

SOLIDARITIES BEYOND BORDERS

SOLIDARITIES BEYOND BORDERS

Transnationalizing Women's Movements

Edited by Pascale Dufour, Dominique Masson,
and Dominique Caouette



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

© UBC Press 2010

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright, www.accesscopyright.ca.

21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on FSC-certified ancient-forest-free paper (100% post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Solidarities beyond borders : transnationalizing women's movements /
edited by Pascale Dufour, Dominique Masson and Dominique Caouette.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7748-1795-0

1. Feminism – International cooperation – Case studies. 2. Women – Social networks. 3. Feminists – Social networks. 4. Globalization – Social aspects. 5. Transnationalism. I. Dufour, Pascale, 1971- II. Masson, Dominique III. Caouette, Dominique, 1962-

HQ1155.S65 2010

305.42

C2010-902166-5

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program provided by the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press
The University of British Columbia
2029 West Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2
www.ubcpress.ca

Contents

Preface / vii
Diane Matte

Acknowledgments / xi

Introduction / 1
*Pascale Dufour, Dominique Masson, and Dominique
Caouette*

Part 1: Understanding Complex Transnationalization

- 1** Transnationalizing Feminist and Women's Movements:
Toward a Scalar Approach / 35
Dominique Masson
- 2** Theorizing Feminist and Social Movement Practice
in Space / 56
Elsa Beaulieu

Part 2: Deepening Solidarities among Women and Women's Issues

- 3** Framing Transnational Feminism: Examining Migrant Worker Organizing in Singapore / 89
Lenore Lyons
- 4** The International Women and Health Meetings: Deploying Multiple Identities for Political Sustainability / 108
Sylvia Estrada-Claudio
- 5** Transnational Activism and the Argentine Women's Movement: Challenging the Gender Regime? / 127
Débora Lopreite

Part 3: Stretching the Scope of Solidarities

- 6** Troubling Transnational Feminism(s) at the World Social Forum / 149
Janet Conway
- 7** Bringing Feminist Perspectives to Transnational Collective Action in Southeast Asia / 173
Dominique Caouette
- 8** Building Transnational Feminist Solidarity in the Americas: The Experience of the Latin American Network of Women Transforming the Economy / 199
Carmen L. Díaz Alba

Conclusion / 223

Dominique Masson and Pascale Dufour

List of Contributors / 243

Index / 247

Preface

DIANE MATTE

When I heard about the seminar titled “Transnationalization of Solidarities and Women’s Movements,” which took place in April 2005 (and from which this book originated), I wanted to be there to explore with academics why so many women and groups were – and continue to be – attracted to our global action. Having been the coordinator of the International Secretariat of the World March of Women during its first nine years of existence gave me a multitude of opportunities to learn from other women and reinforced my belief that feminist and women’s movements are both a tool and a process that we must renew and keep alive. The process of renewal is especially important when we consider the contemporary global reality of a delocalizing world and economy. Listening to and reading over the presentations given in that seminar sparked some thoughts that I wanted to share with you as we participate in a collective effort to understand the impact of global transformations and to articulate the kind of social change that we are striving for in our lives and in our communities.

The World March of Women is a global feminist movement that was conceived in 1995, when feminists in Quebec were organizing the Bread and Roses women’s march against poverty. I had the privilege of coordinating this march and was also one of the women who thought that we should link our action with women’s and feminist groups in other countries. Subsequently, we began spreading the idea of a global feminist march. Although

we encountered various challenges on the road to making it a reality, the ongoing action/movement known as the World March of Women was, and still is, a remarkable feminist success story. Why?

Some of the answers are in this book.

The transnationalization of feminist movements can be understood as a transposition to another scale of the community outreach work inherent to social movements. To have a sustainable impact, movements for change must be controlled and managed by the people affected by systems of oppression, and they must keep learning from these groups. Movements must constantly stay in touch with the changes in people's lives. Social change is not a top-down process, nor can it be directed by experts.

The same is true of transnationalization. It will not be effective if it is a process that concerns and reaches only a few chosen experts. It is essential that we reach out to women in other nations and to other feminist and women's movements on the basis of women's common experiences and, in doing so, strengthen our movements transnationally. We need to think, act, and change not only from the local to the global scale, but also from the global to the local scale. It could be said that the transnationalization of solidarity is a response to postmodern and neoliberal attacks on social movements and their global analysis. It may also be seen as a global response to the "No alternative" refrains of global institutions. The case studies presented here eloquently demonstrate this. They also tackle the very important discussion of how and with whom radical social change can be achieved.

As one of the contributions in this book suggests, the word "transnationalization" may not be the most appropriate one to describe what we are doing, since we do not confine solidarity to the notion of geopolitical borders. Rather, for more and more of us, the concept of transnationalization gives political meaning to solidarity that not only extends across borders but attempts to overcome our tendency to compartmentalize struggles. It is a constant challenge to build and maintain solidarity when we are confronted with language barriers, different political cultures, and stark disparities in access to resources. Nonetheless, the contributors to this book demonstrate that these alliances are the best response to individualism and global indifference.

Solidarity, or transnationalization, in this context, necessitates recognizing our diversity and building on it or, if necessary, around it; it also means recognizing our privileges and identifying our common purposes. In other

words, solidarity comes with an understanding of oppression and a commitment to act upon it with others and, when required, for others. It implies equality, not charity or uniformity.

As you will see from this book, working together creates new opportunities for fruitful cooperation and new analyses. We must constantly remind ourselves, however, of the importance of maintaining strong women's and feminist movements. Part of the challenge that confronts the women's and feminist movements today has to do with how "global feminism" has been defined and practised in the last few years. Changing the institutions is not sufficient. The women's and feminist movements at the global level do not, and should not, revolve solely around the United Nations. Large institutions and governments tend to occupy a preponderant place on our agendas; while we must monitor and ask more from them, it is a mistake to build our movements around them.

In order to change women's lives, we have to change the world. The opposite is also true: in order to change the world, we must change women's lives. The radicalism of feminism resides in its capacity to recognize the need to confront class and race at the same time as patriarchy. Clearly, feminism is about reclaiming our bodies and ourselves, but failing to consider the colour of those bodies and their economic role will result only in maintaining existing power relations and advancing women who are more privileged. It weakens our movements.

Like many other groups, organizations, and networks that you will read about in this book, the World March of Women works to bring solidarity to a new level and to increase the impact of feminism. This collection of case studies and analyses will help us discuss the challenges that we face and articulate the importance of building and sustaining global movements for social change.

Acknowledgments

Our most heartfelt thanks go to the contributors to this volume for all their hard work in the course of putting this book together. Tasks involved, for most of them, transforming a workshop paper into a full-fledged, well-thought-through chapter, responding to editorial suggestions by the three co-editors and by the anonymous reviewers at various stages of their writing, reading each other's chapters and finding further inspiration in each other's ideas, and diligently responding to our e-mails and supporting the project from start to finish.

We are happy to be able to say that this book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Our thanks for providing financial assistance in the course of this project also go to the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Ottawa and the Centre de recherche sur les politiques et le développement social (Research Centre on Social Policies and Social Development) and the Réseau d'études des dynamiques transnationales et de l'action collective (Research Network on Transnational Dynamics and Collective Action), both based at the Université de Montréal.

We would like to express our special thanks to Stephanie MacKay, PhD candidate at the University of Ottawa, who did a great job with the linguistic

revisions of the chapters written by non-native English speakers, and to Carmen Díaz Alba and Patricia Garcia for their work in preparing the final version of this manuscript.

Finally, we are grateful to the two anonymous external reviewers for their evaluation and their suggestions, as well as to Emily Andrew, Senior Editor at UBC Press, for her unfailing support.

SOLIDARITIES BEYOND BORDERS

Introduction

PASCALE DUFOUR, DOMINIQUE MASSON,
AND DOMINIQUE CAQUETTE

Solidarities among the world's women are not new. Like labour movements, women's movements and feminist activism have been internationalized since the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, from the second half of the twentieth century on, quantitative and qualitative changes have occurred in the linkages that women have built at the supranational and global scales. Global networks have grown in numbers, especially in the wake of the increasing attention paid to women by international institutions. Beginning with the proclamation of International Women's Year in 1975 by the United Nations and the Women's Decade that followed (1975-85), women's historical struggles for their rights and the improvement of their living conditions have gained stronger institutional recognition on the world scene. The nature of cross-border linkages among women has also changed, becoming more and more diverse. Today, for example, international non-governmental networks, multinational networks of women's groups, and transnational feminist networks coexist with mixed coalitions of groups advocating for women's rights. Yet, in spite of their numbers and diversity, these sustained and widely recognized global ties are still considered, or so it seems, "women's affairs" by mainstream analysts, who have not granted them the attention bestowed upon other contemporary transnationalizations in the environmental, labour, anti-globalization, and global social justice movements. This relatively sudden realization formed the point of departure for this book. For

instance, an abundance of social movements literature has addressed transnational collective action, especially since the mid-1990s, with large, worldwide protests and demonstrations increasingly taking centre stage; women's movements, however, have rarely been studied as an empirical case, much less as a basis for theorizing transnationalization. Yet, women's movements, like labour movements, have long experience with transnationalization and constitute an important part of the transnational social movement sector. They certainly deserve specific attention beyond the specialized feminist literature.

Our second realization was the strong geographical homogeneity of those who have researched and published on the topic of transnational social movements. Most social movement discourse is circulated in the English language, is produced by researchers living in the North (North America or Europe), and privileges Northern perspectives. Yet, we know that some of the most radical transformations are occurring in Southern countries – in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Diversifying the geographical origin of both researchers and cases seemed essential in order to provide a platform for experts from the South to share their experiences and analyses of transnational movements.

Finally, the standard definition of transnational social movements as sustained protests involving activists from at least two countries and targeting international institutions (see the literature review below) appeared to us to be too limited to cover the full range of activists' and groups' lived experiences in the building of solidarities beyond national borders. Was it possible to open up the dominant conception of transnationalization?

In April 2005, these initial considerations crystallized in the organization of an international workshop, *Transnationalization of Solidarities and Women's Movements*, held at the Université de Montréal. Feminist researchers from diverse disciplines (political science, sociology, anthropology, and women's studies) and origins (Latin America, Europe, Southeast Asia, Australia, and Canada) were invited. The workshop, subsidized by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Centre de recherche sur les politiques et le développement social, and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of the Université de Montréal, had two main objectives: reflecting upon the available knowledge of transnationalization in feminist and women's movements, and initiating a collective search for approaches suited to making analytical linkages among the different transnationalization processes documented by the participants. After forty-eight hours of debate

and exchange, we were able to agree on the following basic assumption: transnationalization demands daily convergence of interests and identities among activists who have multiple territorial and organizational affiliations. In this respect, it is a construction process that can take a variety of forms. Instead of defining it a priori, we chose to adopt a more inductive approach and see what kinds of transnationalization women and feminists create in their respective networks. Transnationalization is also a process of stretching and contracting the scope of collective action and the result of complex interactions between actors' strategies and their institutional and movement environments. In other words, transnationalization is always located somewhere – including inside national territories – and not “up there”; it sometimes happens in different places at the same time. Moreover, it cannot be reduced to a simple change in the institutional level targeted by movement activists, but involves a wider variety of movement processes.

Solidarities beyond Borders: Transnationalizing Women's Movements emerged from this preliminary reflection. Bringing together scholars and cases from various locations, this volume is intended to contribute to the advancement of feminist approaches on the topic, and to bring to a larger audience the richness and diversity of feminist research and of the experience of transnationalization in contemporary feminist and women's movements. Unfortunately, one continent is still missing from our sample of researchers and cases: Africa. This absence is not the result of choice, but of circumstances that have to do with the way structural inequalities affect collaboration among academics.

We have decided to write about what we call transnationalization of solidarities because this notion focuses on the processes by which transnationalization is produced daily in organizations, networks, events, and movements. As Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2003, 7) stresses, solidarities involve “mutuality, accountability, recognition of common interests as the basis for relationships among diverse communities.” In this perspective, the political work necessary to build solidarities becomes the heart of the analysis, and the transnationalization of solidarities is always the result of a convergence, beyond national borders, of actors' differing interests and identities. Consequently, our analyses reveal how diverse are the paths to transnationalization and how complex – and creative – is the articulation of activists' interests and identities in such a context of extreme diversity.

Here, the term “transnational” refers to “a connection among several units (cells, sections, branches, delegations) that are spread over several national

territories, all of which participate in the solidarity relationship as such” (Devin 2004, 20, our translation). The substance, or content, of solidarity is as important as how the various units are organized and how solidarity diffuses within networks. In other words, the building of solidarities by actors involved in transnationalization processes goes hand in hand with the decisions made, strategies formulated, and specific mechanisms established within their respective organizations, movements, or networks. In this volume, we call attention to both the meaning of solidarities and their deployment (or implementation). As we will see, the two combine in different ways.

Thus, the transnationalization of solidarities refers to the processes not only by which solidarities travel beyond established national borders, but also by which they are deepened among women or among feminists. The deepening of solidarities involves mutual recognition and the constitution of stronger ties among activists. It also opens up the possibility for the establishment and cultivation of shared understandings of situations, problems, and, sometimes, solutions. These processes are the focus of Part 2 of the book. Solidarities may also be “stretched” beyond feminists and women’s constituencies and beyond women’s issues to include “progressive” allies and their goals. Issues related to the stretching of solidarities are the subject of Part 3. Finally, we have chosen to draw together literature from various fields of study. One of the main purposes of this volume is to propose an original dialogue between feminist approaches to transnationalization and the mainstream literature on the topic in the fields of social movement studies and international relations (IR). This introductory chapter thus features a review of the literature from these three research fields, followed by a discussion. We begin with recent work addressing the transnationalization of collective action in social movement studies and in IR – bodies of literature that, while quite distinct, share a number of features. Second, we examine feminist contributions in IR. Contrary to mainstream IR scholars, feminists have addressed nontraditional issues and non-state actors, providing a rich and complex understanding of global dynamics. Third, we provide an overview of the ways in which a wider, interdisciplinary feminist scholarship has approached transnationalization in feminist and women’s movements. Our objective is to present the main theoretical offerings currently available for apprehending and understanding transnationalization. How do current conceptions help or hinder us in addressing the issues raised by transnationalization? What are the preferred lines of questioning in the three fields of study, how are they useful, and what are their limitations?

Transnationalization in the Social Movements and International Relations Fields

As Janet Conway (2004) explains, cycles or waves of mobilization have often produced important “theoretical moments.” The recent increase in transnational connections among collective actors is one of these. Key studies conducted in the social movement field in the last few years have focused mostly on the mobilizations of the 1990s and 2000s against neoliberal globalization (Bandy and Smith 2005; della Porta and Tarrow 2005; della Porta et al. 2006; Tarrow 2005). At the same time, IR research has revealed an increased presence of transnational movement actors in world governance processes, and underscored the necessity of considering these actors and their influence in decision-making processes at the international level (Risse-Kappen 1995; Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink 1999). With rare exceptions (for instance, Keck and Sikkink 1998; Macdonald 2005), transnational feminist and women’s movements have not received sustained attention in the social movements and IR fields (except for the work of IR feminists, which will be discussed separately).

The Nature of the Object and the Preferred Unit(s) of Analysis

In 2005, Johanna Siméant, building on Sidney Tarrow’s (2001) initial classification, identified different types of transnational collective action. She proposed to distinguish between simultaneous or coordinated actions in different states (for example, the huge demonstrations around the world against the war in Iraq); mechanisms of diffusion of activist practices (for example, during the fall of communist regimes in 1989 and 1990); mechanisms for the transfer of resources, know-how, and information among movements; mobilizations targeting international institutions and their politics; non-governmental organization (NGO) activism directed toward international institutions; counter-summit mobilizations; protests against multinational corporations; protests against one state by activists from another state (for example, the anti-apartheid movement outside South Africa); activism in favour of a cause located outside one’s country (for example, Western activism against child labour); large movement gatherings such as the World Social Forum; and the building and consolidation of transnational organizations. The purpose of this classification was to put some order into actions and processes generally labelled “social movements’ transnationalization.” It was also indicative of the different facets of the phenomena that count as transnationalization for social movements and IR scholars.

In its bare form, transnational activism has been broadly defined as social movements, other civil society organizations, and individuals operating

across national borders (Piper and Uhlin 2004, 4-5). This definition has been further refined by two social movements specialists, Donatella della Porta and Sidney Tarrow (2005, 7), who refer to *transnational collective action* as “the coordinated international campaigns on the part of networks of activists against international actors, other states, or international institutions.” There are two main components to della Porta and Tarrow’s definition. First, the transnational aspect of collective action is defined by the presence of activists or groups belonging to more than one nation-state; the focus is therefore on the *international* or *multinational* character of the coalitions. Second, the target of the actions must also be *international* or *multinational*, and it must possess institutional features (governmental or non-governmental). Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) use *transnational networks* as their unit of analysis. In their view, these networks have become a concrete expression of transnational social movements. Jeffrey Ayres and Sidney Tarrow (2003) distinguish *transnational social movements* from other categories of analysis. According to these authors, social movements are characterized by protests and contentious politics, while NGOs and networks use more routine and accepted methods in working with international institutions. Joe Bandy and Jackie Smith (2005, 4) recommend considering the various forms of *transnational alliances* in which collective actors are involved. Transnational networks lie at one end of the spectrum, with the most informal types of cooperation, and transnational social movement organizations lie at the other end, with the most formal types. Transnational coalitions fall between these two poles. The issue is not so much what kind of action is transnationalized, but the degree of formalization of transnational connections.

Understanding the Emergence of Transnationalization

The majority of scholars in the social movements and IR fields relate the expansion of the transnationalization of solidarities to globalization and its impacts on social institutions and relationships. Initially, structural changes at the macro level favoured transnationalization through technological developments (with the Internet assuming a key function in the speed of world-scale mobilizations and the long-distance coordination of multinational networks) (Tarrow and della Porta 2005, 228), the rise in international exchanges (the increase in international business going hand in hand with increased travel and contact among activists from multiple national territories), and consideration of the fundamental role of certain

international institutions such as the UN (della Porta, Kriesi, and Rucht 1999; Tarrow 2001). Tarrow (2005) and della Porta and Tarrow (2005) use the expression “complex internationalism” to describe the last phenomenon – that is, “the expansion of international institutions, international regimes, and the transfer of the resources of local and national actors to the international stage, producing threats, opportunities and resources for international NGOs, transnational social movements, and indirectly, grassroots social movements” (Tarrow and della Porta 2005, 234).

Tarrow (2005, 3), however, emphasizes that transnational activism is much more than a mechanical response to globalization. Not only must the institutional context be ripe for transnationalization, offering a “multilevel opportunity structure,” but the actors must also seize these new political opportunities. It is a matter of ascertaining both how international political contexts have allowed for the emergence of transnational collective action (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Smith, Chatfield, and Pagnucco 1997), and how these broader conditions articulate with the specificities of national political contexts (della Porta and Tarrow 2005; Tarrow 2005). For instance, Kathryn Sikkink (cited in Tarrow 2005, 171) suggests that international institutional arenas should be viewed as an ensemble of constraints on, as well as opportunities for, the action of transnational movements. She proposes an analytical grid outlining the interactions of domestic and international political institutions to explain the emergence (and success) of transnational actions by using two concepts, the boomerang effect and the spiral model. These concepts, which have become very influential in the literature, describe patterns of action that develop when activists operating within a domestic opportunity structure that is closed off to their pressures – due either to exclusion from the system of national representation or to political repression – search for allies in international political opportunity structures that offer more openings to their claims in order to “import” pressure “from above” to bring to bear on their own national government.

Tarrow (2005, 32) further complicates such an understanding of the relations between national and international contexts by considering another series of political processes. Global framing (the mobilization of international symbols for the purpose of framing domestic conflicts) and internationalization (a response to foreign or international pressures from within domestic politics) establish connections between national actors and international issues on national territory. Conversely, diffusion (the transfer of forms of protest from one country to another) and scale shift (the

coordination of collective action at a level other than the one at which it began) establish a connection between domestic conflicts and international conflicts and institutions. Lastly, externalization (the vertical projection of domestic demands toward international institutions or foreign actors) and transnational coalition formation (the horizontal formation of networks among activists from different countries sharing similar claims) occur at the international level. According to Tarrow's analysis, these last two processes have the greatest likelihood of giving rise to transnational social movements.

In their search for explanations for the emergence of transnational practices, these authors have tended to ignore the "daily activist work" that is required for transnationalization to occur. Similarly, the accent on macro-level conditions (globalization) and institutional contexts means that the relative autonomy of movement activists and organizations in the construction of transnational solidarities, as well as in shaping the form that they take and their (varied) political content, is not sufficiently considered in these analyses.

Evaluating the Impacts of Transnationalization

Another important issue, which has been dealt with at length in recent studies, relates to the impact of transnational collective action, generally measured through the degree of influence achieved on decisions made at various institutional levels, and in particular by international institutions. For the majority of authors, transnationalization is seldom viewed as having a direct impact; rather, it is usually understood as mediated through relays such as public opinion or political and administrative instruments. Therefore, collective actions that have successfully affected institutions have not "revolutionized" the existing political order. Instead, they have allowed for change involving the incremental pluralization of existing structures of governance (O'Brien et al. 2000). Tarrow (2005) uses the metaphor of the coral reef to describe these incremental changes. Transnational protests occur in waves: national organizations leave the national scene to take part in transnational coalitions and protest activities that form around new "coral reefs" created by international institutions. They then return to their national level of action, having been transformed by their transnational experience. Incremental changes can be perceived within institutions (international or national) each time that national organizations participate in successful transnational action and each time that they return to have an impact on their national targets.

Jackie Smith, Charles Chatfield, and Ron Pagnucco (1997, 73-74) argue that while transnational collective actions may not have a direct effect on policies, they do play a role in the politicization of global issues and their appearance on the international agenda. Organizations involved in transnational collective actions also contribute to the learning processes of governments by gathering information and making it available through transnational communication networks. Lastly, they are involved in modelling political processes that are responsible for generating global policies.

The nature and scope of these impacts may vary as a result of several factors. According to Thomas Risse-Kappen (1995, 25), “under similar international conditions, differences in domestic structures determine the variation in the political impacts of transnational actors.” Smith, Chatfield, and Pagnucco (1997, 60) maintain that the impact varies as a function of the structure of the mobilizations, the political opportunities offered by the various contexts in which they evolve, and how participants go about mobilizing their resources to take action.

The Difficult Task of Building Transnational Solidarities

Transnational mobilizations are forced to deal with difficulties that limit their potential, frequency, and success. As early as 1992, Dennis Young identified four major obstacles to the building of cross-border coalitions: political, cultural, and linguistic *diversity*, which jeopardizes the very notion of coalition since it makes agreeing on common interests arduous; the *physical distance* separating activists, who then require significant resources in terms of travel; *economic barriers* to the movement of people, goods, and information that restrict opportunities to form coalitions; and the specificities of *local political contexts* that determine, in part, the opportunities for local groups to act at a global level. Young (1992, 14; also cited by Bandy and Smith 2005, 8) suggested that these elements, which played against the emergence of transnational coalitions, could be expected to disappear or diminish over time because structural developments (technological, economic, and political) would eventually facilitate the formation of such coalitions and cause the interdependency among both issues and actors to become increasingly obvious.

Today, many scholars instead highlight the restrictive effects of structural economic transformations on the building of solidarities beyond national borders. In the field of work and labour relations, for instance, the liberalization of trade and business exchanges places workers in competition with

each other, thereby limiting perspectives for cross-border solidarities (Azouvi 2000; Gobin 2002; Gobin, Hilal, and Decoene 2007). As well, it has been noted that problems related to the multinational nature of transnational solidarities prevail (Bandy and Smith 2005). John D. McCarthy (1997, 245) underscores the inherent weaknesses in social movements' transnational networks and, specifically, the difficulty in building a common cognitive frame that allows for large-scale mobilizations.

The social movements and mainstream IR bodies of literature that have addressed transnational collective action have attempted to define transnationalization in relation to international political arenas. Researchers have examined the factors favouring the emergence and/or continuity of these mobilizations and attempted to measure their impacts. They have also reflected upon the conditions facilitating or preventing the formation of transnational solidarities. Surprisingly, however, research in this field, while very abundant, does not feature many studies addressing transnationalization and the building of cross-border solidarities in feminist and women's movements. It is feminist scholars, in IR or operating outside mainstream literature, who have made these issues central.

Contributions from Feminist IR

From within the IR field, a sustained current of feminist criticism has challenged the masculine assumptions embedded in the "malestream" paradigm (Tickner 1992, 2001). Feminist IR scholars note that such a paradigm reifies and legitimizes the status quo in IR by normalizing existing power relations and suggesting that the patriarchal order is natural. Cynthia Enloe (1989), in particular, questioned the apparent absence of women in IR theory very early, arguing that transnational issues such as prostitution, sex tourism, and the sex trade were relevant to the field and required a rethinking of its analytical lens. Besides making women visible, Enloe's pioneering work (1983, 1989) also highlighted the contribution of feminist and women's movements in international processes and political change.

Much of the feminist IR literature focuses on transnational dynamics in relation to women and how they organize. At one end of the spectrum are numerous studies that emphasize the role of international processes and institutions in the formation of transnational women's organizations (Friedman 2003; Joachim 2003; Valk, Van Dam, and Cummings 1999). With the growing emphasis on the role of women in development and the large

international conferences organized by the United Nations (Bunch 1993; Chen 1995; Hilikka and Vickers 1994), global women's networks and caucuses are seen emerging. This is the case, for instance, for the International Women's Tribune Centre, created in 1976, Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era, established in preparation for the Third World Conference held in 1985, and, more recently, the Women's Environment and Development Organization, founded in 1991 (Antrobus 2004; Bunch and Reilly 1994). Writing about the 1985 conference, Peggy Antrobus (2004, 18-19) suggests, "It was there that a conscious attempt was made to bring together local and regional experiences as the beginning of a process for the preparation of a platform document for a global event." According to this view, the large gatherings and conferences of the 1980s and 1990s, sponsored by the UN, created momentum for the transnationalization of women's solidarities. Scholars also highlight the important contribution of women's NGOs in "gendering the agenda" (Friedman 2003; Jaquette 1995) of these conferences and in lobbying for and monitoring the agreements reached during these multilateral gatherings (Meyer and Prügl 1999; Stephenson 1995).

At the other end of the spectrum are studies that trace the transnationalization of women's solidarities and action back to larger global processes with a much longer history. Feminist IR scholars who carry out these studies also tend to emphasize the endogenous dimension of women's transnational organizing – the building of feminist solidarities in the struggles against gender regimes and patriarchal rule that are embedded in national and international institutions.

Transnationalization is thus viewed as responding both to exogenous opportunities and to more specific logics internal to women's mobilizations (Estrada-Claudio, this volume; Antrobus and Sen 2005; Stienstra 1994, 2000). Within these twin dynamics, gendered issues such as women's rights (Peters and Wolper 1995), abortion (Ferree and Gamson 1999), female workers' migrations (Parrenas 2001), violence against women (Piper 2001), sexual harassment (Zippel 2004), sexual equality (Cichowski 2002), and women's work, carework, and globalization (Moghadam 2005; Zimmerman and Litt 2006) have increasingly been framed as transnational and have spurred women's cross-border organizing.

Within IR theory, the area of international norms is probably where feminist scholars have made their most important and recognized contribution.

With the work of Martha Finnemore (1996) and Sikkink (1998), “norms” have acquired accepted status as an explanatory variable influencing policy-making in both state and international institutions. As defined by Peter J. Katzenstein (1996), norms are standards of behaviours considered appropriate for specific actors with given identities. Some of the significant work on women’s rights (Thompson 2000) and violence against women (Keck and Sikkink 1998), for instance, has been conducted within such an international norms approach. In addition, explanatory models that underline the impact of norms and norm entrepreneurs have been devised to explain how women’s transnational advocacy networks might be able to influence state policies through the boomerang effect (Keck and Sikkink 1998), cascading patterns of norms and norms life cycles (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998), and norm spiralling (Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink 1999).

It is in the reciprocal dynamics between the local/national and the global political processes in which women’s movements are involved that one can understand the contribution of women’s transnational organizing. Referring to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Mary Geske and Susan C. Bourque (2001, 262), for instance, suggest that regional middle-level organizations, such as International Women’s Rights Action Watch Asia Pacific, act as “an effective mechanism linking local organizations to an international deliberative body.”

Finally, feminist IR scholars also reveal how transnational social movement coalitions may be gender-blind and may end up reproducing exclusionary practices despite their progressive goals. Coalitions opposing free trade in the Americas, Laura Macdonald (2005, 21) notes, “are not free of exclusionary practices.” Such a critical view is echoed by Catherine Eschle (2005, 1743; see also Eschle 2001, 2004), who argues that exclusionary hierarchies within transnational movements and organizations need to be exposed and that “received understandings of what constitutes the movement are being challenged” by feminists. Macdonald (2005, 23) further suggests that “interpretative frames, dominant within society at large, within states, and even within activist networks tend to be characterized by sexist assumptions, making infinitely more difficult feminist activists’ struggles to challenge these assumptions and to bring their concerns within social movements’ frames.” The same applies within the field of expert knowledge produced by global coalitions and non-feminist movements, in which gendered assumptions help to delegitimize the “types of knowledge and skill typically dominated by women” (Macdonald 2005, 37), especially in the area of global

economics and trade agreements (see also Caouette, this volume; Díaz Alba, this volume).

Feminist Scholarship on Transnationalization in Feminist and Women's Movements

Quite apart from the mainstream literature and separate from the work done in feminist IR, there exists a distinct feminist body of work that makes up the lion's share of current publications on women's movements, feminism, and transnationalization. This scholarship is distinctively feminist in the sense that it is grounded primarily in feminist theories and debates – that is, in feminism as an autonomous academic field of study. It is also interdisciplinary in that it draws, although much less visibly and oftentimes critically, on conceptual tools and approaches associated with other disciplines of the social sciences and humanities. Although this scholarship has some degree of affinity with feminist IR work on transnationalization, it does not share the latter's disciplinary orientations.

A Politics of Naming Around Basic Concepts

Approaching transnationalization through the lens of feminist scholarship is made arduous by the existence of a “politics of naming” around basic concepts (Naples 2002, 5). “When women mobilize” and transnationalize “to pursue a wide variety of interests,” are all such mobilizations to be considered “women's movements”? Are all “automatically to be considered feminist” (Ferree 2006, 6)? If not, what counts as such? There is no general agreement in the literature on this issue, and responses range from the conflation of women's with feminist movements (and vice versa) to attempts (many of them viewed as exclusionary) at making sharp distinctions (see Hawkesworth 2006, 25-27). A useful way out of this conundrum is provided by Myra Marx Ferree (2006, 6), for whom these terms refer to distinct realities to be understood in a dynamic and relational way. “Naming ‘women’ as a constituency to be mobilized and building strategy, organization, and politics around issues defined as being particularly ‘women's’ concerns are the two factors that make a women's movement.” Feminism, on the other hand, is to be seen as both theory and movement activism, oriented toward the specific goal of challenging the gender order while taking a plurality of forms and meanings. A dynamic and historically changing relationship between feminism(s) and women's movements thus exists that begs for closer investigation in an era of increased transnational connectivity (Ferree 2006, 8). The expression “feminist and women's movements,” used here, is meant to

acknowledge both the lack of a consensus in the literature and the interest of Ferree's proposition.

The meanings of "international," "global," and "transnational" in feminist scholarship are, similarly, plural and contested. Distinctions between international and transnational activism, for instance, often rest on an assumption of "newness" in the context of emergence of cross-border activism (that is, contemporary globalization), the logic of claims-making (transcending localisms and nationalisms), or organizational form (free-floating networks) that are disputed by other feminist scholars on historical, factual, or analytical grounds (see, for example, Hawkesworth 2006; Miller 1999; Rupp and Taylor 1999). Terminological disagreements around naming may be indicative of various ways of seeing the interconnectedness of nations (Mackie 2001) or, for the matter, of women. In fact, the labels "global feminism" and "transnational feminisms" are indexical of divergent positions in a debate concerned with the grounds, possibilities, and limitations for transnational solidarity among women who are differently located around the globe and within intersecting relations of power and difference.

This debate finds its starting point in Robin Morgan's (1984) notion of "global sisterhood," premised on the assumption of a worldwide, organic solidarity among women against patriarchal rule. Criticism of Morgan focused on her overly homogeneous conception of patriarchy and her erasure of differences and inequalities among women. Against presumptions of undifferentiated patriarchal oppressions, sameness, and automatic and unproblematic solidarity among women, the label "global feminism" emerged, as a feminist discourse and a politics, to acknowledge differences in power and privilege among women and the localized specificities of women's struggles against patriarchy and capitalism. Within global feminist perspectives, however, differences among women are not considered irreducible. They are to be reconciled, if not superseded, through the development of a common "global feminist agenda," fashioned around universalizable claims and associated with a human rights discourse. Anchored in a postmodern and post-colonial feminist critique of both "global sisterhood" and "global feminism," transnational feminism theorists (Alexander and Mohanty 1997; Grewal and Kaplan 1994; Kaplan 1994; Kaplan, Aleron, and Moallem 1999) are more sceptical about the possibilities for a truly universal and egalitarian feminist politics across "discrepant and distinct social conditions" (Mendoza 2002, 302). Rather, they advocate an analytical focus on the politics of location (Mohanty 1992) to unravel the tensions, contradictions, and power relations that necessarily affect attempts at alliances among differently situated

women. Strategies based on practices of affiliation (Kaplan 1994) or dialogic transversal politics (Yuval-Davis 2006) are also presented as alternatives to the relativistic treatment of difference and unrecognized hegemonies that are perceived to mar the analysis of global feminism.

Outside of these terminological and strategic-theoretical debates, “transnational,” “transnationalism,” and even “global feminism” are terms widely used in feminist scholarship to refer to the myriad practices involved in networking and organization-building; mobilizing and transferring resources; framing claims, deploying discourses, and constructing collective identities; and collaborating and acting at the local, national, and supranational levels *in ways that involve feminists and/or women’s movement actors working across or beyond national boundaries*. In this literature, transnational practices are both organizational and discursive. Its actors are variously identified as activists, groups, organizations and networks, and local and national women’s movements, and they also include feminist NGOs and international NGOs that work “to alter gender power relations” (Alvarez 1999, 186).¹ Such work can be roughly divided into two strands: one concerned with the way in which feminist and women’s movement activists take shape and operate in the transnational public sphere, and the other with the encounter between domestic struggles and the new field of transnational feminist connectivity. A preoccupation with the tensions and power dynamics stemming from various axes of difference and inequality runs through both strands, harking back to issues of feminist theory and political strategy.

Transnational Actors in Transnational Settings

The first strand focuses on cross-boundary practices taking place in transnational settings and in the transnational public sphere. Valentine M. Moghadam’s work (1996, 2000, 2005) is an important contribution to such an inquiry because it centres on exposing the origins, membership, organizational structure, goals, activities, and achievements of diverse transnational feminist networks. Other scholars document the nature and characteristics of a variety of transnational experiences, from attempts at bilateral collaboration between local women’s organizations (Sampaio 2004; Weber 2002) to the organization of planetary gatherings such as the World March of Women (Conway 2008; Dufour and Giraud 2005; Giraud 2001). Although overlooked in analytical terms, a regional level of activism is prominent in numerous case studies featuring transnational organizations and networks, for instance in Africa (Adams 2006; Tripp 2005), Latin

America (Alvarez 2000; Mendez 2002), Europe (Helfferich and Kolb 2001), North America (Gabriel and Macdonald 1994; Liebowitz 2001), and Asia (Menon-Sen 2002). Strategies and pressures to expand women's rights in the transnational public sphere are also examined (see, in particular, Antrobus 2004; Cichowski 2002; Hawkesworth 2006). However, the extent of the influence of transnational campaigns on policymaking is disputed.² A recent addition to this strand is concerned with the intricacies of the relationship between transnational women's, alter-globalist, and social justice movements (see Alvarez, Faria, and Nobre 2004; Conway 2007; Latoures 2007; Vargas 2003; Wilson 2007).

Issues of Power, Voice, and Solidarities

Power relations and struggles underlying attempts at creating transnational solidarities are of particular interest to feminist scholars. Unearthing the politics of voice ("What gets said by whom about women's needs and interests" – Hawkesworth 2006, 131) and representation (what gets to be represented as the issues, priorities, and goals of feminist and women's movement organizing in the transnational public sphere) is central to understanding the conflictual nature of such attempts and the contingent and changing character of their outcomes. Chronicles of the construction of shared agendas for the world's women at UN conferences (Basu 2000, 2004; Desai 2005; Druelle 2004; Hawkesworth 2006; Snyder 2006; Stienstra 2000; Tripp 2006) and in other venues (Giraud 2001; Snyder 2005) exemplify such concerns. Together, these stories show that while transnational organizing does bring together the voices of diversely located women, these voices do not speak in unison, nor do they have equal weight in the crafting of common agendas. In the last three decades, tensions have arisen along the North-South divide. Issues deemed of major importance to women from the South – such as poverty, development, colonialism, racism, militarization and political repression, structural adjustment policies and debt, environmental degradation, and so forth – have been slow to find their place in common political platforms due to Northern reticence. The economic, political, and cultural hegemony exercised by Northern feminists in transnational organizing, the centrality of gender in defining women's issues, and major items on Northern feminists' agenda – lesbian rights and abortion rights, among others – have been the object of open contestation in transnational settings.

Categories such as "women from the South" or "Northern feminists," however, are overly homogenizing and should not be reified (Mackie 2001;

Mendoza 2002). Although they may be useful insofar as they indicate differing locations in global relations of power and dominance, these terms fail to acknowledge real differences in priorities and strategies among transnational movement actors from the same hemisphere, region, or country. As well, they preempt our understanding that politico-discursive positionings are not fixed, but, rather, are likely to evolve and change over time (Tripp 2005). Moreover, North-South tensions are crosscut and often compounded by the combined effects of other hegemonies and power struggles. Some scholars explicitly point to the class character of transnational activism. Access to the transnational sphere is contingent on monetary resources, while dominant strategies – international gatherings, reliance on knowledge experts and the Internet – favour participation by middle-class and educated (often white) women of the North and the South (Basu 2000; Desai 2005; Stienstra 2000). The way that the politics of class, race/ethnicity, sexuality, language, nationality (among others) intertwine and play out in contemporary transnational organizing needs more sustained attention (Hawkesworth 2006; Sampaio 2004; Snyder 2005).

While it is argued that the balance is shifting in favour of the South in transnational agenda-setting, notably at the UN, and that various means are being developed for greater inclusion of previously marginalized women and their issues in transnational activism, continuing differences and divergences around priorities, discursive framings, political strategies, and terrains of action reveal that the construction of transnational solidarities remains a problematic endeavour. Despite claims of mutual learning, this process of iterative adjustments remains replete with tensions. Consensual or cohesive strategies masking crucial differences and power dynamics are questioned (Hawkesworth 2006; Snyder 2005; Stienstra 2000), while the “compromise language” of common political platforms is said to bear the “traces of Western feminist hegemony” (Hawkesworth 2006, 132).

Domestic Encounters with Transnationalization

A second strand in the literature focuses on the nature and outcomes of the encounter between domestic activism (grassroots, local, or national) and various processes, events, and actors in a broadly defined field of transnational feminist connectivity. This body of work encompasses very diverse realities, including domestic involvement with international or foreign feminist donor organizations and local or national engagement in transnational campaigns or events – such as the Wages for Housework Campaign, the NGO forums at the UN World Conferences on Women, the Latin American

feminist Encuentros, and the World March of Women. It also includes contacts with and the subsequent deployment of transnational feminist frames, such as the Beijing Platform, and other feminist discourses and ideas whose travels are associated with transnational linkages. As transnationalism fast becomes a major dimension of feminist and women's movement activism, feminist scholars debate its benefits and drawbacks for domestic actors and struggles.

On the whole, encounters with transnational actors, processes, and travelling feminist discourses are riddled with contradictory effects for domestic groups and movements. Some impacts may be very positive. Involvement with international and foreign donor organizations and programs that are feminist or broadly supportive of feminist goals is often beneficial in bringing much-needed financial and political resources. Participation in transnational campaigns or events does enable domestic movements by facilitating knowledge-sharing and political learning among differently located women and networking among activists and organizations, enhancing the movements' visibility and legitimacy at home, and reinforcing mobilization more generally (Adams 2006; Alvarez 1998; Beaulieu 2007; Sandberg 1998; Snyder 2006). Moreover, agendas, discourses, and strategies developed elsewhere or in transnational settings can be profitably "translated" and redeployed locally" (Alvarez 2000, 35; see also Thayer 2000; Wing 2002).

Encounters with the transnational may, however, be detrimental. Funding may have the effect of imposing bureaucratic procedures on recipient groups; of shaping orientations and agendas in ways that privilege Western-style priorities, discourses, and models of feminist organizing over domestic ones; and, on the whole, of colonizing, dividing, and fragmenting domestic movements (Alvarez 2000; Bagic 2006; Friedman 1999; Hrycak 2002; Mendoza 2002). Engagement with UN processes, Latin American feminist scholars have argued, has fuelled the growth of strategies oriented toward international and domestic policymaking, privileging lobbying, expert knowledge, and watered-down liberal feminist framings to the detriment of the awareness raising, direct democracy, and more radical politics anchored in the discourses and practices of community-based women's groups (Alvarez 1998, 2000; Alvarez, Faria, and Nobre 2004; Friedman 1999; Mendoza 2002). Such shifts have also produced new power imbalances among domestic women's movement actors (Alvarez 2000) and cleavages that "often [run] along divisions of class, race and sexuality" (Mendoza 2002, 309).

Yet again, some work suggests, analyses of outcomes for domestic struggles need to be refined. Impacts depend on various factors, such as

the nature of the encounter – funding being particularly infused with power relations – or the specific “action logic” at work in transnational campaigns or events. Sonia E. Alvarez (2000), for example, contrasts the identity-solidarity logic of the Encuentros and similar types of gatherings with what she calls the IGO-advocacy logic of UN processes. The capacity of local and national women’s groups to exert their agency productively in the power dynamics of these encounters also needs more attention. It is possible for local groups to defend their autonomy successfully against funders’ exigencies (Thayer 2001). It is also possible for “imported ideas and practices” to “constructively interact” with the ideas and practices of local actors and to be altered to serve their objectives, even in situations of unequal exchange (Sperling, Ferree, and Risman 2001, 1159; see also Thayer 2000, 2001).

Discussion

With the exception of feminist IR scholars, who have critically and constructively engaged with the dominant assumptions and theoretical frameworks in international relations, feminist work on transnationalization has developed, on the whole, in relative isolation from mainstream perspectives. Proponents of social movement and IR approaches to transnationalization, for their part, have notoriously ignored gender in their conceptualizations and analyses, as well as in the choice of movements and issues they have privileged. Nevertheless, we believe that there is room for cross-fertilization, and laying out the groundwork for a more extended conversation is one of the aims of this book. The juxtaposition of the three perspectives highlighted in this Introduction sketches out a series of criss-crossing avenues of research, debate, and dialogue between feminist and mainstream approaches to transnationalization.

First, there is a general lack of consensus on the very nature of the phenomenon under study, as well as on what the privileged units of analysis should be. More restrictive definitions dominate the social movements and IR literature (including feminist IR), associating transnationalization with organizations, campaigns, events, and normative discourses understood in relation to international institutions and multinational actors. By contrast, the interdisciplinary feminist literature proposes a broader understanding of the phenomenon encompassing a much wider variety of processes, levels, sites, and actors. Thus, a first series of questions concerns the object of study itself. Should we consider transnationalization to be simply a higher-level form of organizing and mobilizing, or the succession of actions, events, and campaigns organized by transnational coalitions? Should we attempt to

apprehend transnationalization as a process (or processes) involving a wider range of actors? What, exactly, is transnationalized?

Second, there are diverging views around the issue of the dynamics presiding over contemporary transnationalizations. Mainstream literature emphasizes either the role of globalization (especially economic and technological) or of a new, complex institutional internationalism. Similar assumptions regarding the conditions of emergence of transnationalization in feminist and women's movements are shared by many feminist scholars across disciplines. Others, however, insist that the field of transnational connectivity has a longer history and that endogenous factors are important in accounting for the cross-border activity of feminist and women's movements. Another series of questions, thus, concerns our analytical approach to the dynamics of transnationalization. Is transnationalization to be analyzed as the product of abstract-structural causes, or of external political factors? Should we adopt the point of view of the actors themselves and try to understand how they construct transnationalization? Can these different levels of analysis be usefully reconciled? Is it possible to capture the interplay of external and endogenous factors?

Third, scholars from all three fields of study concur that the construction and maintenance of solidarity networks across and beyond borders presents a challenge for movement actors. In this perspective, mainstream work in social movements and IR highlights the constraints posed by global economic restructuring, as well as by the specificities of national political and cultural contexts. Feminist scholars focus most of their theory-building and analytical interest on the tensions and conflicts stemming from the co-presence of collective actors who are differently positioned in intersecting webs of structural relations of power and privilege. How can these different explanations be productively integrated for a better understanding not only of the obstacles posed to the construction of transnational solidarities, but also of the strategies developed, or in need of development, by movement actors? Can a focus on the ways that global and structural relations of power "touch ground" and materialize in the specificities of places (national and local) be helpful in this endeavour?

Finally, there are sharp differences among approaches regarding the terrains on which the impacts of transnationalization are considered. Mainstream research, including feminist IR, evaluates the consequences of transnationalization in relation to international (and sometimes national) institutions. The accent, thus, is on institutional change. Interdisciplinary feminist scholars, on the other hand, have tended to focus on the ways in

which transnationalization in feminist and women's movement activism affects the movement sector, be it from the point of view of domestic actors and their struggles or of the constitution of a new, struggle-ridden field of alliances with other transnationalizing movements. Research on impacts is still in its early stages and clearly calls for more attention. In addition, as Elsa Beaulieu (this volume) and Manisha Desai (2005) remark, the way that transnationalization in feminist, women's, and other movements impacts the everyday lives and experiences of women and men in different locales – how it contributes to social change in specific settings – is remarkably absent from current reflections in both feminist research and more mainstream work.

Pursuing theoretical conversations on these issues among feminists, but also through critical engagement with mainstream perspectives, would, we contend, be useful in inspiring and expanding feminist scholarship. Conversely, integrating feminist approaches would be beneficial to mainstream scholars, helping them to refine their analyses regarding the effects of gender and intersectional power relations on transnational action, discourses, and coalitions and broadening their general outlook on transnationalization. We will continue this discussion in the book's conclusion.

Outline of the Book

Because feminist research is by definition interdisciplinary, contributions from less-well-known perspectives, we argue, deserve more attention. The first part of this book thus aims to add to our theoretical toolkit. Conceptual frameworks from geography and anthropology, we contend, bring a fresh outlook on transnationalization, raising new questions for our research agendas and showing strong heuristic potential for feminist analysis. Introducing them from the start sets the stage for further developments in the other sections of the book. Geographical concepts of space, scale, and place, for instance, elaborated on in Dominique Masson's chapter, also feature prominently in the various contributions to this volume. Anthropological approaches and methodologies presented by Beaulieu allow for an understanding of transnationalization processes as involving day-to-day practices – a theme that is also taken up, in various ways, in other chapters. Both conceptual offerings hold much promise for better capturing the situated experiences of women and feminist activists involved in transnationalization processes. Masson's chapter presents the theoretical questions and empirical contributions arising from recent work that develops a geographical perspective on transnational movements and scale. It aims to highlight the

potential that a focus on geographical scale presents for studying transnationalization in women's movements. Laying out the research agenda that this new literature suggests to feminist scholars, she advocates for greater attention to issues of spatiality, relations between scales of movement activity, and the role of place in analyses of transnationalization in feminist and women's movements. Beaulieu proposes a feminist anthropological framework for conceptualizing social movement practices as products and producers of social change processes. She explores anthropological redefinitions of the political as political culture and cultural politics, as well as contributions to practice theory aimed at giving analytic visibility to a wide range of feminist and women's movement practices, including mundane and routine ones. She then stages a dialectical encounter between her theoretical, epistemological, and methodological propositions and empirical data drawn from the case study of the World March of Women in Brazil. Her methodological preoccupations prefigure further discussion of this topic in the conclusion of the book.

The second part of the book focuses on the deepening of solidarities among feminist and women's organizations and activists – that is, on issues of mutual recognition of identities and interests, the reinforcement of social ties, and the elaboration of shared understandings. This dynamic is complex. Using case studies of three NGOs in Singapore, Lenore Lyons examines the multiple ways in which NGOs working to address the rights of female migrant workers understand and articulate their activism in light of transnational feminist discourses. Widening our understanding of transnational feminist activism to include how the transnational is constructed within the activist practices of feminist organizations and how transnational feminisms are framed at the local level allows for an exploration of the ways in which ideas circulate among different scales and are translated into concrete practices within specific organizational contexts. Sylvia Estrada-Claudio provides us with an insider's look into the work involved in attempts to deepen solidarities at the International Women and Health Meeting (IWHM). Focusing on organizational practices at the IWHM, she argues that the key to its successes resides in its continually renewed capacity for recognition of the multiple identities that shape the category "women." Estrada-Claudio identifies the internal mechanisms and strategies that have contributed to the negotiated inclusion and deployment of various identities at the IWHM over the course of three decades. She also addresses the limitations and tensions inherent to such efforts at inclusiveness and reflects upon the consequence of such complexity for transnational feminist

politics. Débora Lopreite's chapter explores the linkages between, on the one hand, transnational women's discourses and strategies in the United Nations and regional (Latin American) arenas, and, on the other hand, women's organizing in Argentina. She argues that a global gender regime has emerged in the international public sphere, and provides discourses, strategies, and sites of activism that have become increasingly significant for Argentine women's struggles, especially in the area of reproductive rights. The transnational character of Latin American women's organizing has also provided an intermediate scale of activism, in which women from the region have been able to build shared understandings and common goals.

In the third part of the book, Janet Conway, Dominique Caouette, and Carmen Díaz Alba explore questions related to the stretching of solidarities – that is, to practices and strategies of transnational solidarity building that involve establishing linkages between, on the one hand, feminist and women's movement organizing and politics and, on the other hand, progressive movements, organizations, activists, and issues. Extending the scope of solidarities in this way and attempting to work with other progressive allies is not without tensions; yet, it could be a major future source of transformation for transnational feminist and women's movements and their politics. Conway's chapter presents a comparative study of transnational feminisms at the World Social Forum (WSF). She demonstrates that plural and competing transnational feminist projects coexist at the WSF and argues that this plurality and the complexity of the relationships among projects and with the WSF all complicate general theories of transnationalism and transnationalization. Conway concludes by arguing for the importance of empirically investigating, comparing, and specifying the highly variable practices of transnational feminism. Caouette examines the formation of three regional activist organizations rooted in Southeast Asia and involved in research and advocacy against mainstream economic globalization. He shows how women and their issues, while being the objects of advocacy by these organizations, remain excluded as agents of critical reflection, and feminism remains alien to theoretical engagement within the malestream movement for global social justice. On a more optimistic note, Díaz Alba shows how the Latin American Network of Women Transforming the Economy (REMTE), a feminist network with national chapters in eleven countries whose participants are rural and urban women, academics, NGOs, and grassroots organizations, has been able to build cross-movement transnational solidarities as a space for analysis and

action. Díaz Alba presents REMTE's strategy of framing gender and feminist perspectives in relation to broader social movements' critical analysis of free trade, providing oppositional knowledge for collective action, common platforms, and research.

In our conclusion, we return to some of the main theoretical questions raised in this Introduction by our staged encounter between mainstream and feminist bodies of literature. The questions of how to conceptualize transnationalization, understand its underlying dynamics, and approach the issue of the constitution of solidarities are at the centre of a discussion that underlines the specific contribution of both feminist work and our contributors' chapters. The additional insights to be gained by the integration of geographically sensitive approaches are then highlighted. Finally, methodological orientations are offered with the objective of furthering feminist research on transnationalization.

NOTES

- 1 For a further discussion of the specificity of feminist NGOs as hybrids in the women's movement field, see Alvarez (1999).
- 2 Contrast Moghadam (2005) and Adams (2006), for instance, with Basu (2000), Hawkesworth (2006), Desai (2005), and Tripp (2006).

REFERENCES

- Adams, Melinda. 2006. Regional Women's Activism: African Women's Networks and the African Union. In *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*, ed. Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp, 187-218. New York: New York University Press.
- Alexander, M. Jacqui, and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, eds. 1997. *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York: Routledge.
- Alvarez, Sonia E. 1998. Latin America Feminisms "Go Global": Trends of the 1990s and Challenges for the New Millennium. In *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-Envisioning Latin America Social Movements*, ed. Sonia Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Alberto Escobar, 293-324. Boulder: Westview.
- . 1999. Advocating Feminism: The Latin American Feminist NGO "boom." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1 (2): 181-209.
- . 2000. Translating the Global: Effects of Transnational Organizing on Local Feminist Discourses and Practices and Latin America. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 1 (1): 29-67.
- Alvarez, Sonia E., Nalu Faria, and Miriam Nobre. 2004. Another (also Feminist) World Is Possible: Constructing Transnational Spaces and Global Alternatives from the Movements. In *World Social Forum: Challenging Empires*, ed. Jai Sen, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar, and Peter Waterman, 199-206. New Delhi: Viveka Foundation.

- Antrobus, Peggy. 2004. *The Global Women's Movement: Issues and Strategies for the New Century*. London: Zed Books.
- Antrobus, Peggy, and Gita Sen. 2005. The Personal Is Global: The Project and Politics of the Transnational Women's Movement. In *Claiming Global Power: Transnational Civil Society and Global Governance*, ed. Srilatha Baltiwala and David Brown, 142-58. Bloomfield: Kumarian.
- Ayres, Jeffrey, and Sidney Tarrow. 2003. The Shifting Grounds for Transnational Civic Activity. *Social Science Research Council*. <http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/ayres.htm>.
- Azouvi, Alain. 2000. Introduction. In *Le syndicalisme dans la mondialisation*, ed. Annie Fouquet, Udo Rehfeldt, and Serge Le Roux, 1-23. Paris: Les Éditions de l'Atelier/Les Éditions Ouvrières.
- Bagic, Aida. 2006. Women's Organizing in Post-Yugoslav Countries: Talking about "Donors." In *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*, ed. Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp, 141-65. New York: New York University Press.
- Bandy, Joe, and Jackie Smith. 2005. *Coalitions across Borders: Transnational Protest and the Neoliberal Order*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Basu, Amrita. 2000. Globalization of the Local/Globalization of the Global: Mapping Transnational Women's Movements. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 1 (1): 68-84.
- . 2004. Women's Movements and the Challenge of Transnationalism. In *Encyclopedia of Women's Studies*, vol. 1, *Women's Movements*, ed. Subhadra Channa, 259-66. New Delhi: Cosmo Publications.
- Beaulieu, Elsa. 2007. Échelles et lieux de l'action collective dans la Marche mondiale des femmes au Brésil. *Lien social et politiques* 58: 119-32.
- Bunch, Charlotte. 1993. Organizing for Women's Human Rights Globally. In *Ours By Right: Women's Rights as Human Rights*, ed. Joanna Kerr, 141-49. London and Ottawa: Zed Books and North-South Institute.
- Bunch, Charlotte, and Niamh Reilly. 1994. *Demanding Accountability: The Global Campaign and Vienna Tribunal for Women's Human Rights*. New Brunswick, NJ/New York: Rutgers University Center for Women's Global Leadership/United Nations Development Fund for Women.
- Chen, Martha Alter. 1995. Engendering World Conferences: The International Women's Movement and the United Nations. *Third World Quarterly* 16 (3): 477-93.
- Cichowski, Rachel A. 2002. No Discrimination Whatsoever: Women's Transnational Activism and the Evolution of EU Sex Equality Policy. In *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*, ed. Nancy A. Naples and Manisha Desai, 220-38. New York: Routledge.
- Conway, Janet M. 2004. *Identity, Place, Knowledge: Social Movements Contesting Globalization*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- . 2007. Transnational Feminisms and the World Social Forum: Encounters and Transformations in Anti-Globalization Spaces. *Journal of International Women's Studies* 8 (3): 49-70.

- . 2008. Geographies of Transnational Feminism: The Politics of Place and Scale in the World March of Women. *Social Politics* 15 (2): 207-31.
- Della Porta, Donatella, Massimiliano Andretta, Lorenzo Mosca, and Herbert Reiter. 2006. *Globalization From Below: Transnational Activists and Protest Networks*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Della Porta, Donatella, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Dieter Rucht, eds. 1999. *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*. New York: Macmillan.
- Della Porta, Donatella, and Sidney Tarrow, eds. 2005. *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Desai, Manisha. 2005. Transnationalism: The Face of Feminist Politics post-Beijing. *International Social Science Journal* 57 (184): 319-30.
- Devin, Guillaume, ed. 2004. *Les solidarités transnationales*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Druelle, Anick. 2004. Que célébrer 30 ans après l'Année internationale de la femme: une autre crise au sein des mouvements internationaux de femmes? *Recherches féministes* 17 (2): 115-69.
- Dufour, Pascale, and Isabelle Giraud. 2005. Altermondialisme et féminisme: pourquoi faire? Le cas de la Marche mondiale des femmes. *Chroniques féministes* 93 (August/December): 9-16.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 1983. *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives*. Boston: South End Press.
- . 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases*. Berkeley: California University Press.
- Eschle, Catherine. 2001. *Global Democracy, Social Movements, and Feminism*. Boulder: Westview.
- . 2004. Feminist Studies of Globalisation: Beyond Gender, Beyond Economism? *Global Studies* 18 (2): 97-125.
- . 2005. "Skeleton Women": Feminism and the Antiglobalization Movement. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30 (3): 1741-69.
- Ferree, Myra Marx. 2006. Globalization and Feminism: Opportunities and Obstacles for Activism in the Global Arena. In *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*, ed. Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp, 3-23. New York: New York University Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, and William A. Gamson. 1999. The Gendering of Abortion Discourse: Assessing Global Feminist Influence in the United States and Germany. In *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*, ed. Donatella della Porta, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Dieter Rucht, 40-56. New York: Macmillan.
- Finnemore, Martha. 1996. *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization* 52 (4): 887-917.
- Friedman, Elisabeth J. 1999. The Effects of "Transnationalism Reversed" in Venezuela: Assessing the Impact of U.N. Global Conferences on the Women's Movement. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1 (3): 357-81.
- . 2003. Gendering the Agenda: The Impact of the Transnational Women's Rights Movement at the U.N. Conferences of the 1990s. *Women's Studies International Forum* 26 (4): 313-31.

- Gabriel, Christina, and Laura Macdonald. 1994. NAFTA, Women and Organizing in Canada and Mexico: Forging a "Feminist Internationality." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 23 (3): 535-62.
- Geske, Mary, and Susan C. Bourque. 2001. Grassroots Organizations and Women's Human Rights: Meeting the Challenge of the Local-Global Link. In *Women, Gender, and Human Rights: A Global Perspective*, ed. Marjorie Agosin, 246-63. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Giraud, Isabelle. 2001. La transnationalisation des solidarités: l'exemple de la Marche mondiale des femmes. *Lien social et politiques* 45: 145-60.
- Gobin, Corinne. 2002. De l'Union européenne à l'europanisation des mouvements sociaux? *Revue Internationale de politique comparée* 9 (1): 119-39.
- Gobin, Corinne, Nadia Hilal, and Aurélie Decoene. 2007. Mobilisations transfrontières et Union européenne: difficultés et réalités de la contestation syndicale – L'exemple du syndicalisme du transport. *Lien social et politiques* 58: 73-86.
- Grewal, Inderpal, and Caren Kaplan. 1994. Introduction: Transnational Feminist Practices and Questions of Postmodernity. In *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*, ed. Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, 1-33. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary E. 2006. *Globalization and Feminist Activism*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Helfferich, Barbara, and Felix Kolb. 2001. Multilevel Action Coordination in European Contentious Politics: The Case of the European Women's Lobby. In *Contentious Europeans: Protest and Politics in an Integrating Europe*, ed. Doug Imig and Sidney Tarrow, 163-86. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hillka, Pietila, and Jeanne Vickers. 1994. *Making Women Matter: The Role of the United Nations*. London: Zed Books.
- Hrycak, Alexandra. 2002. From Mothers' Rights to Equal Rights: Post-Soviet Grassroots Women's Associations. In *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*, ed. Nancy A. Naples and Manisha Desai, 64-82. New York: Routledge.
- Jaquette, Jane. 1995. Losing the Battle/Winning the War: International Politics, Women's Issues, and the 1980 Mid-Decade Conference. In *Women, Politics, and the United Nations*, ed. Ann Winslow, 45-60. Westport: Greenwood.
- Joachim, Jutta. 2003. Framing Issues and Seizing Opportunities: The U.N., NGOs and Women's Rights. *International Studies Quarterly* 47: 247-74.
- Kaplan, Caren. 1994. The Politics of Location as Transnational Feminist Critical Practice. In *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*, ed. Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, 137-52. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kaplan, Caren, Norma Aleron, and Mino Moallem, eds. 1999. *Between Woman and Nation: Nationalisms, Transnational Feminism and the State*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Katzenstein, Peter J. 1996. Alternative Perspectives on National Security 1996. In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, ed. Peter J. Katzenstein, 1-32. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Latoures, Aurelie. 2007. Gender in the Bamako Polycentric World Social Forum (2006): Is Another World Possible? *Journal of International Women's Studies* 8 (3): 164-83.
- Liebowitz, Debra J. 2001. Constructing Cooperation: Feminist Activism and NAFTA. In *Feminist Locations: Global and Local, Theory and Practice*, ed. Marianne DeKoven, 168-90. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Macdonald, Laura. 2005. Gendering Transnational Social Movement Analysis: Women's Groups Contest Free Trade in the Americas. In *Coalitions Across Borders*, ed. Joe Bandy and Jackie Smith, 21-41. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Mackie, Vera. 2001. The Language of Globalization, Transnationality and Feminism. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 3 (2): 180-206.
- McCarthy, John D. 1997. The Globalization of Social Movement Theory. In *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*, ed. Jackie Smith, Charles Chatfield, and Ron Pagnucco, 243-59. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Mendez, Jennifer Bickham. 2002. Creating Alternatives from a Gender Perspective: Transnational Organizing for Maquila Workers' Rights in Central America. In *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*, ed. Nancy Naples and Manisha Desai, 121-41. New York: Routledge.
- Mendoza, Breny. 2002. Transnational Feminisms in Question. *Feminist Theory* 3 (3): 295-314.
- Menon-Sen, Kalyani. 2002. Bridges Over Troubled Waters: South Asian Women's Movements Confronting Globalization. *Development* 45 (1): 132-36.
- Meyer, Mary K., and Elizabeth Prügl, eds. 1999. *Gender Politics in Global Governance*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Miller, Francesca. 1999. Feminisms and Transnationalism. In *Feminisms and Internationalism*, ed. Mrinalini Sinha, Donna Guy, and Angela Woolacott, 225-36. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moghadam, Valentine M. 1996. Feminist Networks North and South: DAWN, WIDE and WLUML. *Journal of International Communication* 3 (1): 111-26.
- . 2000. Transnational Feminist Networks: Collective Action in an Era of Globalization. *International Sociology* 15 (1): 57-86.
- . 2005. *Globalizing Women. Transnational Feminist Networks*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1992. Feminist Encounters: Locating the Politics of Experience. In *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*, ed. Michèle Barrett and Anne Philips, 74-92. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 2003. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Morgan, Robin. 1984. *Sisterhood Is Global: The International Women's Movement Anthology*. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Naples, Nancy A. 2002. Changing the Terms: Community Activism, Globalization, and the Dilemmas of Transnational Feminist Praxis. In *Women's Activism and*

- Globalization. Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*, ed. Nancy A. Naples and Manisha Desai, 3-14. New York: Routledge.
- O'Brien, Robert, Anne Marie Goetz, Jan Aart Scholte, and Marc Williams. 2000. *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. 2001. *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration and Domestic Work*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Peters, Julie, and Andrea Wolper, eds. 1995. *Women's Rights, Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Piper, Nicola. 2001. Transnational Women's Activism in Japan and Korea: The Unresolved Issue of Military Sexual Slavery. *Global Networks* 1 (2): 171-95.
- Piper, Nicola, and Anders Uhlin, eds. 2004. *Transnational Activism in Asia: Problems of Power and Democracy*. London: Routledge.
- Risse, Thomas, Stephen Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, eds. 1999. *The Power of Principles: Human Rights Norms and Domestic Political Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1995. Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Introduction. In *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*, ed. Thomas Risse-Kappen, 3-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rupp, Leila J., and Verta Taylor. 1999. Forging Feminist Identity in an International Movement: A Collective Identity Approach to Twentieth-Century Feminism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 24 (21): 363-86.
- Sampaio, Anna. 2004. Transnational Feminisms in a New Global Matrix. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 6 (2): 181-206.
- Sandberg, Eve. 1998. Multilateral Women's Conferences: The Domestic Political Organization of Zambian Women. *Contemporary Politics* 4 (3): 271-83.
- Sikkink, Kathryn. 1998. Transnational Politics, IR Theory and HR. *PS Online* 31 (3): 517-21.
- Siméant, Johanna. 2005. What Is Going Global? The Internationalization of French NGOs without Borders. *Review of International Political Economy* 12 (5): 851-83.
- Smith, Jackie, Charles Chatfield, and Ron Pagnucco, eds. 1997. *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Snyder, Anna. 2005. Transnational Dialogue: Building the Social Infrastructure for Transnational Feminist Networks. *International Journal of Peace Studies* 10 (2): 69-88.
- Snyder, Margaret. 2006. Unlikely Godmother: The U.N. and the Global Women's Movement. In *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*, ed. Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp, 24-50. New York: New York University Press.
- Sperling, Valerie, Myra Marx Ferree, and Barbara Risman. 2001. Constructing Global Feminism: Transnational Advocacy Networks and Russian Women's Activism. *Signs* 26 (4): 1155-86.

- Stephenson, Carolyn. 1995. Women's International Non-Governmental Organizations at the United Nations. In *Women, Politics, and the United Nations*, ed. Ann Winslow, 135-53. Westport: Greenwood.
- Stienstra, Deborah. 1994. *Women's Movements and International Organizations*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- . 2000. Dancing Resistance from Rio to Beijing: Transnational Women's Organizing and United Nations Conferences, 1992-6. In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*, ed. Anne Sisson Runyan and Marianne Marchand, 209-24. London: Routledge.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 2001. Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 1-20.
- . 2005. *The New Transnational Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney, and Donatella della Porta. 2005. Conclusion: "Globalization," Complex Internationalism, and Transnational Contention. In *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*, ed. Donatella della Porta and Sidney Tarrow, 227-46. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Thayer, Millie. 2000. Traveling Feminisms: From Embodied Women to Gendered Citizenship. In *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*, ed. Michael Burawoy, Joseph A. Blum, Sheba George, Zsuzsa Gille, Teresa Gowan, Lynne Haney, Maren Klawiter, Steven H. Lopez, Seán Ó Riain and Millie Thayer, 203-33. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2001. Transnational Feminism: Reading Joan Scott in the Brazilian Sertao. *Ethnography* 2 (2): 243-71.
- Thompson, Karen Brown. 2000. Women's Rights are Human Rights: Institutionalizing Global Norms about Women's Rights. In *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks and Norms*, ed. Sanjeev Khagram, Jame V. Riker, and Kathryn Sikkink, 96-122. Minneapolis and St. Paul: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tickner, J. Ann. 1992. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 2001. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Cold War Era*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tripp, Aili Mari. 2005. Regional Networking as Transnational Feminism: African Experiences. *Feminist Africa*, April. <http://www.feministafrica.org/>.
- . 2006. Challenges in Transnational Feminist Mobilization. In *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*, ed. Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp, 296-312. New York: New York University Press.
- Valk, Minke, Henk Van Dam, and Sarah Cummings. 1999. Women's Information Centers and Networks: A Global Perspective. In *Women's Information Services and Networks: A Global Sourcebook*, ed. Sarah Cummings, Henk Van Dam, and Minke Valk, 21-29. Amsterdam: Royal Tropical Institute.
- Vargas, Virginia. 2003. Feminism, Globalization and the Global Justice and Solidarity Movement. *Cultural Studies* 17 (6): 905-20.

- Weber, Clare. 2002. Women to Women: Dissident Citizen Diplomacy in Nicaragua. In *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*, ed. Nancy A. Naples and Manisha Desai, 45-63. New York: Routledge.
- Wilson, Ara. 2007. Feminism in the Space of the World Social Forum. *Journal of International Women's Studies* 8 (3): 10-27.
- Wing, Susanna D. 2002. Women Activists in Mali: The Global Discourse on Human Rights. In *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*, ed. Nancy A. Naples and Manisha Desai, 172-85. New York: Routledge.
- Young, Dennis R. 1992. Organising Principles for International Advocacy Associations. *Voluntas* 3 (1): 1-28.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. Human/Women's Rights and Feminist Transversal Politics. In *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*, ed. Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp, 235-95. New York: New York University Press.
- Zimmerman, Mary K., and Jacqueline S. Litt, eds. 2006. *Global Dimensions of Gender and Carework*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Zippel, Kathryn. 2004. Transnational Advocacy Networks and Policy Cycles in the European Union: The Case of Sexual Harassment. *Social Politics* 11 (1): 57-85.