: "Human Rights Activism and Networking," Center for International Studies, University of Southern California (USC) (Los Angeles, 2001); "Working Together: Scholars, Activists and Funders," AWID (Guadalajara, 2002); "Sustainable Feminism**s**," Macalester College (St. Paul, 2003); "Clash or Consensus: Gender and Human Security in Globalized World," Women's Learning Partnership and Global Fund for Women (Washington, DC, 2003), World Social Forum (WSF) (Mumbai, 2004), Feminist Dialogues (Porto Alegre, 2005), WSF (Porto Alegre, 2005).

In order to have sustainable feminisms, the policies of this millennium need to be based on transformative analysis that is integrated into the analyses of all forms of oppression. Such analysis requires the sustained collaboration of activists and scholars. Such collaboration needs to be supported by donors and its findings must achieve an audience with policymakers. However, the separations and differences between activists, scholars, and donors create obstacles to networking and collaboration. The transformative potential of feminism depends not only on the relationships among these but also on transforming the contexts in which they work. In a recent piece of action research around women's human rights

funding, the authors call for a transformation in the movement (Clark et al., 2006). This paper sets out some of the things we need to notice as together we engage in, reflect upon, and support that process.

INSIGHTS FROM FEMINISTS: ACTIVISTS, SCHOLARS, AND DONORS

While often considering themselves part of a larger and collective project, many working in women's human rights in grassroots NGOs do not have the advantages of networking nor access to the places where research is designed or funded. Scholars and activists work in different ways and donors often support the scholars and activists differently (or separately if at all). Consequently, the synergies that might exist in the work of academics and grassroots NGOs are often inadequately exploited. By virtue of the power of money, donors can be agenda-setters. They can use this role to promote and even facilitate collaboration between academics and activists and between local and foreign academics, but they must do so in a way that is cognizant not only of the power of money but also of the other manifestations of power in academic-NGO-community relationships. Donor initiatives can structure incentives in ways that lead to productive collaboration or toward destructive competition among activists, among academics or between academics and scholars.

There are relative differences among women's human rights feminists. These are partly a function of where each situates her work institutionally. I note the characteristics of these differences not to delineate between the participants as much as to know the range of considerations that influence their work. While participants are all interested in promoting women's human rights, they do so in different ways. Attention to these differences may remind us of other important differences and similarities within and across groups. Moreover, it is important to pay attention to the *particular* context of each actor *and* to the shared global context.

"Activism" describes the work of a broad range of organizations and community groups, some well-networked, others not (cf. Sowards & Renegar, 2006 on third wave activism). The work of grassroots activists is driven by a social mission. They work in a short-term time frame in which concerns about how to meet present crises often predominate. For activists, time is precious. The time spent on potential collaborative projects, in a virtual community developing a network, or developing opportunities for

collaboration must pay off, and have the prospects of that payoff clearly visible on the horizon. Activists often work in organizations that are not highly developed, meaning both that their organizational design is flexible and that lines of communication are not always clear. Of course, there is a range of organizational structures implemented by activist organizations, but compared to other participants, their organizations are more flexible, (it doesn't take an act of Parliament to change them). However, activists may be less professionalized. They may be unrehearsed in the discourse of scholars and donors; their speech may reflect the passion that drives them in their social mission. They may not be able to anticipate the interests of donor and policy audiences. Despite their possible professional limitations, in the hands of activists, a little money goes a long way. Many activist organizations are experienced at leveraging small amounts of money for big purposes. They need to be because when there is a macroeconomic downturn, demands on them increase and their resources decrease.

Similarly, "scholars" vary significantly by location, discipline, and other professional factors. In general, scholars interested in women's human rights work share in the activists' social mission. However, given institutional pressures, researchers seek to make an impact on scholarship (Clark, 1995; Stanley, 1997). Whether this means being cited in the near term or having one's contribution recognized and built upon in the long term depends on the scholar and the field. However, compared to the other participants, they work with the least sense of urgency. Also, compared to the others, they work under the most minimal organizational constraints. In addition to the obvious job security of tenured professors, scholars generally are not confined in their work by their organizational structures.[3] Without beneficiaries making demands, social problems requiring immediate investment, political initiatives needing action, scholars can direct their own research agendas. This makes them good partners for activists whose work is confined by pressing needs of a social or political nature. Moreover, scholars also work with minimal financial pressures. Certainly, funding would enable a scholar to pursue a research agenda; a research project needs to be adequately funded in order to be carried out, and certain projects are worth pursuing only if the prospect of future funding is significantly secured such that work that is necessary to inform future work takes place. None of these financial constraints change whether scholars work. They merely affect on what and how they work.

As with the others, "donors" differ institutionally from one another from bilateral agencies to international foundations to women's groups and family foundations. Some seek to mainstream gender in their initiatives, others

have a more oblique interest in women's human rights (Clark et al., 2006). However, all are investing in social and economic change. Investment involves supporting the individual missions of activist organizations, but it also involves seeing activist work as contributing to sustainable change more broadly. Donors see connections that activists could be making with one another. They can spot trends within and across societies. They have a perspective that enables them to see their own work and the work of activists as affecting future generations. Because of organizational structures, they may or may not be able to make connections between activists and scholars. They work under determined organizational and governance structures, including often constraints established by law or contracts. However, donors have been known to be flexible in interpreting their mission and the organizational design required to implement their goals. Finally, though they work with money, their work is not constrained by its lack in the way that the work of activists and scholars is. Changing personnel, priorities, oversight, or organizational structures have had a greater impact on donors than changes in available funds to disburse (Table 1).

Table 1.   Characteristics of Some of the Relevant Features of Participants.

	Activists	Scholars	Donors
Purpose	Social mission	Scholarly contribution	Investing in social change
Conceptual time frame	Immediate	Longest term – in this century and beyond	Medium to long term – in this generation and the next
Organization and governance	Varied and flexible	Almost no relevant organizational governance	Strong but potentially flexible organizational governance
The value of money	High – a little money goes a long way. A macroeconomic crisis increases demands on an organization	Medium – a little money wouldn't change how they work, a lot of money could	Low – more or less money would not affect how a given organization works, but organizations with different amounts of money work differently

FOUR CHALLENGES

In order for activists and scholars to develop transformative gender analysis and transformative policy prescriptions, sustainable women's human rights feminism needs to address fundamental challenges to such partnerships. By discussing the challenges women's human rights advocates face individually and collectively, we can create greater understanding of how we might make gains in the perceived legitimacy of our work, in the effectiveness of advocacy, and in our policy impact. The challenges for networking and collaboration of women's human rights movement participants are unrealized linkages, competition, lack of ethical reflection, and absence of, or underdeveloped institutional support for networking and collaboration. These challenges were identified by activists, scholars, and donors as they reflected on how to bring the insights from the small USC conference to the larger AWID 2002 workshop. The opportunities are:

(1) *Linkages*. How do we link up NGOs and scholars – particularly scholars who are institutionally located in academic institutions (local and foreign)? How do we link local NGOs with one another in order that they may share the benefits of research and increase the effectiveness of their policy advocacy? How do we create communication between those who fund scholarship of women's human rights and those who fund program work? What benefits can accrue from such linkages?

(2) *Cooperation*. When forming these linkages, how do we deal with competition between NGOs (and between some funding organizations)? How can we mitigate the power dynamics that likely emerge in partnerships among those who have been competitors for funding or perceive themselves as competitors for future funding?

(3) *Ethical partnerships*. How are we to work together? What guidelines should inform our working relationships? How can we monitor our working relationships so that they are ethical? What roles can NGOs and scholars play in informing donors' funding strategies?

(4) *Institutional innovation*. What needs to be in place for collaborative research to take place, be perceived as legitimate, and yield the much-needed information? What forms of institutional support would facilitate networking and collaboration?

The distribution of resources among activists, academics, and donors, the funding processes that redistribute economic resources, the research processes that redistribute and package knowledge, and the publication and publicity processes that redistribute and circulate knowledge are *all political*

processes. Activists, scholars, and donors need to be aware of the power dynamics that affect the outcomes of these processes. Moreover, to the extent that these processes impact funding decisions, they must be aimed at changing the size of the pie and utilizing funds more effectively. We must be particularly attentive to not increasing competition for funds which would undermine possibilities for linkages, cooperation, ethical partnerships, and new institutions.

Linkages

Great steps can be made toward making women's human rights scholarship valuable for policy advocacy if university-based academics can link up with local activist and research NGOs. NGOs can save funds for programmatic purposes if they partner with academics who get their funding in grant competitions that do not compete with NGO-directed program funds.

Scholars, activists, and donors can facilitate linkages by discussing the opportunities and challenges to developing linkages at existing forums that bring together scholars, activists, and donors. Because of the limits of networking for those who are not already well-networked, we need institutions to facilitate linkages.

Cooperation

Reliance on outside funding for programmatic work and research create a potential for competitiveness between organizations working in women's human rights related areas. The substantive value of the differences between organizational approaches is undermined when groups perceive themselves to be in competition with one another. Scholars, activists, and donors need to address the threat of lost opportunities due to competition. Donors can help by fostering collaboration among activists. Donors that receive a range of grant applications are well positioned to observe opportunities for collaboration. Where they are not able to facilitate that collaboration themselves, we need institutional means to prevent the observed potential from being lost.

Ethical Partnerships

Scholars, activist, and donors individually and collectively bear the burden of reflecting upon ethical questions. Here I focus on the implications of

ethical considerations for scholarship. However, *the point* is that academics need to reflect with activists and donors about the ethical concerns of partnership.

For action-oriented feminist scholars, the possibilities for doing transformative research are exciting. However, as many feminist methodologists have argued, traditional disciplinary approaches to research may also need to be challenged (Ackerly et al., 2006; Harding & Norberg, 2005). Challenging disciplinary norms does not require visible disdain for accepted practices, just a commitment to imagining new possibilities for productive research (e.g. D'Costa, 2006; Stern, 2006). Especially for junior scholars and other scholars whose professional life is invested in disciplinary norms, a feminist research agenda and methods need not require abandoning disciplinary boundaries, though it does mean rearticulating them.

Research Question and Design

Not all research is best focused on what has happened. At the USC meeting, an advocate for sweatshop workers in the US suggested "because activists' work is often crises-driven and reactive, academics can help us to step back and look at the big picture, as well as help us identify long-term solutions to the problems we are addressing. The 2005 phase-out of garment quotas under the General Agreement of Trade and Tariffs will likely have a huge impact on the US garment industry and garment workers worldwide. The garment industry is expected to shift production to the countries with the lowest labor costs and most vulnerable workforce. Yet, garment worker advocates have not yet begun to address this issue. We need to start assessing what the impact will be for our constituency of garment workers in California and develop programs that will help workers who lose their jobs transition. Academics could help us with research, or with developing job retraining programs." In this way, a research question might be guided by an anticipated change in the economic, political, social, or legal context of activism.

In addition to influencing the topic of research, activists may influence research design. Although the community may not need the information that the researcher was planning on gathering, it may need other information. After designing research in partnership with communities or NGOs, a scholar may collect data that was not required by her research design. These data may ultimately yield important information for the research. However, even if these data end up not being useful to the scholar, their collection may be an important part of carrying out a research design that is respectful of, and valuable to, the research subjects.

Methodology and Methods

Activists' insights also provide methodological suggestions. Certainly, scholars should explore the appropriateness of participatory action research, action research methods, and feminist approaches to methods and methodology for their research question (Fonow & Cook, 2005; Harding & Norberg, 2005; Kesby, 2005; Kirsch, 2005).

Even when the scholar's research is not of *concrete* value to the activists, if properly designed, research can be an opportunity for local capacity-building. For example, Renu Khanna (1999) describes a health study in Bombay in 1992. The study was carried out, not by professional researchers, but by auxiliary nurse midwives (ANM) who where para-professionals employed by the local health department. This study built the capacity of the ANMs for conducting research and enabled them to offer suggestions for the woman-centered health plans to follow. In addition, the training they received in order to conduct the research made them more capable of communicating with women about their health and sexuality in general.

The certain value of the research to those supporting it and the likely value to enhancing the quality and scope of the research should make such partnerships attractive to scholars and their donors. Moreover, partnership between activists and scholars in research design can mitigate potential power dynamics between them. NGOs have the ability to facilitate or hamper research and researchers have the ability to provide valuable research and publicity for NGOs and their beneficiaries.

A research agenda expanded to meet the research subjects' needs may cost more than an unmodified plan or it may cost less depending on the scholar's ability to use existing data or new partnerships effectively. However, if scholars include in the estimated total cost of their research the opportunity cost that activists incur by *not* doing their work while being research subjects, then by making research valuable to the subjects the researcher *decreases* the overall cost of the project.

Funding organizations may find this collaborative approach to research attractive and may seek to foster it. Where donors have not considered the possibility of such collaborative research design, the collaborative scholar's research proposal itself will have an educational effect.

Because partnerships have in the past resulted in research subjects feeling their time or knowledge being abused by researchers as in the example in the prologue, and because researchers have likewise felt their time and knowledge being abused, each partnership should be guided by a mutually agreed upon code of ethics. A code of ethics should include an understanding of how the knowledge generated by the research will be shared and with whom.

Disseminating and Translating Research

Another area for improving scholarship is in the area of making the knowledge generated by research more accessible to the research subjects and to policy audiences. Scholars and journals should provide abstracts of all publications, thus making their findings more accessible to those who do not have the time or the inclination to wade through sometimes discipline-specific academic language and methodological discussions in order to gain the knowledge that might be valuable to them. Even those activists who would like to take the time to become more aware of scholarly work in their field do not have the time to read all articles that *might* be relevant in order to determine which are relevant. In addition, scholars can post their findings in preliminary form and in accessible language on appropriate listservs and websites and share them with independent media.

Where appropriate, scholars can feed findings reflecting gender analysis to the media to counter political analysis that is void of gender analysis. Scholars can widen the media focus on sensational case studies by providing breadth of knowledge.

As academics do research, they can become a clearinghouse for information and research knowledge making particular use of organizations that try to maintain active bibliographies in their respective areas of research.

When sharing findings with a broader audience, it may be necessary to translate concepts into non-academic language, but scholars might consider making the elimination of the need for such translation their goal. In addition to making arguments and conclusions understood in accessible language, good translation means being able to communicate the import of academic arguments for practice and policy.

Effective translation also means the ability to re-deploy academic arguments in political and social life with a sense of urgency. When the subject matter of academic arguments has direct bearing on the lives of people around the world, activists play an essential role in translating arguments and language intended for an academic audience into relevant law, approaches to funding, development programs, and military operations.

Activist-Oriented Urgency

Finally, scholars may feel that urgency and emotion should be outside the scope of research. Certainly, the urgency of a question or the passion with which scholars care about their work or those whose lives are the subjects of their work should not negatively affect the quality of their work. Rather, urgency and emotion should positively affect the quality of scholarship. Because people's lives are at stake, as Sima Wali stated during the USC

workshop, ''irrelevant research is a luxury.'' If scholarship is to be truly feminist, it needs, as Mies (1983) and so many others have said, to be action-oriented (e.g. Naples, 2003). (See also Schmalzbauer, Vadera, & Verghese, this volume; Agathangelou & Spira, this volume.)

New Institutions

In all of the discussions of collaboration – except for discussions of specific ethical breaches by activists or scholars – the power of donors figures large. Academics and activists tailor their agendas to perceived donor initiatives. NGOs compete with one another for funding. Academics' research projects are funded by particular initiatives that do not include activism or practice in their scope. The activities of scholars and NGOs are disconnected because they are not funded within the same sectors or even the same organizations.[4] With or without intent, donors are structuring the environment of networking and collaboration among scholars and activists. Given the political importance, need for legitimacy, and pressing ethical and strategic dimensions of women's human rights work, donors need to be self-conscious of the incentives and disincentives created by their modes of operation.

Scholar-activist partnerships in research can be strengthened by funding support. Collaborative projects may take longer, require different research methods, require greater coordination of more people and needs, and therefore need flexibility as to when they take place. All of these demands may make the existing modes of funding research too confining.

Additionally, in the process of reviewing budgets, funding organizations need to provide guidelines and hold researchers accountable for the ways in which their budget exhibits inequality or could be exploited to foster inequalities. Collette Oseen (1999) illustrates the problems associated with codifying hierarchy in budgets.

Even feminist academics who are aware of the need for collaborative research with activists face the twin challenges of lack of funding and lack of institutional support. To strengthen the reward system for feminist academics within their universities and to counter the marginalization of women's studies within the economic system of universities around the world, donors could use Women, Feminist, and Gender Studies programs and centers within universities as sites for the collaboration between women activists and researchers (University of Minnesota Social Justice Group,

2000). Another strategy is to support feminist and gender scholarship within mainstream programs. The most appropriate strategy will vary by context as either strategy could constitute a capitulation to a power structure.

Where academia has not welcomed women's studies, donors may make themselves a site for the collaboration between women activists and researchers or partner with NGOs to create such spaces. Donor initiatives might include offering a site for networking among activists and scholars (or funding such meetings) and funding partnerships between local "scientists" and foreign gender specialists to build local capacity in gender social science work in the academy. In considering funding such projects, donors should consider the geopolitics of collaboration.

Finally, we need to create opportunities for discussion of these and other challenges to networking and collaboration. These opportunities must promise to be worthy of the time invested in participating. It may be easier professionally for academics to attend "academic" conferences. For NGOs and activists meetings that offer concrete benefits such as a grant-writing workshop (as at the USC workshop), discussion of activist-oriented research questions and possible research designs will be more worth their opportunity cost. Discussions need to be organized with these constraints in mind and with the purpose of not indulging in pre-existing biases about kinds of knowledge. Forums such as the WSF and the Sustainable Feminism conference can broaden the circle of participants.

Donor participation in discussions about networking and collaboration (though potentially corrupted by the power of money) is essential. The structural impediment of donor power can be overcome in the format of such meetings and must be if donors are going to learn about the challenges to these partnerships and if activists and scholars are to learn how to make effective proposals to donors (Ackerly, 2007).

While dialogues are important, we also need to think differently about how we network. An online moderated listserv with low volume, focused on specific questions, accompanied by a secure and searchable database of scholar, activist, and donor issues, strategies, resources, research questions, and expertise, and supported by a moderator devoted to facilitating linkages can be important resources for expanding the possibilities for linkages, cooperation, and ethical partnerships (Ackerly, 2001, 2006). Internet access is not possible for many of the participants in the WSF 2004 workshop who were rural activists from within India. However, for most who are not within reasonable travel of an international forum, internet-based networking is more inclusive than face to face networking.

CONCLUSION

Today, at the dawn of the millennium, post-Beijing Plus Ten, feminist scholars need activists in order to offer gender analysis with transformative potential. Activists need academics who can use the material experience of activists, NGOs, and their beneficiaries to articulate policy prescriptions with transformative potential. Donors need to invest in these partnerships. All three need to articulate their results as policy prescriptions that are comprehensible to the gender competent and gender incompetent policy-makers alike.

Yet, we also know that it is hard to link NGOs to scholars. It can be hard for activists to partner with one another. It is hard for scholars in the global North and South to partner. Ethical questions confront those engaged in collaboration. Collaboration is more likely with institutional support. In this paper, I describe the differing purposes, time-frames, organizational structures, and financial resources of activists, scholars, and donors. These differences, and related power dynamics, create challenges to networking and collaboration.

Conscious of it or not, feminist scholars, activists, and funding representatives have embarked on a collective project. Trust among us is a political strategy. If we do our work while being self-conscious of our shared responsibility for our relationships, we will be increasingly effective at mitigating power hierarchies, and sustaining our feminisms, as we go.

NOTES

1. Elsewhere I develop what this means for how women engage with each other despite significant seemingly intractable differences (Ackerly, 2007) and offer an account of the theory of human right that emerges from reflecting through their differences (Ackerly, forthcoming).

2. Many activists who would agree with the general goals of feminists find the connotation of ''feminism'' politically problematic. In recognition of a common vision *in the most general sense*, I use the term ''feminist'' in this chapter. I do so with apologies, with respect for those who eschew the term, and with optimism that our common vision includes challenging the hierarchies within feminism as well as those that create obstacles to feminism. I refer to all women's human rights activists, scholars, donors, and policy-makers as ''feminists,'' ''participants'' in the movement for women's human rights, or ''advocates'' for women's human rights.

3. Certainly, researches in untenured positions, including junior faculty, graduate students, and independent researchers, do not have the same security as tenured

faculty; yet, like tenured faculty, they generally work in ways that are defined and confined by their disciplines (as opposed to their organizations).

4. There are exceptions that show just how valuable such collaboration can be. For example, Ford funds a partnership between the Wagner Graduate School of Public Service and a community-based organization in New York.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Ackerly, B. A. (2001). Women's human rights activists as cross-cultural theorists. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *3*(3), 311–346.

Ackerly, B. A. (2006). Deliberative democracy theory for building global civil society: Designing a virtual community of activists. *Contemporary Political Theory*, *5*(2), 113–141.

Ackerly, B. A. (2007). "How does change happen?" Deliberation and difficulty. *Hypatia*, *22*(4), Fall.

Ackerly, B. A. (forthcoming). *Universal human rights in a world of difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alvarez, S. (1999). Advocating feminism: The Latin American feminist NGO 'boom'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *1*(2), 181–209.

Basu, A., & McGrory, C. E. (Eds). (1995). The challenge of local feminisms: Women's movements in global perspective. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Clark, C., Sprenger, E., Vaneklasen, L., & Durán, L. A. (2006). *Where is the money for women's rights?* Washington, DC: Just Associates.

Clark, V. A. (1995). *Antifeminism in the academy*. New York: Routledge.

Collins, P. H. ([1990] 1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment, perspectives on gender* (Vol. 2). Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Ferree, M. M., & Tripp, A. M. (2006). *Global feminism: Transnational women's activism, organizing, and human rights*. New York: New York University Press.

Fonow, M. M., & Cook, J. A. (2005). Feminist methodology: New applications in the academy and public policy. *Signs*, *30*(4), 2211.

Goetz, A. M. (2007). Should we swap gender? In: A. Cornwall, E. Harrison & A. Whitehead (Eds), Feminisms in development: Contradictions, contestations and challenges. London: Zed.

Harding, S., & Norberg, K. (2005). New feminist approaches to social science methodologies: An introduction. (editorial). *Signs*, *30*(4), 2009–2015.

Hawkesworth, M. E. (2006). *Globalization and feminist activism, globalization*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kesby, M. (2005). Retheorizing empowerment-through-participation as a performance in space: Beyond tyranny to transformation. *Signs*, *30*(4), 2037–2065.

Khanna, R. (1999). Research and intervention. In: M. Porter & E. R. Judd (Eds), *Feminists doing development: A practical critique*. London: Zed Books.

Kirsch, G. E. (2005). Friendship, friendliness, and feminist fieldwork. *Signs*, *30*(4), 2163–2172.

Lewis, S. (2006). Speech to a conference on UN reform and human rights. Paper read at UN Reform and Human Rights, Harvard Law School, February 26.

MacKinnon, C. A. (2006). *Are women human?: And other international dialogues*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Mies, M. (1983). Towards a methodology for feminist research. In: G. Bowles & R. Klein (Eds), *Theories of women's studies*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Moghadam, V. M. (2005). *Globalizing women: Transnational feminist networks, themes in global social change*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (Eds). (2002). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color. Women of color series* (expanded and rev. 3rd ed.). Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.

Naples, N. A. (2003). *Feminism and method: Ethnography, discourse analysis, and activist research*. New York: Routledge.

Oseen, C. (1999). Women organizing for change: Transformational organizing as a strategy for feminist development. In: M. Porter & E. R. Judd (Eds), *Feminists doing development: A practical critique*. London: Zed Books.

Peck, E. G., & Mink, J. S. (Eds). (1998). *Common ground: Feminist collaboration in the academy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed, theory out of bounds* (Vol. 18). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Sen, G., & Grown, C. (1987). *Development, crises, and alternative visions: Third world women's perspectives, new feminist library*. NY: Monthly Review Press.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Sowards, S. K., & Renegar, V. R. (2006). Reconceptualizing rhetorical activism in contemporary feminist contexts. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, *17*, 57–74.

Stanley, L. (1997). *Knowing feminisms: On academic borders, territories and tribes*. London: Sage Publications.

University of Minnesota Social Justice Group (2000). *Is academic feminism dead? Theory in practice*. New York: New York University Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Brooke Ackerly is an assistant professor in political science at Vanderbilt University. Her research interests include democratic theory, feminist methodologies, human rights, social and environmental justice. She integrates empirical research on activism into her theoretical work. Her publications include *Political Theory and Feminist Social Criticism* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), "Women's Human Rights Activists as Cross-Cultural Theorists" in *International Journal of Feminist Politics* (2001), "Is Liberal Democracy the Only Way? Confucianism and Democracy" in *Political Theory* (2005), and *Universal Human Rights in a World of Difference* (Cambridge, forthcoming). She is currently working on the intersection of global economic, environmental, and gender justice. With Jacqui True (University of Auckland), a text on feminist research methodologies, *Doing Feminist Research in Social and Political Sciences* (Palgrave), is forthcoming.

Anna M. Agathangelou teaches in Political Science and Women's Studies at York University, Toronto. She is also the co-director of Global Change Institute, Nicosia. Author of *the Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation-States* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), Agathangelou is currently working on a book project on neoliberal empire and war. She is also writing a book with L.H.M. Ling entitled *From Neoliberal Empire to Multiple Worlds: Transforming Violence, Desire, and Complicity in Contemporary World Politics.* Agathangelou's research interests include feminist postcolonial, Marxist epistemologies, and poetics of transformation, empire, the global political economy of sex and race, and militarization of social relations. Agathangelou's focus is Eurasia and Europe. She has published poetry in Greek and English.

Chilla Bulbeck is chair of women's studies at Adelaide University's School of Social Sciences (Australia) where she teaches gender studies and social science subjects. She has also taught and researched at universities across Australia and at Beijing Foreign Studies University as well as the University of Tokyo (Professor of Australian Studies in 2002–2003). Among her major

publications are *Re-Orienting Western Feminisms* (1998), *Living Feminism* (1997), and *Australian Women in Papua New Guinea: Colonial Passages 1920–1960* (1992), all from Cambridge University Press. Her other publications in Australian women's studies appear in the *Routledge International Encyclopedia of Women* (2000) and in *Australian Feminism* (1998). Her work has been translated into Korean and Polish. She is currently working on an Australian Research Council funded project on young people's attitudes to feminism and gender issues across North America and Asia.

Alexandra Hrycak is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology at Reed College. She holds a PhD and MA in sociology from the University of Chicago. Her current research analyzes the development of civic associations and identity among women in Ukraine. Her work has appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology*, *East European Politics and Societies*, *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, *Problems of Post-Communism*, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* and in edited volumes and encyclopedias. Since 2006, she has served as the president of the American Association for Ukrainian Studies.

Petra Kuppers is a disability culture activist, a community artist, and associate professor of English, Theatre and Women's Studies at the University of Michigan. She is the author of *Disability and Contemporary Performance: Bodies on Edge* (Routledge, 2003), *The Scar of Visibility: Medical Performances and Contemporary Art* (Minnesota, 2007) and *Community Performance: An Introduction* (Routledge, 2007).

Sonita Sarker is a feminist scholar at Macalester College in St. Paul, Minnesota, in the departments of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, and English, and chair of WGSS from 2001 to 2006. Her co-edited book, *Trans-Status Subjects: Gender in the Globalization of South and Southeast Asia* (Duke University Press, 2002), traced the metamorphosis of gender-roles and their effects on feminist efforts in the sites of origin and migration. She is currently writing a monograph on the responses of modernist women intellectuals to fascism and socialism. She has published on Virginia Woolf, Rokeya Sakhawat Hossain, and Shashi Deshpande, among other authors, and her work has appeared in numerous journals. She is the recipient of a number of fellowships, and has been in as well as currently holds leadership positions in the Modernist Studies Association, Modern Language

Association, the National Women's Studies Association, and KFAI, an independent radio station in Minneapolis/St. Paul.

Leah Schmalzbauer is an assistant professor of sociology at Montana State University where she teaches courses on globalization, immigration, gender, and poverty. Leah's dissertation, *Striving and Surviving: A Daily Life Analysis of Poor Transnational Families*, was published by Routledge Press in 2005. Her most recent work analyzes the social and economic mobility potential of the transnational second generation in Honduras. An activist as well as an academic, Leah worked for many years in the Central American solidarity movement and is currently on the executive board of Proyecto Hondureño, an immigrant rights group in Boston, MA. She continues to engage in participatory action research in the U.S. and Central America.

Tamara L. Spira is a PhD student in the History of Consciousness and Feminist Studies Departments at University of California, Santa Cruz. She has worked as a labor, youth, and community organizer around issues of racial, sexual, and economic justice and is currently involved in collective struggles against mass incarceration in California and its surrounding economies of war, transnationally. She is writing a dissertation on the affectivities of transnational capitalism and is currently examining how the proliferation of cultural productions ''remembering'' slavery created during the global ''prison binge'' lend insights into the subjective logics and political imaginaries of neoliberalism. Mari has published and presented works individually and collectively in the *International Journal of Feminist Politics* and in the fields of visual and literary studies, international relations, and critical prison studies.

Janferie Stone is finishing her dissertation ''Tales of Nawal (Shapeshifter) Wives in a Time of Genocide'' to complete a PhD in native American studies at the University of California at Davis. Her areas of interest include poetics, drama, women's economies, and material culture, intentional and transnational communities.

Meenu Vadera is the programme director of Aagaz Foundation – Centre for women's leadership, which is an institution of learning designed to strengthen transformative leadership abilities amongst women representatives elected to local governance structures. The Foundation is currently

running seven Academies over five States in India. She was the country director of Action Aid in Uganda from 1997 to 2002. A London School of Economics graduate with an MSc in social policy and planning, she specializes in gender issues. A passionate activist of women's rights, she has been working in India and Uganda on women's issues for over 20 years as a grassroots worker, trainer, implementer, and an administrator.

Alice Verghese is the program coordinator for Asia and Pacific regions for the International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims (IRCT) based in Copenhagen, Denmark. She continues to work extensively in conflict and post-conflict areas such as East Timor, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Afghanistan. Previous to working for IRCT, Alice worked for Médecins Sans Frontières with IDPs and in refugees. Alice received her Masters in Science in social policy planning in developing countries from the London School of Economics and Political Science in 1996 where she focused on gender and urban development.

SUBJECT INDEX