The International Studies Encyclopedia

Volume IV

Edited by Robert A. Denemark

WILEY-BLACKWELL
A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication

This edition first published 2010

Blackwell Publishing was acquired by John Wiley & Sons in February 2007. Blackwell's publishing program has been merged with Wiley's global Scientific, Technical, and Medical business to form Wiley-Blackwell.

Registered Office
John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, United Kingdom

Editorial Offices
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The international studies encyclopedia / edited by Robert A. Denemark.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4051-5238-9 (hardcover : alk. paper) 1. International relations–Encyclopedias. 2. World politics–Encyclopedias. I. Denemark, Robert Allen.
JZ1160.I68 2010
327.03–dc22

2009043692

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Set in 10/11pt Baskerville by Graphicraft Limited, Hong Kong
Printed and bound in Singapore by Fabulous Printers Pte Ltd

1 2010

Contents

Zalewski, M. (2007) Do We Understand Each Other Yet? Troubling Feminist Encounters with(in) International Relations. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9 (2), 302–12.

Online Resources

The Boston Consortium on Gender, Security and Human Rights. At www.genderandsecurity.org/, accessed June 30, 2009. The Boston Consortium on Gender, Security and Human Rights is an organization devoted to bringing knowledge about gender and security to bear on the quest to end armed conflicts and build sustainable peace, made up of scholars and researchers from academic institutions in the Boston area, linked with researchers internationally.

The Gender, Peace, and Security Programme of INSTRAW. At www.un-instraw.org/en/gps/general/gender-and-security-sector-reform-5.html, accessed June 30, 2009. The United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women's (INSTRAW) Gender, Peace, and Security Programme focuses on contributing gender-based perspectives to the security sector reform efforts of national governments around the world.

The Women and Public Policy Program at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. At www.hks.harvard.edu/wappp/programs/security/index.html, accessed June 30, 2009. The Women and Public Policy Program has as one of its "program areas" research in gender and security, and hosts a feminist security postdoctoral fellow each academic year as well as providing support for research programs and conference presentations in gender and security.

Women in International Security (WIIS). At http://wiis.georgetown.edu/, accessed June 30, 2009. WIIS is a scholarly and activist organization committed to increasing women's presence and leadership in the security field. In addition to hosting talks on gender and security and providing networking opportunities, WIIS holds a summer symposium for graduate students interested in issues of security, particularly as they relate to gender.

The Feminist Theory and Gender Studies Section of the International Studies Association. At www.femisa.org/, accessed June 30, 2009. The Feminist Theory and Gender Studies Section of the ISA puts on a number of gender and security panels and talks at each annual and regional meeting of the International Studies Association.

About the Authors

Laura Sjoberg (PhD, University of Florida, 2004; JD, Boston College, 2007) is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Florida. She is author of *Gender, Justice, and the Wars in Iraq* (2006) and (with Caron Gentry) *Mothers, Monsters, Whores: Women's Violence in Global Politics* (2007). Her work has been published in many journals, including *International Studies Perspectives and International Studies Quarterly*. She has been Program Chair of the Feminist Theory and Gender Studies Section of ISA from 2007 to 2009, and is the Section Chair-Elect for 2009–2010.

Jillian Martin is a 2007 graduate of Duke University in Political Science, and a Master's Candidate at George Washington University.

"Feminist" Theoretical Inquiries and "IR"

Anna M. Agathangelou and Heather M. Turcotte

York University, Toronto and University of Connecticut, Storrs

Introduction

Feminist International Relations (IR), in all its multiplicities, is a political project that critiques, exposes, and transforms the (re)production of knowledge and practice within the discipline of "IR" and the arena of "world politics." Beginning with these epistemological principles, we look at the discipline of "IR" and its differing major theoretical inquiries (e.g., realism, liberalism, constructivism, poststructuralism, and postcolonialism) to inquire the ways feminism(s) and IR have arisen intimately, in identity, alliance, or antagonism to each other, and to explore under what conditions they link to one another today. For instance, what has international relations meant when women, gender, sexuality, class, and race have been introduced as largely unexamined questions or contested categories of analysis? How have feminism(s) and their racial formations been constituted in the process of being "globally" and "locally" positioned in the field? More specifically, this essay discusses differing feminist IR epistemologies to highlight the intricacies of global power that privilege some global bodies while eliding and exploiting others. The histories of feminist IR necessitate a transnational attention to race, class, gender, and sexual axes of power as part of global politics and the discipline of IR. This essay foregrounds women of color, queer of color, and transnational feminisms as themselves sites of critical inquiry and collective practice that have been instrumental in fostering anticolonial and antiracist theory, method, and practice – both generally, and specifically in relationship to "feminist" and "IR" work.

Feminist International Relations Theories

Within global politics, patriarchy dominates institutions of power and there continues to exist an asymmetrical gender international division of labor. Even after women have, through many struggles and transnational movements throughout the world, made significant gains, they still lag behind in accessing public resources for the welfare of themselves, their families and communities. Yet, women are not the only subjects that are marginalized within global politics. Marginalization and segregation as a process encompasses all genders, albeit differently depending on their location (i.e., class, racial markings, sexual identifications). These segregations of peoples into asymmetrical social relations are informed by and inform gender and feminist theory as a constitutive force. In other words, gender, as a materiality (i.e., social relation) and a category of analysis, is an axis of power that both locates and contributes to the determination of who can access what resources under what conditions and how within international relations practice and theories.

Feminist international relations theories have historically provided interventions and insights into the embedded asymmetrical gender relations of global politics,

particularly in areas such as security, state-nationalism, rights–citizenship, and global political economies (Peterson 1991, 2003; Pettman 1996; Whitworth 1997). Yet, despite the histories of struggle to increase attention to gender analysis, and women in particular, within world politics, "IR" knowledge and practice continues to segregate gendered and feminist analyses as if they are outside its own formation. Drawing on feminists such as Youngs (2004:75; 2008) who unpacks the processes that relegate feminist international relations to the margins of what she calls the "main field" (i.e., malestream) of international relations without engaging the reasons "women and gender are 'essential' to understanding the world 'we' live in," this essay, first, argues that feminism(s) and IR is part and parcel of a larger power struggle and thus its genealogy and its spatial embodiment cannot be understood outside these struggles. Second, we articulate a genealogical reading of what is "feminist IR" by focusing on the larger discipline and its own constitution and production. With a field that historically focused mostly on (inter)state relations, war, conflict, anarchy, and order, it is no surprise that mainstream analyses in IR study power without problematizing such phenomena. The cartography of this essay begins with feminist epistemological principles that argue that the segregation of IR and feminism(s) is problematic as many times this process assumes these two sites being too unified and independent of each other's formation. In addition, this segregation disenables us from articulating alternative possibilities in world politics. IR's major theoretical inquiries (e.g., realism, liberalism, constructivism, poststructuralism, and postcolonialism) provide links to the ways feminism(s) and IR have arisen intimately, in identity, alliance, or antagonism to each other.

What has international relations meant when women, gender, sexuality, and race have been introduced as largely unexamined questions or non-contested categories of analysis? How have feminisms and their racial and national formations been constituted in IR's process of being articulated as "globally" and "locally" positioned in the field? These questions consider the work of several gendered critiques of IR that have exposed IR "as a masculinised or malestream form of knowledge" which allows it to continue uncritically assuming "gender hierarchies (both between men and women and between men through competing masculinities)" which ultimately are "constitutive of the political realities on which IR self-consciously focuses" (Hooper 2001 cited in Squires and Weldes 2007:189–90). Malestream and mainstream are used interchangeably by feminists in IR and refer to the ways dominant debates (i.e., realism and liberalism) in the field ended up focusing on sovereignty, the interstate system, and the market and their contingent constitution of order as if these structures do not have a gender. Although these interstate relations are important and dominate everyday discourses, these perspectives tend to create a problematic sense of homogeneity of all states and markets of the (inter)national state structure which is characterized not only by patriarchy but also neocolonial factors. Therefore, these dominant discursive regimes evade that ideas like social transformation even when chanted by different governments may not be understood in the same way by men and/or women. More specifically, this essay examines differing feminist IR epistemologies to highlight the intricacies of global power that privilege some global bodies while eliding and exploiting others. It foregrounds the intellectual and practical labors and contributions of women of color feminisms, queer of color feminisms, transnational feminisms, and *feminisms of critical geographies* (Massey 1994; McKittrick 2006; Agathangelou and Turcotte 2009) as themselves sites of critical inquiry and collective practice that have been instrumental in fostering anticolonial and antiracist theory, method, and practice – both generally, and specifically in relation to "feminist" and "IR" work. Finally, this essay discusses some of the struggles feminist IR continues to engage in, and explains how these struggles inform and are informed by the dichotomizations and segregations of global politics.

A Spatial Location of Feminist IR

In a 2004 article Youngs begins a spatial description of what she identifies as feminist IR. She argues that it is a set of principles (i.e., an approach) that recognize the divisions of the field; a set of theoretical frames that attempt to explain the interstate system; a discipline that focuses mostly on what it comes to identify as issues to be studied by IR theorists; and a practice that embodies power dynamics in the world. Feminists and/or those theorists that problematize the masculine subject, its production, and its masculinized approach of world politics desired to disrupt these dominant masculine power dynamics of the field and of it as a practice. However, as Youngs highlights, mainstream/malestream IR has come to constitute itself by consistently relegating feminism to an inferior status. This spatial division of feminist IR and malestream IR points to the power dynamics within the field and also its major technologies of power. According to Youngs (2004:77),

> a major part of the problem is the way in which the mainstream takes the appearance of a predominantly male-constructed reality as a given, and thus as the beginning and end of investigation and knowledge-building [. . .] Mainstream International Relations, in accepting that because these realms [i.e., war, state relations, order, etc.] appear to be predominantly man-made, there is no reason to ask how or why that is the case, stop short of taking account of gender. As long as those who adhere to this position continue to accept the sufficiency of the appearances and probe no further, then the ontological and epistemological limitations will continue to be reproduced.

How, then, and taking seriously what Youngs argues, challenge the "sufficiency and appearances" and redefine epistemologically at least the terms of the debates, including the punctuated theoretical limits of the discipline?

International Relations as a field, discipline, and site of contestation of power (Agathangelou in press) has been one of the last fields to open up to gender and feminist analyses. One of the reasons for this "lag" is the intertwinement that social science has had with international institutions likewith the United Nations and its dominant role in the formation of foreign policy. In the 1980s and 1990s some scholars engaged with this "lack" of analysis and started asking about women's lives in international relations. Among those texts, now classics of the field, are Jean Bethke Elshtain's *Women and War* (1987), Cynthia Enloe's *Bananas, Beaches and Bases* (1989), and Anne Sisson Runyan and V. Spike Peterson's "The Radical Future of Realism" published in *Alternatives* (1991). Other significant texts that have affected the field and challenged its internal and external conceptual boundaries are J. Ann Tickner's *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security* (1992), V. Spike Peterson and Anne Runyan's *Global Gender Issues* (1993), Christine Sylvester's *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era* (1994), and Cynthia Weber's piece titled "Good Girls, Little Girls, and Bad Girls" (1994). "While they are very different in their approach, they are united by seeking to rethink IR's basic parameters" (Wibben 2004:98).

Much of this work and the most recent work in IR by feminists has been divided analytically (i.e., liberal feminism, empirical feminism, and standpoint feminism), chronologically, epistemologically, and/or generationally and on principles. What is significant is that such divisions are political and with consequential effects on the way IR imagines and "does" itself. Feminists such as Enloe (1989) focused on bringing in and highlighting women's lives and experiences in international relations and, starting in the 1980s, made powerful and important theoretical gestures to the development of feminist IR, which opened up multiple possibilities for understanding security, conflict, war, and the state that were previously being silenced by mainstream IR.

Enloe was one of the first theorists within IR to ask "Where are the women?" and to go against the canonical grain to illuminate understandings of the intersectionalities of power within militaristic discourses and practices that reproduce the state, military, and understandings of security in monolithic ways. Her works were among the first in IR to draw attention to questions of race, gender, and sexuality within the conversations of the global political economy of war and militarization, particularly in areas of the Global South. For these interventions, Enloe has been imperative to the growth of feminist IR literature, as well as the slowly changing face of mainstream IR.

Enloe's work has rightly gestured to the idea that state and military politics are performed upon the site of women's bodies in a multitude of violent ways. In short, the nation builds itself upon bodies of women. Enloe's analysis suggests that the contradictory approaches by the state and military that represent women as binaries, some to be protected ("wives, daughters, mothers and sweethearts"), others to be exploited ("prostitutes/camp followers") and rightly so, are a means to assert control over women throughout various geopolitical territories. However, and as others have argued in feminist IR (Runyan and Peterson 1991), these binaries are part of a modernist epistemology which is informed by modernity/enlightenment theorizations which articulate particular subjects (mostly male and white) as the universal subjects of change, civilization and order, and other subjects, such as women, as savages deserving violence and/or education to become incorporated as legitimate members of the world order. Enloe's intervention exposed a binary central to the military's formation and consolidation of power. Yet, the logic employed by Enloe seems to be itself based on a binary which situates woman within a space of either vulnerability and/or victimization. She explains that US military bases exploit non-US women by creating a market for prostitution and vulnerabilities to rape and disease (Enloe 1983). On the other side of the binary, military wives are *protected* by the military, yet they experience various forms of physical, emotional, and sexual abuse because of their "dependence" upon their husbands that isolates them from the possibilities of forming relations outside the household. Enloe highlights some of the contradictions of US military practice, enabling us to articulate a more nuanced understanding of women and protection/security. Enloe argues that such contradictions/tensions consolidate the power of the military as a collective body (pp. 46–78). In addition to illustrating this division and/or construction of women on which the military depends to consolidate its power institutionally, which ultimately also allows for other kinds of violence against women, Enloe's work can be read as abstracting and collapsing *bodies* which are located on different axes of power such as sexuality, race, class, religion, nationality and regionality into *one body* of exploitation. This may end up making invisible power relations among women themselves as they are embodied depending on other axes of power. Consequently, Enloe's reading of women as victims (in a universal manner) may contribute to collapsing power to a "monolith" that works the same everywhere, an analytic that may also prevent us from attending to the anatomy of global power and those "exceptions" that cannot be accommodated as easily. Thus, this analytic may foreclose spaces for a collaborative feminist politics that is interested in change and solidarity work (Turcotte 2006).

Enloe further explains that racist and sexist understandings of the military (white, male, heterosexual) have become both normalized and paradoxical within the actions of military men. On the one hand, it was clear which women were to be protected (white, US, married) and which women were to be exploited (brown, poor, foreign); but, on the other hand, as with any categorical formulation, there were contradictions and exceptions. For example, Enloe discusses how a white US soldier marrying a woman of color complicated the ways military men read women's bodies which further informed their relationship to women. "A race relations officer recalls that in the early 1970s on a base in Florida any black woman in civilian clothes seen in the vicinity of the base was presumed to be a prostitute: "This was embarrassing when it turned out to be a colonel's wife" (p. 81).

A further complication can be seen in Enloe's example of a military man of color raping Vietnamese women. Enloe quotes one US soldier: "I was taking her body by force. Guys were standing over her with rifles, while I was screwing her. She says, "Why are you doing this to me? black, why are you doing this to me?" (Enloe 1983:35).

This example as cited by Enloe suggests that the contradiction voiced by the Vietnamese woman fractures and complicates a normalized *Othering* of women through the epistemological frameworks and material practices of military men depending on their race and their class within the military institution (Turcotte 2006). More so, the examples themselves seem to point to the tensions "practical" and "political" sites of interrogation posit for feminist work, that "knowing where the women are" may not be enough, especially for a feminist political project that desires elimination of violence against women, their children, and their communities.

Other feminists such as J. Ann Tickner (1992:ix–x) pushed the boundaries of the field by asking questions such as: "Why is the subject matter of my discipline so distant from women's lived experiences? Why have women been conspicuous only by their absence in the worlds of diplomacy and military and foreign policy-making?" Tickner's questioning pushed the field to engage beyond its mainstream theoretical approaches by centralizing women as a legitimate object of analysis which opened up the space to rethink "realism's" dominant understanding of state relations. In introducing "women" as a major category in the field, both Enloe and Tickner made it possible for other feminists to struggle and disrupt some major masculinist IR modalities and open up spaces to engage with issues often unimagined to be worthy of focus in the field. As these feminists' critiques though became incorporated in the field and as their focus remain on the military, the state, foreign policy and presumed extensively positivist epistemologies, they came to be relegated to the *mainstream* of feminist IR (Peterson 2004). With the reconstitution of a "mainstream" with an addition of some feminist works, always at the peripheries, feminist power ended up itself relegating "other" feminisms with agendas that move us beyond "making the world a better place for women" (Wibben 2004:106). One has to wonder, though, whether the critiques by the first feminists of realism were "heavily dependent on orientalist knowledge for their construction" (Chacko 2007:9). Was its understanding of the state of nature as a gendered site (re)animating and displacing the violence from some "women," the new object of study, into those others (i.e., feminized) of international relations, those "in the state of nature" and/or primitive societies, ideas.

Cohn, a standpoint feminist, (1990) calls for a principled feminist ethics that recognizes that phenomena like war are gendered; that an inquiry that centralizes women's lives in gendered phenomena like war is crucial and is "a central tenet of feminist methodology [. . .] [I]n the context of war, 'women's lives' has two primary referents: the work women do and the distinctive bodily assaults war inflicts on women"; gendered phenomena like war are not spatially and temporally bounded and social relations of power are locatable, and thus "an 'alternative epistemology' which stresses that all thinkers are 'situated' within 'epistemic communities' which ask some but not other questions, and legitimate some but not other ways of knowing" is required. As Cohn argues, "We are each of us also situated by social identities and personal histories. None of us speaks from nowhere; there is no phenomenon that can be seen independently of the situation of the seers." This standpoint epistemology and/or what Harding distinguishes from feminist empiricists and feminist postmodernists refers to those feminists who argue that one's view and knowledge insights depend on where one stands, and this view differs depending on one's gender, culture, race, class, and other factors. Crucial as this constructivist/feminist intervention was, however,

it still took as its starting point the state of nature, the most central tenet informing much of the work of realists, liberals, and constructivists in IR (Hoffman 1977, 1981; Wendt 1992), especially when the material links between the vantage point of women's lives and the knowledges are not explained (Hennessy 1995).

In 1989 Keohane invited those standpoint feminists in the field (ignoring other feminists who have long before the IR feminists engaged with issues of power and phenomena like war) to engage these phenomena and draw on empiricist feminists who can point to examples and cases of women who are being ignored by IR. However, he also suggested in the same article that an empiricist feminist is in danger of committing "the analytical error of reifying a stylized 'patriarchal state' or 'interstate system'" (cited in Wibben 2004:101). Keohane's work and those empiricist feminists that he thinks standpoint feminists can benefit from do not necessarily pay close attention to the effect of their theoretical frames and discourses and "the impact of observation itself on the object of study, the instability and contextual relativity of concepts, and the absence of approaches that can accommodate the ever-changing parameters of international relations" (Wibben 2004:101).

Keohane exemplifies the social scientist whose primary goal is objective science and "disciplinary coherence," and consequently he defends his position which ends up allowing him to see and articulate postmodern feminist approaches as a "dead end in the study of international relations" and consequently as a site of knowledge that deserves his derision and exclusion, and the same from those feminists he deems legitimate. As a social scientist, and especially one informed by ideas mostly informed by "social contractarian thought and early British social anthropology" (Chacko 2007:131–40), he believes in the separation of science and politics, a segregation challenged and disrupted by critical and feminist IR theorists. "The destiny of Modern Man was bifurcated: scientists as scientists were not to meddle in politics; political, economic, and social administrators were not to shape the cognitive direction of scientific inquiry" (Harding 1991:223). Weber, a post-positivist, that is, a theorist whose framework challenges metanarratives and universalism and consequently rejects all-encompassing stories that claim to explain the international system as a whole, argues that neither realism nor liberalism could be the full story. She challenges Keohane's approach by first focusing on how power is constituted through the discourses that he employs. She states that Keohane does not interrogate his own assumptions and "impartially observes and records his observations [. . .] [His] way of seeing constitutes the feminist body of literature as that which is to be seen but not heard from, unless its voice(s) is/are mediated through Keohane's interpretations" (Weber 1994:338). Weber argues that feminists "acknowledge [. . .] the tensions and complications [adopting particular perspectives] creates, [feminists] welcome rather than attempt to constrain the richly transformative visions looking through feminist lenses enables" (p. 339).

Others like Anne Sisson Runyan and V. Spike Peterson who draw not only on IR literature but also on IPE and radical, socialist, and postmodern feminists have argued that the debates and segregations in the field of IR have been defined extensively and in relation to the dominant field of realism and its major understanding of order. They state: "realism does not expect rationality to prevail in interstate relations (any more than it is expected in patriarchal discourse to exist in 'woman'), so it, too, must advocate strong and coercive measures to try to bring madness and hysteria under 'man's' control. Thus, the patriarchal construction of 'woman' as a site of disorder, which must be treated and tamed to conform to the dictates of 'femininity' as a controlled identity, haunts the realist formulation of man/state vs. mad/states" (Runyan and Peterson 1991:69). For these theorists the "where are the women?" research agenda was limiting and pushed to investigating how practices both within IR as a field and also within everyday international relations are shaped by gender, which

opened up the space to ask other more fundamental questions about the way IR orients itself and the methods and categories that such orientations embody: feminists have opted instead for political projects that transgress boundaries but also challenge the formation of those boundaries. As Runyan and Peterson so accurately state:

> In the absence of attention to the problematique of gender, the alienation of thought from the embodiedness and embeddedness of human beings – effected by the dichotomizing moves of Western patriarchal thought and state formation, which privileges masculine over feminine, instrumental reason over affective relations, and control/certainty/transcendence over anarchy/unpredictability/contingency – will remain at the "core" of IR thought. (p. 100)

Runyan and Peterson's brilliant articulation of this binary remains, though, central to their feminist theorization instead of being articulated as an entry point into the ways Western and modern (as embodied through the international) masculine "monolithic" identity comes to dominate even our imaginations with regard to difference. By proffering this construction of gender identities in Western patriarchal thought and state formations as forestructures of inquiry to guide our engagement with global politics, we are also able to engage with the methods by which women, working-class peoples, and (neo)colonized subjects disrupt dominant formations through different kinds of struggles.

In the 1990s, Adam Jones whose article in the *Review of International Studies*, the official journal of the British International Studies Association, asked the question "Does 'Gender' Make the World Go Round?" sprang a debate that continued with the interventions of Ann Tickner who published a piece in *International Studies Quarterly* which suggested that the lack of conversation between feminists and IR scholars is based on (1) misunderstandings about the meanings of gender, (2) different ontologies, and (3) epistemological divisions. As Wibben (2004:100) says, "it remains to be seen whether 'misunderstandings' is the best term to use since differences in ontology and epistemology have also occurred in the debate between (nonfeminist) critics and mainstream IR scholars without leading to a total silencing thereof."

Christine Sylvester, who has consistently challenged the foundations of the field including its positivist and empirical methods, articulates empathetic cooperation as a feminist method for IR in the hopes that the "Other" is taken seriously on his/her terms (Sylvester 2002). For her this approach enables a kind of listening that the dominant scientific and objective method of silence foreclosed. She defines it as "The process of positional slippage that occurs when one listens seriously to the concerns, fears and agendas of those one is unaccustomed to heeding when building social theory, taking on board rather than dismissing, finding in the concerns of others borderlands of one's own concerns and fears" (1994:321). In another volume titled *Global Voices: Dialogues in International Relations* (Rosenau 1993), Sylvester introduces creatively a "play," "a narrative approach [. . .] [which] can keep tension alive and convey information without necessarily imposing a linear structure" (Wibben 2004:108). She draws on this literary method to "hold [. . .] multiple cultural identities even when these 'logically' contradict [because] multiplicity and contradictoriness are made coherent, compelling in their own way" (cited in Wibben 2004:108) and to introduce race and difference into the dialogue on IR, but masks her "national" gendered and racial privilege with a colonizing move. She writes in the name of a Zimbabwean woman rather than having an actual conversation with her. In the form of a play, the chapter unfolds into a narrative among various characters: thus Westfem represents a Western standpoint feminist; Tsitsi, a Zimbabwean woman. Tsitsi ends up speaking only in terms of her own particularities whereas Westfem comments on theory, history, and politics in a universal tone. At one point, Westfem tells Tsitsi about Zimbabwean

men and their patriarchy. Indeed, Westfem speaks for all; Tsitsi only for herself, and not very well. In fact, Tsitsi admits as much.

> Westfem-self, I tell you, we women have been gagged by tradition and colonialism for so long that now it is difficult for us to insist on our own voices, ideologies, and statecrafts. (Sylvester 1993:30)

While Sylvester critiques mainstream IR's but also mainstream international politics' patriarchal epistemic, political, and personal violence, she also participates in equalizing the differences by invoking the "gagging of women by tradition and colonialism." This (neo)colonial move also marks other critical works and pervades the IR scholarship where the "US academic self-righteously presents the woman of color as a victim of 'third-world' patriarchy in need of 'first-world' feminist rescue without questioning either her right or place to do so. No wonder many women of color, inside and outside the West, react to 'feminism' as another form of 'imperialism'" (Agathangelou and Ling 2004a, 2009).

What are the ways in which to understand and disrupt feminist IR's collusions with dominant and hegemonic power and its own closely constituted "margins" as a political project that aims to critique, expose, and intervene in order to transform knowledge production within the discipline of IR and the arena of world politics?

Three decades later, the field of feminism in IR has brought to the fore many important issues, including the ways we analyze the gendered formation of states, the public over the private spatial divide as embodied through the sexual contract, the segregation of politics and economics, the relations of exploitation in the public and private spheres of influence, and the relegation of social reproduction and family relations as a space of female power and influence. As of late, many feminist IR interventions have been at the level of "mainstreaming of gender" (Moser et al. 1999; True 2008; Youngs 2008), bringing a different kind of questioning to the table. While this process and intervention has been useful, a close look at the "mainstreaming of gender" debates and writings reveals the tensions within IR feminisms (Rai 2003; Squires and Weldes 2007; Rai and Waylen 2008). Youngs (2008), for instance, argues that "gender mainstreaming across varied policy contexts may help to transform the 'inferior' status allocated to feminist international relations (IR) in relation to mainstream (masculinist) IR" (p. 688). In other words, the gendered ontology of male over female is part of what defines IR, as it has "traditionally defined political philosophy and theory" (p. 690), and thus for Youngs gender mainstreaming and feminist IR has written itself into IR in a way that allows and continues to disrupt the fundamental assumptions of the field. However, as crucial as this writing may be, masculinist IR continues to "fram[e] itself as complete and gender neutral" (p. 5) and feminist IR as in need of equal positioning within the discipline and world politics, which reaffirms the gendered dichotomizing dynamic and presumptions of equality. Even if gender mainstreaming can potentially shift the terms of the discussion and open the possibility of raising the status of feminist IR to subjecthood, this episteme may foreclose the possibility of asking other questions: How is one to be mainstreamed? Under what conditions is that possible? What are the power dynamics that enable even gender mainstreaming?

As Imam (1997:6) explains, "to be mainstreamed [is to be] incorporated as a principal element among those issues and considerations that should automatically be considered and taken into account." Mainstream IR (Keohane 1989) and mainstream feminist IR materializes and is authored as the sets of literatures, methods, and theories that have come to dominate the geopolitical markings of knowledge within these disciplinary locals. This naturalization of the mainstream can be reflected in the canonical texts repetitively taught because they are seen as the fundamentals of

disciplinary knowledge, as well as the epistemological approaches within a discipline. While one explicit struggle within the discipline has been to intervene in IR's elision of gendered power relations (see, e.g., Enloe 2007), feminist IR also has a contested history of canonizing certain forms of feminism as legitimate and others as "reactionary" to feminist norms of knowledge exchange.

The struggles around mainstreaming mark what we call power contestations not only about the constitution of IR, as a field, discipline, and practice (Agathangelou and Ling 2004b; Agathangelou in press), but also contestations for other politico-economic relations (Parpart and Zalewski 2008). Raising the inferior status of feminism within IR, that is, making possible the mainstreaming of gender and feminism, requires multiple centers of power and multiple marginalities. These institutional struggles for recognition through exclusion may themselves perpetuate similar exploitative relationships of drawing boundaries around legitimate academic and other institutional orders. For instance, many feminists in other areas have articulated the ways mainstream privilege has relied and continues to rely on the silencing and appropriation of *difference*; it is grounded in relations of domination. Much of the time, what has been assumed as legitimate "feminist IR" came to be produced through complex "cartographies of struggle" (Mohanty 1991) that opened simultaneously specific spaces to create the conditions of solidarity but also simultaneously made possible segregation within its borders, the disciplines and global politics. In engaging, listening and writing these struggles requires us to recognize the following: feminisms, feminist IR, and IR are intimately linked through disciplinary struggles and larger geopolitical struggles of world affairs and thus necessitate knowledge terrains attentive to *intersectional* (Crenshaw 1995) and *oppositional* (Sandoval 1991) gendered struggles (i.e., race, sexuality, nation, class, religion, and gender itself).

Feminist IR and Gendered International Relations (GIR)

A vexed question for GIR debates that emerged in the *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* is the relationship between feminist and gendered analyses. Feminism has always been explicitly political as it aims to realize fundamental transformations in asymmetrical and hierarchized gender relations and the shifts in existing power relations in support of women. GIR "advocates promise to broaden the various women's questions in feminist IR into gender questions, which gets men and masculinities squarely into the gender picture and moves gender analysis away from the margins to the centre of IR. GIR questions the necessity of framing masculinity studies around effects on only women or gender relations that affect women" (Zalewski et al. 2008:162). For this reason, feminist research renders the gendered nature of I/international R/relations visible, making the emergence of GIR possible (see, e.g., Enloe 1983, 1989; Parpart and Staudt 1989; Tickner 1992; Sylvester 1994). However, while an earlier generation of feminist IR's labor and struggles have made this pursuit of GIR possible, the one is not synonymous with the other. Zalewski's (2007b) discussion of the state of the discipline conjures up older feminist engagements with IR, its relation to gender, and its contemporary contributions. In "Do We Understand Each Other Yet? Troubling Feminist Encounters with International Relations" (2007a), Zalewski argues for a feminist-informed approach to international politics research and suggests that such analyses should ideally be viewed simply as IR scholarship, rather than as part of a marginal subset of the mainstream discipline. From this perspective the distinction between GIR and IR would collapse, with the concerns of the discipline itself being transformed by feminist insights and analysis. In other words, feminist IR is coterminous with GIR and not something *Other* than or in response to the *real* IR. Feminist IR, for Zalewski, needs to move through the constant fight

to prove itself and talk back to mainstream IR because such conversations solidify structures of domination instead of transformative politics. In another venue Zalewski explains that

> feminism "begins" (is born), we "know" by definition (literally) what it "is": usually women, men, power, etc. And we have a sense of its mission, "emancipation" for example, or to change the "balance of gendered power" [. . .] has garnered some disciplinary currency in IR, which I suggest it achieves through a series of interconnected performative practices [. . .] wrenching "back" to imagined inaugural commitments – for example, subjects and subjectivity very traditionally understood – regularly producing feminism "in IR" as unyieldingly holding on to essentialist views of woman/subjects, or "empowerment" conventionally conceived [. . .] a further consequence of this nostalgic securing and the accompanying sense of time limitation around feminism is an emergent perception that all has not quite gone according to (the feminist) plan. (Zalewski et al. 2008:155)

Zalewski raises some crucial concerns for our understandings of feminisms and international relations. More specifically, she is arguing that feminisms begin with its own commitments and own visions and yet, in the relation with IR it has changed. This "change" leads to other visions of "nostalgic securing" and/or what we want to argue here is a recapturing of static "feminist vision." Zalewski points to a logic that we want to argue is a logic that presumes that the object of desire of feminism is nonchangeable even when clearly the entry of feminist insights and modalities in IR was from the beginning a contestation of some of the dominant, nevertheless, commonsensical views of feminisms within a site that consistently did not "notice" women (Agathangelou in press). For instance, Tickner (in Zalewski et al. 2008:158) explains "IR theory [itself] is gendered, both in the questions it chooses to ask, as well as how it goes about answering them." These conversations within journals like *Millennium* illustrate the struggles that feminists are still embodying but more so to the process of marginalization as a constitutive element of the "discipline as a whole."

This struggle of feminist marginalization within IR and desires for inclusion in one's disciplinarian community, while at times important, has reinforced segregated frameworks that narrow the possibilities of feminist articulations, methods and theories. Tickner (1997) previously argued that there is a miscommunication between feminist IR and mainstream IR because of feminism's different ontological and epistemological approaches. Tickner's claim that mainstream IR "just cannot understand" feminist approaches maintains a perceived divide and an impossibility of feminist IR as IR as if feminist IR is its own entity rather than existing within and alongside of IR's inception. Tickner further explains that IR needs to "realize that speaking from the perspective of the disempowered appears increasingly urgent in a world where the marginalized are the most likely victims of war and the negative effects of economic globalization" (p.630). However, as Agathangelou (1997), Chowdhry and Nair (2002), and Zalewski (2007b) suggest, this stance against mainstream IR contributes to the *alterity* of feminist IR when, in fact, mainstream IR is able to articulate itself as such precisely because of the years of feminist work and struggles. The power trajectories between feminist IR and IR are not one-way trajectories, nor are they contained within the sites of "core and periphery" (Wallerstein 1974, 2004) knowledge frameworks; rather, they are extremely complicated engagements of power that exist because of the histories of exchange between the two sites. These struggles of asymmetrical standing within IR are difficult, highly contested and varied within different sites of feminisms, and they continue to present themselves as a fundamental concern of feminist IR and its perceived unified desire to be recognized within the discipline.

Spivak (2003) suggests that questions of disciplinary and feminist legitimacy make and remake knowledge frameworks in productive ways but, at times, can break the productive powers of a discipline and epistemological insights. Works such as Enloe

(1983), MacKinnon (1989), Peterson (1991), Tickner (1992), Sylvester (1994), and Steans (1998) made necessary and productive interventions into the masculinist constructions and practices of world politics. Each of these theorists made gender and sexual inequalities explicit within the theories and practices of the state, and other institutions such as the field of IR, and created new frames of analysis enabling generations of scholars to embody a feminist critique and pedagogical practice that centered gender and sexual difference within a patriarchical system of knowledge exchange. Out of these struggles and contestations of IR's marginalization of feminism, women, gender and sexuality and in relationship to activist and policy movements to "mainstream gender," different articulations of feminist, neo-feminist and nonfeminist perspectives of gender have proliferated throughout IR, suggesting gender analysis is not necessarily contained within a feminist framework and can be articulated with different political mobilizations. Works such as Keohane (1998), Carpenter (2002, 2003), Caprioli (2003, 2004, 2005), and Jones (2008) develop through mainstream and feminist tensions and result in the denial of feminist practices and visions for the success of gender analysis. Nonfeminist articulations of gender analysis suggest that gender can be found and measured in the everyday practice of international relations and can be analyzed in ways that may, but not necessarily, ascribe to feminist sensibilities or a *radical* feminist project of anti-imperialism (see, e.g., Locher and Prügl 2001; Carver et al. 2003; *Social Politics* 2005). The assumption here is that gender analysis is about questions of equality and inclusion, which can exist outside a feminist politics that calls attention to exploitive relations of racist, heteronormative patriarchy that make up our daily lives as well as our politico-knowledge practices (Lorde 2001).

However, *gender mainstreaming* is an intense site of struggle that manifests and mobilizes in different ways. A feminist sensibility of anti-imperial state frameworks discusses gender mainstreaming as a theoretical, material, and political project of translating and transforming gender within the frameworks of the state (state machinery) as one avenue among many to explicitly analyze global gender inequities in theory and practice as well as rebuild transnational frameworks of gender equity and justice (Liebowitz 2002, 2008; Carney 2003; Rai 2003; Arat 2007). The expanded incorporation of women into exploitative paid and unpaid labor has proliferated women's movements on a local and global scale (Moghadam 1993; Naples and Desai 2002; Agathangelou 2004; Moghadam 2005; Rai 2007). Other feminists have focused on the transnational emergence and development of feminisms (Alvarez 2000; Sarker 2007; Conway 2008). These feminists suggest that much of this transnational mobilizing has also to do with the institutionalization of women's issues and gender mainstreaming that took place through the implementation of the UN Decade for Women (1975–85) and the global UN conferences of the 1990s as well as the World Bank's projects to integrate women in global circuits. For example, in addition to the 1985 Nairobi Conference, the Beijing preparatory process and the conference itself was critical in expanding women's spatial praxis in the local, national, regional, and international realms.

There are solidarities and difference within these articulations that have informed deeper and more complicated struggles within IR. Again, Zalewski (2007a) notes that the emergence of so-called "neo-feminist" scholarship, which adopts a positivist approach to gendered research in order to document men's experiences in international politics, marks a growing schism between feminist scholarship and gender analyses. Zalewski perceives this schism as representing an attempt to recuperate GIR into the discipline while leaving the mainstream unaltered, and counterposes this to a more transformative feminist engagement that seeks to unsettle the discipline. Her suggestion is that the continued "misunderstandings" between feminist and IR scholars, which many GIR scholars have bemoaned, may actually contribute to this

task and therefore should be viewed as productive. So what does this suggest about the "misunderstandings" and misrepresentations within feminisms, IR, and IR's feminist sensibilities?

The Geopolitics of Thought and Practice

The question of feminist projects has been paradoxical, some may even say problematic, as it has confronted the dynamics of power and exclusion within arenas such as the household, community, public and private institutions of national and international governance, and within the hallowed halls of academia engaged in knowledge production about the world. Many gender assumptions undergird knowledge production in most disciplines including the "common sense" of IR, which has certainly been influenced by gendered politics even though it claims an objectivity that is belied by the claims of many of its critics including feminist IR. Feminist scholarship in international relations has not only interrogated the masculinist underpinnings of mainstream IR but has also demonstrated how feminist IR provides more nuanced and different understandings of IR.

However, feminist IR is too often positioned, both by mainstream IR and mainstream feminist IR, as a homogenous group. The continued focuses on "global gender equity," particularly because of the way the geopolitical knowledge of gender is codified and heard through liberal frameworks of equality, disengages transnational feminist politics. Such positioning of feminist IR elides the contestations, contradictions, and nuances of multiple feminisms that comprise, circulate, and produce different geopolitical agendas within and between feminist and postcolonial IR. While it is a constant struggle within IR for the mainstream to acknowledge the productivities of marginalized knowledges such as feminist and postcolonial, this struggle continues to feed segregated politics that erase racial, gender, sexual, and national violences within the "subthemes." Such lack of attention to the multilayered processes of marginalization within the marginal, and the continual remarking of legitimate feminist bodies, is a technology of empire that pushes peoples to the margins and incapacitates them as legitimate actors and decision makers of their communities and world politics as such. While it is because of the critical works of foundational scholars of feminist IR that we are able to expand the geopolitical terrains of global politics in this piece, we take seriously the multitude of feminist theories and methods that suggest boundaries and geopolitical power moves both "inside" and "outside" of feminist communities and require continual reflection and critique of the histories of knowledge relations that enable the naming of feminist territories.

While IR feminists have penetrated the seemingly impenetrable "fortress IR," these feminisms have also engendered their own exclusions and forced incapacitations (Sylvester 1994, 2008). Works such as Biswas (2002), Chowdhry and Nair (2002), and Agathangelou and Ling (2004b) illustrate how claims of early and even some current feminist scholarship based on essentialized categories of women have left other social relations in global politics such as race, class, nationality, sexuality, ability, and issues of bodies unaddressed. Additionally, a support of mainstreaming of gender within international order in discourses of rights, law, security and development through the targeting of "women" in Other geographical locations without critical and analytical attention to transnational justice ends up assuming that violence is of the "there" and outside of the production of the "here." The genealogy of feminist IR (the first world), much like mainstream IR, remains Eurocentric, and the gate-keeping practices and strategies of knowledge production ignore and make invisible non-European philosophical traditions and political and social practices (Agathangelou and Ling 2009). Despite the recent feminist scholarship on IR and the relations (albeit ridden with

many spatial tensions) of race, class and gender, and despite the mea culpas of feminist scholars elsewhere, mainstream feminist IR has not given serious attention to the relations between their own geopolitical constitution and other feminisms who have not fallen in step with the universal claims about women and gender.

The segregation and division of different epistemological engagements and other kinds of practices within IR has been a central process and works to mystify their co-constitutive histories, unequal divisions of labor and makes difficult the raising of questions about its political praxes through the naturalization – the canonization – of IR, feminist theory and postcolonial world politics. Part of the bringing together of critical postcolonial, feminist, and postcolonial feminist IR insights is to illustrate how it is crucial to consider geopolitical bodies (e.g., the state, peoples' physical bodies, regions, knowledges) generally, and the geopolitical bodies of IR (e.g., scholars, researchers, policy makers, and their theoretical productions) more specifically, as constantly forming through their struggles, flows, movements, migrations, and "transnational connectivities" (Grewal 2005) that began with the critiques and theorizations of postcolonial theorists.

Postcolonial feminist theory, method, and pedagogy is not new to feminist IR, and in fact some feminist theorizations in the Global North have reaped the intellectual and material benefits from the knowledges and people of postcolonial feminism. However, despite intergenerational and contested conversations between feminists in the Global North and postcolonial feminists, dominant feminist IR fails to politically engage with the difficult questions of postcolonial feminism that necessitates co-constitutive analyses and historical specificities of colonialism, imperialism and capitalism within spatial political exchanges of knowledge, people and land (Turcotte 2008; Agathangelou in press). For example, the works within Chowdhry and Nair's (2002) edited book detail how axes of power, such as race, gender, sexuality and nation, are mobilized through imperial frameworks to maintain global inequality and violence for the protection of Northern interests. Many movements in world politics, and especially starting with the contestation of slavery in the Americas, challenge and contest the organizing principles of imperialism that naturalize violence and geopolitical positioning (see, e.g., Hartman 1997, 2007; McKittrick 2006). Other postcolonial feminists critiqued, for instance, the nation (Spivak 1988b; Kaplan et al. 1999), destabilizing the us/them binaries built and maintained by the state, the dominant unit of analysis in IR, and the clashes that arise because of the political and social tensions embedded within imperial frameworks of racialized, gendered and classed asymmetrical dichotomizations.

The segregation and marginalization of specific knowledge productions and contexts (e.g., global) and the interests that such processes support within which such productions remain painfully obvious. Feminist IR scholarship, while claiming to disrupt "truth" narratives of mainstream IR, often falls prey to constructing similar truth narratives that do not account for the organization and spatial praxis of feminists worldwide (Conway 2008). For instance, gender mainstreaming, while coming from intense feminist struggles, is producing new subjects to be regulated through US counterterrorist services in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. The building of US bases and US training of Nigerian soldiers and private security forces are directly connected to academic knowledge formations within the Global North whose focus is on how to "secure" women within conflict zones. Take, for example, the recent collaborative work at Georgetown University between Women in International Security (WIIS) and US Africa Command (AFRICOM) that "br[ought] together the varying perspectives among experts from academic, military, governmental and non-governmental organizations [. . .] to discuss the current progress and future of US Africa Command" through a discussion of the "3-D" security framework (Development, Diplomacy and Defense), which advocates an integrated approach to achieving its goals of peace,

stability and prosperity in Africa (Skinner 2008; Turcotte 2008; see also Priority Africa Network 2009).

Though one may say the relationship of feminist IR is not directly connected to this project, dominant IR epistemologies on security, women and conflict zones are informing and are informed by these projects and, in fact, the membership in such organizations often cross over. Collaborations of state and feminist academia reconstitute imperial knowledge exchange, and materialize state regulatory practices of development and militarization on geopolitical sites. Considering such feminist collaboration alongside the insights of postcolonial and transnational feminist theories reveals that this form of feminist collaboration markets, targets, and regulates women's bodies from the Global South in violent ways (Agathangelou 2004a, 2004b; Alexander 2005; Grewal 2005; Nnaemeka 2005a; Mohanty 2006). These epistemologies allow us to place the geopolitical agendas of feminists (protecting women) as the feminist concern rather than addressing the larger geopolitical structures of violence that necessitate such constructions of protection (Agathangelou 2000; Agathangelou and Ling 2003; Lipschutz and Turcotte 2005). Such feminist agendas essentialize, localize, transnationalize and regulate transnational feminist possibilities and bodies through imperial and capitalist patriarchal sensibilities. Disregarding the histories of labor, Third World–postcolonial–transnational feminists have provided feminisms at different sites, further contributing to the mistrust of North–South solidarities by transnational feminists and also to the discourses of "feminist failure" by mainstream IR theorists. How and why do these imperial logics continue to propagate?

Eurocentrism and IR Feminisms

Grovogui's (2006) critique of Eurocentrism and occidentalist understandings of the postwar order, its institutions and political processes opens up a conceptual and political space for us to view the "present" anew. By drawing on a group of African intellectuals' formulations of power, interest, ethics and experiences of subjectivity, Grovogui articulates political possibilities "beyond" anarchy outside of the strictures of Western political formations. And as Muppidi (2004:21) argues following Fanon, such colonial globalities "rely on coercive power – the capacity to inflict violence and control the conditions of living – to be effective" and thus, "it is often only counter-violence that opens up a space for the acknowledgment of difference." *Difference*, the acknowledgment of and political commitment to, continues to be an area of contention within the various sites of IR and the main vehicle of geopolitical segregation, including what comes to be understood as "feminist IR."

Much debate and contestation of the approaches of hegemonic Western-White and Anglo-American feminist theorizations on the issues of sexual differentiation as substantive factors of feminist experience, method, knowledge and practice brought to the fore the significance of theorists' location and the effect of this location on framing and articulating a politics of disruption against imperial and colonizing practices. Works such as Grewal and Kaplan (1994), Hurtado (1996), Alexander and Mohanty (1997), Narayan (1997), Kaplan et al. (1999), Rowley (2003), Alexander (2005), and Smith (2005) all intervene in the project of feminism as a homogenous, unified area of study by complicating the subject of "woman" through transnational attention to gender, race, class, religion, and sexuality, which reframes a feminist project of solidarity from equality rights protection to one that confronts complicities in violence through anti-imperialist, anti-racist, and anti-capitalist frames of knowledge.

Anglo-American, Western-White and neoliberal feminist responses to such theorizations and critiques manifested in "new" modes of global feminism with claims of attentiveness to different needs of feminism and feminist subjects around the globe.

We take Global Feminisms (see Basu 1995) here to mean those feminists whose work stresses "the oppression of women in one part of the world is often affected by what happens in another, and that no woman is free until the conditions of oppression of women are eliminated everywhere" (Tong 1998:226). "As global feminism gained momentum and prominence in the 1980s and 1990s it was a key player in global human rights advocacy operating through international aid organizations and political and legal mechanisms of the United Nations. UN conferences on women have been criticized for their reliance on a western liberal framework" (Chowdhry 2009:53). This work departed from earlier attempts in internationalizing feminisms work that drew on both the political economy of the international structures but also the colonial continued dependencies:

> By pointing to the limitations in the earlier "global sisterhood" model, and its normative liberal/western subject, Basu's work attempted to draw attention to the heterogeneity of women's experiences, and movements around the world. Most importantly, she questioned the analytic frameworks of feminist theory, which portrayed women in non-western contexts predominantly through the lens of development and modernization. What this collection, however, did not adequately address was hegemonic feminist theory's comparable elision of complexities and multiplicities of women's experiences and histories within the United States, nor the points of convergence (and divergence) between US anti-racist/third world feminisms and third world/transnational feminisms. (p. 53)

This kind of Global Feminism often redraws the political boundaries of academic knowledge to secure whiteness and First Worldism as structures of privilege within feminist *and* IR frameworks; these feminist subjects were, in fact, feminist objects. Such theories and practices continue to deepen the polarizations between different modes and people who embody feminist work. More so, these feminists foreclose what Narayan (1997:39) argues the political project of feminists is:

> [A]s feminists we need to attend both to issues within particular nations and to urgent transnational or international issues if we are to achieve greater justice within particular nations, and greater global justice in an increasingly interdependent world.

Similarly, DeFrancisco et al. (2003), Mohanty (2006), Incite! Women of Color Against Violence (2006), and Arat-Koç (2007) argue, that focusing on particular nations and the women within them further generates imperial feminist praxes that foreclose possibilities of solidarity. The theories and methods of some First World, women of color, Third World, Global South, and transnational feminisms from varied geopolitical constituencies struggle to articulate their opposition to gender essentialisms and the racial, class, and heteronormative privileging within international relations through their own locations and oppositional histories to colonization's and imperial knowledge formations and practice (see, e.g., Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981; Spivak 1988a; Mohanty et al. 1991; Nnaemeka 2005b; Eisenstein 2007). Yet, many of these scholars and the knowledges produced with these critical frameworks – both from the Global South and the Global North – are relegated to the margins and asymmetrically located on the varied knowledge matrices of the academy (Shohat 1998; Agathangelou and Ling 2002). Segregation, thus, of social relations both at the level of everyday social relations in the world "we" live in and also in the formation of knowledge becomes strategies of violence fundamental to the formation of the "international." Consequently, the ways we understand and explain the "international" within the world are themselves ridden with such logics, which ultimately demand specific practices that relegate some consistently to the margins of the field itself.

Many of these divisions are embodied by feminists worldwide, which implicate them in the ways they approach and do politics. Much of the work produced by feminists

in the West, the European context, the Global North has focused on the development of their spaces and their own lives greatly at the expense of others at the margins and "outside" of their own environments, and thus much critique has been done by women and feminists outside these dominant sites of knowledge production. For example, at the UN Conference on Women held in Copenhagen in 1980, a significant number of women from the Global North advocated focusing on issues they perceived as common to all women despite differences within nationality, race and class. This feminist position was strongly opposed by a small number of First World women whereas Third World women present argued that gender oppression cannot be separated from national, class, or racial oppressions (Cagatay et al. 1986). At the second UN Conference on the Status of Women in Nairobi in 1985, an increased number of research and activist work drew on gender, class, and racial exploitation and oppressions. These knowledges were integrated in a manner that exposed the multifaceted relations of power and violence on multiple scales including women's own bodies, their ecologies, and above all their resources of survival (Shiva 1996) and their effect on women's and men's lives depending on their structural and institutional locations in the world. Through such Third World feminists' critiques, First World feminists realized that food and poverty are feminist issues, and First World feminists' critiques of the centrality of sexual relations pushed Third World feminists to start integrating gender more explicitly in their work and in national liberation movements (see, e.g., Stichter and Parpart 1988; Mikell 1997; Ackerly et al. 2006).

Other Third World and transnational feminists (see Alexander and Mohanty 1997) further problematized the use of feminists' concepts in different contexts by suggesting that the specificity and geographic location of a woman's life is crucial in articulating strategies for change (see also Chang 2000; Kirk and Okazawa-Rey 2000; Shohat 2002; Falcón 2006; Kuokkanen 2008). Such postcolonial and transnational feminist theorizations emerged out of decolonizing struggles. Much of this theorization brought to the fore that much description and articulation of revolutionary projects cannot be done without theorizing gender relations while recognizing that gender struggles can be reformist if they do not take into account other axes of power, including the structures which make them possible. Such theorizations acknowledge that the spatial praxis that potentiates violence and the need for struggle against such praxis includes the ecologies and social relations that people are part of and embody. Anne McClintock (1997) articulates this geopolitical complexity of feminist relations and theorizations for change.

> There is not only one feminism, nor is there only one patriarchy. Feminism is imperialist when it puts the interests and needs of privileged women in imperialist countries above the local needs of disempowered women and men, borrowing from patriarchal privilege. In the last decade, women of color have been vehement in challenging privileged feminists who don't recognize their own racial and class power. (p. 109)

Such insights disrupt the not so easily seen segregations of feminist social relations, and their epistemologies within which such relations become constituted and founded – including critiques, categories, knowledges, conditions of possibility of generating living ideas – and become part and parcel of our everyday struggles. The idea of a universal context and "global" or feminist IR is only made possible through the cordoning off of separate geographical territories (see also Massey 1994). This simultaneous enactment and erasure of difference and multiplicity within feminism and between feminist scholars perpetuates segregation, distrust, and imperial orders.

Such attention also exposes how feminisms and IR deal with difference by assuming the world divided into domestic and international, relegating it into those spaces outside the dominant "interstate structure" violence. Consider how we, as scholars, declare our "areas" of interest, research and teaching, how we target our subjects and objects of study and our audiences as a way to indicate our intellectual, activist, and policy communities – to delineate who we are in conversation with and what frameworks we are building. This process, while creating some forms of community, relies on the segregation and exclusion of Other unnamed communities as if they are not related to each other or as if there is no attentiveness to how such communities enable the naming of one's community in the first place. Engagements such as these suggest the conceptualizations of the international that require these kinds of violence to be consolidated. For instance, Narayan and Harding (2000:viii) have argued that ignoring "institutional, societal, and civilizational or philosophic forms of sexism and androcentrism that have exerted the most powerful effects on women's and men's lives – the forms least visible to us in our daily lives" – is problematic and further allows exploitations and oppressions based on the regimes of race, class, sexuality, nationality and regionality (see also Mies 1986; Waller and Rycenga 2000; Wing 2000).

Feminist geopolitical frameworks allow us to draw out the connections and contestations of power within various sites of global politics, particularly those "stable" categories such as "women" and the "state" as represented by some in academia, activist and policy arenas. Destabilizing categories as a method opens up unimaginable possibilities in geopolitical and other social relations frameworks. As Kofman argues

> The most successful incorporation of feminist insights and gender issues into geopolitics would dismantle and democratize geopolitics such that it no longer involved the personnel of statecraft located with the most repressive echelons of the state. Real groups would then begin to figure in the landscapes and maps of the global economy and power relations. Geopolitics would open out into a broader context which we could call global political geography, in which comparative analyses and the local, however that is defined, would also be included. (1996:218 cited in Hyndman 2004:313)

Hyndman suggests that Kofman's "description of feminist geopolitics aspires to a more democratic and less punitive version of state-centric realist geopolitics. She also tacitly identifies a gap in the geographical literature: that the scale at which security is generally conceptualized precludes collective concerns, civil groups, and individual protection" (p. 313). Hyndman also states that it is important "to extend and animate the feminist imagination Kofman articulates by suggesting that a feminist geopolitical analytic need not only dismantle the dominant discourse of geopolitics but subvert, shift, and animate the geographically specific narratives of particular groups" (p. 314). In other words, a feminist geopolitics that is attentive to geographic multiplicity, specificity and movement reframes the ways in which we accept and participate in regulatory practices of the state, academia and ourselves.

The major experiences of women in anticolonial and anticapitalist revolutions have highlighted the contradictions of agency within imperial structures. Even when women were invited into national revolutions to change their circumstances, they often were invited by men, which limited their own agency, especially after the revolution (Mama 1997). McClintock argues, "women learn their militancy only at men's invitation. Theirs is a designated agency – an agency by invitation only [. . .] The ferocity of the war was such, the urgency so great, that sheer structural necessity dictated the move [. . .] In this way, the possibility of a distinctive feminist agency is never achieved" (1997:336). Agency, though, is further complicated when not assumed through patriarchal representations of what "resistance" is or can be in anti-imperialist movements. Alexander and Mohanty (1997:xxviii) define feminist democratic agency as follows: "the conscious and ongoing reproduction of the terms of one's existence while taking responsibility for this process. And agency is anchored in the practice of thinking of oneself as a part of feminist collectivities and organizations" (see also Mama 1997;

Mariniello and Bové 1998). Women's relegation to the household and/or the market as workers after the decolonizing struggles officially ended pushed women to recognize and devise non-segregationist intellectual and praxes strategies that could change and transform their own societies and within them the asymmetrical social relations of power by building on existent collectives and forming new frameworks of solidarity.

Transnationalisms of Possibilities within Feminisms, Feminist IR and International Relations

> At the same time, things have gone backwards. Our colleagues have been polite about this, but IR is in a mess, let's face it! IR, as Christine [Sylvester] said, is in its silos, it's in its camps. The realists have come back, red in tooth and claw, responding to the world as it is, but I also have to say, against what most of you believe, that I do not think the post-modernist trend has been a disaster for IR and women's rights as well. (Fred Halliday in Zalewski et al. 2008:170)

Halliday's exasperation and/or rather desperate assertion here about the field of IR reinsert the terms of the debates to be about the given truths of IR. Halliday argues that newer possibilities require the use of "familiar" tools to produce knowledges anew about our lives and our global world. The "post-modernist trend" has not been, according to Halliday, "a disaster for IR and women's rights as well." This sense of relief is also part of an intellectual episteme that disenables us, though, from pushing further the terms of the debate, including the articulation of ideas and concepts that are "struggle concepts" against structures of power and violence. It is here that we also want to suggest that knowledge and its production is not static and linearly delineated. More so, the production of knowledge itself, including what Halliday names "the post-modernist trend," emerges within struggles of violence, power, and asymmetrical inequalities including one's right to live and one's right to die. The "post-modernist trend" provided us with some important struggle concepts to engage with our everyday lives as located and made possible within a world context. This "trend" itself has its own "differences" within. As Vivienne Jabri (in Zaleswki et al. 2008:173) states,

> Any ideology has differences within it, and feminism is no exception. We've been rather incapable of acknowledging these very real ideological differences within feminist IR. However, these differences are beginning to come to the fore in a context which some have referred to as "dark times," a context where violations of rights are not just happening in other people's societies but here at our doorstep.

Jabri's nuanced position here problematizes the dominant assumption of a unified feminist project and she argues that the context of violence brings these "differences" to the fore.

Pushing Jabri's logic further, we argue that it is crucial to recognize that this context is one of unequal power struggles and contestations, which consequently affects the production of ideas and their effect on power, including the advancement of social ends and the serving of social interests. For instance, some of the critical knowledge may end up being appropriated and/or collapsed like other radical struggle concepts and used to serve further property/patriarchal/imperial ends.

Jabri goes on to state that "feminism historically is a critical project [. . .] and historically feminism as a theory and practice has had a great deal to say about issues of war and peace" (in Zalewski et al. 2008:174). This criticality requires more than just a set of historically "situated knowledges" (Haraway 1991; Grewal and Kaplan 1994) but also a set of knowledges fundamental to the newer definitions and insights

that emerge out of struggles worldwide or what some critical theorists have called the "transnational." This concept itself is a contested one and its meaning, valence, and relevance points to a multiplicity of expressions and demands. Focusing on such a multiplicity requires itself "struggle concepts" that highlight the complexity of struggle spaces and the ways specific and very dominant IR "units of analysis" mystify their own restructuring and shift.

While, historically, IR theories have assumed the primacy of the state as a dominant unit of world politics, the dramatic transformations of those world politics problematized its role and raised questions about the interstate structure, the sites of political organizing, and the methods we draw upon to understand the world. Many at the margins of these dominant frames know that organizing in "contained units" is not a viable project and ends up serving against their own social interests. Much of their lives is already grounded in a politics of "transnationalism" which accorded them at least the historical knowledge to recognize as problematic the dominant ideas of IR realist theories that sovereign power is "contained" and is itself one and the same with a specific territory. Experiences of violence (i.e., human rights violations) by many people worldwide, for instance, brought to the fore that states do not always protect the interests of all their citizens and/or workers. Many decisions about the majority of the world's peoples happened within transnational spaces (e.g., organizations like the IMF and the World Bank making decisions about the most intimate aspects of people's lives, such as reproduction in Bangladesh; courts like the European Courts deciding on human rights violations, etc.; the violations by corporations within the Global South). Within this struggle context, dominant epistemes about the "international" (i.e., the most central unit of analysis and politics is the state; the major decision maker about violations should be the state) and feminist issues became more transnationalized, and consequently feminists started organizing and articulating feminist questions and possibilities for a spatial praxis of transnational connections and solidarities.

What would a feminist in the US do with the violations that were taking place, for instance, in Afghanistan against women and also Afghani peoples, as they were racialized, classed, and sexualized within the world context? See, for instance, how Incite!, a US based organization of women of color, responded to this question: "At this moment in Afghanistan, women are living with the return of the Taliban and other misogynistic groups such as the Northern Alliance, a US ally, and with the violence of continuing US and NATO attacks on civilians, despite the US war to 'liberate' Afghan women in 2001" (Incite! Women of Color against Violence 2008).

Transnationalism is not merely a given but is itself a contested idea and practice (Alexander 2005; Grewal 2005; Arat-Koç 2007). Through its development, many feminists continue to ask what makes certain feminist practices "transnational" while so many others remain somehow "local"? Is geographic grounding in New York at the UN more transnational than a "local" feminism, say of a rural women's movement in Brazil that is thoroughly place-based, while simultaneously enmeshed in the transnational feminist flows of donor money, academic ideas, and organizational linkages, as so brilliantly demonstrated by Millie Thayer (2001)? Can we even speak of a single phenomenon, "transnational feminism," with specific modalities, as Desai (2005) seems to imply? Other questions that have emerged and become centralized, especially since the 1995 Beijing Women's Conference, are about: the relationship between feminism as a goal and women's movements as a form of organization; the ways feminists could work transnationally and how has this changed since Beijing; how histories and contemporary understandings and politics about nation-states shape feminists' work in a transnational realm; how the language of universal human rights is mobilized and for whose purposes; the restructuring of capital at the end of the Cold War and how international power has moved attention away from an East–West

axis to specific countries or issues globally; and finally, what relationships do feminists have with other social movements and organizations?

Conway (2008) raises some important epistemological questions, which have serious spatial praxis implications. She asks: Is the signifier "transnational feminism" pointing really to the demand for a new revived global sisterhood project carried by the high politics of a new, now multicultural, highly mobile, well-resourced and globally visible feminist vanguard for imperialism and capitalism? If so, what forms of feminist exchange are necessitated to create different possibilities for transnational solidarities?

Claims of early and even some current feminist scholarship based on essentialized categories of women have not engaged with other social relations significant in the formation of global politics (i.e., race, body, ability, sexuality, etc.). Additionally, this scholarship continues to assume violence as an everyday Order of geopolitics by promoting the mainstreaming of gender within international justice discourses of rights, law, security and development through the targeting of "women" in Other geographical locations. The genealogy of feminist IR (the first world), much like mainstream IR, remains Eurocentric, and some of the gatekeeping practices and strategies of knowledge production do not take seriously engagements with non-European philosophical traditions and political and social practices (Grovogui 2006). Despite the recent feminist scholarship on IR and the relations (albeit ridden with many spatial tensions) of race, class and gender, and despite the mea culpas of feminist scholars elsewhere, mainstream feminist IR has not given serious attention to the relations between its own geopolitical constitution and other feminisms who have not fallen in step with the universal claims about women and gender.

Again, postcolonial feminist theory, method and pedagogy are not new to feminist IR. However, despite intergenerational and contested conversations between feminists in the Global North and postcolonial feminists, dominant feminist IR fails to politically engage with the difficult questions of postcolonial feminism that necessitate co-constitutive analyses and historical specificities of colonialism, imperialism and capitalism within spatial political exchanges of knowledge, people and land (Turcotte 2006, 2008; Agathangelou in press). Scholars often imagine and produce the state by theorizing its existence and promulgating its policies, and thus perhaps the most important part of this intellectual project is the interrogation of the "nation" within the geopolitics of feminist IR. Postcolonial feminist critiques of the nation destabilize the us/them binaries built and maintained by the state, and the clashes that rise because of the political and social tensions embedded within imperial frameworks of racialized, gendered, and classed asymmetrical dichotomizations. Eliding the labors of Third World–postcolonial–transnational feminists contributes to the mistrust of North–South solidarities by transnational feminists and to the discourses of "feminist failure" by mainstream IR theorists. How and why do these logics continue to propagate?

Part of this process is enabled by the ways in which we as scholars and activists within the Global North are conditioned to "see" ourselves as separate from each other through geopolitical territorialization and segregation and also as the "feminist vanguard" to change and transform the world. This epistemological approach violently makes invisible and forcefully incapacitates those feminists that are actively working in specific places and mobilize solidarities that disrupt an imperial and patriarchal capitalist project. In Conway's analysis of the World March of Women (WMW) she states:

> The status of "place" and "the local" in the practices and discourses of the WMW distinguishes it from many other forms of both transnational feminism and anti-globalization politics. The March is constituted as a coordination of place-based feminisms, concretely engaged in specific geographies, on context-specific struggles pertaining to poverty and violence against women, in place-specific terms. These sensitivities to the intersecting politics of place and difference in transnational movement practice intersect, notably and inseparably, with a politics of class in the March's praxis. Increasingly, the WMW is rooted in the survival struggles of poor women and is aligned with mass grassroots economic justice movements like the international peasant confederation via Campesina. It is constructing a feminist transnationalism, a network of spatial connectivity, linking the experiences, struggles, and politics of poor women across vast expanses of space without erasing their differences or denigrating their localness. (2008:221)

As Conway explains, it is especially crucial to centralize geography, space, and place and networks while also attending to the relations and movements that take place simultaneously at different scales. Epistemological emphases on the experiences, struggles, and politics across a vast expanse of space without erasing and/or forcing incapacitation of localities enable us to also historicize and understand revolutionary movements such as de-linking (Amin 1989) rather than segregate them as a "local" moment and movement. However, the imaginative realities of First Worldism produce narratives of vanguard feminism that maintain global inequality through neoliberal appropriations (Zalewski et al. 2008). In short, epistemological segregations become the conditions of the further possibility of (re)production of imperial capital relations with their investments in profit, fear, and ontological (in)securities.

Feminists do not share the "global" equally, nor in the same way. Recognizing this asymmetrical embodiment of the global many times located and articulated feminists in fundamentally opposing ways. Or as Hartsock explains, "the vision of each [group] will represent an inversion of the other, and in systems of domination the vision available to the rulers will be both partial and perverse" (1983:232). Globalization requires new ways of approaching social relations and new methods of achieving social justice. Fraser (2003) draws out some of the complexities of intensified restructuring and need to re-create the possibility of justice within them. Beginning with the most dominant leader and articulator of imperial and capital relations, the US society, Fraser (2003) tells us systematically of the shifts from a Fordist mode of production to a post-Fordist, from a strong manufacturing society to a more knowledge-based society with implications on labor relations and modes of organizing. She also highlights the shift from strong states, which steer the domestic capacities to a more globalizing order that does not any longer contain contestations, to merely class as such changes are embodied at many axes of subordination. These changes demand new strategies to account for the many asymmetries that feminists and feminisms embody in the world, and particularly given the contemporary world situation of global warfare – take the festering sore of Afghanistan and Iraq for example – (re) colonial globality and its consolidation is centralized as a feminist question (Agathangelou 2003; Spivak 2003; Tadiar 2003; Davis 2005; Mohanty 2006; Rai 2007).

How do the United States' claims to global leadership based on its self-image as a leading proponent of "freedom" and democracy depend on non-democratic and non-just relations? How does the US Identity, and within it First World Feminism(s), draw on a (neo) liberal-colonial imaginary that is simultaneously enacting and erasing violence and geopolitical segregation as a hegemonic way of justice? How does such a (neo) liberal-colonial imaginary – one in which "the global is consistently colonized by the American national" (Muppidi 2004:74), one that is dominated by the idea that "what is particular to the United States is actually universal" (p. 65) and one where "Others are never really rational enough, moral enough, or powerful enough to be seen as one's equals" (p. 67) – disenable productive forms of engagement with the "Others" of the world? How are we as IR and feminist scholar-activists complicit in and/or contesting such processes of marketing gender for global consumption? What are the ways in which feminisms of critical geographies can provide a space to reframe and build multiple possibilities of solidarity?

Transitions and Rewritings

Several Third World, postcolonial, Global South and transnational feminisms challenge the "originary status" of Western feminism as the mainstream by calling for a comparative, relational feminist praxis that is transnational in its response and engages with global processes of colonization and neo-imperialisms. These frameworks allow for recognizing the context within which the relationality of social relations, including feminist ones, and the various articulations within the context of multiple violences on a global scale are possible (Shohat 2002). To further, bell hooks argues

> To me, feminism is not simply a struggle to end male chauvinism or a movement to ensure that women will have equal rights with men; it is a commitment to eradicating the ideology of domination that permeates Western culture on various levels – sex, race, and class, to name a few – and a commitment to reorganizing [US] society so that the self-development of people can take precedence over imperialism, economic expansion, and material desires. (1981:194–5).

hooks' epistemology disrupts feminist mainstreams and problematizes feminism as merely a project to integrate women into structures of dominance and exploitation. She highlights that domination is not about "men" and "women" being "bad" but rather the way imperial domination permeates all of our lives by consequently cutting off the possibilities of self and communal development. The central aspect of imperialism is merely its own economic expansion and material desires at the expense of the majority of peoples. Thus, a feminist movement has to engage with this problematic.

The possibilities of transborder and transnational feminist collectives that seek to confront empire begin with this questioning of the geographies of knowledge. The works we have discussed here are rarely put together as such in the configurations of IR, feminist IR, and postcolonial IR. Through our textual interdictions, the bringing together of sites not normally put together (Spivak 2003), we are suggesting that multi- and interdisciplinary work is a critical practice of feminisms of critical geographies. Disciplinary traveling (and sometimes exile) can open up understandings of academic violence and geopolitics more broadly because it enables an engagement with histories of transnational solidarities not always recognizable within one disciplinary location. How do we practice feminist IR, when the mainstay of our theories and methods is constituted through the dictated frameworks of heteropatriarchy and/or whiteness? Multi- and interdisciplinary work can produce very different forms of academic communities, which have to consider what it means to create and be accountable to multiple formulations of community – bringing together postcolonial and feminist insights can transform geopolitical praxes. The attention to knowledge production and formation, and how one participates within them, are one entry point into building a framework of feminisms of critical geographies that speak to larger conversations of global justice by bringing us into closer proximity with one another.

Practices of proximity necessitate a movement of critical attention to what we read, what we write, who we write with, and what types of communities we form and participate in on various levels. Agathangelou (2004) explains that various creations of solidarity enact "alternative ontolog[ies] [. . .] that expan[d] the horizons of limiting social self-understandings" and it is the building of multiple global communities (i.e., within the self, nongovernmental organizations, neighborhoods, friendships, academic-activist arenas) through daily struggles, knowledge exchange, and systemic connections that "constitute a 'movement in progress' to change the racialized and gendered divisions of labor" that perpetuate global inequalities and territorialize possibilities of justice (153–4; see also Turcotte 2008). The constitution of feminist praxis at this specific moment requires that we understand its formation, constitution, and its conditions of possibility by always accounting for its place, space, and multiple scalar nodes it connects with and/or is disrupted by.

References

Ackerly, B.A., Stern, M.S., and True, J. (eds.) (2006) *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Agathangelou, A.M. (1997) The Cypriot "Ethnic" Conflict in the Production of Global Power. PhD dissertation, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.

Agathangelou, A.M. (2000) Nationalist Narratives and (Dis)Appearing Women: State Sanctioned Sexual Violence. *Canadian Woman Studies* 19 (4), 12–21.

Agathangelou, A.M. (2003) Envisioning a Feminist Global Society: Cypriot Women, Civil Society and Social Change. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5 (2), 290–9.

Agathangelou, A.M. (2004a) *The Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence, and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation States.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Agathangelou, A.M. (2004b) Gender, Race, Militarization, and Economic Restructuring in Former Yugoslavia and the US-Mexico Border. In D. Aguilar and A.E. Lascamana (eds.) *Women and Globalization.* New York: Humanity Press, pp. 347–86.

Agathangelou, A.M. (in press) Economies of Blackness and Sacrifice of (Homo)Virilities: Accumulation, Disasters and Slaughterhouses. In S. Nair and S. Biswas (eds.) *Spaces of Exception in IR.* New York: Routledge.

Agathangelou, A.M., and Ling, L.H.M. (2002) An Unten(ur)able Position: The Politics of Teaching for Women of Color in the US. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 4 (3), 368–98.

Agathangelou, A.M., and Ling, L.H.M. (2003) Desire Industries: Sex Trafficking, UN Peacekeeping, and the Neo-Liberal World Order. *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 10 (1), 133–48.

Agathangelou, A.M., and Ling, L.H.M. (2004a) Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire from September 11. *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (3), 517–38.

Agathangelou, A.M., and Ling, L.H.M. (2004b) The House of IR: From Family Power Politics to the Poisies of Worldism. *International Studies Review* 6 (3), 167–92.

Agathangelou, A.M., and Ling, L.H.M. (2009) *Transforming World Politics: From Empire to Multiple Worlds.* Routledge.

Agathangelou, A.M., and Turcotte, H. (2009) Postcolonial Theories and Challenges to "First Worldism." In Laura Shepherd (ed.) *Gender Matters in Global Politics.* New York: Routledge.

Alexander, M.J. (2005) *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Alexander, M.J., and Mohanty, C. (eds.) (1997) *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures.* New York: Routledge.

Alvarez, Sonia E. (2000) Translating the Global: Effects of Transnational Organizing on Local Feminist Discourses and Practices in Latin America. *Meridians* 1 (1), 29–67.

Amin, S. (1989) *Eurocentrism.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Arat, Z.F.K. (ed.) (2007) *Human Rights in Turkey.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Arat-Koç, S. (2007) (Some)Turkish Transnationalism(s) in an Age of Capitalist Globalization and Empire: "White Turk" Discourse, the New Geopolitics, and Implications for Feminist Transnationalism. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 3 (1), 35–57.

Bethke, J. (1987) *Women and War.* New York: Littlefield.

Biswas, S. (2002) The "New Cold War": Secularism, Orientalism and Postcoloniality. In G. Chowdhry and S. Nair (eds.) *Power, Postcolonialism, and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender, and Class.* New York: Routledge.

Cagatay, N., Grown, C., and Santiago, A. (1986) The Nairobi Women's Conference: Toward a Global Feminism? *Feminist Studies* 12 (2), 401–12.

Caprioli, M. (2003) Gender Equality and State Aggression: The Impact of Domestic Gender Equality on State First Use of Force. *International Interactions* 29 (3), 195–214.

Caprioli, M. (2004) Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis. *International Studies Review* 6 (2), 253–69.

Caprioli, M. (2005) Primed for Violence: The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (2), 161–78.
Carney, G. (2003) Communicating or Just Talking: Gender Mainstreaming and the Communication of Global Feminism. *Women and Language* 26 (1), 52–60.
Carpenter, R.C. (2002) Gender Theory in World Politics: Contributions of a Nonfeminist Standpoint? *International Studies Review* 4 (3), 153–65.
Carpenter, R.C. (2003) "Women and Children First": Gender, Norms, and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans 1991–95. *International Organization* 57, 661–94.
Carver, T., Zalewski, M., Kinsella, H., and Carpenter, R.C. (2003) The Forum: Gender and International Relations. *International Studies Review* 5 (2), 287–302.
Chacko, E. (2007) From Brain Drain to Brain Gain: Reverse Migration to Bangalore and Hyderabad, India's Globalizing High Tech. *GeoJournal* 68, 131–40.
Chang, G. (2000) *Disposable Domestics: Immigrant Women Workers in the Global Economy.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
Chowdhury, E.H. (2009) Locating Global Feminisms Elsewhere. *Cultural Dynamics* 21 (1), 51–78.
Chowdhry, G., and Nair, S. (eds.) (2002) *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class.* New York: Routledge.
Cohn, C. (1990) Clean Bomb and Clean Language. In J. Elshtain and S. Tobias (eds.) *Women, Militarism, and War: Essays in History, Politics and Social.* Savage: Rowman and Littlefield.
Conway, J. (2008) Geographies of Transnational Feminisms: The Politics of Place and Scale in the World March of Women's Social Politics. *International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 15 (2), 207–31.
Crenshaw, K. (1995) Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. In K. Crenshaw et al. (eds.) *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement.* New York: The New Press.
Davis, A.Y. (2005) *Abolition Democracy: Beyond Empire, Prisons, and Torture.* New York: Seven Stories Press.
DeFrancisco, V.P., R. LaWare, M., and Palczewski, C.H. (2003) The Home Side of Global Feminism: Why Hasn't the Global Found a Home in the US? *Women and Language* 26 (1), 100–9.
Der Derian, J., Bethke Elshtain, J., Smith, S., Sylvester, C., and Rosenau, J.N. (1993) *Global Voices: Dialogues in International Relations.* Boulder: Westview Press.
Desai, M. (2005) Women, Globalization, and Health: A Critical Social Movement Perspective. In I. Kickbusch, K.A. Hartwig, and J. List (eds.) *Globalization, Women, and Health in the 21st Century.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Eisenstein, Z. (2007) *Sexual Decoys: Gender, Race and War in Imperial Democracy.* London: Zed Books.
Enloe, C. (1983) *Does Khaki Become You?: The Militarization of Women's Lives.* London: Pandora.
Enloe, C. (1989) *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Enloe, C. (2007) *Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
Falcón, S. (2006) Securing the Nation through the Violation of Women's Bodies: Militarized Border Rape at the US–Mexico Border. In Incite! Women of Color against Violence (eds.) *Color of Violence: The Incite! Anthology.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
Fraser, N. (2003) Social Justice in Globalization: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation. In Eurozine. <www.eurozine.com/articles/2003-01-24-fraser-en.html> (accessed November 10, 2008).
Grewal, I. (2005) *Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms.* Durham: Duke University Press.
Grewal, I., and Kaplan, C. (eds.) (1994) *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Grovogui, S.N. (2006) *Beyond Eurocentrism and Anarchy: Memories of International Order and Institutions.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Haraway, D. (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Re-Invention of Nature.* London: Free Association.
Harding, S.G. (1991) *The Science Question in Feminism.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hartman, S.V. (1997) *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Hartman, S.V. (2007) *Lose Your Mother: A Journey along the Atlantic Slave Route.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Hartsock, N. (1983) *Money, Sex, and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.
Hennessy, R. (1995) Subjects, Knowledges . . . and All the Rest: Speaking for What? In J. Roof and R. Wiegman (eds.) *Who Can Speak? Authority and Critical Identity.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 137–50.
Hoffmann, S. (1977) An American Social Science: International Relations. *Daedalus* 106 (3) (Summer).
Hoffmann, S. (1981) *Duties beyond Borders: On the Limits and Possibilities of Ethical International Politics.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
hooks, b. (1981) *Ain't I a Woman? Black Women and Feminism.* Boston: South End Press.
Hurtado, A. (1996) *The Color of Privilege: Three Blasphemies on Race and Feminism.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Hyndman, J. (2004) Mind the Gap: Bridging the Feminist and Political Geography through Geopolitics. *Political Geography* 23, 307–22.
Imam, A. (1997) The Dynamics of WINning: An Analysis of Women in Nigeria (WIN). In M.J. Alexander and C.T. Mohanty (eds.) *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures.* New York: Routledge.
Incite! Women of Color against Violence (eds.) (2006) *Color of Violence: The Incite! Anthology.* Cambridge: South End Press.
Incite! Women of Color against Violence (2008) State of Solidarity with Women Facing War and Occupation. <www.incite-national.org/index.php?s=127> (accessed February 11, 2009).
Jones, A. (2008) *Gender Inclusive Essays on Violence, Men, and Feminist International Relations.* New York: Routledge.
Kaplan, C., Alarcón, N., and Moallem, M. (eds.) (1999) *Between Women and Nation: Nationalisms, Transnational Feminisms, and the State.* Durham: Duke University Press.
Keohane, R. (1989) *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory.* Boulder: Westview Press.
Keohane, R. (1998) Beyond Dichotomy: Conversations between International Relations and Feminist Theory. *International Studies Quarterly* 42 (1), 193–7.
Kirk, G., and Okazawa-Rey, M. (2000) Demilitiarizing Security: Women Oppose US Militarism in East Asia. In M.R. Waller and J. Rycenga (eds.) *Frontline Feminisms: Women, War, and Resistance.* New York: Taylor and Francis.
Kuokkanen, R. (2008) Globalization as Racialized, Sexualized Violence: The Case of Indigenous Women. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 10 (2), 216–23.
Liebowitz, D.J. (2002) Introduction. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 4 (2), 147–50.
Liebowitz, D.J. (2008) Governing Globalization: Feminist Engagements with International Trade Policy. In S.M. Rai and G. Waylen (eds.) *Global Governance.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Lipschutz, R.D., and Turcotte, H. (2005) Duct Tape or Plastic?: The Political Economy of Threats and the Production of Fear. In B. Hartmann, B. Subramaniam, and C. Zerner (eds.) *Making Threats: Biofears and Environmental Anxieties.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
Locher, B., and E. Prügl (2001) Feminism and Constructivism: Worlds Apart or Sharing the Middle Ground? *International Studies Quarterly* 45 (1), 111–29.
Lorde, A. (2001) The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House. In C.L. Moraga and G.E. Anzaldúa (eds.) *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color.* Berkeley: Third Woman Press.
MacKinnon, C. (1989) *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Mama, A. (1997) Shedding the Masks and Tearing the Veils: Cultural Studies for a Post-colonial Africa. In A. Imam, A. Mama, and F. Sow (eds.) *Engendering African Social Sciences.* Dakar: CODESRIA.
Mariniello, S., and Bové, P.A. (eds.) (1998) *Gendered Agents: Women and Institutional Knowledge.* Durham: Duke University Press.
Massey, D. (1994) *Space, Place, and Gender.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Clintock, A. (1997) No Longer in Futile Heaven: Gender, Race, and Nationalism. In ..A. Mufti and E. Shohat (eds.) *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives.* finneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Kittrick, K. (2006) *Demonic Grounds: Black Women and the Cartographies of Struggle.* Minneapolis: finnesota University Press.
:s, M. (1986) *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division.* .ondon: Zed Books.
.ell, G. (ed.) (1997) *African Feminism: The Politics of Survival in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Philadelphia: fniversity of Pennsylvania Press.
ghadam, V.M. (1993) *Modernizing Women: Gender and Social Change in the Middle East.* Boulder: ynne Rienner Publishers.
ghadam, V.M. (2005) *Globalizing Women: Transnational Feminist Networks.* Baltimore: Johns fopkins University Press.
ıanty, C.T. (1991) Cartographies of Struggle: Third World Women and the Politics of eminism. In C.T. Mohanty, A. Russo, and L. Torres (eds.) *Third World Women and the Politics f Feminism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
ıanty, C.T. (2006) US Empire and the Project of Women's Studies: Stories of Citizenship, omplicity, and Dissent. *Gender, Place and Culture* 13 (1), 7–20.
ıanty, C.T., Russo, A., and Torres, L. (eds.) (1991) *Third World Women and the Politics of eminism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
aga, C., and Anzaldúa, G. (eds.) (1981) *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women f Color.* Pittsburgh: Persephone Press.
.er, C.O.N., Tornqvist, A., and van Bronkhorst, B. (1999) *Mainstreaming Gender and Development i the World Bank: Progress and Recommendations.* Washington, DC: World Bank.
ɔpidi, H. (2004) *The Politics of the Global.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
ıles, N.A., and Desai, M. (eds.) (2002) *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics.* New York: Routledge.
ayan, U. (1997) *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions and Third-World Feminism.* New York: outledge.
ayan, U., and Harding, S. (2000) *Decentering the Center: Postcolonial and Feminist Challenges to hilosophy.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
.emeka, O. (2005a) African Women, Colonial Discourses, and Imperialist Interventions: emale Circumcision as Impetus. In O. Nnaemeka (ed.) *Female Circumcision and the Politics Knowledge: African Women in Imperialist Discourses.* Westport: Praeger.
.emeka, O. (ed.) (2005b) *Female Circumcision and the Politics of Knowledge: African Women in nperialist Discourses.* Westport: Praeger.
ɔart, J.L., and Staudt, K. (eds.) (1989) *Women and the State in Africa.* Boulder: Lynne ienner.
ɔart, J.L., and Zalewski, M. (eds.) (2008) *Rethinking the Man Question: Sex, Gender and Violence : International Relations.* London: Zed Books.
:rson, V.S. (ed.) (1991) *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory.* ɔulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
·rson, V.S. (2003) *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy: Integrating Reproductive, oductive and Virtual Economies.* New York: Routledge.
·rson, V.S., and Runyan, A.S. (1993) *Global Gender Issues: Dilemmas in World Politics.* Westview ·ess.
·rson, V.S., and Runyan, A.S. (eds.) (1999) *Global Gender Issues.* Oxford: Westview Press.
man, J.J. (1996) *Worlding Women: A Feminist International Politics.* New York: Routledge.
rity Africa Network. (2009) "Stop AFRICOM." <www.priorityafrica.org/> (accessed March), 2009).
S. (2003) *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State?: Institutional Mechanisms for the dvancement of Women.* New York: Palgrave.
S. (2007) *The Gender Politics of Development: Essays in Hope and Despair.* London and New ·rk: Zed Books.
S., and Waylen, G. (eds.) (2008) *Global Governance: Feminist Perspectives.* New York: Palgrave acmillan.
ley, M. (2003) A Feminist's Oxymoron: Globally Gender-Conscious Development. In Barriteau (ed.) *Confronting Power, Theorizing Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives in the Caribbean.* ngston: University of the West Indies Press.

Runyan, A.S., and Peterson, V.S. (1991). The Radical Future of Realism: Feminist Subversions of IR Theory. *Alternatives* 16, 67–106.
Sandoval, C. (1991) US Third World Feminism: The Theory and Method of Oppositional Consciousness in the Postmodern World. *Genders* 10 (Spring), 1–24.
Sarker, S. (2007) *Sustainable Feminisms.* Amsterdam: Elsevier JAI.
Shiva, V. (1996) *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge.* New York: South End Press.
Shohat, E. (ed.) (1998) *Talking Visions: Multicultural Feminism in a Transnational Age.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.
Shohat, E. (2002) Area Studies, Gender Studies and the Cartographies of Knowledge. *Social Text* 20 (3), 67–78.
Skinner, D. (2008) Conference Panelists Discuss Progress of Africa Command. *US Africa Command Public Affairs.* Washington, DC: US Africa Command Public Affairs Office.
Smith, A. (2005) *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide.* Cambridge: South End Press.
Social Politics (2005) Special Issue on Gender Mainstreaming. *Social Politics* 12 (3).
Spivak, G.C. (1988a) *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics.* New York: Methuen.
Spivak, G.C. (1988b) Can the Subaltern Speak? In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture.* London: Macmillan.
Spivak, G.C. (2003) *Death of a Discipline.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Squires, J. (2007) *The New Politics of Gender Equality.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Squires, J., and Weldes, J. (2007) Beyond Being Marginal: Gender and International Relations in Britain. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9 (2), 185–203.
Steans, J. (1998) *Gender and International Relations: An Introduction.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Stichter, S., and Parpart, J. (eds.) (1988) *Patriarchy and Class: African Women in the Home and Workforce.* Boulder: Westview Press.
Sylvester, C. (1994) *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
Sylvester, C. (2002) *Feminist International Relations: An Unfinished Journey.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
Sylvester, C. (2008) *Art/Museums: International Relations Where We Least Expect It.* New York: Paradigm Publishers.
Tadiar, N.X. (2003) Feminist Hope in the Midst of Global War. In *The Wave: A Periodical for the University Community and Friends of Women's Studies* 6 (1), 1, 17.
Thayer, M. (2001) Traveling Feminisms: From Embodied Women to Gendered Citizenship. In M. Burawoy, J.A. Blum, S. George, G. Zsuzsa, M. Thayer, T. Gowan, L. Haney, M. Klawiter, S.H. Lopez, and S. Riain (eds.) *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Tickner, J.A. (1992) *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Tickner, J.A. (1997) You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists. *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (4), 611–32.
Tong, R. (1998) *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction.* Boulder: Westview Press.
Turcotte, H.M. (2006) Disciplining Cartographies: Critical Inquiries into the Methods and Theories of Feminist International Relations. Conference paper given at the International Studies Association Annual Conference, San Diego, CA.
Turcotte, H.M. (2008) Petro-Sexual Politics: Global Oil, Legitimate Violence and Transnational Justice. PhD dissertation. University of California, Santa Cruz. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
True, J. (2003) Mainstreaming Gender in Global Public Policy. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5 (3) (Nov.), 368–96.
Waller, M.R., and J. Rycenga (eds.) (2000) *Frontline Feminisms: Women, War, and Resistance.* New York: Garland Publishing.
Wallerstein, I. (1974) *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century.* St. Louis: Academic Press.
Wallerstein, I. (2004) *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction.* Durham: Duke University Press.
Weber, C. (1994) Good Girls, Little Girls, and Bad Girls: Male Paranoia in Robert Keohane's Critique of Feminist International Relations. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 23 (2), 337–49.

Wendt, A. (1992) Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization* 46 (2).
Whitworth, S. (1997) *Feminism and International Relations: Towards a Political Economy of Gender in Multilateral Institutions*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Wibben, A.T.R. (2004) Feminist International Relations: Old Debates and New Directions. *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 10 (2) (Winter/Spring), 97–114.
Wing, A.K. (ed.) (2000) *Global Critical Race Feminism: An International Reader*. New York: New York University Press.
Youngs, G. (2004) Feminist International Relations: A Contradiction in Terms? Or: Why Women and Gender are Essential to Understanding the World "We" Live In. *International Affairs* 80 (1), 75–87.
Youngs, G. (2008) From Practice to Theory: Feminist International Relations and "Gender Mainstreaming." *International Politics* 45 (6), 688–702.
Zalewski, M. (2007a) Do We Understand Each Other Yet? Troubling Feminist Encounters with(in) International Relations. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9 (2), 302–12.
Zalewski, M. (2007b) *Feminism after Postmodernism?* New York: Taylor and Francis.
Zalewski, M., Tickner, J.A., Sylvester, C., Light, M., Jabri, V., Hutchings, K., and Halliday, F. (2008) Roundtable Discussion: Reflections on the Past, Prospects for the Future in Gender and International Relations. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 37 (1).

Online Resources

Feminism and postcolonialism at www.cddc.vt.edu/feminism/poc

Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography at www.tandf.co.uk/journals/carfax/0966369X

Incite!: Women of Color against Violence at http://incite-national.org

Postcolonial literature bibliography at www.ripon.edu/library/support/postcolonial.htm and www.literaryhistory.com/20thC/Groups/postcolonial

The Imperial Archive, key concepts in postcolonial studies at http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofEnglish/imperial/key-concepts/feminism-and-postcolonialism

About the Authors

Anna M. Agathangelou is Associate Professor of Political Science and Women's Studies at York University, Toronto, and is the co-director of the Global Change Institute, Nicosia, Cyprus. Her publications include *The Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation-States* (2006) and *Transforming World Politics: From Empire to Multiple Worlds* (2009), co-authored with L.H.M. Ling (New School).

Heather M. Turcotte is Assistant Professor in Political Science, Women's Studies and International Studies at the University of Connecticut, Storrs. Her research and teaching focuses on Africana Studies, Global Critical Race Theory, economies of violence and transnational feminisms. She is currently working on a book-length project that examines gender violence and geopolitical segregation to analyze how US–Nigerian petroleum relations, through the discourses of international security and law, inform and are informed by sexual violence and the possibilities of transnational justice.

Finance

Tony Porter

McMaster University

Introduction

This essay focuses on the insights that have been provided by the evolving and now voluminous literature on the global organization of finance. With regard to *organization*, a contribution of this literature has been to show that popular images that obscure the organized character of global finance, such as those that picture it as ephemeral flows of electronic signals or atomized arm's length market transactions responding to an invisible hand, are misleading. As this essay will show, there are numerous ways in which the global *organization* of finance has been analyzed, including understanding the role played by states, by transnational public sector regulatory bodies, by the structural properties of capitalism, by ideas and ideologies, or by the discursive properties of risk models or business practices, among others. A number of topics that in other contexts might be included in discussions of global finance are not the focus of this essay because they appear elsewhere in this compendium, including money, sovereign debt, financial crises, foreign direct investment, the political economy of development, and formal international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. There is also a large literature on technical or more purely economic aspects of global financial markets, such as how to price derivatives, that is not included in this review, in part because the lack of attention to power or to the state in such work leaves it outside the boundaries of the field of international political economy. The literature's treatment of the role of organization in the very rapid growth of transnational financial markets over the past half century is the focus of this essay.

This essay discusses both the empirical and theoretical implications of the literature it reviews. Empirically the literature has added new topics as they have emerged with the growth of the global financial system, but also in response to theoretical innovations that have suggested new lines of inquiry. In its earlier days a key task for the literature was to identify the relative importance of states, markets, technology, and other factors in explaining the rapid growth of global finance in the 1960s and 1970s. By the 1990s the literature devoted attention to the greater complexity that was evident in global finance as traditional bank lending was increasingly displaced by other types of financial instruments, such as bonds, equities, and derivatives, which were also spreading geographically to influence "emerging markets" in the developing world and in the countries in transition from communism. Theoretically the literature on the global organization of finance has been inspired by and has contributed to debates and trends in the larger literatures to which it is connected. In its earlier days the three categories that were typically used, with varying labels, to distinguish major theoretical trends in the fields of International Relations (IR) and International Political Economy (IPE) – realism, liberalism, and Marxism – could fairly easily be applied to the study of the global organization of finance as well. However, this threefold distinction is inadequate today. Many other approaches are evident now, some