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INTRODUCTION

Neither European based new social movement theory nor U.S. based resource mobilization theory offer satisfactory analytical and conceptual tools to analyze feminist movements in transnational relation to each other. While the two aforementioned theoretical approaches provide useful ways to think about political opportunity structures, mobilizing structures, framing and collective identity formation, neither adequately addresses issues related to social location, asymmetric power relations and everyday resistance and dissent. Moreover, neither approach successfully integrates structural and organizational analysis with the study of individual and collective identity formation.

Jean Cohen and Andrew Arato (1992) describe the Atlantic divide in approaches to theorizing social movements that occurred in the 1970’s. New social movement theory emerged in Europe while resource mobilization theory developed in the U.S. In a response to this divide, Cohen and Arato present the concept of dual politics, a politics of influence and a politics of identity that bridge the two legacies while maintaining their individual integrity. This approach combines the polity oriented organizational and procedural analysis of resource mobilization with attention to culture, the politics of identity and discursive processes.

Sonia Alvarez (2000), in her discussion of feminist movements in the 1990’s, highlights two main types of logics, international governmental organization (IGO) advocacy and international identity-solidarity. She asserts that these two logics are not separate. Indeed, IGO advocacy utilizes and builds upon the dense networks of international identity solidarity and international identity solidarity constructs new discourses and meanings that inform IGO advocacy concepts and practices. I use transnational and U.S. women of color feminism to study the mutually constitutive qualities of dual politics by focusing on social location as the conceptual and analytical point of entry. The issues that drive both types of dual politics are largely due to historical and contextual exclusions; therefore an
analysis of social location forms the theoretical foundation for analyzing transnational feminist movements and the women's rights movement in specific.

Given the general limitations of U.S. social movement theories, I contend that women of color and transnational feminism provide effective analytical and conceptual tools for the study of feminist movements and their efforts to build transnational coalitions and networks. Women of color feminism is especially conscious of accounting for local embodied social actors. By taking the issue of social location, specifically gender, race/ethnicity, class, and sexuality, women of color and transnational feminisms present an important intervention in social movement theory. They expose how the structural and organizational aspects of social movements and individual and collective identity formation are mutually informative and constitutive. In other words, dual politics, the politics of influence and identity can be bridged conceptually if social location is taken as a point of reference.

My dissertation will evaluate the effectiveness of human rights discourse as a vehicle for Peruvian and Colombian women's efforts to make visible the impact of the conflict on their lives. Transnational and women of color feminisms provide conceptual and analytical tools to examine how women appropriate, interpret and re-deploy the discourse of human rights across international, regional, national and local levels of scale. I employ five interrelated lines of inquiry to frame my research question: the local in relation to multiple levels of scale, the dynamic quality of identity formation, structural inequality, the production and reception of ideas, practices and knowledges, and the circuits and flows of people, funding and discourse. I ask how the documentation of human rights abuses both facilitates and constrains Peruvian women’s efforts to articulate and record the impact of the civil conflict on their lives. Studying women's organizations exposes the strategic utility of universal claims to human rights and the constant and dynamic process by which Peruvian and Colombian women adapt and stretch human rights discourse to more accurately address their particular context.
In this statement I will explicate how transnational and women of color feminisms intervene in social movement theory, providing an effective basis for the study of transnational feminist movements. I elaborate on the concept of dual politics and the conceptual and analytical divide between influence and identity based politics and the way U.S. social movement theory prioritizes the politics of influence. First I explain how U.S. social movement theory's presuppositions marginalize the study of feminist movements, especially in conflict-ridden contexts such as Colombia and Peru. Second I show how social movement theory ostensibly maintains the conceptual and analytical divide between influence and identity approaches, with some attempts to absorb identity-based analysis into polity oriented organizational and procedural analysis. Resource mobilization largely separates the study of the mechanics of mobilizing processes from the reasons why people mobilize collectively. I argue that this divide functions to occlude the processes of collective identity formation, coalition building and political strategizing within and among feminist movements. Last, I evaluate U.S. social movement theory efforts to address the issue of transnationalism. In this final section, I situate the discussion of the transnational within related areas of the international and the global and examine how the divide between the politics of influence and identity continues to vex efforts by social movement theorists to conceptualize the transnational. However, I stress transnational social movement theory that shifts the theoretical lens to include a close analysis of power asymmetries. Such theoretical work approximates an analysis of social location that both U.S. Latina and Chicana and Latin American feminist movements carefully elaborate and constantly negotiate inside their movements and with other movements transnationally.

Within the study of transnationalism, I will detail two issues. First I present a close reading of feminist interventions in international human rights. During the last 30 years, international human rights have become a strategic tool and point of theorizing in feminist movement building and political
advocacy on local, regional, national, international and transnational levels. Social movement literature on women's rights lends itself more to the structural and organizational tendencies of resource mobilization theory. As I develop the history and main arguments surrounding the establishment of women's rights I show how many insightful interventions have come from women of color and transnational feminisms. Ultimately, issues of social location underlie much of the feminist theory and practice that engages international human rights. The human rights debate of universalism vs. cultural relativism underscores the ongoing material and discursive problems caused by complex and asymmetrical vectors of power. Kimberlé Crenshaw and Celia Romany analyze multiple vectors of oppression and critically link their consequences and affects on various levels including structural, discursive, political and identity politics. Human rights discourse, a seemingly formal political and representational issue, is illuminated through identity politics.

In addition to the increased use and importance of human rights and other international conventions to transnational feminist movement building and theorizing, regional and international conferences and meetings illustrate how coalition building is a closely related and highly charged area of theory and practice. I will develop the second part of my argument through an exploration of feminist coalition building. U.S. Latina and Chicana and Latin American feminist movement theorists grapple with questions of movement heterogeneity, identity formation, gender, race/ethnicity, class, sexuality and nationalism among other movement and coalition building sticking points. Here I present the concept of coalitional thinking that brings together U.S. Latina and Chicana, Latin American and transnational feminisms to elaborate upon two concepts, cultural translation and relationality. Coalitional thinking provides a framework for theorizing about and working in feminist coalition. My goal is to complement the point I make regarding the political and representational aspects of women's
rights as informed by identity politics. I will show how identity politics and theories of coalition directly relate to internal structural and organizational movement concerns.

Social location is the unifying thread that connects coalition building and the role of international human rights as related to U.S. Chicana and Latina and Latin American feminist movements. Through the study of international human rights and coalition building, women of color and transnational feminisms offer substantial contributions to transnational social movement theory by elucidating how dual politics are mutually constitutive.

**DUAL POLITICS - LIMITS OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY**

This section provides an overview of the concept of dual politics and an examination of the limits of social movement theory for the study of transnational social movements. In theorizing social movements, the dominant approach until the 1970's was collective behavior theory, which presupposes behavior to be nonrational or irrational. This bias assumes that collective action erodes civil society, thereby negating the constructive and complicated relationship between the two. In the 1970's two new approaches developed resource mobilization in the U.S. and new social movements in Europe. Contrary to collective behavior, both these approaches shared the assumption that collective action is rational and conflictual collective action is normal within modern pluralist civil society. According to Cohen and Arato, the new aspect of social movements was their "self-limited radicalism" that "abandons revolutionary dreams in favor of radical reform that is not necessarily or primarily oriented to the state." (Cohen and Arato 1992, 493)

Resource mobilization theory is based on the logic of strategic interaction and cost-benefit calculations with a goal oriented focus on political and economic structures. (Cohen and Arato 1992, 523) Rational actors within social movements have sophisticated organizational forms and modes of communication. Political process theory is one of three variations of resource mobilization theory, the
other two being rational actor and organizational-entrepreneurial approaches. Cohen and Arato emphasize the need to examine the organizational forms that resource mobilization theory presupposes and the social political terrain upon which it is set. (Cohen and Arato 1992, 499) Civil society is this terrain upon which "social actors assemble, organize, and mobilize, even if their targets are the economy and the state." (Cohen and Arato 1992, 502) Yet, resource mobilization theory shortchanges an analysis of political identity and discursive processes by incorporating culture and acknowledging some of the ways culture mediates structure. (Flacks, 3) Cohen and Arato respond to this problematic by proposing "a dualistic politics of identity and influence, aimed at both civil society and the polity." (Cohen and Arato 1992, 504)

On the other hand, new social movement theory focuses on issues of social norms and collective identity. The creation of identity "involves social conflict around the reinterpretation of norms, the creation of new meanings, and the challenge to the social construction of the very boundaries between public, private and political domains of action." (Cohen and Arato 1992, 511)

Therefore, "civil society is the target and terrain of collective action, to look into the processes by which collective actors create the identities and solidarities they defend, to assess the relations between social adversaries and the stakes of their conflicts, to analyze the politics of influence exercised by actors in civil society on those in political society, and to analyze the structural and cultural developments that contribute to the heightened self-reflections of actors." (Cohen and Arato 1992, 509) They assert that the politics of influence is focused on political society while the politics of identity is focused inwardly to the lifeworld.

Social movements have a dual politics of defending civil society from encroachment by the state and economy while democratizing within civil society. This dualistic approach groups the two divergent tendencies within the study of social movements. The politics of influence calls for a polity oriented organizational and procedural analysis common to resource mobilization. The politics of identity claims that discursive processes are ends in themselves, as new social movement theory emphasizes. Civil
society is the domain of struggle, "the social realm in which the creation of norms, identities, institutions and social relations of domination and resistance are located." (Cohen and Arato 1992, 515) Yet they underscore that civil society should be differentiated from sociocultural lifeworld in that civil society emphasizes structures of socialization that are institutionalized or on the way to being institutionalized. (Cohen and Arato 1992, x) Therefore, the theory of civil society as related to social movements emphasizes institutionalization and influence on formal political and economic institutions.

Cohen and Arato take the feminist movement as an example in that there are two main fronts. One the one hand, the politics of identity is evidenced in that gender codes must be reworked discursively and on the other, politics of influence is critical to contest "inequities in the distribution of money and power must be contested." (Cohen and Arato 1992, 543)

The dual logic of feminist politics thus involves a communicative, discursive politics of identity and influence that targets civil and political society and an organized, strategically rational politics of inclusion and reform that is aimed at political and economic institutions. (Cohen and Arato 1992, 550)

Cohen and Arato's measure of success is the level to which values, norms and institutions are democratized. This reiterates the fact that they favor the realm of civil society institutions and their politics of influence focused on political and economic institutions. They argue that this displaces movement fundamentalism, the extreme of identity politics, and political elitism, the extreme lack of a politics of influence. (Cohen and Arato 1992, 563) I argue that this approach holds presuppositions about the state, political society and civil society that correspond to feminist movements in the U.S. or Europe, yet are significantly tested when studying feminist movements in Latin America or South Asia for example. U.S. movement theorists, specifically political process theorists share these liberal presuppositions especially regarding the state.
Marginalizing of feminist movements

The main thrust of this critique builds upon a theoretical limitation that political process theorists identify themselves; that their theory is most applicable to Western liberal democratic regimes (McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly 2001, 18. Tilly, Charles 1978, 10. Tarrow 1998, 19). This U.S. based theory has a blind spot of feminist movements in the Global South for two reasons. First it does not provide an analytical lens to account for varied and complex types of regimes, regime transitions and civil conflict and their impact on women and their political organizing. Second, political process theorists analytically separate the study of how movements organize, mobilizing processes, from why they organize, grievances. This analytical divide functions to eclipse the processes and construction of feminist movement's collective identities and action strategies.

Tarrow writes that nonviolent contention can be useful as a "relatively risk-free means of assembling large numbers of people and giving them the sense that they are acting meaningfully on behalf of their beliefs. But on the other hand, it deprives organizers of the potent weapon of outrage." (Tarrow 1998, 84) This assertion exposes the assumption of baseline order and tranquility. In violent and unstable contexts, mobilization is rarely, if ever risk-free. Likewise, the weapon of outrage, that assumes the potential use of violence, is a dangerous option for social movement participants. Movement participants who use the "potent weapon of outrage" risk being perceived as operating on the same plane as violent social actors. Tarrow 's concept of unobtrusive mobilization, when linked to non-violence assists in thinking about feminist movement strategies and tactics.

Repressive states depress collective action of a conventional and a confrontational sort, but leave themselves open to unobtrusive mobilization which can signal solidarity that becomes a resource when the opportunities arise. (Tarrow 1998, 84)
The rules that usually go along with social movement repertoires of action are not the same if there is no baseline order and stability. Non-violence and pacifism become important tactical options when interacting with violent or armed actors.

Ray and Korteweg (1996) explore the impact of instability and disorder on women’s lives and mobilizing strategies in the context of Third World states in transition. As regimes shift, women's identities also transition along with the conditions under which they mobilize. (Ray and Korteweg 1999, 63) Secondly, they assert that concepts such as political opportunity structure must be adapted to address postcolonialism among other political conditions. Political opportunity has been defined as "consistent - but not necessarily formal or permanent - dimensions of the political environment that provide incentives for collective action by affecting people's expectations for success or failure." (Tarrow 1998, 19-20) Ray and Korteweg study shifts in regime type, democratization, anticolonial and nationalist struggles, socialist and religious/fundamentalist movements, in relation to women's mobilization. Political processes in general and crises of the state in particular fundamentally shape Third World women's movements. Ray and Korteweg (1996) claim that the way "activists understand the nature of the state profoundly shapes the form and content of their activism." (Ray and Korteweg 1999, 62) Political opportunity is central to this claim, yet the general differences and dynamism of states in the Third World must be understood for this concept to be relevant.

Attention to the characteristics of the state is necessary to fully understand movement political opportunities and constraints. While the state has clear dangers and limitations, Ray and Korteweg (1996) support the approach of cautious and selective engagement with the state. Rai (1999) asserts that in the Third World, the state is critical to women's public and private lives. The state cannot be abandoned as an arena for struggle, rather struggle is focused upon women's access to the public sphere, particularly economics and politics. Within this context, Rai (1999) highlights three features of post-
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colonial states that are relevant for the study of women's struggles. The state capacity to enforce laws and regulations impact the level of transformation in society as well as the agendas of political and social movements. The next feature, corruption, is the dark side of weak state capacity. In this context, implementation of laws may be undermined and working directly with the state may be useless. In this case, women's movement and organizational capacity to protest is critical for change. Yet, the risks are high in that mobilization brings women in confrontation with the state. Rai’s attention to these features dovetails nicely with Ray and Korteweg's call for the enhancement of the concept of political opportunity structure to incorporate conditions of postcolonialism.

Rai's work incorporates a poststructuralist understanding of the state, she analyzes the discursive strategies of the state with regard to gender and highlights characteristics of postcolonial states that are critical for the study of women’s struggles. Specifically, Rai applies the poststructuralist concepts of the state as fluid and power as dispersed to explain how the embeddedness of the state in civil society is not always positive, indeed it can be dangerous and unpredictable for women. Though positioning the state as central to the study of women in the Third World, Rai asserts that both the state and civil society are complex terrains "fractured, oppressive, threatening, while at the same time providing spaces for struggle and negotiation." (Rai 1996, 15) This illustrates the complexity of women's relations in civil society, negating the possibility of rejecting either the state or civil society as a whole. Georgina Waylen and Vicky Randall provide complementary poststructural insights. Waylen asserts that the state is a "collection of agencies, discourses and institutions at local and national levels." (Waylen 1998, 15) Randall, echoing Rai, highlights the need "to recognise the multiple arenas of state activity" in addition to the varied access women may have in each arena. (Randall 1998, 196) Only by being aware of the limitations of the various arenas and creatively waging struggle on multiple fronts can women's
movements negotiate a level of protection for themselves and retrieve, regain and reconstruct control over the meanings and signifiers in their lives. (Rai 1996, 19)

I am interested in studying movements that work both in and against the state, including both reformist and revolutionary tendencies in an overarching network. This strategy relates directly to the complex role the state takes in relation to violence and women. Pettman explains this succinctly.

States have long resisted any responsibility for women's security from male violence and become complicit by not taking violence against women seriously. As well, it is often agents of the state, especially police and military, who are major abusers of women's rights. At the same time, state legislation and provision can make a profound difference to women's survival and choices. (Pettman 2002, 183)

Therefore, movement goals and strategies bridge the tension of reformist and revolutionary efforts. In political process terms, movement grievances exist on various levels and mobilization processes must be constructed to address these different demands, their complex interactions and potential contradictions. Randall offers the example that "in order for women's political participation to be effective there needs to be a combination of an autonomous or grassroots feminist movement with women's significant presence within state institutions." (Randall 1998, 202)

The revolutionary aspect of feminist movements could be understood as long term effects in consciousness raising. Villareal explains how women have the capability to subvert authoritarian power through their gender roles and behavior choices thereby shifting social relations. If women have the opportunity to develop their self-awareness and mobilize around their citizenship and democratic rights, they can subvert tradition by transmitting values of solidarity and equality. (Villareal 1997, 370) Tarrow explains three kinds of long term movement effects that he sees as important: their effect on political socialization, political culture, and political institutions and practices. (Tarrow 1998, 164) In addition, “extension of beliefs in society, survival of friendship networks, greater readiness to mobilize” are positive outcomes of ongoing movement building. (Tarrow 1998, 165) While these effects do not
measure up to the grand outcomes of revolutions such as Cuba in 1959 or Mexico in 1911, feminist movements utilize different tools in their struggle. Since their tools largely exclude violence, their goal is not to stage a monumental and punctuated transition of power. Feminist movements are commonly marginalized and their transformative potential as sources of social change and political innovation are under analyzed. Yet women's movements challenge and reshape dominant structures of power and governance. (Massicote 2003a, 15)

A general conceptual limitation of PPT is its emphasis on either mobilization processes or the assumption of grievances as a central component of studying social movements. Simply put, either research questions revolve around "how" social movements mobilize by studying processes or "why" they mobilize by studying grievances. For example, McCarthy and Zald take mobilizing processes as an independent variable, therefore studying the how rather than the why of social movements. (McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald 1987, 18) Their definition of social movement follows. "A social movement is a set of opinions and beliefs in a population representing preferences for changing some elements of the social structure or reward distribution, or both, of a society." (McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald 1987, 20) This bureaucratic definition assumes that a movement's goals are limited to changing some elements. Clearly influenced by McCarthy’s organizational structure approach, this dulls social movement theorizing into reformism and erases the radical potential of movements. Tarrow's definition of social movements, "those sequences of contentious politics that are based on underlying social networks and resonant collective action frames, and which develop the capacity to maintain sustained challenges against powerful opponents," is less reform oriented. (Tarrow 1998, 2) By analyzing the "how" and the "why" of movements in relation to each other, the analyst has the greatest possibility of capturing the complex interaction of movement collective identity formation with goals and strategies. Therefore, to hold the whole of a given feminist movement, one has to engage both "how" social movements mobilize
by studying processes and "why" they mobilize by studying grievances since one informs the other and one cannot make sense of them separately.

Positioning Transnationalism

Sidney Tarrow's *Power in Movement* (1998) and McAdam, McCarthy and Zald's *Comparative Perspectives* (1987), explicate the central concepts and frameworks of political process theory (PPT), which include political opportunity and mobilizing structures and framing. Recently such concepts have been stretched to account for the global level and maintain the problematic conceptual and analytical divides between the politics of influence and identity and the study of mobilization processes as separate from movement grievances. Before evaluating how social movement theory addresses transnationalism, I will address various terms, such as transnational, global, and civil society to contextualize and position my approach to transnational feminisms. I align myself with feminist scholars that use the term transnational rather than international or global. The term transnational alludes to how capital, cultural production, information, people, etc. cross national borders through varied and numerous channels, blurring the line between domestic and international levels. (Keck and Sikkink 1998, 29) In the context of studying transnational social movements, actors include non-state entities. While global feminism universalizes women's struggles, thereby homogenizing and abstracting women's agency and specific struggles, transnational feminism underscores the complex relationship between the global and the local levels. Transnational feminism maintains the contradictions and "tensions between nationalism, imperialism and internationalism, while those such as "international feminism, global feminism and feminist internationalism tend to elide them." (True 1999, 269) I focus on non-state actors, civil society and social movements and draw upon feminist transnationalism to attend to varied and mutually constitutive levels of analysis. On the other hand, it is worth mentioning that feminist international relations scholars commonly use global to escape the problematic associations with international such as
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a singular focus on international organizations and state actors. In this sense, globalism acknowledges non-state actors and challenges the centrality of sovereignty and the nation-state.

Within U.S. based social movement theory Tarrow's dynamic statism is one example of the transition from nation-state based social movement theory to efforts to account for "transnational repertoires of organization, strategy, and collective action." (Tarrow 1987, 53) To study how the state is remade through contentious processes, Tarrow develops the idea of dynamic statism, which "allows us to specify political opportunity for different actors and sectors, to track its changes over time, and to place the analysis for social movements in their increasingly transnational setting." (Tarrow 1987, 45) Dynamic statism functions in theorizing about feminist movements because it is not completely bound to the nation-state; it addresses the variation of levels of scale including sub-national, sub-group and transnational influences. Tarrow defines transnational social movements as "sustained contentious interactions with opponents --national or non-national--by connected networks of challengers organized across national boundaries." (Tarrow 1998, 184) Yet as much as he attempts to come to terms with the transnational aspects of social movements, Tarrow asserts that the true significance of transnational contention is within national political struggles. (Tarrow 1998, 162) He is especially critical of the concept of global civil society, calling it an abstraction.

Ronnie Lipschutz's notion of global civil society can be aligned with feminist international relations scholars use of globalism since he is wary of the state-centered approach. He argues that the contradiction between the homogenizing and fragmenting qualities of globalization presents significant challenges to boundaries based on the nation-state and civic communities. He suggests a global response to avoid the conflict and violence that would be associated with efforts "to re-establish boundaries and civic communities." (Lipschutz 1999, 209) Lipschutz envisions this global response coming from global civil society. "A structure of actors and networks within which these new authorities
emerge" in "the transnational arena, where it constitutes a proto-society composed of local, national and
global institutions, corporations and non-governmental organizations. (Lipschutz 1999, 220-221)
Global civil society designates "the self conscious constructions of networks of knowledge and action,
the decentred, local actors, that cross the reified boundaries of space as though there were not there." (Lipschutz 1992, 390) These networks are a complex intersection of "economic, social and cultural
practices." (Clark, Friedman, and Hochstetler 1998, 3) The unifying norms of global civil society are "in
reaction to the legal and other socially constructed fictions of the nation-state system" and are connected
to a growing global consciousness. (Lipschutz 1992, 398) He argues that global civil society comes into
being due to the state's loss of sovereignty, the retreat of the welfare state, and in reaction to the
international system. (Lipschutz 1992, 399) "Ultimately, it is simultaneous individual resistance to the
consumer culture of global capitalism and collective resistance to its short and long-term effects that
give life and power to global civil society." (Lipschutz 1992, 418) Lipschutz describes the possibility of
global civil society rather than an assertion of its existence. I ask; how is global civil society constructed
and global consciousness nurtured?

Keck and Sikkink (1998) do not find sufficient evidence for the concept of global civil society. They argue that global civil society is based on a diffusionist perspective that overlooks the challenges and difficulties social actors face in constructing processes the can support and sustain global interaction. Keck and Sikkink prefer transnational civil society defined as an arena of struggle: "a fragmented and contested area where the politics of transnational civil society is centrally about the way certain groups emerge and are legitimized (by governments, institutions and other norms)" (Keck and Sikkink 1998, 33-34). Clark, Friedman and Hochstetler (1998) argue that global civil society is a developing concept, yet still incomplete and state sovereignty sets the limits. They determine this through testing the concept of global civil society through a systemic empirical assessment of
transnational relations, specifically NGO participation in UN World conferences. The focus on NGO's within civil society carves a specific cross-section of the larger definition of civil society. Their study illustrates that while there has been an increase in NGO's shared procedural repertoires, governments respond selectively and NGO's and states lack sustained social relationships. (Clark, Friedman and Hochstetler 1998, 5)

Tarrow forwards a state-centric critique of the concept of global civil society, furthering Keck and Sikkink and Clark, Friedman and Hochstetler's empirical critiques of global civil society. First, he contests the level to which the variety of movements can be unified under a global umbrella. Second, there is a lack of methodological rigor in that the causal mechanisms between globalization and resistance have not been demonstrated empirically. Third, the relationship between states and international institutions and global civil society is under theorized. Last, the study of global civil societies is dominated by the Global North. (Tarrow 2002, 233)

While Tarrow is still focused on mechanisms and processes and the analysis of domestic contention, he attempts to translate his conceptual framework up to the transnational level. He argues that "a dynamic mechanism-and-process approach can take us beyond both the static structuralism of the domestic social movement model and the poorly specified approach of globalization theorists in understanding the dynamics of transnational mobilization." (Tarrow 2002, 240) Transnational activism, according to Tarrow, could just be an extension of domestic practices and definitely does not merit the new name of global civil society. Yet Tarrow values the research agenda of exposing the causal mechanisms between globalization, resistance and activism.

Similar to Tarrow's first critique that questions the universality of global civil society, Massicote challenges the concept of a progressive global civil society as a unifying paradigm of social movements.
She asks a key question for transnational social movement theorizing that demands attention to social positioning.

How are participants adopting a transnational strategy that involves sustained exchanges, cooperation and common actions across borders, while remaining firmly rooted in specific cultural, socio-economic and political contexts which shape their objectives, analyses, and political projects? (Massicote 2003a, 6)

Countering the logic of globalism, Massicote asserts that transnational social actors have local and national roots and histories. Moreover, grassroots sociopolitical movements are still the main spaces where people get involved and implement projects. (Massicote 2003b, 106) Movements cooperate with different agendas, political practices and priorities, and influence and adapt to each other in unpredictable and creative ways. Movements may consolidate through local, national and transnational organizing yet do not "add up to a "universalized revolutionary struggle."" (Massicote 2003a, 16) I endorse Tarrow's insistence on analysis of the local level and Massicote's attention to the social positioning of embodied social actors. As I will illustrate later, women of color feminism offers excellent analytical and conceptual tools to integrate an examination of local and embodied social actors with structural, representational and discursive analysis.

**Theorizing Transnationalism**

I will explore three main ways transnationalism is theorized in relation to social movements. As Tarrow's critique of global civil society illustrates, there is a tendency in the U.S. to focus on domestic level mechanisms and processes. This tendency is echoed most recently by Smith, Chatfield and Pagnucco (1997), Keck and Sikkink (1998), Khagram, Ricker and Sikkink (2002), Friedman (1999) and Sperling, Marx Ferree and Risman (2001). Smith and Johnston (2002) and Guidry, Kennedy and Zald (2000) and Naples and Desai (2002) take the transnational intervention into social movement theory more seriously and reconfigure their analysis accordingly.
A third body of literature, influenced by postmodernism, poststructuralism and postcolonialism, theorizes culturally inflected notions of transnationalism, affiliating it with new social movement literature. I will narrow my review of this body of literature to primarily feminist contributions, such as Mandaville (1999), Heitleinger (1999), Frankenburg and Mani (2001), Grewal and Kaplan (1994), and Basu (2000). I will place the feminists studying transnationalism into conversation with women of color feminists including the contributors to the anthology This Bridge Called My Back (1981), Zavella (1991), Alarcón (1990), Patricia Hill Collins (1989), Crenshaw (1991), Smith (1998), and Mohanty (1991).

These three main variants will be briefly reviewed and evaluated with regard to the conceptual and analytical divides between the politics of influence and identity and the mobilization processes and movement grievances. I argue that transnational and women of color feminisms offer an important intervention in theorizing feminist social movements, by analyzing heterogeneous social actors in relation to macro circuits, systems and structures of power. This survey of approaches to transnationalism will set the basis for a further exploration of my argument through the two main issues of exposition: international human rights and coalitional thinking.

Smith, Chatfield and Pagnucco take the domestic analytical tools of resource mobilization theory and apply them to the transnational arena, asserting that "transnational social movements and their organizations contribute various forms of political leverage needed to overcome systemic barriers to global problem solving." (Smith, Pagnucco and Chatfield 1997, 60 and 243) This approach is a combination of sociology and international relations and its main contributions are to question the state as a unitary actor and blur the boundaries between domestic and international levels. The transnational social movement activity they analyze includes "creating and mobilizing global networks, participating
in multilateral political arenas, facilitating interstate cooperation, acting within states, and enhancing public participation." (Smith, Pagnucco and Chatfield 1997, 260)

Smith, Chatfield and Pagnucco are systematic in their application of the domestic analysis of the mechanics and processes of social movements to the transgovernmental arena, which prioritizes institutions. Transgovernmental arena emphasizes "the decision-making role of intergovernmental agencies and also include the role of nongovernmental ones." (Smith, Pagnucco and Chatfield 1997, 67) Mobilizing structures and political opportunity structures are also translated to the transnational level for analysis of transnational social movements and organizations. Smith, Pagnucco and Chatfield acknowledge that there are various levels of change; "movement actors must respond to these opportunity structures even as they work to alter them." (Smith, Pagnucco and Chatfield 1997, 66)

Echoing Cohen and Arato's dual politics, they categorize high politics as activity in explicitly political arenas, politics of influence, and deep politics as shaping values and behavior, politics of identity. This latter politics is accomplished through strategies and frames, which completes the translation of resource mobilization to the transnational level.

Keck and Sikkink's intervention is at the intersection of comparative politics social movement theory and international relations constructivism, yet with a strong focus on networks and attention to bridging dual politics. Networks are "forms of organization characterized by voluntary, reciprocal, and horizontal patterns of communication and exchange." (Keck and Sikkink 1998, 8) Transnational advocacy networks (TANs) are the centerpiece to their analysis, "networks of activists, distinguishable largely by the centrality of principled ideas or values in motivating their formation." (Keck and Sikkink 1998, 1) These networks are significant because they transform the practice of national sovereignty and behavior of international organizations. Again, dual politics is practiced in the political spaces carved by TANs through both influencing policy outcomes and changing the terms and nature of key debates.
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(Keck and Sikkink 1998, 2) TANs have alternative power through the use of information, symbols, leverage and accountability politics. (Keck and Sikkink 1998, 16) Keck and Sikkink borrow frames from resource mobilization theory to elaborate their idea of frame resonance, which is used to crystallize meanings and propel transnational campaigns.

Similar to Keck and Sikkink, Khagram, Riker and Sikkink (2002) take up the analysis of transnational social movements and networks with similar reference points and interventions. In particular, they bridge international relations transnationalism with political science social movement theory. They focus on non-state actors, new arenas of action and blur the line between domestic and global with the goal of researching how "transnational advocacy groups contribute to restructuring world politics by altering the norm structure of global governance." (Khagram, Riker and Sikkink 2002, 302) To study how non-state actors influence and create new norms and practices, Khagram, Riker and Sikkink focus on transnational networks, coalitions, movements and international non-governmental organizations. They define transnational social movements as a minimum of entities in three countries mobilizing together in a sustained manner. Their analysis of transnational social movements continues to utilize resource mobilization concepts such as sources, processes, political opportunity structures and outcomes while trying to bridge issues related to the politics of identity.

International relations discussions of norms and ideas are brought to bear on struggles over the meaning and the use of persuasion and moral pressure to change international institutions and governments. Norms are defined as "shared expectations held by a community of actors about appropriate behaviors for actors within a given identity." (Khagram, Riker and Sikkink 2002, 13) While norms address the issue of meaning making, it is a weak conceptual tool for the demands related to studying the politics of identity and this claim will be developed at length in the section on coalition building. The authors identify the double charge of transnational NGO's, networks and social
movements: to address internal asymmetries to increase internal democracy and to enhance external deliberation and representation in international institutions. Yet, they lack an analysis of the asymmetries to which they refer. This is the territory of structural and discursive analysis of power relations, and feminist critical race scholarship is extremely useful in exploring this under-theorized area in both international relations transnationalism and political science social movement studies.

Friedman offers an important intervention in transnational social movement theory through her notion of "transnationalism reversed," which highlights how transnational organizing translates back to the domestic level through downward links with mixed results. While transnational activities provide opportunities, they can heighten tensions in the following ways: manipulative leaders may work for their own ends rather than the interests of the movement, the introduction of irrelevant foreign agendas, and unequal financial support that can divide the movement internally. (Friedman 1999, 378) This is not a state-centric approach rather it is a consequential assessment underscoring the importance of studying all the various levels of scale to assess social movements in transnational relations.

Sperling, Marx Ferree and Risman complement Friedman's intervention by asserting that transnational organizing, specifically TANs, are not unidirectional, indeed "resources and discourses become objects of struggle" and "reciprocal benefits accrue to both local and extralocal activists and organizations." (Sperling, Marx Ferree and Risman 2001, 1155) Like Friedman, Sperling, Marx Ferree and Risman draw attention to how transnational relations take place on the ground in reciprocal yet unequal ways. Guidry, Kennedy and Zald also make the point that the global and local are mutually informative, while these relations are "shot through with power relations." (Guidry, Kennedy and Zald 2000, 14) Furthermore, Sperling, Marx Ferree and Risman point out that a top-down analysis portrays local activists as "more homogenous, powerless, and silenced than we found them to be." (Sperling,
Guidry, Kennedy and Zald echo this argument, as I will explore next.

The following set of authors while anchored to varying degrees in resource mobilization theory, take further conceptual and theoretical steps to identify and address its limitations on the transnational level in addition to stretching the framework to incorporate alternative traditions and insights. Smith and Johnston are the most strongly anchored in resource mobilization theory and their book *Globalization and Resistance* (2002) is a response to the transnational trajectory within social movement theorizing. They continue with a state-centered analysis while entertaining insights provided by transnationalism and identity politics. (Smith and Johnston 2002, 2) States are understood as actors nested "within a highly interdependent and stratified state system." (Smith and Johnston 2002, 9)

Smith and Johnston attempt to address the travels and translations of movement ideas, strategies and tactics yet depend upon diffusion theory, which limits their analysis of transnational processes. The following quote illustrates the issues Smith and Johnston are grappling with, "when activists from different countries get together, their diverse experiences can translate into new understandings of global phenomena that extend beyond those bounded by national opportunity structures." (Smith and Johnston 2002, 5) An important conclusion that they underscore relates to the issue of coalition building.

Activists see a need to build broad and strong alliances that can compensate for their separate weaknesses and poverty, and this demand for unity forces them to seek ways to negotiate their many important differences. (Smith and Johnston 2002, 5)

Here they are wading into the politics of identity, which includes the study of identity formation and the impact of structural inequities and social movement meaning making.

Sean Chabot's chapter, "Transnational diffusion and the African-American Reinvention of the Gandhian Repertoire" (2002) employees a variation of diffusion theory to analyze how concepts and repertoires travel. He critiques diffusion theory for being too linear and adapts it to account for nonlinear
processes and general unpredictability. Disappointingly, his adaptations amount to reworking stages of a diffusion process, just as Tarrow sticks steadily to his study of political contention in the concluding chapter. Smith, Chatfield and Pagnucco are equally as satisfied as Tarrow to translate resource mobilization from domestic to transnational contention. Yet, Tarrow and Smith and Johnston attempt to address issues related to coalition building such as identity formation and relational asymmetries.

Guidry, Kennedy and Zald's (2000) engagement with resource mobilization is inflected with cultural studies approaches to transnationalism. They critique social movement theory for starting with a local and territorial-oriented prism focused on the individual and bound by the nation-state, thereby limiting the transnational side of collective action. As an alternative concept, they offer transnational public sphere as "simultaneously national and transnational", and activists can and do work on both levels deploying identities from all levels strategically. (Guidry, Kennedy and Zald, 2000, 347)

Following the "translating up" of resource mobilization theory, they propose that globalization is a new opportunity structure, yet they couch this in their concept of transnational public sphere, "a real as well as conceptual space in which movement organizations interact, contest each other and their objects, and learn from each other." (Guidry, Kennedy and Zald, 2000, 3)

Transnational public sphere allows the authors to study modalities of power and resistance, identity formation, and what they call the normative penumbra of movements and movement theory. Transnational civil society is understood to be the social infrastructure of the public sphere. To their credit, they note the global asymmetries or inherent hierarchical character within this transnational civil society and public sphere. Sikkink and Smith also acknowledge this and specify that INGO's in particular are concentrated in the Global North. Unfortunately Sikkink and Smith present an argument that apologizes for this imbalance.

Despite this concentration in the developed world and the great dependence on financing from U.S. and European foundations, it is interesting to note that the issues around which social
Sikkink and Smith should also be concerned with who is included in the formulation of issues, which voices are heard presenting them and how they are situated transnationally.

Returning to the ways Guidry, Kennedy and Zald address structural asymmetries, they acknowledge that systematic exclusions are part of the formation of public spheres and there is an inherent tension between the homogenizing (and exclusionary) aspect of globalization and the fragmenting heterogeneity of globalization. They urge analyzing the tension as a productive theoretical site where "social movements can generate contingencies, transformations, and reconfigurations of both identities and power." (Guidry, Kennedy and Zald, 2000, 11) Through their analysis of power, Guidry, Kennedy and Zald construct an inclusive logic on which to base their concept of transnational public sphere. Their approach to power relations underscores "the ubiquity and contradictoriness of power and resistance, rather than an approach based on transparent and fundamental antagonisms typically characterizing the approach of both movement actors and their analysts." (Guidry, Kennedy and Zald, 2000, 17) They assert that manifestations of power are context specific and "the quality of the field of power relations in which movements operate" is an important aspect of study. (Guidry, Kennedy and Zald, 2000, 22) This attention to particularity as connected to larger matrices of power overlaps with feminist theorizing of power relations.

Naples and Desai also problematize the way the majority of literature on globalization and transnationalism theorize homogenization and fragmentation. While political-economic (structuralist-homogenizers) and cultural practices (particularist-heterogenizers) construct globalization and fragmentation as contradictory divergent tendencies, Naples and Desai suggest that if one takes women as an analytical entry point, these tendencies are not so contradictory. Indeed, women are enacting "innovative political, economic and cultural strategies" in "new sites of action at the local, national and
transnational levels" as a response to global political economic shifts. (Naples and Desai 2002, 16)

Naples and Desai's work exemplifies one of its main challenges to feminist transnationalism. Keck and Sikkink point out that a key flaw with social movement theory is its assumption of homogeneity among participants, which is never the case for transnational social movement participants. While Naples and Desai illustrate women's innovative responses to homogenizing tendencies, they don't place as much attention on the heterogeneity of women's lived experiences.

TRANSNATIONAL AND WOMEN OF COLOR FEMINISMS

This last set of authors consider culturally inflected notions of transnationalism as they relate to social movements. Mandaville (1999), Heitleinger (1999), Frankenburg and Mani (2001), Grewal and Kaplan (1994), and Basu (2000) fill out the picture of transnational theory from a cultural perspective, bridging new social movement insights on identity formation and highlighting feminist contributions. Insights taken from this last set of texts will be put into conversation with several analytical frames developed by women of color feminist scholars including contributors to the anthology This Bridge Called My Back (1981), Zavella (1991), Alarcón (1990), Patricia Hill Collins (1989), Crenshaw (1991), Smith (1998), and Mohanty (1991). I will build on the previous transnational movement scholars with transnational and women of color feminist contributions that explore the following five interrelated areas; the local in relation to multiple levels of scale, the dynamic quality of identity formation, structural inequality, the production and reception of ideas, practices and knowledges, and the circuits and flows of people, funding and discourse. This grouping of analyses takes the study of transnational feminist movements beyond the limits of resource mobilization analysis and its liberal presuppositions as I will show in the next sections on international human rights and coalitional thinking.

Within international relations debates on transnationalism, Peter Mandaville (1998) questions the linkage between territory and political identity. Borrowing from Appadurai, he proposes the concept of
translocality to further theorize the role of territoriality as related to identity. In contrast to
transnationalism, translocalism decenters the nation-state and its territorially based logic. Mandaville
focuses on --

people and processes which do more than operate across or between the borders of nations; rather, they actively question the nature and limits of these boundaries by practising forms of political identity which, while located in a geographical space, do not depend on the limits of territory to define the limits of their politics. (Mandaville 1999, 654)

Massicote emphasizes that locality and situatedness are critical for understanding political identity beyond nation-state territorial logic. Moreover, Mandaville underscores that locality and situatedness are never static. This complicates Tarrow's insistence on an analysis of the local by dislodging its anchor in the nation-state. Mandaville, Appadurai and Massicote maintain an emphasis on the local (populated by heterogeneous social actors) within a transnational context.

Mandaville asserts that such an approach leads to questions about the scope of what is considered political. He is particularly interested in politics as a creative and popular activity, which occurs at the juncture between localities and movements.

To focus on these junctures is to open two analytical dimensions: first, locality as the place where movements arise and where they meet; and second, movement as a mode of action that redefines political community, and hence connects localities to one another. (Mandaville 1999, 661)

Mandaville frames the questions that feminist scholars take up in relation to coalition building and the travels and translations of discourse.

On the one hand I am interested in how movement creates new political space, and on the other in those sites (and sorts) of politics which travel. By the latter I mean the ways in which competing identity and ethical claims are transformed as they move within and across territories, all the while challenging the logic of bounded community. (Mandaville 1999, 663)

Alena Heitlenger (1999) writes of transnational feminisms as extremely diverse and at times contradictory and anchored in varied levels of scale; local, regional, national, international and transnational. The binary thinking that supports the logic of Western and non-Western undermines the
possibility of understanding of the subtleties of transnational feminism and the multiplicity of positions within each category. Transnational feminism, drawing from postmodernism and postcoloniality, demands accountability to the ideological and geographical limitations of one's social positioning. (Tyyskä 1999, 262) In addition, the symbolic and material itineraries of feminist ideas, resources and practices are complex and uneven. Therefore, transnational feminist theorizing has several moving targets to negotiate; first the dynamic quality of identity and second the constant "appropriation and transformation of ideas and practices from "outside" as well as their particular "internal" socioeconomic and political particularities." (Heitlinger 1999, 11) This approach attends to the fluidity of identity formation, the production and reception of knowledge and transcultural flows of ideas and practices, yet maintains an analysis of structural and material inequalities. U.S. feminists of color offer important elaborations on the analysis of structural and material inequalities and political identity, as I will show next.

Verónica Schild (1999) invokes Mandaville's concept of translocality to explain transnational feminist links:

As networks of women differentially located, both nationally and internationally, through which cultural and discursive (for example, academic feminist debates, expert knowledge, activist knowledge) and material (for example, funding opportunities, conferences) resources are circulated that empower some women more than others, but that ultimately contaminate them all. (Schilds 1999, 79)

Amitra Basu (2000) asserts that it is important to map transnational flows, funds, people and groups and discourses. To deal with power asymmetries within the global-local relations, Basu looks at all sites as local, including sites in the North that usually pass as unmarked signifiers. Moreover, she studies how each local site interacts on the global level. Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan (1994) provide theoretical and conceptual analysis of local global relations and their corresponding power asymmetries.
Grewal and Kaplan find postmodernity to be useful for countering mainstream feminism's weak analysis of difference and collusion with modernist agendas that maintain global relations of domination. While, the authors highlight problematic areas of postmodernity, 1) the dismissal of postcolonial cultural productions, 2) the lack of gender analysis, 3) the dependence on unsophisticated core/periphery analysis, they claim that it is the study of postmodernity that offers feminists complex, dynamic model of social, economic, and political relations. (Grewal and Kaplan 1994, 4) The authors argue that postmodernity is applicable for analyzing the "way that a culture of modernity is produced in diverse locations and how these cultural productions are circulated, distributed, received and even commodified." (Grewal and Kaplan 1994, 5) This approach can map the structural links that divide and bridge differences, emphasizing the multidirectional (linked and disjunctive) flow of culture that provides hegemonic and counter-hegemonic possibilities. This article identifies a key task: to study how women construct effective opposition, considering material conditions that structure women's lives in diverse locations. (Grewal and Kaplan 1994, 17) In studying varied sites, one must look for specific markers of difference beyond the forms we typically read for such as race, class, gender and sexuality. According to Kaplan's definition, 'politics of location' analyzes the tension between temporal and spatial notions of subjectivity in transnational feminist practices. A 'politics of location' attempts to destabilize stereotypes of colonial discourse and expose structural inequalities. The goal of this approach is to develop alliances that are accountable to power asymmetries.

Frankenberg and Mani present an excellent example of a 'politics of location' analysis through their feminist examination of the term post-coloniality. Reflecting concern with the assumed hegemony of the term post-coloniality, they ask the following question. What do we erase with the concept post-coloniality as a condition or way of being? Their argument takes this point of departure by asserting that post-colonial is a "notion of political, economic and discursive shift, one that is decisive without being
definitive." (Frankenberg and Mani 2001, 483) In other words, the term postcolonial marks a shift yet the context of the shift determines its meaning. Their feminist conjuncturalist approach requires a close look at the historical and temporal context in which post-colonial is used. Such an approach is attentive to "subject formation and cultural practice within matrices of domination and subordination." (Frankenberg and Mani 2001, 488) This article uses the principles of a 'politics of location' to complicate and work against the decontextualized application of the term postcolonial.

Transnational feminist theory is especially strong in theorizing the local in relation to multiple levels of scale, the production and reception of ideas, practices and knowledges, and the circuits and flows of people, funding and discourse. Women of color theory develops sharp analyses of heterogeneity, the dynamic quality of identity formation and intersecting vectors of oppression, while holding issues related to structural inequalities centrally. These theoretical and practical contributions ground discussions of identity in lived realities. Transnational and women of color feminisms provide complementary analytical tools for theorizing international human rights and coalition building, illustrating how the politics of influence and identity spill into each other. I will review key contributions by women of color theorists that go beyond the liberal approaches to difference, such as assimilationalist concepts of diversity and multiculturalism, and set the basis for next two sections on international human rights and coalitional thinking.

The contributors to the anthology *This Bridge Called My Back* (1981), Zavella (1991), Alarcón (1990), Patricia Hill Collins (1989), Crenshaw (1991), Smith (1987), and Mohanty (1991) all underscore the critical importance of analyzing social location. One of the key concepts I employ in the following sections is intersectionality. While this concept has been received in many varied contexts, it has roots in women of color feminism.
The ground breaking anthology *This Bridge Called My Back* (1981) intervenes in U.S. feminist theory, asserting the multiple subjectivity of women as related to interlocking systems of domination. The radical women of color project calls for “a revolution in the hands of women,” (Moraga and Anzaldúa 2002, liii) based upon a recognition of the multiple dimensions of struggle and need for coalition building strategies. As Barbara Smith states, “I feel it is radical to be dealing with race and sex and class and sexual identity all at one time. I think that is really radical because it has never been done before.” (Moraga and Anzaldúa 2002, 139) The concept of women of color is founded upon the recognition of intersecting oppressions and their lived consequences. Cherrie Moraga's concept of "theory in the flesh" speaks of lived experience as a nexus for feminist theorizing, "a politics born out of necessity" that works to "bridge the contradictions in our experiences." (Hurtado 2003, 261)

A theory of the flesh means one where the physical realities of our lives-- our skin color the land or concrete we grew up on, our sexual longings-- all fuse to create a politic born out of necessity. (Moraga and Anzaldúa. 2002, 21)

Collins (1989) also writes of interlocking systems of race, class and gender oppression and cites many black women scholars that also develop variations on this analysis including Frances Beale, Angela Y. Davis, Bonnie Thorton Dill, and bell hooks as connected to a tradition of feminist activism and creative expression. She asserts that black women have their own standpoint analysis of oppression, yet she is careful to underscore the plurality of experiences and heterogeneity of black women within the overarching term “standpoint.” The two interrelated aspects of this standpoint analysis include political and economic status and a distinctive feminist consciousness and interpretive framework, which set the foundation for resisting oppression. This analysis links individual and collective agency with larger structural factors.

Collins writes:

Living life as an African-American woman is a necessary prerequisite for producing Black feminist thought because within Black women’s communities thought is validated and produced
with reference to a particular set of historical, material, and epistemological conditions (Collins 1989, 770).

While one might come to the facile conclusion that this is an essentialist assertion, it points to the dangers and productive tensions that drive the women of color project. The theoretical and conceptual stresses and frictions between experience, interpretation, identity formation, knowledge claims, and resistance fuel women of color theorizing.

Zavella (1991) works within these tensions, specifically to addresses the way in which diversity is conceptualized within women's studies. She highlights various problems and suggests that the social construction of race, class, gender, sexuality, etc should be analyzed with careful attention to "the danger of essentializing any of the categories of oppression."(Zavella 1991, 74) Paralleling Collins, Zavella analyzes the relationship between structural conditions and the way women "construct subjective representations of their experiences."(Zavella 1991, 74) This attention to women's social location, and the dialectical process between "historical conditions, including cultural traditions, and the social construction of self" allows for a careful look at both the social affinities and divides. (Zavella 1991, 75)

Smith (1987) writes that her intellectual work has always developed in conversation with the intellectual, cultural and political aspects of the women’s movement. She uses the term relations of ruling or ruling apparatus to analyze complex relations of power, specifically the structural and discursive implications of individualized privilege. Ruling refers to a complex of organized practices, including government, law, business and financial management, professional organization, and educational institutions as well as the discourses in texts that interpenetrate the multiple sites of power” (Smith 1987, 3). As a measure for when a mode of ruling has become dominant, is when it gains the capability of abstracting and generalizing “all local and particular actualities of our lives” (Smith 1987, 3). Through a process of transcription, interpellation, and disembodiment, the local actualities of life are absorbed into relations or ruling. While this analysis could be read as structural, Smith asserts the
agency of the individuals working within relations of ruling and urges taking up relations of ruling “as an organization of a lived world in which we are active and in which we find and make ourselves as subjects.” (Smith 1987, 6)

While relations of ruling are specifically deployed to study gender, Smith reflects that in the study of gender, class and race are also implicated. She writes that working towards a full understanding of the “intersection of racial oppression with the gender organization of the relations of ruling” (Smith 1987, 8). Her framework is born out of standpoint theory yet it is flexible enough to apply to varied circumstances and contexts of the everyday world. “It points to the fact that the everyday world as the matrix of our experience is organized by relations tying it into larger processes in the world as well as by locally organized practices. A feminist mode of inquiry might then begin with women’s experience from women’s standpoint and explore how it is shaped in the extended relations of larger social and political relations” (Smith 1987, 10). The problem with standpoint is that it collapses experience with knowledge, constructing an authoritative position from which to speak or produce theory on the given topic.

Alarcón (1990) offers an alternative to this problematic aspect of standpoint theory. She is critical of the politics of unity, which relies on the idea that there is a unitary and synthesized identity. The politics of unity is predicated upon a posture of domination and parallels the aforementioned problems with globalism. In contrast, Alarcón forwards a politics of solidarity, reframing consciousness as a site of multiple voices. Her notion of this 'consciousness as site of multiple voicings' is extremely helpful for shifting the analytical point of departure away from a static or abstracted subject. Instead, Alarcón theorizes a subject engaged in struggle with "discourses that transverse consciousness," actively rejecting identity categories that function to contain and essentialize, such as woman or other. Alarcón's theoretical reference point is sensitive to the heterogeneity of social actors.
Crenshaw (1991) studies intersecting patterns of racism and sexism as related to structural, political and representational aspects of violence against women of color. She uses intersectionality to describe and frame relationships between race and gender and to "describe the location of women of color both within overlapping systems of subordination and at the margins of feminism and antiracism" (Crenshaw 1991, 1265). Intersectionality maps the ways that racism and patriarchy have shaped concepts of violence against women of color, it describes the unique vulnerability of women of color to these converging systems of domination and it tracks the marginalization of women of color within antiracist and feminist discourses (Crenshaw 1991, 1265).

An intersectional analysis argues that racial and sexual subordination are mutually reinforcing, that Black women are commonly marginalized by a politics of race alone, and that a political response to each form of subordination must at the same time be a political response to both (Crenshaw 1991, 1283).

While Smith hints at the intersection of racial oppression with the gender organization of the relations of rule, Crenshaw elaborates upon the intersection.

Working from a juridical reference point, Crenshaw presents an assessment of identity politics and its critiques. First she breaks down the notion of anti-essentialism in order to differentiate it from intersectionality. Anti-essentialism has been used to critique the white feminist 'woman' as a common denominator approach that erases women of color. This is informed by post-modernist thinking and can fall into relativism, i.e. everything is socially constructed. From there, conservative forces can use this to argue that race, gender, etc do not have social significance. Crenshaw clearly argues that such socially constructed categories DO have social significance due to the "particular values attached to them and the way those values foster and create social hierarchies." (Crenshaw 1991, 10) This formulation gets away from the problem associated with standpoint theory of essentializing women of color while retaining a critical analysis. In the current historical and political context, it is critical to defend a politics of social
location. The notion of intersectionality assists in a reconceptualization of identity that allows the reading and "telling" of processes of marginalization and their lived consequences. (Crenshaw 1991, 1)

Together transnational feminist and U.S. feminist of color bring varied and complementary analyses of social location that are critical to the study of transnational social movements. Next I will analyze the women's rights movement, specifically feminist interventions in international human rights discourse and practice. I will contextualize the debates regarding the motto: "women's rights are human rights," which lends itself to a politics of influence. I will show how this analysis is also illuminated by a politics of identity approach, highlighting the mutually constitutive quality of the politics of influence and identity.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS ARE HUMAN RIGHTS

Feminist intervention in international human rights lends itself to politics of influence and international governmental organization (IGO) advocacy, yet feminists are making critical contributions to expand and reconfigure human rights. Women of color feminism is theorizing collective identity in relation to representation, discourse and power. Transnational feminism is necessary to examine how human rights, in addition to international conventions such as the 1979 Convention for the Elimination of Violence Against Women (CEDAW); (1) travel from place to place and (2) how and why they get translated and implemented in different contexts. In contrast to these two approaches that traffic between the politics of identity and influence, Cohen and Arato's politics of identity is focused on the internal relations of civil society. This eclipses the possibility of applying the politics of influence to internal workings of civil society and the possibility that dual politics are mutually constitutive. As Alvarez (2000) points out, international identity solidarity provides structures upon which IGO advocacy efforts depend. These internal movement networks and structures also have their problematic aspects that demand attention to organizational issues, internal politics and hierarchical relations that are intimately
linked to the negotiation of collective identity issues. Coalition building processes in terms of politics of identity have direct impact on the configuration of social movement networks and structures. Therefore, the dual politics of influence and identity or IGO advocacy and international identity solidarity must be theorized in relation to each other, as I will illustrate through debates within and regarding the women's rights movement.

From an international relations perspective on transnationalism, women's movements engage with international human rights to change the norm structure thereby restructuring world politics. Based on the politics of influence, this form of power relies on persuasiveness of information, communication and the use of moral authority as leverage. (Sikkink 2002, 303) Such soft power is exercised at the margins of formal or first track politics. Through proposing alternatives, questioning givens, criticizing and publicizing key issues, women's movements remake norms through a process of normative change. (Brown Thompson 2002, 110) Brown Thompson analyzes the mechanics of soft power as related to women's rights. First she rightly asserts that the relations between the state and its people are historically contingent and socially constructed. States, NGOs and IGOs reconstitute these relations through women's rights, and changing state/family and public/private dichotomies, which can be both politically empowering and disempowering. (Brown Thompson 2002, 97) While she does include issues related to structural inequality, she does not offer analytical tools to unpack and critique it nor does she provide alternatives. She does however identify the limitations of working within a rights based approach.

It cannot provide the conditions of possibility for eradicating many forms of gender oppression such as those involving global economic processes and racism…..the discourse on human rights contains particular kinds of social knowledge about causes of gender oppression and appropriation remedies for this oppression. (Brown Thompson 2002, 116)

The problems of international human rights due to its Western liberal framework fuels a key feminist debate. While Brown Thompson identifies the limitations of human rights, she still sees value in its use.
In contrast to Brown Thompson, Grewal builds upon Mandaville's call for attention to locality through her claim that women's rights as human rights does not adequately address the local or transnational specificities that create gender inequalities. (Grewal 1999, 337) In other words, key issues for women's movements are beyond the scope of the international human rights framework. Grewal suggests economic and social justice as more adequate concepts. I agree with Grewal in principle and fully support agendas based on social and economic justice that work against universalizing discursive and legalistic containment. Yet, I argue that U.S. feminists of color and transnational feminisms critically engage within international human rights discourse, addressing Grewal's underlying concerns.

**Women's Rights**

Women’s rights are a product of women’s movements’ application of human rights as a tool to make visible, document and address women’s subordinate position vis-a-vis men and to legitimate women’s claims to civil, political, economic, social and cultural inclusion. Such claims are rooted in a broad and contested spectrum of argumentation including equality, difference, and the intersectional model. Feminist arguments regarding human rights intersect with the larger debate of universality and cultural relativism. By theorizing through an intersectional model, placing questions of gender and ethnicity centrally, some U.S. feminists of color have suggested an approach to human rights that would hold space for the multiple consciousness of traditionally marginalized subjectivities, thereby expanding the human rights normative framework.

Feminist engagement with human rights sheds light on structural inequalities and their subsequent effect of compound social marginalization in addition to exposing conceptual and operational gaps in human rights. Feminist framing of violence against women within human rights discourse elucidates how women’s subordination to men is related to the role of the state in the public and private spheres. Feminist claims to the indivisibility of rights challenge and expose compound social
marginalization, forcing a shift in the normative model. Here I will review the development and impact of the women's human rights movement, feminist arguments, the central debate of universality and cultural relativism, and the intersectional model to show how the politics of identity and influence inform each other.

*Women's Movements and Human Rights*

The women’s human rights movement evolved from women’s organizing on the local, regional, national, international and transnational levels to address issues that affect and relate to daily lived experiences. The United Nations opened a political space for the further articulation and consolidation of movement efforts through the UN Decade on Women 1975-1985 and the World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna in 1993. Elisabeth Friedman argues that the international human rights framework gives legitimacy to women’s political demands because governments recognize human rights accords and their protocols. (Friedman 1995, 19) Yet such assertions of frame resonance do not go uncontested. Radhika Coomaraswamy makes the counter argument that in “the area of women’s rights as human rights there is the least amount of resonance.” (Coomaraswamy 1994, 39) She defines resonance as a correlation between human rights’ “normative textual essence” and a general responsiveness within public consciousness and legal culture. The lack of resonance with the “myth of rights,” due to ideological resistance and the lack of proper implementation machinery and infrastructure, prevents the effective implementation of rights. As I will develop later, Coomaraswamy asserts that the ‘woman” evoked by CEDAW is situated within the parameters of liberal discourse based on the equality argument. Since the various debates on the topic of women and human right’s are co-implicated, I will introduce them briefly to avoid the limits of stark categorization and then develop them further in their own section.
Returning to women’s movements and human rights, in the 1980’s regional and transnational connections were fostered and developed to promote CEDAW. The International Women’s Rights Action Watch (IWRAW) was born in 1985 at the World Conference on Women in Nairobi. These networks effectively disseminated the human rights framework and functioned to share information and experiences, which formed the basis for the women’s human rights movement. Then, at the end of the 1980’s, the mainstream human rights movement picked up on women’s movement efforts. At the end of the Cold War, the global human rights movement served as a unifying ideology across nations, filling the gap left by opposing ideological camps. (Friedman 1995, 25) The movement began the process of operationalizing the human rights framework in order to document human rights abuses against women, hold government accountable for abusive patterns, construct a way for women to gain legal and political recourse and advocate for policy and institution changes.

The World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna was a turning point for the women’s human rights movement. In preparation, the International Women’s Tribune Center, the Center for Women’s Global Leadership and the International YWCA sponsored a petition in 1991.

As the Universal Declaration of Human Rights protects women, the World Conference should ‘comprehensively address women’s human rights at every level of its proceedings’ and recognize gender based violence ‘as a violation of human rights requiring immediate action. (Friedman 1995, 28)

The response was enormous, a low estimate of 300,000 signatures were collected from 123 countries in 20 languages. The motto “Women’s Rights are Human Rights" came out of the Vienna Conference, where women’s rights were successfully incorporated.

Maria Suarez Toro maintains that the successful incorporation of women's right to the mainstream human rights agenda at the Vienna Conference illustrated the dual directional linkage between grassroots women's organizing and international organizations. Similar to Friedman's
"transnationalism reversed", she is attentive to the way such gains in the international arena translate back to the local arena.

We must make certain that international legislation reflects and supports advocacy that is taking place at the local and national levels. Despite advances made at the international level, most real gains for women have in fact been the result of women's struggles in their own communities. (Suarez Toro 1995, 190)

Suarez Toro places this gain within global-local relations, allowing for an expanded contextual analysis of the development and articulation of women's human rights and grassroots processes by invoking embodied social actors.

**Feminist Arguments**

The arguments used to frame women's rights vary, yet most engage the following four issue areas: structural inequalities, the gap between practice and theory, public vs. private spheres, violence against women and the role of the state. Most authors incorporated in the following three sections take up debates surrounding these issues to varying degrees.

Katarina Tomasevski's book *Women and Human Rights* published in 1993 in the shadow of the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna, presents a liberal feminist take on human rights with an effort to operationalize the framework for activists. Central to liberal argumentation is the claim of equality. “The momentum of existing efforts to place equal rights for women on the global human rights agenda has begun to redress the traditional neglect of women.” (Tomasevski 1993, xi) Tomasevski argues that women’s rights based on assumptions of motherhood are misfounded. While women, "are entitled to full protection of their rights and freedoms because they are human beings,” the concept of 'woman' is left uninterrogated within a liberal feminist analysis. (Tomasevski 1993, ix)

Liberal feminist arguments commonly call for a shift from women as objects of special protection to women as subjects of human rights and fundamental freedoms. In highlighting the gap between recognition and enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Tomasevski critiques
the idea of gender-neutral standards and procedures, “this neutrality amounts in practice to a disregard of women, in human rights as everywhere else.” (Tomasevski 1993, x) Julie Peters and Andrea Wolper get at the same issue from a different angle. "Traditional human rights formulations are based on a 'normative' male model and applied to women as an afterthought, if at all. The delineation of rights, it would seem, deals with state agents acting on behalf (or against) a polity largely defined by men." (Peters and Wolper 1995, 2)

Christine Chinkin, in her analysis of the international legal response to violence against women, levels a similar critique to that of Peters and Wolper regarding the 'normative' male model. Human rights law has been drafted to guarantee men protection against harm that they fear could happen directly against them. "It fails to take account of women's experiences and to provide even theoretical protection against those acts that are directed at women because they are women." (Chinkin 1995, 23) Chinkin maintains that violence against women, usually referred to as an aberrant issue, is actually structural. "It is both a manifestation of the power imbalance between men and women, and a social mechanism which forces women into continuing subordination." (Chinkin 1995, 24) Indeed, Friedman argues that violence against women is the issue that exposes the limits to human rights law thereby identifying the changes needed to make it more inclusive. "Violations of women's rights are often perpetrated by "private agents" -- members of women's communities, from family members to coworkers-- and not the "government agents" generally targeted by human rights law." (Friedman 1995, 20-21) Reflecting back on the women human rights movement(s), the issue of violence against women has been taken up as the entry point for broadening and reconceptualizing the agenda.

Although the law is an insufficient instrument to defend and enforce women's rights, Caroline Sweetman asserts that it is necessary to work towards inclusion. Charlotte Bunch makes the same point:
The definition of certain people as less human, as not deserving human rights or full participation in society, becomes the basis upon which violence against them is tolerated and sometimes even state supported. (Bunch 1995, 12)

One of the main strategies employed in the preparations for the World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995 was reinforcing the idea that all rights are indivisible. This declaration challenges both the divide between the generations of rights, political and civil as first generation and economic, social and cultural and second generation and the private--public divide. Furthermore, both divides disarticulate the subjectivities of women and silence the implications of their daily-lived experiences. The violence in the private sphere is not regulated by the state, making it a blind and therefore a passive accomplice to systemic violence against women. At the same time, the state regulates women's bodies, i.e. fertility and reproductive rights through its mandate, thereby controlling the social reproduction of the nation, with explicit racial and class implications. These aspects of the private-public divide will be further developed in the next two sections.

This section serves to introduce the feminist liberal argument in addition to the key issues within feminist debates on human rights. Another key argument is based on culture/difference, which spills over into larger questions regarding universality and cultural relativism, which will be developed at length in the next section.

*Universality and Cultural Relativism*

Liberal feminism supports the universality of the human rights framework. This position is highly critiqued for ignoring cultural specificity and therefore furthering Western imperialism. In effect, the successes of the women's human rights movements on the international level during the 1990's are fraught with this problematic. While Eva Brems highlights the gains in 1993 at the World Conference on Human Rights, integrating women's concerns in all human rights issues and recognizing violence against women as a human rights violation, she also underscores the impact of the staunch feminist universalist stance. At the 1995 World Conference on Women in Beijing, "the West rallied around the
goal of firmly closing all doors to cultural relativism." (Brems 1997, 136) Global sisterhood gained center stage at the cost of cultural relativist assertions regarding the limitations and inadequacy of the international human rights protection system for all peoples.

Alda Facio (1995), on the other hand, argues that universality should not be questioned because cultural relativist arguments are deployed by fundamentalist conservative regimes that utilize the position to deflect critiques of human rights violations. She calls for defending the strategic aspect of universality that trumps regime's claims to sovereignty in the case of state-authored human rights violations. Julie Dorf and Gloria Careaga Pérez (1995) point out that states use the cultural relativist shield to defend against inquiry into their heterosexist human rights violations. Lesbians are denied basic rights due to discriminatory legislation, criminalization of sexual behavior, punitive psychiatry and denial of freedom of expression through speech or use of press. These violations of human rights are rationalized by arguments based on moral values and cultural relativism.

While Facio, Dorf and Careaga Pérez present convincing arguments for the strategic usage of universalism, Arati Rao (1995) deepens the discussion through a close reading of the notion of culture as related to human rights. Her objective is to adjust and rework the human rights based approach so that it can be more relevant and effective as a tool for conflict resolution between culturally diverse actors. Regimes that use the cultural relativist argument to deflect accusations of human rights violations base their logic in a falsely rigid and ahistorical notion of culture that is selectively chosen to serve their interests. Such an interpretation of culture disarms and discredits the utility of a human rights approach to conflict resolution.

The resort to cultural explanations of women's status is usually defensive, combative, and specifically designed to placate an international audience consisting primarily of national political leaders and statist diplomats. (Rao 1995, 169)
Furthermore, women have little access to voice their positions in "public and/or international forums in which the politics of claims against rights on the basis of culture occur." (Rao 1995, 172)

Rao's analytically rigorous exposition of the notion of culture within human rights begins from the following assertion.

Without questioning the political uses of culture, without asking whose culture this is and who its primary beneficiaries are, without placing the very notion of culture in historical context and investigating the status of the interpreter, we cannot fully understand the ease with which women become instrumentalized in larger battles of political, economic, military, and discursive competition in the international arena. (Rao 1995, 174)

Rao questions why claims to cultural difference are seldom examined. The issue of cultural difference usually comes up when asserted and then claims are accepted unquestioningly. She calls for a thorough exploration of the claimants positionality in relation to the axes of class, race, ethnicity, sexuality, age, and religion. In whose name is the claim advanced? What degree of involvement does the invoked group have? And more generally, what is culture? This set of questions serves to expose the potential instrumentalization of culture, which facilitates the ongoing violation of women's human rights.

Within the statist human rights framework, women represent the social reproduction of the population. They are considered the "repositories, guardians and transmitters of culture," implicitly serving nation-state interests. (Rao 1995, 169) Therefore, the statist human rights framework holds a strategic disinterest in addressing private social institutions such as the family. Violence against women is not only eclipsed by the demarcations of public and private and the emphasis on political and civil rights, international law is formulated to restrain state intervention into the private sphere. Due to this, Donna Sullivan states that "many abuses against women have not been acknowledged as human rights violations." The state enshrines the family and its right to privacy, turning a blind eye on the site of the most egregious violations of women's physical and mental integrity.
The corresponding notion of culture utilized by the state and logically continuous with international law, is necessarily reductionist, essentialist and decontextualized at the expense of women's rights. Rao's counter-definition places culture as part of "the operation of social relations, which expresses contradiction as well as cohesion." Culture is "a series of constantly contested and negotiated social practices whose meanings are influenced by the power and status of their interpreters and participants." (Rao 1995, 174) Such an adjusted definition within a human rights framework facilitates a respectful and alert attentiveness to the workings of claims to cultural difference.

This enables us to locate and condemn the particular historical formulations of culture that oppress women (such as the emphasis placed by male religious leadership on those passages in the religious test that permit wife beating) as well as to understand and support women's ability to wrest freedom from amidst these oppressive conditions (such as women's emphasis on other passages that advocate nonviolent and respectful treatment of wives.) (Rao 1995, 173)

Rao's examination of culture as related to gender and human rights complicates the simplistic conceptual divide between feminism and cultural relativism, predicated upon the separate and mutually exclusive categorization of 'woman' and 'racialized other'. Eva Brems warns that if feminism and cultural relativism only focus on one facet of exclusion, both run the risk of becoming rigidly essentialist. By reviewing both arguments, Brems shows that both 'camps' see the need to substitute the abstract individual subject of human rights for a situated self.

The first half of the 1990's held key developments for the women's rights movement that were punctuated by CEDAW, the World Conference on Human Rights, the Security Council's establishment of the International Tribunal to prosecute offenses committed in ex-Yugoslavia, the creation of the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against women, and the World Conference on Women. Much literature came out during this time period, emphasizing the universal nature of women's human rights. The debates within the women's rights movement(s) regarding claims to cultural difference have exposed the constraints of arguments based on equality or difference. The next section explores recent
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theoretical efforts to move away from the limits of arguments based on sameness or difference and introduces an approach that attends to the multi-faceted and multi-vocal positionalities of women.

The Intersectional Model: Expanding the Human Rights Normative Framework

As mentioned earlier, Rahdika Coomaraswamy asserts that the ‘woman’ evoked by CEDAW is situated within the parameters of liberal discourse based on the equality argument. The privileged subject is “the free, independent women as an individual endowed with rights and rational agency,” extending “the rights of man” to woman within the logic of the enlightenment project. (Coomaraswamy 1994, 40) The underlying assumption of singular subjectivity eclipses the vast array of differences among women such as class, ethnicity, religion, and sexual orientation in addition to ignoring the multiple subjectivities implicit in difference. While Coomaraswamy agrees with the enlightenment view of individuality, she maintains that the values contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are by no means universal. “However, to work toward this enlightenment ideal, it is important to expose the ideologies of power that sustain counter-ideologies which view women as inferior.” (Coomaraswamy 1994, 41) In turn, she claims that attention to local legal systems is critical to identifying how women’s rights are legitimated particularly in relation to the private sphere (family/household). While all authors are highly critical of the limitations of international human rights, they all agree that the framework is a very important tool for the documentation and mapping of violence against women and claims making by women. If only for strategic and tactical reasons, the human rights framework needs rehabilitation.

One strategy to broaden the normative framework of human rights is the claim to indivisibility of rights, which directly challenges the public-private divide. This would necessarily foreground the traditionally neglected gender-specific abuses. Furthermore, indivisibility challenges the depreciation of the economic, social and political value of women's activities. Sullivan highlights that while CEDAW
addresses the state's responsibility to protect women from gender based violence by non-state actors as related to women's subordination in public and private life, mechanisms for implementation are critically lacking. An analysis of structural inequality further complements the claim to indivisibility in challenging the public-private divide. An example of this type of analysis applied to the family foregrounds the way in which vectors of oppressing such as race, class, ethnicity and sexual orientation shape and determine the extent to which protection against state and/or market intervention is available.

Brems makes visible structural inequality by centering the multi-vocal and multi-faceted positionalities of women. She draws upon African feminists (strangely they were not named) who argue for a broader conception of feminism that encompasses the legacies of imperialism and patriarchy in addition to contemporary divergent contexts. Similar to Rao's definition of culture, Brem highlights the African feminists' call for multiple consciousness to make space for competing claims regarding self and community.

Celina Romany takes Brem’s approach and concretizes it by analyzing human rights from a racialized gender perspective, making visible compound social marginalization, as the consequence of structural inequalities. She uses critical race theory, critical race feminism and postmodernist feminism to shed light on international human rights law. In her article, “Themes for a Conversation on Race and Gender in International Human Rights Law” (2000), Romany challenges “the incoherence of a system of international protection build from a perspective of compartmentalized selves,” demands alternative accounts for the construction of a racialized feminist subject and presents an intersectional model to facilitate the translation of international law to the national level. (Romany 2000, 55) Romany underscores the need for multiple consciousness. Building upon the body of women of color feminist literature, she argues that instead of categorizing gender and race separately, the idea of multiple consciousness shifts this to a simultaneously gendered AND raced consciousness. Furthermore multiple
consciousness politicizes compartmentalizing discourses and critiques their epistemic foundations. Such a lens historicizes human rights while expanding and exploring the formation of social identity.

However, Romany asserts that, “theoretical insights coming from a discourse and reality of multiple consciousness have yet to fully inform feminist scholarship and practice in international human rights law.” (Romany 2000, 56) This is necessary to shift the normative male model of human rights, re-envision and reinterpret the law to be more inclusive, thereby placing international human rights law at the function of social justice transformation. Romany advocates asking the women/race question when studying human rights documents and their implementation because it fosters “an integrated and more coherent use of international instruments” and there is a strategic imperative since human rights holds high moral and emotional legitimacy. (Romany 2000, 65) Furthermore,

A way to walk reformist paths while simultaneously waging more radical battles is to keep a contextualization critique of international human rights law alive and well. The move from equality to anti-subordination, a paradigm better suited to deal with intersectional and multiple source of oppression, then finds its breathing space. (Romany 2000, 65)

As I stated earlier, I am interested in studying how feminist movements goals and strategies bridge the tensions between reformist and revolutionary tendencies. Romany's call for a contextualizing critique illustrates how women of color feminisms further the study of transnational feminist movements through an analysis of structural inequalities, multiple vectors of oppression as related to identity formation. The debates around feminist engagement with international human rights and UN can be enriched through a closer look at identity formation, coalition building and cultural translation in particular.

The intersectional model illustrates critical race feminist interventions into legal discourse, which in turn reconfigures advocacy strategies and the politics of influence. This critical race feminist approach offers a more promising direction than efforts by norms-based analyses to theorizing meaning making and the travels and translations of discourse such as Sikkink and Brown Thompson in the beginning of this section. Two additional examples of the limits of transnational social movement
analysis that I explored in earlier sections include Khagram, Sikkink and Riker (2002) and Chabot (2002). Khagram, Sikkink and Riker use international relations' norms and ideas to study transnational feminist movement meaning making. Chabot applies an adapted diffusion theory to study the travels of movement discourse. Romany's intersectional model as applied to the human rights normative framework illustrates the mutually constitutive nature of the politics of influence and identity by filling out the story from an identity politics reference point.

As a testament to the applicability of the intersectional model in a non-U.S. context, Rosa Linda Fregoso utilizes it in her study of the murders and disappearances of women in Ciudad Juárez. She writes that Romany's "intersectional methodology directs us to ask the woman/race question" and, in the case of Juárez, the class question as well." (Fregoso 2003, 23) The most useful aspect of the intersectional model is that it does not dictate the particular intersections to theorize, rather the context determines relevant vectors of oppression that compartmentalize and divide subjectivities, denying their existence.

This is not to occlude Fregoso's strong critique of the liberal underpinnings of human rights.

The rhetoric of human rights discourse is based on Western notions of the abstract subject and practices of individualism that ignore other, more fluid, definitions of rights and subjectivity, especially those rooted in the context of the Americas and derived from indigenous notions of identity and group/collective property rights. (Fregoso 2003, 37)

Yet Romany's intersectional model "expands the framework of human rights to include socioeconomic rights to basic needs such as food, health care, a living wage, environmental safety, and shelter." (Fregoso 2003, 37) It seems that Romany's reframing addresses Grewal's concern with historical contingency and the localized and transnational specificities of gender inequality and violence. Grewal claims that "only nuanced understandings of various economic, state, political, and cultural formations that are historically contingent can become useful for activist work." (Grewal 1999, 346) Grewal would
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ask the following question of Romany's intersectional model: to what extent does it fundamentally shift
the construction of the subject from its liberal basis in modernity and the state-system? I argue that
Romany constructs a sound theoretical foundation for the shift Grewal identifies.

Grewal asserts that the way human rights knowledge frameworks and affiliated resources
circulate have yet to be traced through most feminist organizations. (Grewal 1999, 352) Friedman's
study of "transnationalism reversed" in the Venezuelan women's movement is an example of tracing
back the impact to UN Global conferences in particular, which fits within human rights knowledge
frameworks. She is careful to elaborate how the interaction between domestic and global arenas is very
complicated and transnational organizing has mixed consequences that are "conditioned by specific
national contexts." (Friedman 1999, 4) Friedman is careful with issues related to the local in relation to
multiple levels of scale and the production and reception of ideas, practices and knowledges, but lacks
attention to the dynamic quality of identity formation and movement heterogeneity, which form the
basis for Grewal's critique. To fully address Grewal's research agenda, Friedman would have had to
foreground the Venezuelan women's movement heterogeneity as related to the mixed consequences of
transnational organizing.

COALITIONAL THINKING

Teresa Carrillo (1998) takes a closer look at the obstacles and difficulties of transnational
coalition building through her study of U.S. Chicana/Latina and Mexican women's movement coalition
building efforts in relation to global economic restructuring. She shows how the agendas of the two
groups differ -- U.S. women of color focus on gender and race while Mexican women focus on gender
and class, and how miscommunication occurs, leading to weak collaborative work. In addition to these
difficulties, spatial separation compounds the barriers to transnational movement collaborations.
Carrillo asserts that despite the difficulties inherent in transnational collaborations, they are very
important for information sharing, making material and theoretical connections and deepening shared understandings of globalization, gendered citizenship and local issues. Transnational networks based on specific or single issues or regionally based issues have the most success. Yet, once networks establish ongoing communication, they struggle to negotiate differing interests, agendas and reference points. This clearly highlights the need for cultural translation and development of a contextualized foundation for collaborative efforts.

Comparative approaches to the study of Latin American and U.S. Latina/Chicana feminist movements tend to presuppose a basis for comparison, such as similar language, cultural heritage or family relations, and therefore may obfuscate critical differences. Also, a comparative and social movement approaches can maintain a static sense of national context for the study of movements. Given Carrillo's example, since feminist movements are stretching beyond national borders, approaches to their study need to be reconceptualized. An alternative approach must be introduced to capture the way in which feminist movements in the Américas function within a context that includes increased migration, changes in the role of the state, economic restructuring, accelerated transcultural flows and usage of international and regional forums and networks. Such an alternative approach would also attend to the heterogeneity within and among movements, as Grewal insists.

In the previous section I explored how critical race feminism analysis of the politics of identity serves to reconfigure the basis for human rights advocacy strategies. In other words, the politics of identity is relevant to women's rights, an issue that lends itself to a politics of influence. In the following analysis I will elaborate further on the mutually constitutive quality of dual politics by examining the politics of identity as related to coalition building. Crenshaw explains how the concept of intersectionality can be applied to the tensions within identity politics "as a way of mediating the tension between assertions of multiple identity and the ongoing necessity of group politics" (Crenshaw 1991,
She claims that the identity groups are really coalitions because of previously unrecognized or suppressed internal heterogeneity.

Recognizing that identity politics takes place at the site where categories intersect thus seems more fruitful than challenging the possibility of talking about categories at all. Through an awareness of intersectionality, we can better acknowledge and ground the differences among us and negotiate the means by which these differences will find expression in constructing group politics (Crenshaw 1991, 1299).

Only through "telling" the locations on the margins can lasting coalitions be formed and the concept of intersectionality takes us closer to this possibility.

Like Crenshaw's concept of intersectionality, coalitional thinking highlights analytical linkages among movements on a theoretical level and coalition building on a practical level. Moreover, this approach foregrounds how the theoretical and the practical are mutually constituted and interwoven.

Drawing upon transnational and women of color feminist theory, coalitional thinking accounts for social location, the reconfiguration of socio-political and cultural relations and power disequilibrium in a transnational context. Millie Thayer explains how such economic and discursive imbalances occur in relation to the North-South travel of feminist concepts. In her analysis of discursive exchange between U.S. and Brazilian feminism, she explores how "global power relations constrain or facilitate theoretical and discursive migration."(Thayer 2000, 206) Brazilian intellectual production is considered exotic and specific while U.S. intellectual production is assumed to be universal and generally applicable. She concludes that global forces "have the power to close borders and exclude, or to ensure their porosity to cultural imports." (Thayer 2000, 229) Thayer closes with a call for continued efforts towards creating "a social space where horizontal discursive travel could replace the fundamental asymmetries in global cultural flows." (Thayer 2000, 229) As most authors in this statement agree, attention to asymmetrical power relations is critical for negotiating alternative relationships.
Another aspect of coalitional thinking is the recognition and creation of epistemologies and knowledge production that de-centers the (Northern and Western) Self as related to the (Eastern and/or Southern) Other. Marnia Lazreg explains the problems of Western liberal feminism's reception of the Other women's intellectual production. The limitations are all linked to an oppositional relationship in which the Other woman is subsumed into the Western liberal feminist discourse as different from yet always intimately related to the privileged signifier. Lazreg proposes criteria for a more healthy relationship between feminists, which requires a "de-centering of the self" in order to "receive Other women's work as reflecting another modality of being human." (Lazreg 2000, 37) Western feminists must not assume a transparent reading or knowability of the Other woman. Through accepting the unknowable aspect of women that hold different social positions, Western liberal feminists can de-center themselves. This decentering process is a foundational aspect of respectful coalition building.

Lastly, coalitional thinking re-vindicates creative and playful collective expression as a source of self-referential power. Maria Lugones explains playfulness as an attitude "that carries us through the activity, a playful attitude, turns the activity into play." (Lugones 1997, 180) Other qualities of playfulness are openness to surprise and self-construction, and ability to let go of rules and order. These qualities of a playful attitude facilitate identification with others unlike oneself. In Lugones' words, when people extend themselves to each other by travelling to each other's worlds lovingly, they can become fully subjects to each other. Lugones' theory contributes to building relational collective understanding for coalitional efforts. The four main analytical reference points of coalitional thinking include; 1) the interwoven nature of theory and practice, 2) an analysis of power within transnational relations, 3) decentering Western liberal feminism and 4) re-vindication of creativity and playfulness. Coalitional thinking is comprised of two concepts; relationality and cultural translation, which share the aforementioned analytical reference points.
Relationality

I map the concept of relationality through the Latina Feminist Group, Ella Shohat, Bernice Johnson Reagon and Chela Sandoval. *Telling to Live: Latina Feminist Testimonios* is based on a Pan-Latina relational theory and practice. Relational politics informs their approach to coalition building by working within the heterogeneity of Latina identities. Luz del Alba Acevedo, citing María C. Lugones and bell hooks, introduces the notion of friendship as the basis of historically and politically contextualized feminist solidarity. This is in contrast to an oppositional approach based on dichotomies that pit women each other. Global sisterhood can be seen as an oppositional approach because it proposes a unifying umbrella that incorporates women of color into "an ethnocentric feminist agenda" and fuels the hierarchic logic of social oppression. (Acevedo 2001, 261)

Through testimonio as relational and coalitional method, the Latina Feminist Group utilized creative expression to represent and interpret lived experiences and "translate ourselves to each other." (Latina Feminist Group 2001, 11) Of course conflict and contestation present themselves within the Latina Feminist group. Acevedo explains how this was negotiated.

Power relations did emerge in our Latina Feminist group, but these *nudos de poder* (nodes of power) could be loosened and united through a process of collaboration and polyphonic negotiation of difference without compromising the validation, understanding, and affirmation of diversity. We did not avoid confrontation and we acknowledged our ideological disagreements and looked for other ways to understand the strength that comes out of difference. (Acevedo 2001, 261)

Echoing Crenshaw and Romany, all forms of systemic violence and human agency must be recognized, spoken, written and given space through an inclusive framework.

While Ella Shohat does not specifically refer to testimonio, her relational multicultural feminist project fits neatly with the Latina Feminist Group's vision. Relational multicultural feminism contextualizes feminism, making space for the contradictions inherent in multiple subjectivities. (Shohat
2002, 68) One aspect of this approach is to map histories in dialogical relation to each other, communities-in-relation, in order to avoid binary thinking, and emphasize "dialogical encounters of difference." (Shohat 2002, 75) Another aspect is the implementation of a "multiperspectival approach to the movement of feminist ideas across borders." (Shohat 2002, 70) Shohat's work brings poststructuralism, multiculturalism and historical materialism together. The Latina Feminist Group comes to this intersection from knowledge grounded in women's lived experiences, exposing the variety of claims to experience and knowledge. I will address the debate regarding legitimate feminist knowledge production later in this section.

The following aspects of Shohat's work furthers the points of commonality with the Latina Feminist Group. Shohat's project interprets experience and knowledge as dialogical concepts based on a set of discursive practices, negotiated by personal and communitarian interpretation, and situated in time and geographical space. (Shohat 2002, 71) Activism and theorizing are interlaced, activism being the practice and testing of ideas. This project allies itself with anti-colonialist and anti-racist struggles, assuming a multiaxis analysis of interrelated issues. "Multicultural feminism is a situated practice in which histories and communities are mutually coimplicated and constitutively related, open to mutual illumination." (Shohat 2002, 75)

Bernice Johnson Reagon's work on coalitional politics and Chela Sandoval's work on oppositional consciousness introduce issues of external movement relations and strategic use of different approaches for specific environments. In "Coalitional Politics: Turning the Century," (1981) Reagon explicates the tensions between internal movement work and external coalition building. Internal movement dynamics usually among friends allow participants to be vulnerable. On the other hand, coalition work is dangerous and uncomfortable, demanding much energy and patience from the participants.
Continuing with the challenges to external movement relations and coalition building, Chela Sandoval presents a differential mode of oppositional consciousness drawn from the experience of social marginality and working against hegemonic feminisms. According to this approach, ideological positions are tactics to be deployed in specific contexts. In other words, ideological positions such as separatism are modes of action that can be selected. A mode of action is used when it is the most effective response to the specific configuration of power. Oppressed people have honed this survival skill of moving between different ideological positions. *Chicana Feminisms: A Critical Reader* utilizes the organizing metaphor of an intellectual *glorieta* (carousel), which relates directly to Sandoval's call for differential conscious or tactical movement between varied ideological positions.

The dialogue is fast-paced, fluid, and flexible, at times unnerving; it forces intellectual dexterity. Such agility is foundational to the Chicana feminist political project, which intervenes in important ways to raise consciousness and further the struggle for decolonization against multiple oppressions. (Arredondo et al. 2003, 2)

Taking power as relational, the authors of the book work towards an "explanatory matrix that confronts the shifting boundaries of discourse and captures the ties to lived experiences." (Arredondo et al. 2003, 2) The authors of *Chicana Feminisms* articulate a relational approach to the study of "lived realities, creative expressions, and politics of representation in Chicana feminisms." (Arredondo et al. 2003, 11)

Taking all these perspectives together, how and where do we work relationally when hegemonic feminism is oppositional? I would suggest that the relational approach that the Latina Feminist group formulates is an internal movement 'tactic' in Sandoval's terms. Within a group committed to collectivity, the relational approach is especially useful for building solidarity because it provides a way of negotiating heterogeneity. In contrast to Reagon, I would also assert that home is not necessarily safe and Reagon's stark distinction between internal movement work and external coalition building might be over emphasized. Internal contestation occurs, as the Acevedo highlights. The critical piece is whether or not the group is committed to building collectivity, which requires "non-judgmental listening,
building trust, and constructing an alternative, inclusive framework." (Latina Feminist Group 2001, 11)

Clearly, not all coalition building contains such a collective commitment. In such cases, discomfort is usually the most prominent emotion and working in such spaces is extremely challenging and exhausting, as Reagon explicates. Sandoval's contribution of oppositional consciousness is most helpful in contexts where friendship is not necessarily possible or necessary. Yet, this fragile coalitional work is strategically necessary for achieving material and discursive goals in addition to shifting the basis of coalitional work towards enduring mutual respect.

Cultural Translation

Like relationality, the concept of cultural translation has multiple entry points. Here I will start with Robert Carr and move through contributions by both transnational and U.S. women of color feminists such as Ella Shohat, the Latina Feminist Group, Anna Tsing, Ofelia Schutte, Elba Sanchez, Niranjana Tejaswini, and Rosi Braidotti. Robert Carr explains that the process of translation is one "of speaking across culture and ideology for the sake of international and intercultural alliances." (Carr 1994, 156) Processes of cultural translation are understood to be "productive dialogue and negotiations across multiple geopolitical and theoretical borders." Echoing Marnia Lazreg's concerns regarding knowability, Carr also identifies the problematics of First World efforts to know.

What First World and Eurocentric strategists need to broach is the reality of the subaltern Third World Other in its seeming "madness," "excess," and "nonsense," the hallmarks of specific and ontological alterity that complicate --if not block-- First World analogizing. (Carr 1994, 156)

Ella Shohat links relationality to translation for the purpose of coalition building across the vast and infinite world of subject-positions and epistemologies that Carr emphasizes. She explains that relational analysis has to address "the operative terms and axes of stratifications typical of specific contexts, along with the ways these terms are translated and reinforced as they travel." (Shohat 2001, 74) Such an approach maps power interrelations and therefore keeps us honest;) Worlds are coeval, "living
the same historical moment but under diverse modalities of subordination and hybridization." (Shohat 2001, 74) This last assertion is very helpful for reading against narratives of modernity and linear concepts of social evolution that contain the Other in stereotypical and anachronistic constructs.

Niranjana Tejaswini explains how translation studies and its academic cousin, ethnography, are tools for imperialist projects. This analysis traces the genealogy of power imbalances inherent in translation. One of the presuppositions of translation is that it transmits "an essential meaning" therefore ignoring the 'heterogeneity that contaminates 'pure meaning' from the start." (Tejaswini 1992, 55) To work critically with translation, Tejaswini calls for attention to the intertextuality of translations and the asymmetry of power that forms the foundation of translation. Anna Tsing offers a way of approaching critical engagement with translation. Cultural theorists argue that translation is the "faithless appropriation, a rewriting of a text in which new meanings are always forged by the interaction of languages." (Tsing 1997, 253) Tsing asserts that "meaning arises from the slippages and supplements of the confrontation." (Tsing 1997, 253) Although translation is filled with claims to purity and originality, Tsing and Tejaswini agree that there is no origin or stable meaning to a term.

The master narrative of the "West and the rest" eclipses the interactive and dynamic quality of translation. Tsing points out three methodological strategies to foreground the processes of translation. First, question the tight coherence of Western history by studying how Western thinkers are written into it. Second, investigate the narrative contestation around how cultural difference is identified and constructed. Third, examine how Western defined universals are strategically adapted and used globally. Tsing calls the reader to "explore the nature of global encounters." (Tsing 1997, 255) She looks at how civil society environmentalists build their discourse on political equality and universal human rights through an imagined global future. In this case, universalisms are used for their flexibility in translation, allowing for cultural negotiation that unifies groups with varied interests, national and international,
under a strategic alliance. Therefore, if we are to "work with 'universal' concerns, it must be in recognition of their shifting, devious, and much-fought-over multiplicity," and we must "appreciate the continuous and diverse translations that allow us to work with, rather than exclude each other." (Tsing 1997, 269) Translation is the process that shapes ideas and strategies of social movements out of heterogeneous resources, discourses and practices.

Linked to questions of knowability addressed by Carr and Lazreg among others, Ofelia Schutte explores the conceptual limitations of translation. As Tsing asserts, the messages that words and language communicate are not fixed, indeed they are better understood as a dynamic process with uneven and imbricated meanings. The additional mediation of a translator ensures the principle of incommensurability. Schutte describes this principle as the excess of meaning, "the untranslatable aspects of language vis-á-vis another language." (Schutte 1998, 56) Another way to approach this concept is "to look at nodes in a linguistic interchange or a conversation in which the other's speech, or some aspect of it, resonates in me as a kind of strangeness, as a kind of displacement of the usual expectation." (Schutte 1998, 56) The approach of cultural alterity calls attention to these telling moments as part of a nontotalizing approach to difference, which is also a critical component to building transnational alliances.

Elba Sanchez addresses the issue of incommensurability in her essay "Cartohistografia: Continente de una voz/Cartohistography: One Voice's Continent." (2003) In her reflections on her poem "Tepalcate a Tepalcate" she highlights the lack of adequate language in English to convey meaning.

I will not translate poems like "Tepalcate a Tepalcate." I could not do justice a la realidad de la palabra. [to the real significance of the word] At times, translation is frustration; there is no discourse to turn to. Even after breaking the word down, the greatest challenge to the translator or interpreter is to come as close as possible to a dignified expression and meaning of the word. There are times, therefore, when I refuse to translate. (Sanchez 2003, 24)
Braidotti discusses this same concept in terms of the ineffability of language. When ineffable concepts are forcibly translated, this violence can be understood as a process of banalization, taming or colonizing. (Braidotti 2000, 721) Sanchez rejects this violence. Tepalcate literally translates to shard.

How can "shard" possibly translate or give meaning to a word that is my umbilical cord, that links me to my mestizo reality? How can the sounds and smells of the water as it fills the jar, the vivid red of the wet clay, that are deeply imprinted in my mind and heart when I hear that living breathing word, become a real experience for someone else in the translation? (Sanchez 2003, 22-23)

Working within such interstitial spaces of language, discourse and knowledge production demands that we humbly stretch ourselves into unspoken terrains, with the intention of searching out and negotiating connections. The Latina Feminist Group's practice of testimonio offers a way into such terrains.

Testimonio was critical for breaking down essentialist categories, since it was through telling life stories and reflecting upon them that we gained nuanced understandings of differences and connections among us. These revelations established respect and a deeper understanding for each of us as individuals and as Latinas. (Latina Feminist Group 2001, 11)

Intimacy is one of the most challenging aspects of testimonio. In "translating ourselves to each other," The Latina Feminist Group accepts the vulnerability that comes with intimacy as part of their relational methodology.

The Latina Feminist Group's use of testimonio invokes the way it has been used historically as an artistic form and liberatory method throughout Latin American struggles. (Latina Feminist Group 2001, 10) Acevedo refers to testimoniando con poder as not only a methodology but also a political strategy. "My theoretical understanding of the intersection of gender, race, class, and sexuality in constructing diverse women in a multiethnic society was constantly reshaped by the experience I was living." (Acevedo 2001, 260) The way in which Acevedo utilizes her lived experience as the basis for knowledge is part of the women of color feminist project, born from the productive tension between women of color as identity marker, political project and mode of analysis.
Drawing from U.S. feminists of color and transnational feminists, the notions of relationality and cultural translation taken together offer a set of conceptual tools for reconfiguring socio-political and cultural relations in a transnational context and a method for being accountable to relations of power. Coalitional thinking is informed by four principles; the mutual constitution of theory and practice, accounting for power disequilibrium in a transnational context, recognition of alternative epistemologies that presuppose de-centering of the Western Self, and re-vindication of playfulness. Cultural translation and relationality function to focus and integrate these principles within coalitional thinking. I enlist relationality and cultural translation in the tireless project of de-centering the Western Self through relational politics. Moreover, coalitional thinking works toward equal legitimacy for all subject positions. These feminist insights based on an analysis of social location show how identity politics, specifically individual and collective identity formation directly inform internal movement structural relations. Cohen and Arato's politics of influence is focused externally, and for that reason women's rights lends itself to such an analysis. Yet movement's internal workings also have structural and organizational qualities that must be studied and turning the politics of influence inward does not provide sufficient conceptual and analytical traction. Only by exploring the interrelated aspects of identity politics and structural and organizational factors can one develop an integrated assessment of transnational feminist movements.

CONCLUSION

The transatlantic divide within social movement theory marks the study of transnational feminist movements. Resource mobilization theory has an organizational and institutional legacy that informs the politics of influence. New social movement theory has linguistic and discursive roots that underpin the politics of identity. I trace how these two tendencies manifest in contemporary literature on social movements and its treatment of transnationalism. Specifically, I underscore how these literatures
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maintain a conceptual separation between process and procedure-oriented insights and analysis of power relations and social positioning. In this statement, I foreground efforts to bridge these conceptual and theoretical gaps through interventions by transnational and U.S. women of color feminisms. By investigating how social movements mobilize and the why they mobilize as inseparable questions, there is a greater possibility of capturing the complexity of movement activities, goals and strategies.

Furthermore, I argue the politics of influence (concerned with how) and identity (concerned with why) are mutually constitutive and their transformative potential resides in a commitment to analyzing social location and power relations in a transnational context.

Transnational feminist movements work at varied levels of scale. On the national level, coalition building occurs across movements that work both in and against the state, including both reformist and revolutionary tendencies. Therefore, transnational and women of color feminisms, through analyzing different kinds of states, political instability and regime change in relation to women and women's movements, move beyond the limits of resource mobilization and its liberal presuppositions. Likewise, critical race feminism, through its analysis of structural inequalities, multiple subjectivities, and compound social marginalization, proposes fundamental changes in the international human rights normative framework. Romany's critical race feminist intervention in international human rights elucidates exactly how an intersectional model, born from a politics of identity, can expand the international human rights normative framework, thereby shifting the discourse of the politics of influence. Insights offered by U.S. feminist of color and transnational feminists have the potential of strengthening the transformative capacity of social movements by theorizing dual politics as mutually informative and constitutive.
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