Molony, Barbara, and Jennifer Nelson. "Introduction." *Women's Activism and "Second Wave" Feminism*. By Barbara Molony and Jennifer Nelson. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. 1–12. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781474250542-004>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 12:42 UTC.

Copyright © Barbara Molony, Jennifer Nelson and Contributors 2017. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Introduction

Barbara Molony and Jennifer Nelson

This volume grew from a workshop on the history of women's activism in various countries from the middle of the twentieth into the early twenty-first centuries that we chaired at the 2014 Berkshire Conference on the History of Women in Toronto, Ontario. Themes of transnational feminisms, intersectionality, and challenging the appropriateness of periodizing women's activism in "waves" emerged from the workshop's discussions. Following the workshop, most of the participants wished to expand their papers with these categories of analysis in mind, and thus the book was born. The editors next invited leading scholars from around the world to contribute additional studies that probed transnational feminisms, women's activism, and intersectionality, both in practice and as analytic categories.

What scholars in the past two decades have referred to as transnational feminism and intersectionality had long existed, although they were not so designated. Feminists worked with counterparts across national borders—for example, as activists across the Pacific in organizations like the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the YWCA, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the Pan Pacific Women's Association; and across the Atlantic as abolitionists and for women's suffrage at times when women did not enjoy full civil rights in their own nations—more than a century before cross-border collaborative associations came to be viewed as one way of enacting transnational feminism. Intersectionality, while also not named for over one hundred years, was articulated, for example, by the American antislavery activist Sojourner Truth in 1851 in her "Ain't I a Woman" speech, in which she stressed her identity as both a woman and an African American. Transnational feminisms and intersectionality were preformed, but they were neither named nor theorized as such. Women's activism existed in practice, and thus historians can create a narrative of activism; but unlike transnationalism and intersectionality, activism is not itself an analytic category. Transnationalism and intersectionality emerged as analytic categories in the late 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, in part as a reaction to the limitations of the "wave" model of periodizing women's movements. How, then, can a volume that employs these categories retain the wave paradigm, even if we use quotation marks to suggest that we are calling it into question?

Challenges to the wave metaphor

A central theme of this collection is the reimagination and re-periodization of the "second wave" of feminism, which in the past has been described as occurring between the early 1960s through the 1970s.¹ There has been much discussion about the usefulness of the "wave" metaphor first used by feminists active in women's movements in those decades. When American activists claimed they were a "second wave," they used the term to distance themselves from a "first wave," often perceived of as a narrow struggle for suffrage that began in Seneca Falls in 1848 and terminated in 1920 with the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment to the US Constitution. As Nancy Hewitt writes, "The decades excluded from the waves—before 1848 or from 1920 to 1960—are assumed to be feminist-free zones, an assumption belied by recent scholarship."² In the United States, the period immediately after women won the vote until the 1960s was viewed as devoid of feminist activism and dominated by conservative beliefs steeped in rigidly dichotomous gender roles. This view of the "doldrums" has changed,³ as have historical accounts of the period that followed the "second wave" (the 1980s and the era of Reagan), which had also been described as an era of conservative backlash against feminism and devoid of activism, which in turn gave rise in the 1990s to a self-described "third wave" of feminist activism.⁴ As Hewitt remarks, each "wave" is presumably an improvement upon the last in a "script ... that each wave overwhelms and exceeds its predecessor."⁵

The "third wave" was identified by younger feminists in the early 1990s who, in their criticism of their feminist forebears, attempted to go beyond "dichotomous notions of gender toward consideration of the multiple identities of age, class, race, and sexual preference,"⁶ which many scholars now see as "third wave" feminists' adoption of intersectionality developed earlier by scholars and activists of color in the United States and elsewhere throughout the world. The wave metaphor, even one that includes a more expansive consideration of intersectional identities (i.e., intersectionality), suggests that women's activism occurs in discrete phases led by individuals who prioritize gender/sex inequality. In the United States, this has generally produced a notion of the importance of activism led by middle-class white women. For most historians, this view has now become far too narrow.

Although groundbreaking historical work focusing on the lives of women of color and working women emerged in the early 1980s, historians writing about feminist movements in the United States have, since the 1990s, turned their attention to the contributions of women of color and working-class women to those movements, demonstrating that feminist activists have not spoken with a singular voice or articulated a set of homogenous demands.⁷ Nor did women of color and working-class women merely react to an already constituted set of white and middle-class feminist demands. Instead, scholars point out that women of color, working-class women, and middle-class white women have been in dialogue with each other, although they have not always articulated the same set of priorities, agreed with each other, or worked easily together.⁸ Focusing on how the movement for sex equality intersected with demands for racial and economic justice in the post-Second World War period has

prompted historians to, once again, rethink the traditional historical periodization of the history of feminism that rested on the “wave” metaphor. To be sure, studies of heterogeneities in feminist movements have not been limited to North American scholarship, nor have they been limited to those of race or ethnicity.⁹

Periodization of the history of feminist and women’s activism has been further complicated by transnational feminist activism. The wave metaphor has been both embraced and challenged by feminists outside North America. It was adopted widely outside North America in the 1980s as a convenient way for historians to “explore change over time and to compare one time period with another,”¹⁰ not to mention their need to find appealing parallels with movements in other countries. For example, after its approval by the United Nations General Assembly at the end of 1979, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) was lauded by feminists in country after country as an indication of their nation’s temporal convergence with global feminism (i.e., being part of the progressive “second wave”).¹¹

Yet, as is evident in several of the chapters in this volume, feminisms emanating from transnational NGOs or the United Nations World Conferences on Women—first held in Mexico City in 1975 and culminating in the Beijing World Conference in 1995—continued to bear the imprint of white Western feminism that superimposed itself on existing but largely overlooked women’s movements. Some of these movements traced their roots to the trough of the supposedly “feminist-free zone” between the “first” and “second waves” and continued after the “second wave” presumably ended. Although this volume of histories continues to use the wave metaphor (albeit in quotation marks) because of its historical significance—it was used by feminists in many global settings in the late twentieth century—we recognize the need to modify it. One way to do so would be to expand the time period under consideration to embrace the decades immediately following the Second World War and into the early twenty-first century. Many of the chapters in this volume take this long view of “second wave” feminism. This view has a historical precedent as well. After all, the “first wave” was generally viewed as occupying three-quarters of a century, from the 1850s to the 1920s; why could a “long-second wave” not enjoy the same kind of endurance? Establishing the beginning of the “second wave” in the 1940s and 1950s and extending it into the early twenty-first century (thereby subsuming both the trough after the original “second wave” as well as the “third wave”) would encompass the work of activists not included in the narrow band of US and European feminism confined to the 1960s and 1970s.

This expanded periodization allows us to include women documented in this book: women who fed children in the Bronx (Povitz); reimagined *Chicanismo* to counter racism in Silicon Valley (Estruth); fought apartheid as exiles from South Africa (Sandwell); resisted colonial and neocolonial domination in Quebec (Ricci); exposed paternalistic rhetorical contradictions to reveal the brutality of a repressive dictatorship in Chile (Pieper Mooney); led movements for global (later transnational) as well as local feminisms in socialist and post-socialist nations (Ruthchild and Grabowska); connected sexuality, antiracism, and feminism in historically black colleges and universities (Haynes); strategically forged a language of “difference” against hegemonic feminism in India whose dominant feminists considered *themselves* ignored by white

global "North" feminists (Mehta); struggled for recognition of female Indian informal sector workers who had suffered from a historical lack of labor organization (Boris); worked to bring recognition and justice to women oppressed by sexual violence in Japanese-occupied areas during the Second World War (Mackie and Kim and Lee); debated long-held values of secular feminism in France (Chetcuti-Osorovitz), and rejected a discourse of "global sisterhood" that rested on the supposed degradation of Indian women by Indian men (Jha). This expansion of the historical period of the "second wave" makes particular sense when we go beyond the borders of the United States; in addition, it does not exclude the white middle-class American women whose foregrounding of gendered inequality did play an important though not the only role in inspiring women in the United States and elsewhere.

An additional way of embracing a broader view of women's activism is to think of it as "women in movement" rather than exclusively as "women's movements."¹² The latter suggests that feminism prompted activism; the former allows for feminism to grow organically from activist responses to marginalizations and oppressions. As several of the chapters in this volume argue, women who were activists for antiracism, political freedom, community well-being, and nationalist justice developed a strong feminist consciousness while working for these other causes. Women did not cease to be "in movement" just because their initial focus was not women's rights. Even in the troughs between the "first" and "second waves" and after the "second wave" presumably ended, women were involved in community, politics, and other forms of activism, creating a more fluid trajectory of feminism than that suggested by more rigidly defined wave patterns.

The articulation of transnational feminist studies as well as the historical study of transnational feminism has also prompted conversations and debates about the meaning of feminism and its relationship to women's activism that is not perceived as necessarily feminist. This volume addresses these conversations by including scholarship on both feminism and women's activism, at times in the same chapter. Amrita Basu, drawing on the formative work of Maxine Molyneux, explains that one way to distinguish between feminism and women's activism has been to separate women's practical and strategic interests. "Strategic interests, which are commonly identified as feminist, emerge from and contest women's experiences of gender subordination. Practical interests, by contrast, emerge from women's immediate and perceived needs."¹³ Because the latter (practical interests) often gives rise to the former (strategic interests), the concept of "women in movement" can help to recognize how these types of activisms can coexist at the local, national, and transnational levels and to underscore continuity (while also recognizing local specificities) among activist movements of various time periods, rather than occurring only in discrete waves.

Rather than abandon the wave metaphor, this volume tries to fill in the troughs and find ways to better connect women in movement across time and place. As Leila J. Rupp and Verta Taylor point out, the wave metaphor may still be useful "as long as we understand that the lulls between the waves are still moving, that, from a transnational perspective, there may be choppy seas rather than even swells, and that waves do not rise and crash independently of each other."¹⁴

Transnational feminisms and intersectionality

Conversations and writings about the relationship between colonialism, imperialism, nationalism, transnationalism, and feminism began to emerge in the late 1980s and 1990s and consolidate into an interdisciplinary field of study referred to as transnational feminist studies. In one of their foundational works, Inderpal Grewal and Karen Kaplan explain that transnational feminist studies are the “study [of] the relations between women from different cultures and nations.”¹⁵ This differs from much of feminist studies that preceded their work in that gender inequality and relationships between gender and power are studied across national boundaries and among women operating in transnational feminist networks across those boundaries. Furthermore, the emphasis is not only on imbalances of power structured by gender, but also on relationships of power structured by global economic and political relations that cross borders, for instance, imperialism, and the “legacies of imperialism,”¹⁶ neo-imperialism, and globalization.

Those relationships of power are not only among the “West and the rest”¹⁷—that is, “sisterhood is global” Western-centric relationships that many practitioners of transnational feminist studies have sharply criticized¹⁸—but also among non-Western countries and within nation-states. For example, in this volume, the *practice* (as distinct from the *theorizing* of transnational feminist studies) of transnational collaborations among Asian feminists or among African feminists, as well as among South Asian and African American feminists, downplays national borders. Paradoxically, even within a nation-state, transnationalism can also play a role, as in the case of First Nations people in Quebec, Canada.¹⁹ In short, transnational feminist activism can both reify and unsettle the nation.

Transnational feminist analysis came to dominate the study of global feminism about a decade after another type of analysis—Third World feminism—developed in “opposition to white second-wave feminists’ single-pronged analyses of gender oppression that elided Third World women’s multiple and complex oppressions in their various social locations.”²⁰ Ranjoo Seodu Herr notes that transnational feminist analyses consider “nation-states and nationalism as detrimental to feminist causes, whereas Third World feminists are relatively neutral to, and at times even approving of, nation-states and nationalism.”²¹ Rather than focusing on the problems of the nation-state, as does transnational feminist analysis, Third World feminism focuses more intently on local and national contexts. Because Third World feminist analysis has lost its appeal in the past decade, Herr argues for a reclamation of that paradigm in order to bring greater attention to people on the ground rather than to the networks of organizations highlighted in transnational feminist analysis. The chapters in this volume show that these two types of analysis need not be mutually exclusive; most of the chapters focus on individual case studies (or the local in the local/global paradigm) to “pay attention to individual women’s agency and voices,”²² a prime feature of Third World feminism. The essays are grounded in the “histories, contexts, and preoccupations of the specific locations being studied,” rather than being too dependent on theory—a critique of transnational studies put forward by Leela Fernandes.²³ As local histories, the chapters recognize what Uma Narayan has asserted in her critique of the notion

that feminism is necessarily a Western import: "feminist perspectives are not foreign to ... Third World national contexts."²⁴ At the same time, the chapters also recognize the effects of global economic and political forces on women's lives, which may necessitate transnational networked responses from feminists inhabiting different regions of the world. As opposed to internationalism focused on international alliances among already established nations, transnational feminist studies attend to "transnational circuits of information, capital, and labor, [to] critique a system founded on inequality and exploitation."²⁵

The concept of intersectionality, first articulated by women of color in the United States in the 1970s and 1980s and coined as a theoretical term in 1991 by Kimberlé Crenshaw,²⁶ has been a powerful analytical tool in feminist and antiracist studies that allows for the theorization of "the dynamics of difference and sameness," including along overlapping axes of gender, class, race, ethnicity, and sexuality. An "intersectional frame of analysis" allows us to examine the historical "mutually constituting" operation of identity categories that have produced complex relationships of power that defy simple dichotomous statements, such as men oppress women. In addition, activists may undertake "political interventions employing an intersectional lens."²⁷ All the essays in this volume consider their feminist subjects through an intersectional frame of analysis.

Jennifer Nash asserts that although the contemporary academy conflates intersectionality and transnationalism with diversity and difference, respectively, as a way of addressing important contemporary issues, intersectionality and transnationalism are not inherently at odds.²⁸ Indeed, transnational feminist studies have deepened intersectional analysis by shifting the focus away from the United States and Europe. Instead, the focus of transnational feminist studies has been on how power moves across historically shifting borders that both separate and generate nations and political regions and how this movement of power operates to structure inequalities in relation to mutually constituting categories (such as gender, class, race, ethnicity, sexuality, and nationality). Along these lines, Vrushali Patil argues that transnational feminists "encourage an examination of how categories of race, ethnicity, sexuality, culture, nation, and gender not only intersect but are mutually constituted, formed, and transformed within transnational power-laden processes."²⁹

Chandra Mohanty, another central theorist of the first articulations of transnational feminist studies, has written critically of US and European feminisms grounded in the notion of a monolithic patriarchy that oppressed an equally monolithic "third world woman." She explains, "An analysis of 'sexual difference' in the form of a cross-culturally singular, monolithic notion of patriarchy or male dominance leads to the construction of a similarly reductive notion of ... that stable, ahistorical something that apparently oppresses most if not all women in these countries."³⁰ She has emphasized that a feminist theory based on this type of cross-cultural generalization exercises its own power to erase—Mohanty calls it "discursive homogenization"—the complex and heterogeneous lives and histories of women around the world. She argues that the scholarly "view from above of marginalized communities of women in the global South and North" fails to attend

“to historical and cultural specificity in understanding their complex agency as situated subjects.”³¹ The authors included in this volume of essays also seek to recover the complexity and heterogeneity of histories of marginalized women’s lives in multiple contexts around the globe by situating them in transnational and local historical contexts.

Structure of the book

We have grouped the fourteen chapters in this book into three parts, reflecting three primary themes of the collection: Redefining Feminism; Reconsidering “Second Wave” Feminist Genealogies; and Transnational Feminist Linkages. Taken together, these themes emerge from the title of the collection—*Women’s Activism and “Second Wave” Feminism: Transnational Histories*—and the germinating presentations and conversation that occurred in the 2014 workshop that developed into many of the chapters you will read here.

All the chapters in this collection redefine feminism in some capacity. Yet, the first three chapters listed in Part One, “Redefining Feminism,” do so by focusing on the dynamic relationship between practical and strategic gender interests as expressed earlier by the concept of “women in movement.” These three essays tell of women who identified challenges in their communities and developed an intersectional feminist response linked to their particular experiences. Transnational considerations also played an important role in each of these cases despite their grounding in women’s local experience and strategic activism. Many women activists, however, did not claim feminism explicitly, as we see in Chapter 1, “Hunger Doesn’t Take a Vacation: The Food Activism of United Bronx Parents.” In this essay, Lana Dee Povitz reveals that Puerto Rican mothers in the Bronx (a borough of New York City)—most of whom were poor and without much political influence—utilized individual “women’s work” as food providers for their families to collectively press public schools to provide nutritious meals. In Chapter 2, “‘Sex-Ins, College Style’: Black Feminism and Sexual Politics in the Student YWCA, 1968–80,” April Haynes demonstrates that in the late 1960s, black college women in the American South utilized the YWCA to connect antiracism and positive sexual expression as fundamental demands of women’s liberation at a time when many historians have presumed that feminist agendas were dominated by white women’s demands and that black women did not speak explicitly about sexuality. Political debates over the banning of the “headscarf” worn by Muslim girls in public school in France are at the center of Chapter 3, “Contemporary Feminisms and the Secularism Controversies: A Model of Emancipation,” in which Natacha Chetcuti-Osorovitz traces the reconfiguration of French feminist thought and activism as necessarily linked to secularism in an increasingly multicultural French society.

The last two chapters in this part redefine feminism by tracing its independent emergence in non-Western contexts. Eileen Boris in Chapter 4, “SEWA’s Feminism,” chronicles “women in movement” among home-based and self-employed workers organized in the Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA) in Ahmedabad, India. Her chapter reveals that women from the most marginalized positions utilized

collective action and cooperation to empower themselves and improve their daily lives. Rochelle Ruthchild in Chapter 5, "Feminist Dissidents in the 'Motherland of Women's Liberation': Shattering Soviet Myths and Memory," the last chapter in this part, writes of Russian dissident feminists who critiqued gender-based oppression in Russia. Forcefully opposed by the Soviet state, and also by many of their male dissident comrades, they continued to produce uniquely Russian feminist writings as exiles that in some cases differed markedly from European or US feminisms, such as in their open embrace of Russian Orthodox Christianity, and in other cases found a home within transnational feminism.

The four chapters in Part Two, "Reconsidering 'Second Wave' Feminist Genealogies," expand the periodization of the "second wave." The first two chapters—Jadwiga E. Pieper Mooney's Chapter 6, "On the 'F'-Word as Insult and on Feminism as Political Practice: Women's Mobilization for Rights in Chile"; and Magdalena Grabowska's Chapter 7, "Beyond the 'Development' Paradigm: State Socialist Women's Activism, Transnationalism, and the 'Long Sixties'"—link women's mobilizations and feminist activism of the 1960s and 1970s to earlier decades of the century. Pieper Mooney takes a long historical view of maternalist Chilean female activism that begins in the first decades of the twentieth century when women demanded changes that would improve family and community life and continues through the 1980s women's protests against Pinochet's dictatorship, which they said violated its supposed reverence for mothers and families when it caused the disappearance of individuals opposed to the state. Grabowska argues that Polish feminists embraced state-socialist feminism in the immediate post-Second World War period to foster an international feminist movement of Women's Congresses well before transnational feminist movements were founded by Western feminists in the 1970s and 1980s. Priya Jha's Chapter 8, "'Making a Point by Choice': Maternal Imperialism, Second Wave Feminism, and Transnational Epistemologies," interrogates the effects of historical amnesia on claims to "global sisterhood" by US "second wave" feminists. Jha argues that Mary Daly's claims (in the 1970s) to women's universal oppression rested on racist misrepresentations of Indian women by American journalist Katherine Mayo in her 1927 book *Mother India*. The failure to recognize the historical genealogy behind claims to "global sisterhood" reinforced false understandings of women's oppression in the "global south" that had nothing to do with their own experiences. The last chapter in this section by Seungkyung Kim and Na-Young Lee, Chapter 9, "Shared History and the Responsibility for Justice: The Korean Council for the Women Drafted for Military Sexual Slavery by Japan," also makes connections across the twentieth century from Japan's sexual exploitation of Korean women during the Second World War to the 1980s and 1990s when Korean women activists took advantage of increased democracy in Korea to build a case before international human rights organizations to provide justice for surviving "comfort women."

The last part, "Transnational Feminist Linkages," includes five chapters that represent women's organizing and activism that crossed borders, often both conceptually and physically. In Chapter 10, "Visions for the Suburban City in the Age of Decolonization: Chicana Activism in the Silicon Valley, 1965–75," Jeannette Alden Estruth highlights conceptual border crossing among Chicana women activists

in the Santa Clara Valley (now Silicon Valley) who embraced transnational Third World decolonization movements to demand community control over their local suburban housing and transportation. Purvi Mehta in Chapter 11, “Dalit Feminism at Home and in the World: The Conceptual Work of ‘Difference’ and ‘Similarity’ in National and Transnational Activism,” examines the strategic use of the concept of “difference” among Dalit women activists to distinguish their experiences of marginalization from other Indian feminists and Dalit men. Furthermore, she uncovers the transnational activist ties built by Dalit feminists with women outside India—for example, black American women—whose intersectional experiences of oppression and marginalization by both US white feminists and black men similarly shaped their social justice struggles. Also documenting the movement to demand justice for the Korean “comfort women,” Vera Mackie in Chapter 12, “One Thousand Wednesdays: Transnational Activism from Seoul to Glendale,” employs both transnational and intersectional frameworks to narrate how feminists from different regions built coalitions to demand recognition and retribution for survivors of wartime sexual slavery. Considering women’s assertions of national identity across regional and national borders, Amanda Ricci in Chapter 13, “Contesting the Nation(s): Haitian and Mohawk Women’s Activism in Montreal,” shows how both Indigenous Mohawk and Haitian immigrant women in Montreal engaged civically, claimed citizenship, and contested territorial dispossession shaped by colonial historical legacies. In addition, she raises the issue of transnationalism within the context of a single nation-state. Finally, in Chapter 14, “If Not Feminism, Then What? Women’s Work in the African National Congress in Exile,” Rachel Sandwell chronicles the development of “gender conversations” critical of gender norms among exiled African National Congress women in three separate locations outside of South Africa—in Dar es Salaam and Morogoro, Tanzania; and in Maputo, Mozambique. She also shows how ideas about feminism traveling from the United States and United Kingdom were transformed among South African women fighting apartheid in exile.

Notes

- 1 Sarah Evans, *Personal Politics* (New York: Vintage, 1980) and Alice Echols, *Daring to Be Bad* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989) were the two most influential books on the history of Women’s Liberation or the “second wave” US feminist movement previous to the explosion of writing on Women’s Liberation history in the beginning of the twenty-first century. Activists from the movement began to publish firsthand accounts of the movement in the late 1990s, which included Rachel Blau DuPlessis and Ann Barr Snitow’s *The Feminist Memoir Project* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1998) and Susan Brownmiller’s *In Our Time: Memoir of a Revolution* (New York: Dial Press, 1999). A collection of documents from the movement, *Dear Sisters: Dispatches from the Women’s Liberation Movement* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), edited by Rosalyn Baxandall and Linda Gordon.
- 2 Nancy A. Hewitt, ed., *No Permanent Waves: Recasting Histories of U.S. Feminism* (New Brunswick, NJ and London: Rutgers University Press, 2010), 2–4.

- 3 Leila J. Rupp and Verta Taylor, *Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s* (New York: Oxford, 1987).
- 4 See, for example, Astrid Henry, *Not My Mother's Sister: Generational Conflict and Third-Wave Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004); Krista Jacob and Adela C. Licona, "Writing the Waves: A Dialogue on the Tools, Tactics, and Tensions of Feminisms and Feminist Practices over Time and Place," *NWSA Journal* 17, 1 (2005): 197–205; Amber Kinser, "Negotiating Spaces for/through Third-Wave Feminism," *NWSA Journal* 16, 3 (2004): 124–53.
- 5 Hewitt, *No Permanent Waves*, 4.
- 6 Kathleen A. Laughlin, in Kathleen A. Laughlin et al., "Is It Time to Jump Ship? Historians Rethink the Waves Metaphor," *Feminist Formations* 22, 1 (Spring 2010): 77.
- 7 Estelle Freedman, *No Turning Back* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2002); Sarah Evans, *Tidal Wave* (New York: Free Press, 2003); Jennifer Nelson, *Women of Color and the Reproductive Rights Movement* (New York: New York University Press, 2003); Benita Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Premilla Nadasen, *Welfare Warriors* (New York: Routledge, 2004); Kimberly Springer, *Living for the Revolution* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Wini Breines, *The Trouble Between Us* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Anne Enke, *Finding the Movement* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); Elena Guittierez, *The Politics of Mexican-Origin Women's Reproduction* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2008); Nancy Maclean, *Freedom Is Not Enough* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008); Aimee Carrillo Rowe, *On the Subject of Feminist Alliances* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008); and Anne Valk, *Radical Sisters* (Chicago: Illinois University Press, 2010).
- 8 Becky Thompson, "Multiracial Feminism: Recasting the Chronology of Second Wave Feminism," in *No Permanent Waves*, ed. Hewitt, 39–60.
- 9 Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, eds., *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1994); M. Jacquie Alexander and Chanda Talpade Mohanty, eds., *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures* (New York: Routledge, 1997); Caren Kaplan, Norma Alarcón, and Minoo Moallem, *Between Woman and Nation: Nationalisms, Transnational Feminisms, and the State* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999); Wendy S. Hesland and Wendy Kozol, eds., *Just Advocacy? Women's Human Rights, Transnational Feminisms, and the Politics of Representation* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, 2005); Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp, eds., *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights* (New York: New York University Press, 2006); Amanda Lock Swarr and Richa Nagar, eds., *Critical Transnational Feminist Praxis* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2010).
- 10 Laughlin et al., "Is it Time to Jump Ship?," 84.
- 11 Lisa Baldez, *Defying Convention: US Resistance to the UN Treaty on Women's Rights* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 89.
- 12 Sheila Rowbotham, *Women in Movement: Feminism and Social Activism* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
- 13 Amrita Basu, ed., *Women's Movements in the Global Era: The Power of Local Feminisms* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2010), 4; Maxine Molyneux, "Mobilization without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State, and Revolution in Nicaragua," *Feminist Studies* 11, 2 (Summer 1985): 227–54.

- 14 Leila J. Rupp and Verta Taylor, "Foreword," in *Different Wavelengths: Studies of Contemporary Women's Movement*, ed. Jo Reger (New York and London: Routledge, 2005), xi.
- 15 Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan. "Postcolonial Studies and Transnational Feminist Practices," *Jouvert: Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 5, 1 (2000).
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Sylvanna M. Falcón, in Sylvanna M. Falcón and Jennifer C. Nash, "Shifting Analytics and Linking Theories: A Conversation about the 'Meaning-Making' of Intersectionality and Transnational Feminism," *Women's Studies International Forum* 50 (2015): 3.
- 18 Robin Morgan, *Sisterhood is Global: The International Women's Movement Anthology* (Garden City, NY: Anchor/Doubleday, 1984).
- 19 Ranjoo Seodu Herr, "Reclaiming Third World Feminism: Or Why Transnational Feminism Needs Third World Feminism," *Meridians* 12, 1 (2014): 1–30; Maylei Blackwell, Laura Briggs, and Mignonette Chiu, "Transnational Feminisms Roundtable," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* 36, 3 (2015): 4.
- 20 Herr, "Reclaiming Third World Feminism," 1
- 21 Ibid., 2.
- 22 Ibid., 25.
- 23 Leela Fernandes, *Transnational Feminism in the United States: Knowledge, Ethics, Power* (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 123.
- 24 Uma Narayan, *Dislocating Cultures/Identities, Traditions, and Third-World Feminism* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 4.
- 25 Grewal and Kaplan, *Scattered Hegemonies*.
- 26 Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color," *Stanford Law Review* (1991): 1241–99.
- 27 Sumi Cho, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall, "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Application, and Praxis," *Signs* 38, 4 (Summer 2013): 785, 787.
- 28 Jennifer C. Nash, in Falcón and Nash, "Shifting Analytics and Linking Theories," 5–6.
- 29 Vrushali Patil, "From Patriarchy to Intersectionality: A Transnational Feminist Assessment of How Far We've Really Come," *Signs* 38, 4 (Summer 2013): 847–8.
- 30 Chandra Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Discourses," *Feminist Review* 30 (Autumn 1988): 63.
- 31 Chandra Mohanty, "Transnational Feminist Crossings: On Neoliberalism and Radical Critique," *Signs* 38, 4 (Summer 2013): 967.