

FIELD STATEMENT TWO

Disciplining Cartographies: Critical Inquires into the Methods and Theories of Feminist International Relations

**In Preparation for Qualifying Exams
On November 10, 2005**

Heather Turcotte
University of California, Santa Cruz
Politics Department

Committee Members:

Sonia Alvarez, Politics, UCSC

Gina Dent, Feminist Studies, UCSC

Ronnie Lipschutz, Politics, UCSC

Vanita Seth, Politics, UCSC

Please Do Not Cite Without the Consent of Author

Introduction

Why must woman stand divided?
Building the walls that tear them down?

--Genny Lim¹

Questions of war, security, and militarization remain an important focus of study within the discipline of International Relations. Together, these three areas contribute to a larger framework of analysis within IR and political science as a whole—the theorization of nation building and the state. Throughout the years, the discipline has produced vast amounts of knowledge about nation states and their inhabitants, and theorists have importantly illuminated areas of violent contradiction within theories and practices of war, security, militarization, and the state. Shifting paradigms of IR thought have questioned the monolithic understanding of the state, the citizen, and the international structure by bringing forth important critiques of mainstream² IR. These *critiques* of IR have manifested into their own disciplinary formulations of critical, feminist, and more recently postcolonial and postcolonial-feminist IR. Critical theorists such as Karin Fierke,³ Robert Cox,⁴ and R.B.J Walker,⁵ feminist theorists such as V. Spike Peterson⁶ and Ann Tickner⁷, and postcolonial/postcolonial feminist theorists such as Anna Agathangelou,⁸ Geeta Chowdhry and Sheila Nair,⁹ and L.H.M. Ling,¹⁰ have called upon the discipline to ponder questions such as, whose security and whose life is being inscribed through relationships of power and desire? The work of critical, feminist, and postcolonial IR challenges the knowledge re/productions of both mainstream IR¹¹ and the subsets themselves. In this interrogation of power, the subsets of IR have been relegated to the margins, both within the mainstream and within the hierarchy of the subset, to gnaw towards the center of a perceived “authentic” political knowledge. Questioning knowledge re/productions has proven difficult, but these critical reflections have brought important moments of crises that have contributed to epistemological shifts within the framework of IR. However, a crisis is still upon *us*, the multifaceted participants of IR theorization and methods, because theorizations and methodologies continue to re/produce people in ways that target or erase particular people within the international system.

This field statement is concerned with the processes of *mapping*, which I am defining as the *desire* to fix, to make bodies legible, and to recover a certain body that can be accessible and assimilated into IR frameworks for the epistemological and material advancement of certain *bodies* of knowledge. IR theories of inter/national security continue to *map* out the *world's*

political, economic, and social relations and in doing so the discipline marks *bodies* as the sites of these relations. The main concern of this statement is how bodies are mapped as the sites of politics without the adequate reflection upon how these mappings re/produce dichotomous epistemic and material violences that construct the body as either the privileged site of agency or the victimized *Other*.

I am inquiring about the possibility to theorize and methodologize international relations without targeting bodies as sites of destruction because *Bodies Matter*. It may seem superfluous to explain why bodies matter, but a historic reflection upon human interaction illustrates a series of relations where people have been subject to a multitude of bodily (and emotional) harm. Processes of war, structures of racism, slavery, the penal institution, and interpersonal violence all mark the body with forms of violence and it is not just *any body* who feels the affects of these violences. Knowledge re/productions inform who is to be targeted within these processes, structures, and interpersonal interactions. These knowledges include those that are re/produced within the academy.

I have chosen to look at the site of IR to flesh out understandings of material and epistemic violence because the discipline has been constructed around the theorization and methodologization of security, conflict, and war, all of which are major components of and to violence. I am interested in the way that different formulations of IR map out bodily violence and how those knowledge re/productions have affected the relationships of violence in both material and epistemological ways. Precisely because of the current political moment of the *US War on Terror*, which simultaneously spectacularizes and normalizes the brutalization of bodies, IR theorists must seriously reflect upon the historic engagements of neo/colonial and neo/imperial productions within the discipline of IR and how these processes continue to inform, and at times impede, our political practice.

More specifically, I am interested in how IR has re/produced the spectacle and normalization of bodies through its theories and methodologies. For example, how do we understand the US military bombing of Afghanistan to free Afghani women? Or how do we explain the terror involved in the raping of South Vietnamese civilians by members of the US military who occupy the region under the claim of protecting these same civilians from the oppressive grips of North Vietnam? How do *we*, as theorists, participate in the torture of Iraqi detainees at the Abu Ghraib prison? These questions are located within contexts of US warfare,

where the rhetoric and justifications of the US government are to protect *embodied*¹² national interests of democracy, capitalism, god, and civilization against the terror and chaos of wartime and disorder. Understandings and materializations of violences are enabled through the epistemological history of national interest that *desires* to protect some bodies from the terrorizing *Other*. As this paper will further discuss, the knowledges re/produced within IR are very much part of these constructions.

In an effort to negotiate out some of the desires and affects of IR knowledge re/productions, I would like to focus on the struggles, interventions, and problematics of feminist IR. More specifically, I am concerned with the ways in which feminist IR theorizes and methodologizes bodies. First, it is necessary to call attention to the historic and increasing tensions within and related to feminist IR. I am focusing on feminist IR because of my own level of attachment and commitment to the work that it has introduced throughout the years and the possibilities it could produce if it became more reflective of its own embodied interests within ideas of protection and terror. I *desire* a more committed *anti-racist feminist praxis*¹³ within feminist IR.¹⁴ A praxis where ideas of *racialized, sexualized gender within a global political economy*¹⁵ are taken seriously because heteronormativity and heterosexual re/production are put into crises, where bodies are not mapped as the sites of theory, politics or violence, and where the desires and interests of the theory producing self does not dominate over the conflictual and collaborative struggles of a larger political community. For decades ‘women of color’ feminisms, ‘third world’ feminisms, and cultural theorists have theorized and written about the complex asymmetrical power structures and relations within an understanding of international relations and the body, yet mainstream feminist IR rarely engages in a political project that utilizes these teachings. Those who do are pushed further from the center of discussions within IR, demonstrating that there are incredibly high political and emotional stakes involved in critiquing an already contested site of IR theorization. While feminist IR seeks to protect itself from attack, it targets those who threaten it with exclusion or denial.

What are the contradictory complicities of knowledge re/production that simultaneously protect some bodies (in its metaphorical entirety) and terrorize *Others*? Why does feminist IR continue to trip over or silence its involvement in knowledge re/productions that map ideas of *Otherness*? Is it useful to remain attached to an idea of feminist IR? I was recently asked, “Is feminist IR an oxymoron? Has it become *domesticated* within the discipline of IR?”¹⁶ These two

questions made me realize that processes of racialized, sexualized neo/colonization and neo/imperialism are still not taken seriously despite explicit attempts.¹⁷ Feminist IR can no longer securitize its borders from other forms and ideas of feminist theory, collaborative work is a necessity.

My understanding of feminist IR is that it is a body of thought that seeks to reveal contradictory theories and practices within IR that terrorizes *gendered* bodies in a multitude of ways. I have understood feminist IR to claim a feminist praxis that works to be aware of intersectionalities, multiplicities, and dynamic relations of power so that *gendered* perspectives of security, war, and conflict would not be silenced and violated within the discipline; that it would negotiate and grapple within itself to avoid being complicit in the marking of bodies for physical and structural forms of violence. Unfortunately, there are few critical theorizations of *differently gendered bodies*¹⁸ that question the assumptions within the political projects of both IR and feminist IR. Are there ways to discuss racialized, sexualized gender within a global political economy which refuses the mapping of differently gendered bodies? This question is not to deny the histories of struggle that feminist IR has experienced, which has introduced crucial spaces of critical theorization. Nor is this an attempt to silence those who have actively and painfully been involved in the years of struggle within feminist IR to re/address the very critique I am raising. My purpose is to re/verbalize the theoretical normalization and violence that has taken place within the discipline because too many assumptions and contradictions have been perpetuated. This pedagogical crisis looms large.

For example, why do theorizations of differently gendered bodies continue to take place through a collapsed heteronormative understanding of *man* and *woman* that is then mapped onto assumed ideas of sexuality, race, and class that are constantly disjointed or slapped together for purposes of 'clear' analysis? Or why is there continuous struggle to situate bodies within legal frameworks that mark these bodies legible or illegible to human rights according to an archaic idea of the state and legal frameworks that continue to perpetuate forms of violence? Why is feminist IR refashioning *Othered* bodies for its own interests of protection and understanding of social justice? In short, why does feminist IR continue to map its interests, desires, and legibilities on *Othered* bodies, particularly in an effort to be heard by the mainstream?

Much of the problem within the mapping of bodies is the inability to discuss the complexities and multiplicities involved within the theorization and methodologies of bodies.

Theorists discuss only certain understandings of the body at a time. For example, increasingly IR theorists have attempted to re/address ideas of sexuality, but these analyses fall short in an acknowledgement or theorization of race.¹⁹ Few have taken the intellectual risks necessary to discuss ideas of racialized, sexualized gender within a global political economy²⁰ and in doing so these few have created a malleable space for epistemological shifts and political change. Feminist IR must become fully accountable to these complex histories of struggle within IR. It needs to be accountable to what has been constructed as “outside” the discipline, such as ‘women of color’ and ‘third world’ feminisms to name only two examples, because these refusals contribute to the continued mapping of *Othered* bodies. Knowledge re/productions that ignore the complexities and multiplicities of knowing and being in the world bestow epistemological and material violences upon particular people, which stunt the transformative and collaborative possibilities of feminist IR.

I am calling on feminist IR to ask *us*²¹ to collaboratively think about the implications of the knowledges we re/produce. What is assumed and who is targeted? Whom do these theories serve? If IR theories help to make bodies legible, feminist IR needs to seriously consider the possibilities of violence that could be derived from these markings. IR continues to refashion people to fit into desired categories of analysis—again I ask whose political purpose does this serve? This line of questioning is not to deny the material realities of those who request protection from the state or practices of law because of their experiences with various forms of violence, rather this is to question the ways in which structures of protection are theorized and re/produced within IR. Where is terror produced in our own work and how might feminist IR re/negotiate these re/productions of violence?

In short, I am suggesting a re/negotiation of feminist IR. I am asking that feminist IR acknowledge the histories of struggle not only within the theorizations of IR but within other locations of feminist theory and the world at large. In this discussion, I am hoping to provide a space that is committed to a continued open dialogue, one that questions *our* attachments to IR, and one that critically analyzes what and whom feminist IR protects and terrorizes. I am hoping to create a space where conversations that normally do not get put together can, in fact, be put together. Within the collaboration and conflict of interdisciplinary work there can be hope for the development of accountable theorizations, methodologies, and praxis within feminist IR and IR that could lessen both epistemological and material violences. I am examining the

contestations of power that are taking place within the devaluation of certain theories to illuminate what can be learned from these power struggles.

I will begin my analysis with a discussion of the critical interventions that feminist IR theorist Cynthia Enloe has made into mainstream IR through her theorizations of militarization. This analysis will include an illustration of how even critical interventions can re/produce the methodology of mapping bodies. I will be discussing Enloe's foundational and groundbreaking text, *Does Khaki Become You?*, to show how her methodological and theoretical style not only reveals silenced violences of the military and state, but also contributes to 'other' possibilities of epistemological and material violence. Secondly, I will discuss how Enloe's frameworks of mapping bodies continue to be re/produced within current feminist IR, particularly the recent literature that focuses on gender and rights. This is particularly important because it reveals the continued *ignore-ance* of the complexities and multiplicities of differently gendered bodies within theory, method, and practice. Thirdly, I will analyze the possibilities of negotiating through dichotomous processes of mapping, where bodies are neither removed nor privileged as the site of IR theorization and practice, through other locations of feminist theory and method such as 'women of color', 'third world', and 'African' feminisms in an effort to bring together 'separated' conversations. The purpose of this discussion is (1) to deny the body as spectacle, (2) to re/consider how IR theorization participates within the *commodification of bodies*, and (3) to provide a space for collaborative re/theorizations of desire and security within and throughout an increasingly porous boundary of IR.²²

Mappings

Find another connection to the rest of the world
Find something else to make you legitimate
Find some other way to be political and hip

I will not be the bridge to your womanhood
Your manhood
Your human-ness

--Kate Rushin²³

One way that I would like to ground some of the above listed questions is through an *historical* discussion of the military and militarization within feminist IR. I think it is important to realize how feminist IR is complicit in the regulation of bodies that it critiques. I start this process with a discussion of Cynthia Enloe's work. Enloe has written extensively on the effects of militarization on women's lives, ideas of masculinity and the military, and thoughts about

feminist international politics.²⁴ Enloe's work, 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 was previously being silenced by mainstream IR. Enloe's texts have been foundational to the understanding of international relations and feminist IR and have provided a critical feminist framework that has been built upon throughout the years. Enloe was one of the first theorists within IR to go against the canonical grain to illuminate understandings of the intersectionalities of power within militaristic discourses and practices that re/produce 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 Mappings

It is necessary to utilize Enloe's texts in a judicious way that illuminates historical contexts that have produced both the possibilities and limitations of feminist IR theorizations, methodologies, representations, and re/productions of knowledges. For example, all of Enloe's books gesture 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 the contradictory approaches by the state and military that represent women as binaries, some to be protected ("wives, daughters, mothers and sweethearts") and others to be exploited ("prostitutes/camp followers"), is a means to assert control over women throughout various geopolitical territories. These binaries mark women's bodies through homogenous constructions of race, class, culture, and hetero/sexuality that target women differently for abuse by the military depending upon the relationship of the woman to the military. Either side of the binary situates woman within a space of vulnerability and victimization. For example, Enloe explains that US military bases exploit non-US women by creating a market for prostitution and vulnerabilities to rape and disease.²⁵ 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 an *outside* social structure to receive support. Enloe highlights some of the contradictions of US military practice, which problematizes the relationship between women and protection/security. According to Enloe, these contradictory relationships of power solidify the collective body (structure) of the military.²⁶ While importantly illustrating how binary constructions of women by the military re/produce different forms of violences against women, her analysis collapses *different bodies* into *one body* of exploitation. This sets up problematic possibilities for a collaborative feminist politics that is interested in change and solidarity work not only because it narrows the framework to one of victimhood, but also because it sets up a hierarchy of exploitation amongst groups of women without particularly identifying how women construct and are constructed by these complex set of relations.²⁷

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, wives) and which women are to be exploited (brown, poor, foreign) but, on the other hand, like 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'.²⁸

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? Why?... You're black, why are you doing this to me?'²⁹

This example suggests 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. But what do these examples offer a theorization of racialized, sexualized gender within a global political economy and a theory of militarization? Importantly, they illustrate contradictions within the static mapping of women's bodies, but the way that

Enloe shows these contradictions is still through a stable understanding of women's bodies that is then mapped onto the critique of binary constructions of women based on their race through the eyes of military men. These examples continue to produce women as static, agentless bodies within the knowledge re/productions of military men and feminist IR.

While Enloe's analysis attempts to reveal normalized military violences within IR theory, she can do so only in relationship to the framework already provided within IR. The state, military, women, and men may have contradictions but they are accepted bodies of analysis. Race, gender, sexuality, and class are given categories of analysis. But what does woman constitute? How do the ideas of the state change in various locations? How is race formulated within the larger political project of the book and the discipline of IR? Enloe lacks a reflective theorization of her 'subject', which silences the complexities of power and desire involved within the construction of bodies and categorical analysis both within her texts and IR in general. The main impetus of *Does Khaki Become You?* is to show that "all spheres of a women's life can and have been militarized".³⁰ Again, how does this analysis speak to an understanding of racialized, sexualized gender within a global political economy—how does it speak to a theory of militarization? I think inadequately because not only does Enloe conflate gender into ideas of woman and military man, which she constructs as stable universalized categories crossculturally, but both of these bodies become legible spectacles in which the violences of capitalist patriarchy can viewed and theorized.

Much of the ongoing critique within feminist IR is *still* talking about the conflation of "gender" and "women",³¹ but Enloe's foundational framework is more than a mere conflation. It is an unreflective acceptance of bodies of analysis. This acceptance continues to locate politics upon women's bodies, a normalization that she was struggling to demystify.

For it seemed to me that by revealing both how military forces had depended on women and had tried to hide that dependence, *we*, as women could expose a vulnerable side of the military which is usually overlooked. [my emphasis]³²

This vulnerable side of the military is only revealed through the vulnerability of women. Enloe produces an homogenized woman as the site of agency through her location of victimization, who is given 'voice' by the theorist and collapsing an understanding of *we*. Enloe's theorization of the military and the state is only legible through the visibility of *woman*. The question becomes not only how the military reads women's bodies, but how does her theory re/produce

bodies that are legible to the intellectual? For example, focusing on an *idea* of woman and how she is affected by processes of militarization creates and enforces a process of *finding bodies* to mark as woman, as race, as class, as any categorical formulation made possible because it is not a theorization, it is a methodological mapping. This process seeks to make women's bodies legible so that they can be understood by the IR community for the purpose of exposing military exploitation, but it is crucial to think about the political implications of targeting bodies for theoretical and methodological mapping. As Enloe is trying to uncover silenced forms of military exploitation and give her understanding of these women's 'voice' within the context of IR theorization, she is marking women within these particular bodily and geographical locations as victims of the military structure. This form of marking re/produces particular knowledges about women within these areas and limits the possibility of multiplicities within their lives and experiences. It also targets a particular understanding of women as the site for further academic theorization, meaning women become the targets of academic exploitation where the theorist controls an understanding of their agency and re/produces it for the IR community. This raises serious questions about the accountability of the theorist in re/producing knowledges that seek to make an understanding of *women* legible to IR theories and methodologies. For whom does this process serve—the prostitute in Vietnam or the theorist seeking a tenure track position?

Reconfiguring Cartographies

According to Chandra Talpade Mohanty, locating and writing women's bodies in such a way is an "exercise of power and domination,"³³ it is a colonial project of controlling bodies. Enloe's project, like most IR projects, becomes about mastering bodies.³⁴ This type of project solidifies *the body of woman*, and narrows the possibilities of agency and multiplicities of being by mapping victimization, responsibility, and categorical formulation upon women's bodies. The process of finding woman to be named, known, and understood is a project of colonial legibility³⁵ because it renders women visible to an *actively normalized*³⁶ hegemonic discourse by the theorist without the necessary critical reflection upon its imperialistic quality. This critique is enabled because of the prior work of Gayatri Spivak's discussion on ideas of the subaltern³⁷ and Mohanty's discussion on "women as category of analysis" and the production of "third world woman" within ideas of western feminist scholarship.³⁸ I have chosen to discuss Spivak's and Mohanty's theorizations not out of a desire to conflate the two, but rather because they have been

two of the most widely cited scholars within the feminist IR literature that has sought to critique mainstream IR and feminist IR. It is a deliberate choice on my part to highlight old lessons that continue to be contested and refused to be learned.

Spivak cautions the intellectual to acknowledge the complexity of the power relations involved within the desires and interest to *represent* the silenced *Other* by invoking the question why does the theorist desire to make *Other* voices heard? In doing so, she warns *us* to be aware of the “continuing construction of the subaltern” who is thought to be able to be found and given voice. Performing this process causes the intellectual to link up “imperialist subject-constitution” together with the retrieval of “silenced areas”. This can be seen as a form of epistemic violence because it marks bodies as the “muted” subaltern woman without calling into question how this marking could be wrong or how it affects the bodies that it seeks to reveal.³⁹ Spivak is not against the retrieval of silenced voices per se, but rather concerned with the processes that produce *the voice* of the supposedly unspoken and for what political purpose that then serves. According to Caren Kaplan and Inderpal Grewal, anglo-american feminists tend to misread Spivak’s discussion as the subaltern cannot speak. This misreading enables anglo-american feminism to be the site of the subaltern’s voice in which the theorist becomes the interpreter of this voice. Kaplan and Grewal explain that “the intensity of the desire to extract authentic information and testimony from what is perceived to be peripheral or “other” suggests that what is necessary for an Anglo-American feminism is the misrecognition of complicity in colonial and neocolonial discursive formations”.⁴⁰

It is this point that concerns me about Enloe’s methodological mapping. Enloe desires to reveal the militarized violence that takes place upon women’s bodies. She seeks to give visibility to the women that the military silences, abuses, and relies on. This process of representing an understanding of victimized bodies begs the question, at whose expense? The answer is complicated because it cannot be denied that some women may benefit from the un-silencing of the military’s exploitation of women possibly through law cases where military men are brought to trial, through the demand of human rights abuses against the military becoming known and acknowledged internationally, or through women being able to have access to other knowledges and experiences that would then enable collective work to contest military oppression. However, the method continues to present and locate an understanding of other women as victimized and without agency and certain women as having the agency and power to

represent them. In Enloe's mapping of military exploitation in which she herself desires to empower other women, she contains understandings of these women only within the space of oppression and thus separates herself from an understanding of accountability of her actions and positions of exploitation.

Mohanty's theorization develops out of different discursive and political contexts, but is critical to the understanding of accountability of the intellectual when mapping women's bodies for the purpose of theory and method that could then inform state policies. Mohanty is concerned with western feminism's re/production of the universalized category of woman and the dichotomous and asymmetrical construction of first world/third world woman to serve the theorizations of western feminists. Mohanty clearly explains that the utilization of women as category assumes "an already constituted, coherent group with identical interests and desires".⁴¹ The lack of theoretical critique around the constructions and utilizations of categories perpetuates forms of epistemic violence because it solidifies static and homogenous representations of being in order to mark and control bodies. *Othering* and constructions of binaries silence the politics within each side of the binary that makes the other side possible. Whom do these binary constructions serve? According to Mohanty, it serves the imperialistic desire and interest of the intellectual within the larger political-economic-social context.

By contrasting the representation of women in the third world with what I refer to earlier as Western feminisms' self-presentation in the same context, we see how Western feminists alone become the true "subjects" of this counterhistory. Third world women, on the other hand, never rise above the debilitating generality of their "object" status.⁴²

Again, I invoke Enloe's desire and interest within her representations.

For it seemed to me that by revealing both how military forces had depended on women and had tried to hide that dependence, we, as women could expose a vulnerable side of the military which is usually overlooked.⁴³

Within IR, this could be viewed as a process about protecting the self within the *crazy-making*⁴⁴ of the discipline, meaning it could be a gesture towards transnational collaborative work that strives to demystify asymmetrical relations of power. Enloe desires to collaboratively "expose a vulnerable side of the military," but what are the political ends of this work? It is unclear what, if at all, is transformed from this exposure. Enloe's successive texts suggest little transformation. Instead they reveal further victimization, vulnerability, and militarization that have expanded onto other bodily sites throughout the world. Despite the desire to reveal social injustice for the hopes of justice, one cannot separate the re/production of theory from political

economy and the material specializations of jobs and advancement. While theorists climb up the institutional ladder, *othered* bodies remain within their *othered* locations. So again, what are the political stakes in representing *Others*? It is crucial for theorists to reflect upon their own desires and interests in representing silenced violence within the constructions of *Other*. We risk not only silencing or interpellating our contradictory and privileged selves within these representations, but we risk silencing the complexity of power relations, the silencing of larger political projects of capitalist imperialism and resistance, and the silencing of bodies and spirits. The mapping of bodies within feminist IR refashions ideas of subjectivity to be visibly silenced for a multitude of political objectives and this crazy-making must be re/considered.

While recognizing that Enloe's text was written twenty-two years ago, this critique revisits her piece out of a concern that her framework of making women's bodies legible to IR theory continues to be replicated by feminist IR as a way to make understandings of women visible and legible within world politics to serve the intellectual's desires. This verges dangerously towards the imperialistic constructions that Mohanty and Spivak critiqued decades ago. I am also quite aware that this critique is not *new* within feminist IR. There has been a constitutive and contested triple process of (1) feminist IR wanting to be heard by mainstream IR, (2) feminist IR protecting itself from the terrors of the mainstream, and (3) feminists within feminist IR challenging its own monolithic constructions. There have been and continue to be struggles within feminist IR that are part of the Spivakian and Mohantian critiques.⁴⁵ Again, this is not to deny the existence of these critiques, rather it is to continue to work towards a larger collective project that challenges knowledge re/productions and neo/colonial territorialization of knowledge. Much of feminist IR, even many of those who critique it, continues to produce political knowledges and critiques through the sites of women's bodies (particularly women of othered bodily and geographical locations such as women of color and women within the 'third world') and through regurgitated masculinist hegemonic concepts within the discipline.⁴⁶

Cartographies of the Same

The foundation of feminist IR may never change, as is suggested by the subtitle to Enloe's 2004 text—"Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire,"⁴⁷ but reforming the foundational texts is not the main concern of this discussion. The seriousness of this critique is embroiled within the current literature's re/production of *women's legibility* to explain world

politics and promote the protection of particular bodies within IR theory and legal frameworks.⁴⁸ Increasingly, theorizations of war and gender have focused on soldiers' practice of sexual abuse as a violation of human and humanitarian rights and a form of genocide.⁴⁹ Human rights theorizations within IR have become about how to protect certain bodies from forms of hetero/sexual terror and abuse performed by *Othered* bodies. However, in order to decipher who to protect and who are the terrorists, bodies are rendered legible to theory and law. Bodies must fit into a predetermined framework that determines their worth for distribution of 'justice'. The theorization of international human and humanitarian rights law within feminist IR continues to replicate the practice of searching out bodies that can be made legible to ideas and practices of rights. My question is not about how the law reads or does not read particular bodies; rather it is about how and why feminist IR is producing a body of literature that makes certain bodies legible to itself and international policy through its theoretical and methodological mappings?

One example of making bodies legible for the protection of citizens under humanitarian law is R. Charli Carpenter's, *"Women, Children and Other Vulnerable Groups": Strategic Frames and the Protection of Civilians as a Transnational Issue*.⁵⁰ Carpenter claims to be providing an "explanation for the use of gender essentialisms" within international *human and humanitarian*⁵¹rights efforts to protect civilians from the consequences of war.⁵² The essentialisms that Carpenter is highlighting are the "tropes associating men and women with mutually exclusive and oppositional attributes".⁵³ Her concern is with the perpetuation of stereotypes that produce women and children as both vulnerable and innocent within a state of war, but exclude adult males because they are produced as combatants. Carpenter explains that these understandings are distorted because there are contradictory positions of female and child soldiers and non-combatant adult males. According to Carpenter, this perpetuation of stereotypes by human and humanitarian rights advocates "fails to recognize and address the specific protection needs of civilian males".⁵⁴ Importantly, Carpenter is concerned with the ways that the transnational community (this includes international and non-governmental bureaucrats, citizens, journalists, and statespersons) re/produces norms surrounding military and war activity, which are codified by international humanitarian law, that only protect an understanding of the stereotypical civilian and re/produce narrow understandings of human security.⁵⁵ Carpenter argues that the use of "women and children" is a strategic discourse to gain access to

international agendas for human and humanitarian rights, thus not always benefiting all of war affected society.

Carpenter is interested in the cost/benefit analysis of the use of gender essentialisms. Methodologically, she looks at how civilian protection has been “articulated and politicized in the post-Cold War era with respect to different transnational audiences, and the way in which pre-existing gender discourses regarding war-affected populations influenced this process of strategic social construction.”⁵⁶ Carpenter “identifies and codes” the use of women, men, girls and boys through the analysis of documents, minutes, and other online texts of social networks on the United Nations Official Document System, as well as through interviews with officials from various transnational organizations that deal with war affected populations, to see how these categories are being utilized. Carpenter suggests that her findings of high utilization of “women and children” in relationship to the concepts of “civilian,” “vulnerable,” “peace,” and “victims” support international networks that use the language and imagery of victimization of women and children to bring the issue of civilian protection to the forefront of humanitarian law activism. According to Carpenter, it is through these processes that men are excluded from the category of civilian and are assumed as potential combatants based on their *gender*, while women and children are protected within the category of civilian because they are assumed to be peaceful and vulnerable.⁵⁷ Carpenter argues that these discourses “invoke specific gendered understandings regarding who deserves protection and why”.⁵⁸ In short, Carpenter is saying that because of their gender and the existence of gender essentialisms within the law and discourses of transnational communities, women and children are targeted as vulnerable and needing the protection of humanitarian law and draft age men fail to be encompassed within the rubric of civilian protection. Carpenter further explains that despite ‘gender mainstreaming’ approaches started in the 1990s by development and humanitarian organizations, the framing of civilians continues to either re/produce civilians as women and children or it negates the category of civilian through the framing of women and children as possible combatants.⁵⁹

While Carpenter importantly points out some possible contradictions of the discourses and practices around civilian protection and gender essentialisms, her discussion continues to locate the politics of these discourses and practices on the sites of women’s bodies because it is about locating and the targeting of women in order to highlight the silencing and exclusion of men. Gender continues to conflate into an understanding of man/woman that can be identified as

we see with her methodological mapping. While her methodological codifying of the utilization of “women and children” in relationship to vulnerability is a powerful illustration of the *numbers*, it also illustrates her reinforcement of pre-existing categories and frameworks that locate an understanding of woman in relationship to man. This woman is an othered woman from the perspective of the theorist or the humanitarian advocate when she is categorized as vulnerable, in need of protection, and lacking a voice which only the theorist or humanitarian can provide. I am referring not only to Carpenter’s unreflective examination of gender as a conflation to pre-existing understandings of woman and man, but also the lack of questioning that would reflect upon her own accountabilities within her gender constructions and production of civilian. Carpenter alludes to the idea that there are gaps of ethnicity, class, and sexuality within the construction of the gendered discussions of civilian, but she never interrogates what this may mean for her analysis. Instead, she re/produces an universalized understanding of “woman” and “man” within the context of war by not questioning her own and other theorist’s statements about how wo/men experience war. She re/produces ideas that wo/men in Rwanda experience war in the same way as wo/men in Bosnia. Carpenter also re/produces a binary understanding of women because she never questions the dichotomy of woman as civilian/woman as combatant, she only points out that women could be either and that they are not always just civilians. She produces the same understanding of men by arguing some men are civilians and not always combatants. Her analysis lacks the fundamental interrogation of the meaning and utility of continuing the civilian/combatant divide because she follows the predetermined framing of humanitarian rights. All that is re/produced from her analysis is the call for the inclusion of men within the category of civilian.

This is an example of both methodological inversion and insertion that Spivak has warned against because Carpenter’s theorization continues to support the idea of binary relationships of human/humanitarian, civilian/combatant, men/women, and vulnerable/protection through the ‘adding’ of men and the ‘targeting’ of men for inclusion into civilian protection.⁶⁰ The conversation fails to disrupt the categorical and political meanings of re/producing a need for humanitarian rights, as well as failing to disrupt gender essentialisms she is claiming to explain. This is a difficult critique to make because materially people die from the effects of war and putting more people into the frameworks of rights and protection could save their lives, but this form of method and theorization continues to support and replicate the same static

understandings of international relations that mainstream IR has re/produced for years. Her analysis merely makes pockets of inclusion within a violent structure that will continue to devalue bodies for its own relationships of power. In Carpenter's illumination of the contradictions of the strategic use of women as civilians by transnational communities as part of a global political economy of civilian production, which she argues benefits these humanitarian advocates but only marginally benefits wo/men, she fails to question the political economy of war, law, and academic theory that make it possible for her to make that claim in the first place.

I choose to discuss Carpenter's piece at length because, while it attempts to provide a critique and reformulation of gender essentialisms within the context of war, security and law, I see it to be a methodological re/production of locating static categories of wo/men to be made legible to IR theory and practice. Despite the twenty-two years between Enloe's and Carpenter's pieces, the methodology of recovering a certain body that is accessible and assimilated into IR frameworks remains the same. I am concerned with this lack of theoretical and methodological growth within both mainstream IR and an understanding of mainstream feminist IR. It appears this lack of growth exists partially because of mainstream feminist IR's continued desire to be heard and understood by mainstream IR, thus keeping it within a narrow framework of language, methods, and theories. For example, Anne Tickner argues that there is a miscommunication between feminist IR and mainstream IR because of feminism's different ontological and epistemological approaches to IR. However, her conversation is kept within the framework of mainstream IR's theoretical knowledges because mainstream 'just cannot understand' feminist approaches.⁶¹ Tickner proceeds to explain feminism to the mainstream, but she does so in such a way that she re/produces feminism as a critique against the mainstream rather than existing within and along side of it. This justifies the exploitive power of the mainstream to remain methodologically and theoretically myopic because feminist IR always has to speak back to it through its own language in order to be recognized.

Tickner also re/produces feminist IR as a homogenous group that has the same goals, knowledge frameworks, and understandings of international relations. Her explanations and examples of feminism and feminist IR remain within a social constructivist understanding of equality between 'men' and 'women'. Again, there is no reflection upon what gender and feminism means beyond the binary construction of men/women and ideas of equality. What are the racializations and sexualizations within a global political economy that produce

understandings of gender and feminism? Instead of interrogating the relationships of power that produce feminist IR as separate from mainstream or interrogating the relationships of power within feminist IR, Tickner is more concerned with pointing out how feminist IR is misunderstood by mainstream IR. So she calls on mainstream IR 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”.⁶² In Tickner’s attempt to bring mainstream IR and mainstream feminist IR (though she would not call it such) into conversation with one another, she solidifies extremely narrow understandings of feminism and feminist theory that remain contained within mainstream IR’s framework making feminist IR the victimized other.

Another example of incorporating feminist IR into the mainstream is Carpenter’s discussion on how to “mainstream gender” within IR.⁶³ Carpenter’s analysis, like Tickner’s, re/produces feminism’s goal as ending women’s oppression. According to Carpenter, the gap between feminist IR and mainstream IR is about “overcoming the notion that gender studies is a feminist preserve”.⁶⁴ For Carpenter, feminist IR would be taken more seriously if it clarified itself through the approaches of constructivism, which would give space for feminist and nonfeminist constructivists to forge new methods and theories about world politics. In short, feminist IR (again re/produced as an homogenous group) needs to incorporate the methods and theories of the mainstream in order to be recognized as a valid approach to international politics. These two examples support the idea that part of the problem for the lack of theoretical and methodological growth within mainstream feminist IR’s re/productions is because of its continued focus on speaking within the frameworks of mainstream IR.

These two examples also highlight the failure of mainstream feminist IR to expand the possibilities and multiplicities of knowledge re/productions within feminist IR and mainstream IR because of their continued focus on coming up with a definition of *gender* and *feminism* that can be made legible to themselves and mainstream IR. While it is necessary to develop knowledges around theories, methods, and practice, the growth of the multiplicities of knowledge is restricted when one constantly tries to capture a particular meaning that can then be universally applied. For example, in 2003 the *International Studies Review* published a forum on “Gender and International Relations” with Terrell Carver, Marysia Zalewski, Helen Kinsella, and R. Charli Carpenter.⁶⁵ The four following questions were the subject of debate:

1. What is the relationship between conceptualizations of gender and different forms of feminist and non-feminist IR?
2. What influence does methodological choice have on conceptualizing gender?
3. What are the available methodologies and what rightly influences a researcher's choice?
4. What understanding of sex and sexuality go into different conceptualizations of gender, and which ones are particularly relevant in IR?⁶⁶

These questions alone illustrate IR's process of locating that which is legible to its frameworks. There is no interest in the 'how' or the 'why' gender is constructed as a necessary category of analysis, nor is there a possibility that gender may encompass or be in relationship with more than the categorizations of sex or sexuality. The focus of the discussion is to target "gender" as a category of analysis and define it to the larger audience of IR so they can decide if it is 'relevant' or not to use methodologically and theoretically in their re/productions of world politics.

What type of project is this? It is a project of legibility that seeks to *know* gender for the theorists' own recognition and contribution to the field of IR. It is not about collaboratively working to develop multiplicities of knowledge that can offer perspectives on ideas of feminism and gender. I say this because throughout the forum each participant talks about the plurality of possibilities feminism offers theory, that there is no one definition of feminism, but then they all keep an idea of feminism within an idea of gender that is tied to ideas of sexed bodies, particularly women, who are devoid of intersectionalities⁶⁷ and multiplicities. In short, "knowing gender" or "sexing feminist IR" continues to re/produce knowledges of feminism in binary relationship to mainstream IR, it continues to seek definitions that are recognized by the mainstream, and this type of feminist theorizing continues to re/produce a monolithic and homogenous understanding of feminism and feminist IR. Kinsella is correct when she states,

A number of us suspect that it is because gender analysis necessarily requires an exploration of disciplinary and productive power—exactly that which is considered to contaminate the fundamental and ostensibly neutral binaries of fact-value, problem solving-critical theory, and brute-social so beloved by international relations scholars and upon which claims are staked and careers are made.⁶⁸

However, what she fails to articulate in this instance, and what most of mainstream feminist IR refuses to see, is that this exploration of disciplinary and productive power should also be taking place within the multiple locations and positionalities of feminist IR. The lack of growth within much of feminist IR's methods and theories is a result of the lack of reflection upon the ways in

which knowledges of feminism are re/produced by feminist IR scholars. It is hard to deny that this process continues because careers are made from it.

If feminist IR is to be accountable to the knowledges it re/produces and the populations these knowledges affect, it must seriously look within itself to re/configure its relationship to ideas of feminism, gender, and wo/men and strive for interdisciplinary work within its own various locations. Feminist IR needs to work collaboratively with the multiplicities of feminist theories and knowledges, it cannot afford to continue to reconstitute itself through itself and in relationship to mainstream frameworks. Feminist IR must unsettle itself through the critiques and locations of other forms of feminism that keep knowledges in constant fluctuation and thus provide the space for multiplicities of knowing and being. The securitization of feminist IR's borders must be halted and critical, collaborative, transborder projects supported in an effort to produce transformative methodological, theoretical, and material understandings of the world. Listening to and utilizing the multiplicities of feminist theories and *meanings of feminism* produced by 'women of color' feminisms, 'third world' feminisms, critical race theory, cultural theory, and literary theory to name only a few, could enable collective political struggles that would shift the epistemological and material terrors that keep mainstream feminist IR in a seemingly constant state of insecurity. The project no longer is about how to get others to think critically, it is about how to critically think within a collaborative group of other critical thinkers. In short, the feminist project of making feminism, gender, and wo/man legible to larger frameworks of analysis (methods, theories, hegemonic thought) needs to be reconfigured so that the body of woman is not targeted as the site of world politics that can be known, theorized, and used by academics and state policy makers to further their own advancements in the name of women's empowerment and equality. This reconfiguration requires 'new' methodological and theoretical frameworks that target, track and/or make legible conceptualizations and relations of power rather than bodies. Again, this is not to remove bodies from the discussion of world politics, rather it is to deny the targeting of particular bodies for theories, laws, and policies that seek to determine and control certain people's existence and placement within the world. One way to unsettle the solidified methodological and theoretical structures of mainstream feminist IR is to listen to and utilize various constructions of 'feminist' theory, method, and praxis located in various disciplinary locations. I propose that the lessons, experiences, and teachings of 'women of color' feminisms, 'third world' feminisms, critical race theory, cultural theory and

critical literary theory provide multiplicities of knowing and being within the world that together undo monolithic knowledge constructions of western, white, liberal feminism that dominates feminist IR. The mappings of particular bodies for theoretical and material exploitation must end.

Multiplicities

...and until our white sisters indicate by their actions that they want to join us in our struggle because it is theirs also. This means a commitment to a truly communal education where we learn from each other because we want to learn each other, the kind of commitment to a truly communal education where we learn from each other because we want to learn from each other, the kind of commitment we do not seem to have at the present time...

--Mitsuye Yamada⁶⁹

The re/productions of histories affect possibilities, understandings, and constructions of ideas on feminism. Sherna Gluck importantly questions “whose histories” and “whose feminisms” are re/produced as *The History of Feminism* and for “whose benefit”?⁷⁰ V. Spike Peterson introduces a similar set of questions to IR in relationship to the study of states and institutions when she asks, “What is security? Whose security? How does security affect people differently”?⁷¹ Peterson interrogates these questions by offering the idea of moving beyond state sovereignty to discuss notions of world security and what they may look like within the modern state system. Importantly, Peterson is not asking for the inclusion of women in state security practices; rather, she is critically questioning the contradictions of state security for women. She is not asking for a reform of the state, she is introducing the possibility of questioning the institution itself and looking for ways to (re)envision the institution and processes of security as we know them. This (re)envisioning is not an institutional reform because it requires thinking about dichotomous histories produced through the processes of institutionalization and rejecting naturalized constructions of the state so that the state becomes unrecognizable to its current form. Peterson calls not for a dualistic alternative to the state; rather, she is motioning towards multiple conceptualizations of the state in order to understand and transform structural violences that certain people are made vulnerable to and within.⁷² Much like Peterson’s claims, this section is not seeking a reform of feminism, it is providing a space for re/conceptualizing theories, methods, and practices of feminism within IR. Gluck’s and Peterson’s questions are a necessity within feminist IR analysis. The following discussion of feminisms re/produced differently within various geographical, theoretical, and methodological locations opens up the space to

think about ‘new’ collaborative methodological and theoretical frameworks that could strengthen the work of feminist IR. History making is not only a project of the past, it is a project of the present. Let it be clear that this discussion is not an attempt to incorporate ‘other’ women’s histories (insertion and inversion) into feminist IR to be named and known, rather it is an attempt to make apparent some of the complexities of the relations of power involved within re/producing feminist knowledges. In short, the following discussion highlights the multiplicities of ideas on feminism and feminist histories, as well as illustrating how multiplicities of feminist thought, activism, and methodology have developed within and along side one another (be it in collaboration or conflict, but not merely as a reactionary response to each other) in an effort to broaden the understandings of international relations and theoretical accountability.

Knowledges in Movement and Exchange

Gluck challenges the homogenization⁷³ of “the” US hegemonic model of feminism⁷⁴ through the analysis of women of color and US third world women histories that were silenced by white liberal feminists.⁷⁵ These histories reveal significant differences in the conceptualizations and material reality of how ‘women’ were involved in feminist praxis within the US during the 1960s-1980s. Not only were differences between gender, race, and class important in the construction of the multiple feminist movements that took place during this time, but also sexuality, geopolitical location, and actual lived experience contributed to understandings of feminist consciousness and activism. For example, Gluck points out that for many women of color and US third world women, meeting the needs of the community, rather than the individual, was part of feminist movements’ strategies. These strategies revolved around issues of survival such as economic survival, cultural survival, survival of the family/community, as well as survival of the self.⁷⁶ While privileging the body, both collectively and individually, as a site of politics, women of color and US third world feminisms did not produce the body as a site of destruction or victimization. Understandings of the body were produced differently by women of color and US third world feminisms through the articulation of survival and agency that spoke to a multiplicity of bodily locations that could not be expressed within hegemonic understandings of the white liberal body.

According to Gluck, the actions and theorizing of women of color and US third world women reconstituted “feminism in their own image” creating a “new language... that

emphasize[d] a feminism rooted in their own experience and positionality”.⁷⁷ This is important because it denaturalizes the idea that feminism is a fixed framework that all women’s bodies can fit into, instead it begins a different discussion about the possibilities of feminism being a political category of coalition work that did not develop out of US, white, middle-class liberal feminism. However, it needs to be noted that Gluck promotes her discussion through a methodological analysis of insertion, which is about incorporating “other” histories that have previously been silenced by mainstream understandings of History. While she importantly points to the spaces of multiplicity within understandings of feminism, she continues to do so in relationship to hegemonic understandings of white liberal feminism.

Patricia Hill Collins’, *Black Feminist Thought*, is one example of how to discuss “Black women’s experiences and ideas at the center of analysis” without comparing or incorporating these experiences and ideas with “White feminist thought”.⁷⁸ Collins avoids insertion by refusing to situate her analysis within pre-existing hegemonic frameworks. This is not to say that she excludes an understanding of the interrelationship of feminist thought, rather she is not concerned with restructuring her arguments to be understood by white feminist thought. Her position suggests that white feminists do their own work to “investigate the similarities and differences among their own standpoints and those of African-American women”, rather than Black women having to explain themselves to white women’s frameworks.⁷⁹ This is an important lesson feminist IR can learn in regards to its constant need to do the work for mainstream IR in order to be understood by the ‘community’. Collins suggests that this type of approach is not needed because it does not determine the productive power of theories, methods, and experiences.

Maylei Blackwell, in “Contested Histories”⁸⁰ and Anne Enke, in “Smuggling Sex Through the Gates”⁸¹, also address complex relations of power involved within the dynamics of constructing feminist histories through a critical analysis of space and place. Their discussions analyze ideas about imagined communities⁸² that could open up spaces for multiplicities of being within the world. Blackwell’s relational analysis of print culture on Chicana feminisms and the Chicano/a movement highlight the importance of print as historical inquiry and a mediating space that constitutes political, racial, and gender identities⁸³ and spaces of movement within knowledge production.⁸⁴ Enke’s analysis of public space “show[s] how gender, race, social, and sexual boundaries within public spaces were mutually and simultaneously constituted, so that

what ‘woman’ and ‘feminist’ meant, and what her actions signified, were both informed by and challenged the meanings of spaces and the placement of boundaries”.⁸⁵ The historical construction of spaces/places influences feminist praxis. Both of these theorists utilize differing forms of methodology, which are not about insertion or inversion, to highlight the multiplicity of history production within feminist knowledges helping to bridge many of the disconnects between history, theory, and practice. Blackwell’s piece is useful to see how the space of the written word creates access to a plurality of voices and meanings that allows for ‘productive’ textual contestation. The formulation of journals that Blackwell discusses opens up a space for multiplicities of languages to be heard through the understandings and meanings of Chicana women’s lived experiences, thus expanding ideas of feminist thought and practice. Enke’s discussion of women attending a coffee house as a ‘safe’ space to be together as women (both sexually and non) highlights contractions and silences of what it may mean to create a space for women’s experience. The point of these two examples is to illustrate the the relations and intersections of gender, race, class and sexuality can be discussed through locations other than the body. These theorists do not map politics on women’s bodies, they discuss politics through theoretical and methodological conceptualizations of space and place.

As with all re/productions of history, it is important to reflect upon the ways in which histories are represented. Gluck reminds us of the problematics involved when an “individual experience represent[s] the group”, or when there are “ties of government funding” influencing feminist goals, or possible “unitary views” that are adopted in an effort to promote and strengthen marginalized feminisms. Gluck’s suggestion to avoid the traps of history’s exclusionary and contradictory constructions and to move forth with a more multilayered history is through a “new generation of feminist scholars” who write histories in a new language of history that is not “tied up to their own direct experience and the sense of ‘ownership’”.⁸⁶ This is an important critique that should be balanced with the acknowledgement of the inability to separate ourselves away from our experiences and how they influence our theories, methods, and practice and attachment of experience to truths. I disagree with Gluck that a ‘new generation’ would be able to void themselves of direct experience and senses of ownership; rather, I think it is more important to be critically reflective of one’s position, experience (directly or indirectly), and relationship to the knowledge we work with and re/produce. The locations of the self are very much part of our theories, methods, and practice. As I stated before, our careers are made

out of them. However, this does not mean that academic work is all about the self because this, too, produces negative reflections upon the knowledges we interact with and re/produce. The important point of these examples is there have been and continue to be other areas (spaces and places) that facilitate collaborative and contested conversations around the meanings of feminism.

An important part of the processes involved in re/producing feminist knowledges is through the theories, methods, and practice of anthologizing knowledges, meaning the collaborative work of producing anthology texts. The architecture of an anthology theoretically and materially opens up a space for particular ways of writing that puts voices in conversation with one another, which forms a *message* rather than a linear agenda. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color* is among the most influential and groundbreaking anthologies because it is the text that opened up a way for anthologizing practices that promote self-defining frameworks of writing rather than neo/colonial models of writing that legislate what is to be considered valid academic writings.⁸⁷ Anthologies (and publishing companies who produced them) in the 1980s were radical approaches to knowledge re/productions. An interview with Mariana Romo-Carmona, who was an editor of Kitchen Table Press, the publishing company of the second edition of *This Bridge*, explains that the production of anthologies

...would be the first time that the work of our writers, women of color, would be looked at critically and given the space and the respect to evaluate the work on its own merit, with an understanding of all its cultural and linguistic richness. This had not been the experience we ourselves had encountered as writers. We knew that our work was looked at as marginal, as coming from a strange place that would have to be “revised” in order to make it fit into white mainstream literary culture. Even among white feminist editors, women of color’s work was not finding a place of understanding and appreciation. That’s why Kitchen Table Press was so crucial to our collective survival and development as writers.⁸⁸

At the time of its production, *This Bridge* provided a collaborative forum for women of color artists to come together in a space where they were not often grouped together. The text provided a visual disruption of the category of woman, which had been essentialized and racialized as white, as well as a disruption to hegemonic methods by using unconventional methods of spirituality as cultural method to enable conversations that were previously being silenced. Anthologizing is a transformative framework of writing because it is an embodiment of multiplicity and textual interdiction, it contains multiple ways of knowing and being in the

world. M. Jacqui Alexander, in “Remembering This Bridge, Remembering Ourselves”, explains that *This Bridge* is as much a political identity as it is a space for spiritual identities to be rooted in such a way that it speaks to the development of its own framework, not a reaction to what already exists.⁸⁹ Sometimes these conversations agree and sometimes they conflict, but they are always in collaboration with one another. *This Bridge* and anthologizing practices provide a method of interdisciplinary work through their multilayered focus that reveals not only the successes and struggles, but also reveals the complexities within relations of power that re/produce knowledge. There is much to be gained from anthologies when they are constructed with transformative collaborative work in mind because they can be seen as one form of protection against the crazy-making of academia. However, when anthologies become disciplined in an effort to sell ideas rather than disrupt them they, too, become counterproductive to the multiplicities of knowledge re/production.

Feminist IR has utilized anthologizing methods to ensure a collaborative space that supports conversations and contestations of IR theories, methods, and practice. However, as Alexander explains, although *This Bridge* provides a space of home, home is not always a safe place.⁹⁰ Anthologies must always be reflected upon for what conversations they are re/producing or intervening in, as well as what or whom is excluded and included in the forum. Particularly within feminist IR, the anthologizing forum has yet to be expanded to include a multiplicity of participants both within and outside of IR for a collaborative presentation of world politics. This is not to say that feminist IR has not produced anthologies that discuss ideas of racialized, sexualized gender within a global political economy within various geopolitical locations through multiple participants;⁹¹ rather, my concern develops out of feminist IR’s lack of utilizing the knowledges produced by anthologies in other geographical and disciplinary locations. As with single authored texts, IR and feminist IR recognizes that which is produced within its own boundaries regardless of the pertinence of knowledges produced in other locations that may expand the understandings of the theories and methods produced by IR, as well as the meanings of world politics. For example, feminist IR may include writings from scholars either from or focusing on international geographical locations, but rarely is there an IR text that collaboratively produces with inter/national scholars contested meanings of feminist analysis within world politics. Instead, there are bounded locations of anthologies that re/produce their own conversations without engaging with other anthologized conversations. Ideas of ‘third world’

and ‘women of color’ feminists continue to be seen as criticisms of what already exists within feminism and feminist IR, rather than in conversation with and part of the ideas of feminist IR.⁹² For example, why is *This Bridge* not read within the discipline of IR? Why is *Gendered States* not put into conversation with *Engendering African Social Sciences*?⁹³ Why can we begin to talk about Judith Butler’s *Gender Trouble*,⁹⁴ but fail to talk about texts such as *African Women and Feminism*?⁹⁵ This is especially troubling when feminist IR constructs knowledges around and about women within international locations without listening to and learning from the knowledges produced within those locations. For example, the upsurge of working papers at the International Studies Associations Annual Conferences that focus on rape as forms of genocide within the context of Rwanda are completely void of any discussions of racialization, neo/colonization and meanings of gender, rape, and genocide from ‘third world’ or African scholars or those scholars who utilize the teachings of African knowledges.⁹⁶ As Imam has explained, western theories “should be criticized not *because* they are Western, but to *the extent* that, having developed in cultural, historical, class, racial and gender realities in the West, they misrepresent African realities and obscure analysis of Africa.”⁹⁷ I am arguing that the continued re/productions of white, liberal feminism within feminist IR is detrimental to the discipline because of its myopic re/productions of theories, methods, and practices. If we are to take feminist IR seriously, then feminist IR needs to take feminism and all its multiplicities seriously regardless of the uncomfortable and contentious possibilities that a conversation on racialized, sexualized gender within multiple geopolitical locations would produce.

African Conversations on Ideas of Feminism

The following is a brief review of some of the knowledges produced within understandings of African feminism and its relationship to hegemonic forms of feminism. This discussion is an attempt to illustrate that there are multiple ways of knowing and utilizing feminism and feminist praxis to discuss meanings of world politics. While acknowledging that feminist IR is unable to know and analyze all forms of feminism and inevitably someone or something will be overlooked within the conversation, I argue that feminist IR needs to gesture towards getting into conversation with other re/productions of feminism (rather than just amongst themselves) if it is going to be re/producing knowledge and making policy recommendations about people within various geopolitical locations. This is not an argument

that African knowledges are *better* than or are formulated separate to western re/productions; rather, what follows is an attempt to illustrate how ideas of African feminism are in conversation with western constructions both in collaboration and in contestation with themselves and each other. This is an attempt to follow lessons learned from *This Bridge* by creating a space for theorists to come together where they are not often grouped together. What would it mean for feminist IR to engage in the conversations about ideas of African feminism? It might change the framework through which feminist IR is re/produced. Knowledges are not constructed within a vacuum, they are interrelational and constitutive of one another. It is crucial that feminist IR become part of these conversations if it seeks to continue to provide theorizations and methods about the international sphere.

In a discussion on development, ‘Molara Ogundipe-Leslie discusses the 1975 Dag Hammarskjold report entitled, *What Now*. She claims that development should not only be critiqued for “its cultural imperialism and ethnocentrism, but also for ignoring the social cost of its effect of upheaval on individual and collective lives and its interruption of the internal and natural dynamics of evolution in the societies into which it has been introduced”.⁹⁸ Ogundipe-Leslie posits three critical ways to restructure *What Now* : (1) ‘de-masculinize’ the discourses of development; (2) prioritize the problems of socioeconomics before focusing on ecology and ecosystems; and (3) acknowledge that ruling elites of most countries, not just the west, are both accomplices and rivals in exploitation and the answer is not in OPEC extorting economic demands. Ogundipe-Leslie explains that the “condition of African women is situated within this global socioeconomic reality”.⁹⁹ Culture is a critical aspect that informs and is formed by women’s location in development processes. It is important to note that Ogundipe-Leslie defines culture as “the total product of a people’s ‘being’ and ‘consciousness’ which emerges from their grappling with nature and living with other humans in a collective group...[it] is the total self-expression of a people in the two relations basic to human existence in society: the relations between generic man and nature and the relations between person and person in that society”.¹⁰⁰

According to Ogundipe-Leslie, women face oppression in all localities of the world. She discusses this condition as the ‘six mountains’ on a woman’s back: (1) oppression from the outside (colonialism); (2) traditional structures of society; (3) constructed as backward in view of development (neo-colonialism); (4) man; (5) race; and (6) herself.¹⁰¹ Focusing mainly on the first two forms of oppression, Ogundipe-Leslie claims that one needs to “periodize” African

history adequately, as well as pay attention to social and historical categories that affect past and present formations of woman's position in Africa, meaning it is 'easier' to access knowledge of women during colonialism and after because it is not in the distant past. However both pre-colonial and colonial need to be further examined for their misrepresentations.¹⁰² She offers brief examples of how colonial occupation reshaped woman's economic, political, and social role both publicly and privately within society and created a new 'class' of subordination for women. She also explains how colonialism "brought out the basic sexist tendencies in pre-capitalist Africa"¹⁰³ through the proletarianization of women and their labor roles that resulted in longer and harsher work conditions for women, particular cultural practices that were vilified (such as female circumcision), and a level of social insecurity that caused African men to an idealized notion of African cultural, economic and political activity because of their "fear of equal sexual freedom for women".¹⁰⁴

It is important to note that Ogundipe-Leslie is not advocating sexual freedom, as she clearly states "African women tend not to wish to emphasize the quest for sexual freedom and promiscuity which preoccupy the western feminist".¹⁰⁵ Rather, she is concerned with illustrating how western agendas of feminism have complicated social relations within Africa. She further explains that the oppression of backwardness (#3) is a result of (neo)colonialism, which 'kept' women behind in education and economic possibilities. Race oppresses women because the "international economic order is divided along race and class" and it is these perceptions of race that maintain unequal power relations within the development discourses between the North and South. The oppression of man is embedded in "his centuries-old attitude of patriarchy" that continues feelings and practices of male superiority and cannot be easily broken down because man does not want to relinquish his power. Thus, it is up to women to fight for "democratic rights" and "redistribution of privilege, power and property".¹⁰⁶ Finally, woman has herself to contend with because she is "shackled by [her] own negative self-image" due to the "interiorization" of patriarchal ideologies and gender hierarchies. Ogundipe-Leslie provides suggestions on how to negotiate these conditions. First, 'basic needs' must be met. Second, the economic practices of the ruling elite need to be reconsidered. Third, social, economic and political structures must be transformed by the people within the states concerned. Fourth, women need to control their labor and be more valued. Fifth, re-education on sex roles is necessary in all states for conscious-raising. Sixth, education and public information should be

readily accessible, especially for women. Finally, African women in the arts “need encouragement and financial assistance”.¹⁰⁷ Her points are important because each speak to the necessity of recognizing the complexity of relations in racialized, sexualized gender within a global political economy. Ogundipe-Lelie’s suggestions are not strictly about providing spaces of development for women, they are also about providing spaces for which gendered relations can explore and expand their meanings within a historic and changing global context.

It should be noted that this essay was originally written in 1984, situating it within a particular discussion of development that was just beginning to take force, the critique of how development negatively affects ‘third world’ nations and its people, particularly women. While this piece offers an important analysis of the affects of development on relationships within Africa, there are a couple of concerns as to how understandings of ‘woman’ and ‘African’ are being re/produced so that the west will hear what Ogundipe-Leslie is saying. First, “African” and “women” are universal categories that are in binary relationship to “western” and “men”. Ogundipe-Leslie does not question the universalizing and dichotomous relationship western development produces. She is more concerned with explicating how women are negatively affected through these relationships. Second, although Ogundipe-Leslie critiques development, her “solutions” are through a reform of development rather than an interrogation of the utility of development itself. In hindsight, it is easy to see how the call for financial empowerment of the 1980s was furthering the problem of targeting women for development programs and controlling their lives (i.e., micro-credit programs). Third, an interrogation of education and consciousness-raising is necessary in order to avoid a replication of western values and systems of domination. What form? By whom? With what agenda? While Ogundipe-Leslie provides important discussion that highlights the contradictions and negotiations of power dynamics within development discourses and how it affects African participants, she continues to suggest that women will continue to be responsible for “fighting” the burdens off their back. Development remains on the site of women’s bodies. Ogundipe-Leslie importantly highlights another view of development that was previously ignored, but she keeps the conversation in relationship to western frameworks.

In “Ugandan Feminism”, Barbara Mbire-Barungi discusses ideas about the differences of knowledge re/production between women in Uganda and between notions of African and western feminism.¹⁰⁸ Mbire-Barungi follows western rights discourse, that ‘women’s rights are

human rights', but does so differently when she calls for African articulations of feminism and rights within these discourses. According to Mbire-Barungi, the "polarization between women from the south and from the north is increasingly evident" and conceptualizations of international feminism must occur through a lens of diversity (historical, cultural, economic, social, and national priorities and interests).¹⁰⁹ Mbire-Barungi discusses the 'tensions of difference' involved in being "woman" in Uganda through the example of one woman's experience of divorce. She illustrates that differing perceptions of a woman's role within Ugandan society, between the 'city/modern/westernized' woman and the 'culturally traditional' woman, place women within a precarious balance. Mbire-Barungi explains that, although there exist discourses about women's rights and empowerment on a global level, there is a lack of implementation on local levels for specific issues. Mbire-Barungi explains that steps have been taken within the Ugandan government, since 1995, to start addressing gender inequalities. Issues such as the exclusion of women in property rights, unequal pay and benefits for women workers, and 'domestic violence' are a few of the issues under debate in Uganda.

However, according to Mbire-Barungi, "a feminist movement is yet to be born".¹¹⁰ Mbire-Barungi believes there are differences between African and western feminism that must be addressed in order to "bridge the gap between women of the south and women of the north as we move towards gender equity and empowerment".¹¹¹ According to Mbire-Barungi, acknowledgement of cultural power relationships and conflicts of interest, both within African societies and between African and western societies, must be recognized and examined. Mbire-Barungi calls for African feminism to be part of the international debate "without simply adding it on as an afterthought".¹¹² Acquiring gender equality must come through the "raising the consciousness of women to a greater extent regarding their rights"¹¹³ and African feminists should both challenge and lead the "thematic debate from African perspectives" with local peculiarities made into an international awareness through an African women's movement.¹¹⁴ Mbire-Barungi concludes "it is only through this 'self-awakening' process that true 'decolonisation' of any international debate can occur" and "we [must] culturally evolve" from customary practices that promote and enforce male domination in order to move beyond 'tokenism' and achieve policy "aimed at empowering women".¹¹⁵

Although Mbire-Barungi calls for articulations of feminism by African women, and the acknowledgement of conflicts of interest within African feminism and between African and

western feminism, her framework is very much that of western liberal feminism. This is potentially problematic because it frames the discussion of what African feminism should be or is, meaning ideas of African feminism are predetermined through western frameworks of gender equality and rights to be acknowledged and enforced by the state. Approaching African feminism in this sense closes the possibilities of other forms of African feminism. Mbire-Barungi discusses women who are categorized as ‘traditional,’ as needing education (raise their consciousness) and to be ‘taught’ their rights. At one point, she states “whilst the modern woman who has been influenced by western feminism questions the customary way of life, the traditional woman in her rural setting accepts it as her destiny”.¹¹⁶ This statement is highly problematic because it suggests that the modern-westernized woman, she who is able to question life, is the way to be, while the traditional woman, unenlightened, oppressed and duped, is not the way to be, but should be transformed into the modern woman. In her discussions of difference, it is unclear how difference can survive her push for gender equality. At the end of her discussion, she claims that “western feminism in particular cannot simply be brushed aside as imperialist”¹¹⁷, that there is something to be learned and benefits to be gained from western frameworks. This is important because international law does dictate people’s lives in a series of ways and people need access to forms of protection within their daily lives. However, her discussion keeps the possibilities of African feminism within the discourse of western liberal feminism, making pre-existing frameworks of human rights the only way to achieve forms of justice. There is no interrogation of the meaning of rights in the first place or why it is that this is the only avenue for social justice.

Gwendolyn Mikell explains that the term ‘feminism’ was rarely used by women in Africa prior to the 1990s.¹¹⁸ Mikell lists three hesitations in using the term feminism within Africa: (1) western hegemonic definitions of individualism, militant patriarchal opposition and hostility to males do not coincide with African society; (2) western labeling of ‘women’s movements’ inadequately acknowledges the “continuum” of women’s activities within Africa; and (3) the dichotomy of educated, elite feminist versus rural, ordinary pre-feminist devalue African cultural traditions and the interests of women.¹¹⁹ Mikell argues that the use of feminism is claiming a ‘new’ understanding that is emerging within Africa. It is one that “is political, pragmatic, reflexive and group oriented”.¹²⁰ Mikell specifically defines this form of feminism as “approaches to addressing the unequal status of women relative to men, with the goal of

mediating gender differences and providing women access to the repertoire of valued roles and statuses within society”.¹²¹ According to Mikell, the focus of African feminism is women’s actions and relationships within and towards the state, both in regards to political representation and the securing of rights within the law. She further explains that African feminism has emerged on its own “internal clock” and is not a result or continuum of western feminist agendas, because it seeks to accomplish gender equality not through the ideologies on the female body, women winning over men, or the value of marriage and motherhood. Instead, Mikell claims, women in Africa are critically addressing the roles of culture, state practices and laws, and economic systems as a means to put forth ‘feminist agendas’ that will create public change within state structures that will then inform and influence family structures.

Mikell’s argument is couched within a discussion of political opportunity structures, which she coins “dialogue opportunities”.¹²² African women with whom she spoke—in Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Liberia, South Africa, and Kenya—use the political and economic “crisis of the nation” as an opening to increase women’s participation in gender-political critiques, as well as increase their action toward “eradication of discrimination against women in customary norms, modern law and social conventions”—what she coins “politico-legal” struggles.¹²³ Mikell notes the difficulties, as well as the successes, in utilizing these extended spaces for actions, dialogues, and transformations. Part of women’s success is critically acknowledging the difficulties of ‘tradition’ that have shaped gendered roles within their communities. Rather than trying to ‘overthrow’ these social constructions, they seek to work within them in order to transform their meanings. For example, on the issue of female circumcision, women in Nigeria have argued for “private diplomatic intervention and the need to educate men about the hazards of clitoridectomy, so that their wives or daughters would face fewer communal pressures, rather than for legal suppression of female circumcision”.¹²⁴ As Mikell explains, “women’s activism need not constitute a rejection of religion or culture”.¹²⁵ African feminism acknowledges the differences within what it means to be African and women, faced with difficulties of class and ethnic differences, as well as possible co-optations by state leaders’ wives seeking to redefine women’s objectives and roles within the state and law procedures.¹²⁶ Historically, the state attempts to hide or suppress women’s movements and organizations for the benefit of the state, but Mikell explains that more women are “willing to pay” the price of overt and public feminism

and this is creating “positive changes in African political structures and contribute to greater gender equality before the law”.¹²⁷

Within Mikell’s discussion, the boundaries between ideas of western feminism and African feminism seem at times to overlap, particularly in relationship to equality within state structure and legal practices. African feminism, although not negating culture and ‘tradition,’ and defining the state, rights, and law differently, still seems to be in relationship to the state and ideas of human rights containing it within the framework of western liberal discourse. Mikell’s use of western feminism is narrow while her use of African feminism is broad, implying an understood western woman and western feminism and a universal African woman. It is also unclear how Mikell is position herself in this discussion. At times she uses “we” to suggest she is part of these groups defining notions of African feminism and at other junctures she defines herself as an anthropologist “observing” and “recognizing” particular relationships. Although Mikell’s argument blurs the boundaries of public and private, it seems that African feminism exists mainly in the public sphere and that feminist agendas are about representational politics. Importantly, Mikell discusses how the invoking of feminism can produce strategic gains within an understanding of international rights and the international community. While she seems to be going a bit further than Mbire-Barungi’s insertion method or Ogundipe-Leslie’s inversion method, the context of her African feminism is in relationship to equality of rights based on a predetermined understanding of sex through the analysis of cultural differences within a framework of international rights.

These three examples of ideas about feminism within Africa contain their discussion within human rights and development frameworks of sexual equality. They are examples of methodological insertion and inversion through the lenses of African knowledges and experiences. While making important contributions to the necessity of recognizing and legitimating African ways of being within a system that privileges whites from the west, these discussions fail to disrupt the foundations of western feminism, development, and human rights discourses. Instead, they reinforce hegemonic productions of the west and ignore critical analyses that do exist in the west. These three examples call on the west and western feminists to recognize and legitimate African forms of feminism, and this in itself is a pushing of the boundaries within feminist thought. However, this call is still giving power to the white, western expert to validate African knowledges and existence.

The following discussions on the ideas of African feminism fundamentally challenge ideas of feminism, the west, and Africa, as well as construct 'new' frameworks for understanding and re/producing knowledges of feminisms. Feminism is not the liberal idea of equality of the sexes, it is about transformation and multiplicities of being. I choose these different perspectives as a model for feminist IR to highlight the contesting engagements that exist within re/productions of African feminism, because despite contrasting approaches to understanding feminisms, these scholars remain in conversation with each another. They do not shut each other out because of conflicting perspectives. Their articles appear besides one another in edited journals and anthology texts, and there is a commitment to collaborative work even amidst turmoil and struggle. I also chose the following theorists' discussion to begin a conversation that broadens the larger possibilities of feminist theories, methods, and praxis.

Anthonia Kalu discusses the relationship between western development's gender construction and African gender construction through the use of literary texts of both African American writers and African writers. Kalu highlights the contradictions and problems of "supplanting western thought into African feminism" and how this misrepresentation and misunderstanding "continues in prevailing trends in African feminist studies".¹²⁸ Beginning with a discussion about Marxist interpretations of capitalist development, Kalu explains that capital has two purposes in relationship to Africa: "first, to destroy primitive cultures and second, to rejuvenate them".¹²⁹ According to Kalu, African culture has been portrayed as static and lacking the "social change mechanism". Kalu explains that the west's lack of acknowledging "epistemological differences inherent in both the origin and contradictions of knowledge and knowledge bases" between the west and Africa continues to subsume African feminism within a framework of western feminist discourse and knowledge basis, thus denying possible meanings and productions of African feminism.¹³⁰ Her goal is a "rearticulation of the female principal" that is "mapped on Africa's cultural landscape".¹³¹ Western discourses focus on the marginalization of women. Western knowledge bases locate women within the periphery rather than the center. Kalu argues that this conceptualization is contradictory to African knowledge bases, speaking particularly of Igbo, where women are located within the center of society. Kalu illustrates this discussion through African myths, legends, and other forms of narrative that locate women in prominent roles within their communities, as well as within the world. Language is a significant factor in the mis/representation and understanding of the ideas of

African women, because both the English language and the written word become privileged ways of knowing, which impose western knowledge upon African ways of knowing. Kalu suggests to the “Africanist” that “a knowledge of the worldview is not only important, it is necessary for the reclamation of the African woman from the depths and breadths of languages we mostly speak but have neither the authority nor the opportunity to employ when we conduct “meaningful” research within a western-oriented academy”.¹³² This world view is not strictly the western production of the world; rather, knowledge of the worldview is to recognize the multiple ways of knowing that are not always or already subjugated by western modes of dominance. Kalu claims this is possible by recognizing these surviving aspects of African cultures that have not fallen to capitalist agendas. For example in her discussion of rememory, the recognition of thought (regardless of its materiality) ensures both collective survival and the indestructibility of entire knowledge bases.

Through Kalu’s discussion of particular texts, she illustrates how the construction of women ensured positive responsibilities and roles within society and within themselves, but also how African culture provided spaces of balanced existence and survival. Kalu also illustrates how western colonialism and discourses created imbalances and subjugated women’s roles and understanding within society. According to Kalu, “our continued insistence on defining ourselves in western feudal and capitalist terms maintains both the pitfalls of African underdevelopment” and development projects that continue to “alienate Africans from Africa’s problems”.¹³³ The continued use of western discourse and language maintains the dynamics of power that privilege western ways of knowing. For example, why does “development for Africa mean only the shift from an African natural resource and technological base to Western bases”?¹³⁴ Kalu calls for a deeper analysis of African centered research programs that search for epistemological differences. Kalu also calls for modern African writers and Africanists to be aware and avoid the dangers of “merging African female experiences with western thought” because this misdirects Africa’s future.¹³⁵ One should also avoid “working towards a standardization of African historical thought”, which is a common practice of many anthropologists, sociologists, and historians. The Africanist in the west subjugates African knowledge when s/he “grants validity to African ways of knowing” because the western Africanist becomes the expert of what is determined valid African knowledge.¹³⁶ Africanists should move towards “a clearer articulation of the “already said” within the limits of its

meanings for the present”.¹³⁷ Kalu concludes that the African development agenda must be redefined to “ensure no one is left at the periphery of existence or analysis or remains at risk”.¹³⁸ According to Kalu, the dualities of development have feminized Africa and masculinized the west and the rearticulations of gender within an African cultural context could halt the subjugation agenda of the west.

Kalu importantly lists the inadequacies and damaging affects of western epistemologies and discourse. Her methodological analysis of language through literary texts highlights possible multiplicities of understanding Africa and African feminism, pointing particularly to how mis/articulations have been made through textual practice. She causes one to question the use of terminology and language within western academic productions, as well as to take notice of her political project of speaking to the west through the English language. How does her article itself contribute to subjugated ways of knowing within Africa? How does one successfully avoid subjugation when writing in English? Her discussion reveals complexities involved within transnational conversations. There is no outside to language because it has been involved in the construction of African knowledge, just as African languages and African ways of knowing have formed the English language and western epistemologies. Kalu’s discussion is an example of how to begin to articulate and negotiate through “colonial” fingerprints to acknowledge Africanness without containing it within western frameworks. However, her usage of African, westernized Africans, and African-American seems to be conflated within the text. There needs to be a further explanation as to how these groups of people are produced differently within various contexts and geopolitical locations. How would re/articulations change understandings of African ways of knowing within the diaspora? What are the possibilities of collaborative work between these various understandings? Importantly, Kalu illustrates the necessity of accountability within knowledge production by necessitating reflection upon the way in which scholars have naturalized language.

Abena Busia discusses contradictions and negotiations involved with ‘translating identity’ through ideas of language in a postcolonial, gendered, and racialized context. Invoking Homi Bhabha’s interrogations of identity, Busia dis/locates the hybridities within her own possible localities of identity. She explains “we speak the self in hybrid tongues to disempower or undo the conditions of our misnaming or our unseeing”.¹³⁹ Language is an ‘othering’ that has historic relations of power. According to Busia, “in the context of writing, identity and

nationality, the language of national identity and nationalism remains destructive to the place of women and the will of the mother”.¹⁴⁰ Busia explains that even small spaces “for the articulation of the place of women” must be used to create “new” languages, ideologies, and nationalisms.¹⁴¹ Importantly, she recognizes the “dilemmas we face is that in the language of the colonial, we must negotiate visions of the self in tongues which inscribe our own visibilities. Yet not quite”.¹⁴² Busia negotiates her hybridity (Ghanian born, UK educated, and US employed), the use of colonial language, and the meaning of representation through the performance of a poem that she “heard” and “wrote”. She first addresses dress as a form of language that has a dual focus. Her choice to go “ethnic” rather than colonial cocktail dress at her performance was “to make you see my African-ness, as well as to dress me as I see myself”.¹⁴³ She then “mediates between [her] ‘deep’ and ‘written’ selves” of scholar and poet, explaining that her written prose fails to capture the meaning of her spokenness.¹⁴⁴ Her poem *Mawu/Mawo* “arises out of the particular circumstances of my parentage” because it is a “play on words in my father’s language (Twi)” through the “nomenclature ” of her mother’s language (Ga).¹⁴⁵ One of the important aspects of her example is that it exemplifies the tensions within meanings of the written and spoken words in multiple languages Twi, Ga, and English, as well as the tensions within multiplicities of identity. According to Busia, the categories of identity exist mutually and are “boundaries within which I must exist or which I have to cross every waking moment”.¹⁴⁶ Through her example we *see* her, we see ‘others’, and we see the tension of the relationships between ‘them’. Busia illustrates the “articulation of the *agonism* of difference, or is it the unified other?”¹⁴⁷ Thus, putting into question the processes of othering.

Busia’s discussion is extremely useful for understanding possibilities of contradictions and negotiations involved in the use of language, particularly in relationship to constructions of history and cultural contexts. The essay invokes the question of locality and the ability to use language without replicating violence upon particular identities. For example, Busia discusses the intersections of language and visual identity through the use of “visuality,” where words and cultural meanings are one example of the multiple pronunciations of *ma wo* that would mean either “birth” or “death”. A mispronunciation results in death rather than life. She explains “the terror of obliterating birth by death, becomes rather a unity”.¹⁴⁸ In thinking about the differences and power dynamics of colonial language and ‘indigenous’ language, has the “terror” been subdued in recognizing possible unity of the dualism? The colonial language is not as important

and powerful as the colonizer would like one to believe, rather, it is but just one identity within a possibility of locations.

According to Philomena Okeke, the focus on postmodern feminist critiques diverts feminists (both African and non) from the larger issue at hand: who, what, and how are feminist knowledges begin produced?¹⁴⁹ Although postmodern theory may acknowledge relations of power in regards to the production of knowledge, it fails to acknowledge the power relations of the theorist as the “gatekeeper” of subjugated voices. Okeke explains that postmodern grounding of “plural and localized knowledge bases” that form the “database” of African women “depends heavily on the state of African-Western feminist relations”.¹⁵⁰ Okeke highlights some tensions involved within feminism, particularly the relationships between ‘black feminists’, ‘third world feminists’, and ‘western feminists’, suggesting that ‘black feminists’ and ‘third world feminists’ have similar points of contention with western-white-middle class feminism. However, rather than focusing primarily on the concerns of patriarchy, ‘third world’ and ‘black feminists’ insist that “imperialist relations with the west should be placed equally on the agenda” of feminism.¹⁵¹ Okeke explains that, although the postmodern debate has incorporated more women into the discussion than were previously included, there is “danger” in celebrating these works because new forms of exclusion or dominant knowledge could be produced. The point is not to just add more women to discuss and analyze; rather, the point is about critically analyzing the knowledges that produce the idea that more women are included in theoretical and methodological debates. The earlier critique of Enloe or Carpenter is one example of the dangers involved in the ideas of incorporation within feminism. Okeke states, “what the global community knows about African women at present is traceable largely to the writings of white female scholars” and the contributions of indigenous scholars “must be weighed against its (white, western feminism) racist and sexist colonial history”.¹⁵² Forms of neo/colonialism continue to exist because African women’s stories have been “appropriated as raw data” for usage by western feminists. Okeke warns that even critical reflection on the part of the western white feminist has failed to seriously interrogate the relations of power that “undermine the emergence of indigenous voices”.¹⁵³ Part of the problem lies in the fact that western feminist methodologies and theories inadequately address the reality of experiences of African women.

According to Okeke, writing within feminist scholarship can be alienating rather than emancipatory and the scholarship itself needs a reconceptualization. Okeke calls for a “more

systemic dialogue,” for a critical reworking of the current scholarship. The continued production of the ‘one-sided’ conversation of western scholarship inhibits the emergence of ‘other’ knowledges. Okeke is clear to state that “neither the insider-outsider nor the margin-center view of the debate” is a sufficient approach to reworking theory.¹⁵⁴ Knowledge claims need to be contested regardless of positionality, meaning that it is also insufficient if knowledge of African women is regulated too strictly to the ‘insider’ position. Okeke warns that systemic dialogue is a site of struggle. The difficult process of unsettling dominant forms of feminism and scholarship has begun, but much more needs to be done in order to create spaces where African scholars “effectively share their insights”. In the words of Okeke, “we cannot begin to talk about analytical frameworks, theories, concepts, and methodologies when the diversity of our lived experiences is largely unexplored”.¹⁵⁵

Okeke’s discussion is important for its interrogation of western white feminism’s focus on the postmodern as a means to ‘open up’ feminism because she illustrates how this is another reinforcement of power dynamics that continue to construct particular knowledges about African women. She calls for collaborative conversations that engage seriously with questions of knowledge reproductions. She leaves the space to think critically and collaboratively about what it may mean to engage in systematic dialogue. Okeke does not do all the work for us by telling us how to converse with one another; rather, she opens the pathways to begin the conversation. Importantly, this feminist practice must follow the language critique put forth by Kalu and Busia and it is also clear that the postmodern cannot be ignored as it is part of the constructions of knowledge. A process of radical anti-racist feminist praxis is not about the abolition of western epistemologies, it is about the process of expanding the possibilities of feminist epistemologies that have constitutively developed within and alongside feminist knowledges. It is no longer fruitful to maintain the dichotomy of western and African in such a way that constantly produces these epistemologies as separate from one another.

Obioma Nnaemeka promotes an idea of nego-feminism, which is the “feminism of negotiation” and stands for “no ego feminism”¹⁵⁶ as a way to address the tensions of empty theorizing by western theorists who fail to anchor their theories in the ‘realities’ of those they are theorizing about. According to Nnaemeka, nego-feminism is the “building on the indigenous”, proactive, “rooted in the African environment”, and “emanates from the cultural and philosophical specificity of its provenance”.¹⁵⁷ Nnaemeka invokes Claude Ake’s discussion of

‘traditional’ and ‘indigenous’ to highlight that building on the indigenous refers to “whatever the people consider important to their lives, whatever they regard as an authentic expression of themselves”.¹⁵⁸ For Nnaemeka, women in Africa are located within the ‘third space’, which is the “boundary where the academy meets what lies beyond it... where the immediacy of lived experience gives form to theory, allows the simultaneous gesture of theorizing practice and practicing theory, and anticipates the mediation of policy, thereby disrupting the notion of the academy and activism as stable sites”.¹⁵⁹ It is here that the critical engagements of nego-feminism form. Nnaemeka calls for the “interrogation and repositioning” of positionality and intersectionality within feminist theory and feminist studies.¹⁶⁰ Theory should not be unidirectional, rather it should be constitutively informed and formed through the multiplicities of difference within ways of thought. Knowledge formations should be scrutinized through feminist scholarship, but this scholarship should not be contained within the privileged locations of western post-structuralism.¹⁶¹ Through a critique of post-structuralism, in which the focus is on “discourse and aesthetics instead of social action and which encourages the egocentricity and individualism that undermine collective action”,¹⁶² Nnaemeka illustrates how African frames of knowledge have been and continue to contribute to critical modes of thought and being through a communal voice. Nnaemeka explains how the pattern of knowledge production has been to allocate ‘third world’ voices to specific locations that are excluded from theory and are used as case studies to “rematerialize” the theoretical positions that were constructed by western theorists.¹⁶³ Nnaemeka particularly critiques the theoretical and ‘practical’ aspects of NGOs, illustrating the unequal relationships of theory and practice between the west and Africa and calls for African NGOs to “challenge donor institutions and demand accountability and responsibility from them” so as to end the violence of using Africans as ‘informants’ for western projects.¹⁶⁴ In doing so, Nnaemeka also is calling for the accountability of western theorists in producing particular knowledges about their ‘object’ of study.

According to Nnaemeka, western feminism’s focus on cultural and developmental understandings of African women and their relationships is a guise for the ‘real’ problems that African women face. For example, the focus on polygamy as a major problem for African women places blame on “minority cultures” rather than addressing the west’s role in the creation and perpetuation of problematic socioeconomic structures such as racism and unemployment.¹⁶⁵ Nnaemeka explains that US theorists never blame US culture for the problems of their own

society or why the US has failed to ratify international conventions that seek to promote women's well being. She then asks "do 'third world' women have the moral responsibility to intervene on behalf of oppressed females of the US?"¹⁶⁶ It is here that Nnaemeka points out that interventions of the west are "not aimed at saving the 'victims' but rather at transforming them in the image of the interventionists".¹⁶⁷ She utilizes the discussion to illustrate how academia does not ask questions, but rather "manufacture[s] answers in search of questions"¹⁶⁸-- "ethnographers create cultures".¹⁶⁹ According to Nnaemeka, culture is not neutral and theorists and development practitioners should be aware of the relations of power within culture that inform the processes and practices of development. This process of development is facilitated through the theoretical and practical "building on the indigenous", nego-feminism.

Another important element of nego-feminism is how it informs the construction of women/feminist studies disciplines in academia. Nnaemeka illustrates the differences in formation of women studies programs in Africa and the west, explaining that the African programs are focused on gender inclusiveness and social relevance. It is here that she points out the higher number of male participants in African than US programs. The explanation of difference lies in the African knowledge frameworks that view gender and language as "rooted in the indigenous".¹⁷⁰ Nnaemeka claims that African women are "more inclined to reach out and work with men in achieving set goals".¹⁷¹ Difference is needed in order to "challenge and promote self examination".¹⁷² It is through negotiation, collaboration, and compromise rooted in African theories of feminism that African women and men are able to work towards social change. Feminist theory, as 'we know it' has the capacity to be more "productive and enriching" through the 'defamiliarizing' and 'refamiliarizing' processes of "seeing feminist theorizing through the eyes of the other".¹⁷³ Nnaemeka concludes that the feminist journey should heed the advice of her great uncle—"walk like a chameleon... goal-oriented, cautious, accommodating, adaptable, and open to diverse views".¹⁷⁴

Nnaemeka's discussion addresses pertinent issues and tensions of theory, method, and practice that ideas of feminisms currently face. Nego-feminism offers multiple possibilities of theories, methods, practices, and policy frameworks because it opens up discussions that encourage the participation of multiple knowledge formations. Nnaemeka critically pushes the boundaries and meanings of feminism to highlight the importance of diverse coalitions of knowledge. Positionality and intersectionality of subjects, including the academic, must be

critically reflected upon in order to re/produce accountable theories and methods that have material implications on people's lives. Western theories, practices, and policies continue to fail to acknowledge African knowledge frameworks and continue to impose western frameworks that result in disparities and resistance within academia, development arenas, and international social relationships. Nnaemeka causes one to question how African feminisms "know" how to negotiate and challenge "patriarchal land mines"? I understand part of this is derived through African knowledge frameworks based on historicity, culture, identity formation, and social relations, but how does nego-feminism address systemic shifts of power that are non-indigenous? She offers an example of the western NGO where African NGOs should challenge the donor, but what happens when the funding is cut because of this challenge? How does one avoid the unequal compromising position that the west enforces? One of the lessons to be learned from Nnaemeka's discussion is the re/productions of communal, negotiation, and compromise within knowledge frameworks.

Knowledge is not rigid, it is fluid. Feminist IR could benefit from participating within a conversation that seeks to re/negotiate meanings of feminism that supports fluidity. Collaborative coalitions would open feminist IR's frameworks up to multiple ways of knowing and being in the world causing its theories, methods, and practice to be accountable to the subjects it is re/producing through its constructions of world politics and ideas of violence against bodies. This discussion section is a methodological attempt to put texts and knowledges into conversation within one another to highlight similarities and contentions that exist within theories, methods, and practices of 'feminisms'. This section was also a space to think about how these collaborative conversations could take place (i.e., anthologizing). Interdisciplinary work that listens, learns, and utilizes multiple locations of knowledge is crucial to the re/configurations of methodology that refuses to mark particular bodies for the sites of academic theorization and institutional violence. Making the effort and taking the time to have uncomfortable conversations (including those within the self) about relations of power and privilege begins a transformative process that builds towards collaborative knowledge production and infrastructures of support.

Conclusion

I am a welder.
Not an alchemist.

I am interested in the blend
Of common elements to make
a common thing.

No magic here.
Only the heat of my desire to fuse
what I already know
exists. Is possible.

We plead to each other,
we all come from the same rock
we all come from the same rock
ignoring the fact that we bend
at different temperatures
that each of us is malleable
up to a point.

Yes, fusion *is* possible
but only if things get hot enough –
all else is temporary adhesion,
patching up.

--Cherríe L. Moraga¹⁷⁵

Feminist IR has re/produced important and transformative theories and methods within the discipline of international relations. However, it is not void of theoretical and methodological stagnation and violence. This field statement was an attempt to critically reflect upon the ways in which feminist IR has contributed to a project of legibility for its own purposes of security within an hostile environment of disciplinary war games. My aim here is not to ridicule and abandon feminist IR; rather, it is an effort to shake the grips of foundational feminist IR theory, method, and praxis to open up spaces for other possibilities of feminism that inform and shape world politics. The desire is to put into conversation those theories, methods, and practices that are often not thought of together to illustrate the importance of *interdisciplinary* work. We are accountable to knowledge productions, but we are not fixed within one modality of production. I suggest that we continue to think of feminist IR differently, that we work collaboratively with the multiplicities of feminisms available to figure out possibilities of feminist theorizing that relieves us of the search for bodies to be refashioned. I have asked that we stop locating and analyzing politics only through the sites of bodies in an effort to avoid being complicit within the productions of violence that negatively affects some but not others. I have asked that we listen to the lessons of ‘women of color’ feminisms, ‘third world’ feminisms, African feminisms, and post-colonial feminist IR to produce ‘new’ methods and theories of

analysis that seek to broaden dialogues and refuses to target women in neo/colonial and neo/imperialist ways.

As I continue this methodological exploration of mapping throughout my research, I will continue to listen, learn, and utilize multiple locations of knowledge that seek to map methods differently by refusing to spectacularize women's bodies. These knowledges already exist and numerous scholars and activists have done this work throughout the year. For example, M. Jacqui Alexander use of morality, rather than bodies, as a method to talk through practices of state and legal violence.¹⁷⁶ The immediacy of my exploration is to continue to make efforts to bring these works in conversation with one another so transformative possibilities continue to expand. The work of this piece is to re/verbalize the necessity of feminist IR conceptualizing and utilizing spaces of multiple modalities and possibilities for collaborative work. Otherwise, the transformative possibilities of feminist IR will relinquish itself to violent re/productions and naturalizations of mainstream thought.

Bibliography

- Agathangelou, Anna. *Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence, and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation States*. London: Palgrave, 2005.
- Agathangelou, Anna M. and L.H.M. Ling. "The House of IR: From Family Power Politics to the *Poiesis* of Worldism". *International Studies Review* (2004a) 6, 21-49.
- . "Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire from September 11". *International Studies Quarterly* (2004b) 48, 517-538.
- Alexander, M. Jacqui. "Redrafting Morality: The Postcolonial State and the Sexual Offenses Bill of Trinidad and Tobago". *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Eds. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington, Indiana UP, 1991: 133-152.
- . "Remembering This Bridge, Remembering Ourselves". *Sing, Whisper, Shout: Feminist Vision for a Just World*. M. Jacqui Alexander, Lisa Albrecht, Sharon Day and Mab Segrest, Eds. New York: Edge Work, 2003: 611-639.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 2nd Ed. London: Verso, 1991.
- Blackwell, Maylei. "Contested Histories: Las Hijas de Cuauhtémoc, Chicana Feminisms, and Print Culture in the Chicana Movement, 1968-1973". *Chicana Feminisms: A Critical Reader*. Eds. Gabriela F. Arrendondo et al. Durham & London: Duke UP, 2003: 59-89.
- Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: MacMillan, 1977.

Heather Turcotte

OE Two: Disciplining Cartographies: Critical Inquiries into the Methods and Theories of Feminist International Relations

Busia, Abena. "Performance, Transcription and the Languages of the Self: Interrogating Identity as a "Post Colonial" Poet". *Theorizing Black Feminisms: The Visionary Pragmatism of Black Women*. Eds. Stanlie James and Abena Busia. New York: Routledge, 1993: 203-213.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Carpenter, R. Charlie "Gender Theory in World Politics: Contributions of a Nonfeminist Standpoint?" *International Studies Review* (2002): 4(3), 153-165.

----- . "Women, Children and Other Vulnerable Groups": Gender, Strategic Frames and the Protection of Civilians as a Transnational Issue". *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (2005): 295-334.

Carr, E.H. *The Twenty Years Crisis: 1919-1939: Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. Houndsmill: Palgrave, 2001.

Carver, Terrell, Ed. "The Forum: Gender and International Relations". *International Studies Review* 5 (2003): 287-302.

Chase-Dunn, Christopher. *Global Formation: Structure of the World Economy*. Blackwell, 1989.

Chowdhry, Geeta and Sheila Nair, Eds. *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color". *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*. Eds. Kimberlé Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas. New York: New York Press, 1995: 357-383.

Collins, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Cox, Robert. "Global Perestroika". *The Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy: A Reader*. 2nd Ed. Eds. George Crane and Abla Amawi. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991

----- . *Production, Power and World Order: Social Forces and the Making of History*. New York: Columbia UP, 1987.

Cox Robert with Michael Schecter. *The Political Economy of a Plural World: Critical Reflections on Power, Morals, and Civilization*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Davis, Angela. *Women, Race, and Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.

Enke, Anne. "Smuggling Sex Through the Gates: Race, Sexuality, and the Politics of Space in Second Wave Feminism." *American Quarterly* 55.4 (2003): 635-667. available online <http://lion.chadwyck.com>. Online pages 1-17.

Heather Turcotte

OE Two: Disciplining Cartographies: Critical Inquiries into the Methods and Theories of Feminist International Relations

Enloe, Cynthia. *Bananas, Beaches & Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley:

California UP, 1989.

------. *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*. Berkeley: California UP, 2004.

------. *Does Khaki Become You?: The Militarization of Women's Lives*. London: Pandora, 1983.

------. *The Morning After: Sexual Politics and the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley: California UP, 1993.

Falk, Richard, Lester Edwin J. Ruiz, and R.B.J. Walker, eds. *Reframing the International: Law, Culture, and Politics*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Fierke, Karin. *Changing Games, Changing Strategies: Critical Investigations in Security*. Manchester:

Manchester UP, 1998.

Gluck, Sherna. "Whose Feminism, Whose History?: Reflections on Excavating the History of (the) US Women's Movements." *Community Activism and Feminist Politics: Organizing Across Race, Class, and Gender*. Ed. Nancy Naples. New York and London: Routledge, 1998.

Gilpin, Robert. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1981.

Gomez-Vega, Ibis with Mariana Romo-Carmona. "The Telling of Cuentos: Stories by Latinas A Conversation About Art and Politics with Mariana Romo-Carmona". Available online <http://www.home.earthlink.net/~romochan/id5.html> [5 October 2004].

hooks, bell. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: South End Press, 2000 (original 1984).

Howes, Ruth and Michael Stevenson, Eds. *Women and the Use of Military Force*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1993.

Huntington, Samuel. "The Clash of Civilizations." *Foreign Affairs* 72.3 (1993): 22-50.

Imam, Ayesha, Amina Mama, and Fatou Sow, eds. *Engendering African Social Sciences*. Chippenham: Antony Rowe, 1997.

Jabri, Vivienne and Eleanor O'Gorman, Eds. *Women, Culture, and International Relations*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1999.

Jervis, Robert. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma". *World Politics*. (January 1978)

Kalu, Anthonia. "Women and the Social Construction of Gender in African Development". *Africa Today* 43.3 (July-September 1996): 269-288. Online pages 1-24, 1.

Kaplan, Caren and Inderpal Grewal. "Transnational Feminist Cultural Studies: Beyond the Marxism/Poststructuralism/Feminism Divides". *Between Woman and Nation: Nationalisms, Transnational Feminisms and the State*. Eds. Caren Kaplan et al. Durham: Duke, 1999. 349-363.

Keohane, Robert, ed. *Neo-Realism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia UP, 1986.

Heather Turcotte

OE Two: Disciplining Cartographies: Critical Inquiries into the Methods and Theories of Feminist International Relations

Krasner, Stephen. *International Regimes*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983.

Lim, Genny. "Wonder Woman". *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981): 22-23.

Ling, L.H.M. *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire Between Asia and the West*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.

Lorde, Audre. "An Open Letter to Mary Daly". *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981).

Mbire-Barungi, Barbara. "Ugandan Feminism: Political Rhetoric or Reality?" *Women's Studies International Forum*. 22.4 (1999): 435-439.

Mikell, Gwendolyn. "African Feminism: Towards a New Politics of Representation". *Feminist Studies* 21.2 (Summer 1995): 405-424. Online pages: 1-23.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Cartographies of Struggle: Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism". *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Eds. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.

----- *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham: Duke, 2003.

----- "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses". *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Eds. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991. 51-80.

Moraga, Cherríe. "The Welder". *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981): 245-46.

Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. *The Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981).

Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 4th ed. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1967.

Nnaemeka, Obioma. "Nego-Feminism: Theorizing, Practicing, and Pruning Africa's Way". *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 29.2 (2003). Online pages 1-21.

Nussbaum, Martha. *Sex and Social Justice*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

Okeke, Philomina. "Postmodern Feminism and Knowledge Production: The African Context". *Africa Today* 43.3 (July-Sept 1996): 223-234. Online Pages: 1-15.

Ogundipe-Leslie, 'Molara. "African Women, Culture, and Another Development". *Theorizing Black Feminists: The Visionary Pragmatism of Black Women*. Eds. Stanlie James and Abena Busia. London: Routledge, 1993: 102-117, 103.

Oyewùmí, Oyèrónké, ed. *African Women & Feminism: Reflecting On the Politics of Sisterhood*. Trenton: Africa World, 2003.

Peterson, V. Spike, ed. *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*.

Heather Turcotte

OE Two: Disciplining Cartographies: Critical Inquiries into the Methods and Theories of Feminist International Relations

Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1992.

------. "Security and Sovereign States: What is at Stake in Taking Feminism Seriously?". *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Ed. V. Spike Peterson. Boulder: Rienner, 1992.

Peterson, V. Spike and Anne Sisson Runyan. *Global Gender Issues: Dilemmas in World Politics*. 2nd Ed.

Boulder: Westview, 1999.

Rai, Shirin and Geraldine Lievesley, Eds. *Women and the State: International Perspectives*. Bristol:

Taylor and Francis, 1996.

Rosen, Ruth. *The World Split Open: How The Modern Women's Movement Changed America*. New

York: Viking, 2000.

Rushin, Kate. "The Bridge Poem". *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*.

Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981): 1vii-1viii.

Skocpal, Theda. *States & Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia & China*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1979.

Smith, Barbara, Ed. *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*. New York: Kitchen Table/Women of Color Press, 1983.

Spelman, Elizabeth. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1988.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. London: Macmillian, 1988. 271-313.

------. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia UP, 2003.

Tickner, J Ann. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia UP, 1992.

------. "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists". *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (1997): 611-632.

Turcotte, Heather. "Colonial Legibilities and the Embodiment of Violence". *Working Paper*. 2005.

Yamada, Mitsuye. "Asian Pacific American Women and Feminism". *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981): 74-79.

Walker, R.B.J. "Gender and Critique in the Theory of International Relations". *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Ed. V. Spike Peterson. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1992.

Heather Turcotte

OE Two: Disciplining Cartographies: Critical Inquiries into the Methods and Theories of Feminist International Relations

-----, *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Walker, R.B.J. and Saul Mendlovitz, eds. *Contending Sovereignties: Redefining Political Community*.

Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1990

Waltz, Kenneth. *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia UP, 1954.

Weber, Cynthia. *Faking It: US Hegemony in a "Post-Phallic" Era*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1999.

Zalewski, Marysia and Jane Parpart, Eds. *The "Man" Question in International Relations*. Boulder: Westview, 1998.

¹ Lim, Genny. "Wonder Woman". *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981): 22-23, 23.

² I am following Ayesha Imam's discussion of mainstream where she states, "to be mainstreamed [is to be] incorporated as a principal element among those issues and considerations that should be automatically considered and taken into account". Imam, Ayesha. "Engendering African Social Sciences : An Introductory Essay." *Engendering African Social Sciences*. Eds. Ayesha Imam, Amina Mama and Fatou Sow. Chippenham: Antony Rowe, 1997: 1-30, 6. I further define "mainstream" as the sets of literatures, methods, and theories that have come to dominate the making of the discipline. Mainstream can be reflected in the canonical texts that get repetitively taught because they are seen as the fundamentals of the discipline, but it is also the epistemological approaches within the discipline. Mainstream theories and practices maintain their hegemony by perpetuating the importance of narrowness and simplicity in theories and methods. The political science market continues to pull in students and policy makers who seek "truth" in these productions, thus keeping the mainstream in business.

³ See Fierke, Karin. *Changing Games, Changing Strategies: Critical Investigations in Security*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998.

⁴ See Cox

⁵ See Walker, R.B.J.

⁶ Peterson, V. Spike, ed. *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1992.

⁷ Tickner, J Ann. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia UP, 1992.

⁸ Agathangelou, Anna. *Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence, and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation States*. London: Palgrave, 2005.

⁹ Chowdhry, Geeta and Sheila Nair, Eds. *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class*. London: Routledge, 2002.

¹⁰ Ling, L.H.M. *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire Between Asia and the West*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.

¹¹ Canonical texts include, but are not limited to: Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: MacMillan, 1977; Carr, E.H. *The Twenty Years Crisis: 1919-1939: Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. Houndsmill: Palgrave, 2001; Chase-Dunn, Christopher. *Global Formation: Structure of the World Economy*. Blackwell, 1989; Gilpin, Robert. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1981; Huntington, Samuel. "The Clash of Civilizations." *Foreign Affairs* 72.3 (1993): 22-50; Jervis, Robert. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma". *World Politics*. (January 1978); Keohane, Robert, ed. *Neo-Realism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia UP, 1986; Krasner, Stephen. *International Regimes*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983; Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 4th ed. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1967; Skocpal, Theda. *States & Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia & China*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1979; and Waltz, Kenneth. *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia UP, 1954.

¹² Embodied is used here to reflect the material manifestation of ideological and discursive constructions. For example, democracy can be embodied within the voter or capitalism within the worker.

¹³ My understanding of anti-racist feminism develops out of Chandra Talpade Mohanty's discussion and definition: "racializing feminism is a political and epistemological act of great significance...anti-racist feminism is simply a feminist perspective that encodes race and opposition to racism as central to its definition" (253 note 2) in Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham: Duke, 2003.

¹⁴ This concern has been intensifying over the past five years (2000-2005) of my attending the International Studies Annual Conferences, where the ability and willingness to discuss and incorporate theorizations of race and sexuality within discussions of gender is only being done in extremely small circles, which are being marginalized through the *mainstreams* (this includes IR in general and feminist IR).

¹⁵ I borrow this formulation from Anna Agathangelou and L.H.M. Ling and thank them for detailing the complexities of power relations within understandings and constructions of "racialized, sexualized Others". See Agathangelou, Anna M. and L.H.M. Ling. "The House of IR: From Family Power Politics to the *Poises* of Worldism". *International Studies Review* (2004a) 6, 21-49; and Agathangelou, Anna and L.H.M. Ling. "Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire from September 11". *International Studies Quarterly* (2004b) 48, 517-538.

¹⁶ I thank Ronnie Lipschutz for his questions in February of 2005 that threw my concerns of feminist IR into deeper crisis and created a deeper desire for the commitment to salvage the theoretical and material possibilities of feminist IR.

¹⁷ See Agathangelou and Ling (2004a) and the growing postcolonial IR literature.

¹⁸ Again, differently gendered bodies refers to the multiple categorical formulations that are embodied within, upon and outside the body. It is an attempt to acknowledge the inability to be one type of body but also to recognize that the legibilities of bodies are always contested sites of power, which has different meanings and dis/embodiments within differing epistemological frameworks. To think of differently gendered bodies is to seriously question the constructions of bodies, categorical formulations and the interplay of these constructions. Foundational to an understanding of differently gendered bodies is the formulation of *Otherness* because 'differently' already assumes an understanding of multiple categorical formulations which are only made possible because of an understanding of *Other*.

¹⁹ See Weber, Cynthia. *Faking It: US Hegemony in a "Post-Phallic" Era*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1999; Kinsella, Helen

²⁰ See Agathangelou (2005); Agathangelou and Ling (2004a&b); Chowdhry and Nair (2002); and Ling (2002).

²¹ I am deliberating using the term 'us' as an unfixed and undefined site in the *hope* of widening the participants for this discussion, while struggling to be fully aware of the asymmetrical and silenced relations that are potentially

involved in this collaboration. It is absolutely necessary to be critical of who is required to do what type of labor for this collaborative discussion, as well as who is excluded.

²² I would like to thank Tamara Spira for numerous conversations which helped me negotiate through our ideas on larger political debates about the body which enabled me to articulate the complexity of my desires for this paper and larger political contexts.

²³ Rushin, Kate. "The Bridge Poem". *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Moraga, Cherrie and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981): 1vii-1viii, 1viii.

²⁴ I am specifically referring the following texts written by Cynthia Enloe: *Bananas, Beaches & Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: California UP, 1989; *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*. Berkeley: California UP, 2004; *Does Khaki Become You?: The Militarization of Women's Lives*. London: Pandora, 1983; and *The Morning After: Sexual Politics and the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley: California UP, 1993.

²⁵ Enloe (1983): 1-45.

²⁶ *Ibid* 46-78.

²⁷ I would like to thank Anna Agathangelou for illuminating this point to me.

²⁸ *Ibid* 81.

²⁹ *Ibid* 35.

³⁰ *Ibid*. See back cover.

³¹ Carpenter, R. Charlie "Gender Theory in World Politics: Contributions of a Nonfeminist Standpoint?"

International Studies Review (2002): 4(3), 153-165.

³² Enloe (1983): ix.

³³ Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Cartographies of Struggle: Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism". *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Eds. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991. 35.

³⁴ I would like to thank Ronnie Lipschutz for discussing with me the idea that the project of International Relations is about mastering bodies and neo/liberalism is a project of making the individual master its own body, thus masking the importance of bodies.

³⁵ For discussion on colonial legibility see Turcotte, Heather. "Colonial Legibilities and the Embodiment of Violence". *Working Paper*. 2005.

³⁶ I use actively here because it requires a lot of labor, power, discipline and violence to make ideas and practices appear as normal and naturalized.

³⁷ Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. London: Macmillan, 1988. 271-313.

³⁸ Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses". *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Eds. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991. 51-80.

³⁹ Spivak: 294-295.

⁴⁰ Kaplan, Caren and Inderpal Grewal. "Transnational Feminist Cultural Studies: Beyond the Marxism/Poststructuralism/Feminism Divides". *Between Woman and Nation: Nationalisms, Transnational Feminisms and the State*. Eds. Caren Kaplan et al. Durham: Duke, 1999. 349-363: 355.

⁴¹ Mohanty. "Under Western Eyes": 55.

⁴² *Ibid* 71.

⁴³ Enloe (1983): ix.

⁴⁴ My use of crazy-making is to refer to the competitive and comprising nature of the discipline to produce 'experts' in the field that can speak scientific truth as to how people and states will interact with one another in an effort to understand war and conflict. However, this institutionalizing process seeks to produce students that only speak one particular language, the language that existed before them, in an effort to perpetuate hierarchies of power that have worked hard to solidify themselves as the powerful. Challenges to theory and method are often unsupported, viciously critiqued, or outright ignored leaving the student or junior faculty member to struggle with the how to re/negotiate their existence within the discipline. The lack of support or acknowledgement results in the desperate search to find those who can/do relate. At times, the craziness may cause one to leave the discipline and venture forth into other disciplines. Many times, it enables the growth of subsets within the discipline where people can work together collaboratively, but still having to fight the mainstream battle. However, the craziest of the crazy-making develops within the subset. As the subset struggles to solidify itself within the discipline as a valid approach to understanding IR, it begins to re/produce the actions and insecurities of the mainstream. In an effort to protect

itself and those ‘founding’ members who have struggled to obtain some level of recognition and power, it shuns those who question, critique it, or seek to broaden its analytical framework. Crazy-making is the process of continuously closing the possibilities of multiplicities of knowing and being.

⁴⁵ I am referring specifically to Chowdhry and Nair (2002); Jabri, Vivienne and Eleanor O’Gorman, Eds. *Women, Culture, and International Relations*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1999; Ling (2002); and Rai, Shirin and Geraldine Lievesley, Eds. *Women and the State: International Perspectives*. Bristol: Taylor and Francis, 1996.

⁴⁶ The list of feminist IR is too vast for me to list completely here. The following are only a few examples: Howes, Ruth and Michael Stevenson, Eds. *Women and the Use of Military Force*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1993; Jabri and O’Gorman (1999); Nussbaum, Martha. *Sex and Social Justice*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999; Peterson (1992); Peterson, V. Spike and Anne Sisson Runyan. *Global Gender Issues: Dilemmas in World Politics*. 2nd Ed. Boulder: Westview, 1999; Rai and Lievesley (1996); Tickner (1992); and Zalewski, Marysia and Jane Parpart, Eds. *The “Man” Question in International Relations*. Boulder: Westview, 1998.

⁴⁷ See Enloe (2004).

⁴⁸ I would like to remind the reader that feminist IR is not the only academic body that re/produces legibility as such—it too is rendered legible within and to a larger political framework.

⁴⁹ I am thinking particularly of the recent publications within *International Studies Quarterly* and *International Studies Review*.

⁵⁰ Carpenter, R. Charlie. “Women, Children and Other Vulnerable Groups”: Gender, Strategic Frames and the Protection of Civilians as a Transnational Issue”. *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (2005): 295-334.

⁵¹ I would like to point out that Carpenter is discussing human and humanitarian in binary relationship to one another. Human rights law refers to the rights of individuals during times of peace, the right to life. Humanitarian rights law refers to the rights regulated during times of war, how to decipher who is to be killed and who is to live. She points this out specifically on page 302.

⁵² *Ibid* 295.

⁵³ *Ibid* 296.

⁵⁴ *Op cit*.

⁵⁵ *Ibid* 298.

⁵⁶ *Ibid* 300.

⁵⁷ *Ibid* 300-307.

⁵⁸ *Ibid* 307.

⁵⁹ *Ibid* 311.

⁶⁰ See Spivak, Gayatri. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia UP, 2003.

⁶¹ Tickner, J. Ann. “You Just Don’t Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists”. *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (1997): 611-632.

⁶² *Ibid* 630.

⁶³ See Carpenter (2002).

⁶⁴ *Ibid* 163.

⁶⁵ Carver, Terrell, ed. “The Forum: Gender and International Relations”. *International Studies Review* 5 (2003): 287-302.

⁶⁶ *Ibid* 287.

⁶⁷ I am following Kimberlé Crenshaw’s understanding and utilization of intersectionality, in “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color”. *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*. Eds. Kimberlé Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas. New York: New York Press, 1995: 357-383, which discusses categorical constructions are always in relationship to one another with varying levels of relations of power depending on the context of the interaction. For instance, race does not exist separate from the identity of woman—the location and identity of ‘women of color’.

⁶⁸ Carver (2003): 297.

⁶⁹ Yamada, Mitsuye. “Asian Pacific American Women and Feminism”. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981): 74-79, 79.

⁷⁰ Gluck, Sherna. “Whose Feminism, Whose History?: Reflections on Excavating the History of (the) US Women’s Movements.” *Community Activism and Feminist Politics: Organizing Across Race, Class, and Gender*. Ed. Nancy Naples. New York and London: Routledge, 1998.

⁷¹ V. Spike Peterson. "Security and Sovereign States: What is at Stake in Taking Feminism Seriously?". *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Ed. V. Spike Peterson. Boulder: Rienner, 1992. 31-32.

⁷² *Ibid.* 57-58.

⁷³ For an in depth discussion on the illusions of feminist homogeneity and a critical examination of "white, middle-class bias in feminist theory" in relationship to women of color feminisms see Davis, Angela. *Women, Race, and Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1981; hooks, bell. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: South End Press, 2000 (original 1984); Lorde, Audre. "An Open Letter to Mary Daly". *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981); Smith, Barbara, Ed. *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*. New York: Kitchen Table/Women of Color Press, 1983; and Spelman, Elizabeth. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1988.

⁷⁴ For a discussion of what I am referring to as the hegemonic women's movement within the US see Rosen, Ruth. *The World Split Open: How The Modern Women's Movement Changed America*. New York: Viking Press, 2000.

⁷⁵ Gluck (1998): 32-34.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 40-44.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 50-51.

⁷⁸ Collins, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2000: vii.

⁷⁹ *Op cit.*

⁸⁰ Blackwell, Maylei. "Contested Histories: Las Hijas de Cuauhtémoc, Chicana Feminisms, and Print Culture in the Chicana Movement, 1968-1973". *Chicana Feminisms: A Critical Reader*. Eds. Gabriela F. Arrendondo et al. Durham & London: Duke UP, 2003: 59-89.

⁸¹ Enke, Anne. "Smuggling Sex Through the Gates: Race, Sexuality, and the Politics of Space in Second Wave Feminism." *American Quarterly* 55.4 (2003): 635-667. available online [Hhttp://lion.chadwyck.com](http://lion.chadwyck.com)H. Online pages 1-17.

⁸² I am using imagined communities in the way that has been described by Anderson, Benedict

⁸³ Blackwell (2003): 60-61.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 72, 80.

⁸⁵ Enke (2003): online 14.

⁸⁶ Gluck 53-55.

⁸⁷ Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. *The Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981).

⁸⁸ Gomez-Vega, Ibis with Mariana Romo-Carmona. "The Telling of Cuentos: Stories by Latinas A Conversation About Art and Politics with Mariana Romo-Carmona". Available online [Hhttp://www.home.earthlink.net/~romochan/id5.html](http://www.home.earthlink.net/~romochan/id5.html)H [5 October 2004].

⁸⁹ Alexander, M. Jacqui. "Remembering This Bridge, Remembering Ourselves". *Sing, Whisper, Shout: Feminist Vision for a Just World*. M. Jacqui Alexander, Lisa Albrecht, Sharon Day and Mab Segrest, Eds. New York: Edge Work, 2003: 611-639.

⁹⁰ Alexander (2003).

⁹¹ For example see Chowdhry and Nair (2004); Jabri and O'Gorman (1999); and Rai and Lievesley (1996).

⁹² Jabri and O'Gorman (1999): 5.

⁹³ Imam, Ayesha, Amina Mama, and Fatou Sow, eds. *Engendering African Social Sciences*. Chippenham: Antony Rowe, 1997.

⁹⁴ Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

⁹⁵ Oyewùmí, Oyèrónké, ed. *African Women & Feminism: Reflecting On the Politics of Sisterhood*. Trenton: Africa World, 2003.

⁹⁶ This example is taken from one of the panels that I chaired at International Studies Association Annual Conference, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, March 1-5, 2005 entitled, "Gender, Violence and War".

⁹⁷ Imam (1997): 17.

⁹⁸ Ogunidipe-Leslie, 'Molara. "African Women, Culture, and Another Development". *Theorizing Black Feminists: The Visionary Pragmatism of Black Women*. Eds. Stanlie James and Abena Busia. London: Routledge, 1993: 102-117, 103.

- ⁹⁹ *Ibid* 105.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid* 105-06.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid* 107.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid* 110.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid* 109.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid* 113.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Op cit*.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Ibid* 113-114.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Ibid* 116.
- ¹⁰⁸ Mbire-Barungi, Barbara. "Ugandan Feminism: Political Rhetoric or Reality?" *Women's Studies International Forum*. 22.4 (1999): 435-439.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid* 435-36.
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid* 436.
- ¹¹¹ *Ibid* 439.
- ¹¹² *Op cit*.
- ¹¹³ *Ibid* 438.
- ¹¹⁴ *Ibid* 439.
- ¹¹⁵ *Op cit*.
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid* 438.
- ¹¹⁷ *Ibid* 439.
- ¹¹⁸ Mikell, Gwendolyn. "African Feminism: Towards a New Politics of Representation". *Feminist Studies* 21.2 (Summer 1995): 405-424. Online pages: 1-23.
- ¹¹⁹ *Ibid* 2-3.
- ¹²⁰ *Ibid* 1.
- ¹²¹ *Ibid* 13.
- ¹²² *Ibid* 5.
- ¹²³ *Ibid* 6.
- ¹²⁴ *Ibid* 17.
- ¹²⁵ *Ibid* 10.
- ¹²⁶ *Ibid* 9.
- ¹²⁷ *Ibid* 13.
- ¹²⁸ Kalu, Anthonia. "Women and the Social Construction of Gender in African Development". *Africa Today* 43.3 (July-September 1996): 269-288. Online pages 1-24, 1.
- ¹²⁹ *Ibid* 1.
- ¹³⁰ *Ibid* 2.
- ¹³¹ *Ibid* 19.
- ¹³² *Ibid* 2.
- ¹³³ *Ibid* 7.
- ¹³⁴ *Ibid* 10.
- ¹³⁵ *Ibid* 11.
- ¹³⁶ *Ibid* 13.
- ¹³⁷ *Ibid* 15.
- ¹³⁸ *Ibid* 19.
- ¹³⁹ Busia, Abena. "Performance, Transcription and the Languages of the Self: Interrogating Identity as a "Post Colonial" Poet". *Theorizing Black Feminisms: The Visionary Pragmatism of Black Women*. Eds. Stanlie James and Abena Busia. New York: Routledge, 1993: 203-213, 205.
- ¹⁴⁰ *Ibid* 205.
- ¹⁴¹ *Op cit*
- ¹⁴² *Ibid* 206.
- ¹⁴³ *Ibid* 207.
- ¹⁴⁴ *Ibid* 208.
- ¹⁴⁵ *Ibid* 210-11.
- ¹⁴⁶ *Ibid* 209.
- ¹⁴⁷ *Ibid* 212.
- ¹⁴⁸ *Op cit*

¹⁴⁹Okeke, Philomina. "Postmodern Feminism and Knowledge Production: The African Context". *Africa Today* 43.3 (July-Sept 1996): 223-234. Online Pages: 1-15.

¹⁵⁰*Ibid* 3-4.

¹⁵¹*Ibid* 4.

¹⁵²*Ibid* 5.

¹⁵³*Ibid* 5-6.

¹⁵⁴*Ibid* 7.

¹⁵⁵*Ibid* 9.

¹⁵⁶Nnaemeka, Obioma. "Nego-Feminism: Theorizing, Practicing, and Pruning Africa's Way". *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 29.2 (2003). Online pages 1-21, 15.

¹⁵⁷*Ibid* 14.

¹⁵⁸*Ibid* 14-15.

¹⁵⁹*Ibid* 15.

¹⁶⁰*Ibid* 4.

¹⁶¹*Ibid* 5.

¹⁶²*Ibid* 6.

¹⁶³*Ibid* 7.

¹⁶⁴*Ibid* 9.

¹⁶⁵*Ibid* 11.

¹⁶⁶*Ibid* 11-12.

¹⁶⁷*Ibid* 12.

¹⁶⁸*Op cit*

¹⁶⁹*Ibid* 13.

¹⁷⁰*Ibid* 16.

¹⁷¹*Ibid* 17.

¹⁷²*Ibid* 16.

¹⁷³*Ibid* 18.

¹⁷⁴*Op cit*

¹⁷⁵Moraga, Cherríe. "The Welder". *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Moraga, Cherríe and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 3rd Ed. Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 2002 (original 1981): 245-46, 245.

¹⁷⁶See Alexander, M. Jacqui. "Redrafting Morality: The Postcolonial State and the Sexual Offenses Bill of Trinidad and Tobago". *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Eds. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres. Bloomington, Indiana UP, 1991: 133-152.