

Advancing Feminist Thinking on Globalization

KATHY E. FERGUSON AND MONIQUE MIRONESCO

We bring this intellectual and political journey to an end, not with a final summary or act of closure, but with our reflections on what we have learned and where we might go from here. While no single or unified conclusion is available, or indeed desired, to sum up this complex, layered material, the collective force of these analyses makes fresh thinking possible. Returning to the three umbrella themes we developed in our introduction, we find that the first two—representations/reproductions and spaces/borders—have endured while morphing in unanticipated directions, but the third—voices/bodies—has dispersed among the others and an unexpected newcomer—methods of scholarship/activism—has joined the fray.

Representations/reproductions has developed to include the multiple levels and genres in which discursive practices produce and are produced by power relations. This theme could be called semiotic—it refers to the meaning-making practices entailed in constructing imaginaries, naming events, producing categories, identifying genres, detecting and responding to voices, and following representations as they travel.

Spaces/borders has expanded to include physical arrangements of states, labor markets, families, bodies, clinics, schools, prisons, and security apparatuses. This theme could be called material—it encompasses multiple sites for producing, distributing, prohibiting, and transforming globalizing flows of bodies and institutions. State practices, both ideological and structural, have come to the fore, suggesting that globalization alters but does not overcome government power.

While it may be tempting to refer to the material level of analysis as “real,” in contrast to “merely” discursive inquiries, the force of these essays disqualifies that easy, misleading distinction, showing language practices as no less real and no less implicated in power than more tangible arrangements. Both of these umbrella themes are best thought of as verbs, as something we *do*—we globalize by representing and by materializing, interactively, simultaneously.

Feminist methods of scholarship/activism has emerged as a theme due to the essays’ shared reflections on *how* feminists study globalization. How do we connect

careful empirical work and robust theorizing to activist agendas? These essays exemplify careful practices of identifying and interpreting data, vigorous attention to what counts as knowledge, and sustained consideration of the relations between studying the world and changing it. While none of these essays is “quantitative” in that they do not employ sophisticated mathematical techniques, all are empirical in the stronger sense that they are grounded in evidence gathered about specific times and places.

Confronting Colonial Discourses

The global reach of colonial authorities into the Pacific has imposed several kinds of violence on native societies: the physical violence of disease and dispossession; the institutional violence replacing indigenous with colonial organizations of land, medicine, education, family, and law; the cultural violence that erases or debases indigenous worldviews and assaults them with western ways of making meaning. Yet indigenous peoples are never simply passive recipients of colonial encounters. They are active participants, sometimes resisting and other times incorporating western practices into local ways of being. Further, the colonial authorities sometimes find themselves changed as well, as their relations with those they intend to control or “save” become unruly or take unexpected turns.

In Raiskin’s analysis of Sia Figiel’s novel *where we once belonged*, painful yet creative interactions take place at the intersection of indigenous ways of knowing with formal colonial education. Set in American Samoa, Figiel’s characters struggle to make their way in the confusion of clashing worlds. Not only education and knowledge but also proper gender relations and sexual identities are challenged. Yet these sites of struggle sometimes provide their characters with resources to negotiate the conflicts between colonial and local ways. Similarly, Metaxas’s analysis of missionary medical practices in nineteenth-century Hawai‘i reveals a pervasive violence against indigenous practices of health along with the remarkable persistence of native ways. Missionary doctors combined their religious convictions about “heathens” with their patriarchal views of women to draw self-serving conclusions about native health and disease. Yet, again, encounters between colonial and indigenous practices of health and wellness host continuing struggles that colonizers do not always win. Critical readings of missionary records and self-reflections dislocate the common narrative about the inevitable march of “progress” in medical science and replace it with a political account of power and resistance.

The rapid growth of literary culture in the Pacific Islands since the 1960s offers literary forms and themes addressing and constituting globalization. At the semiotic level, tensions abound: while the first language of many Pacific Island writers is their national language, much Pacific Island literature is written in English, the lan-

guage taught in colonial schools (or those based on formerly colonial curricula). Discursive struggles between languages are layered on top of parallel frictions within languages. At the material level, literary scholars date the emergence of literature in English by Pacific Islanders to the establishment of regional universities, the University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG) in 1966 and the University of the South Pacific (USP) in 1968. These universities provided a meeting place and a publishing venue for writers from countries across the Pacific with diverse experiences of colonialism. Small magazines and journals such as *Mana* published this work, and two important collections edited by the Samoan writer Albert Wendt, *Lali* (1980) and *Nuanua* (1995), introduced regional and international audiences to Pacific Island writers. Journals and universities provide the material opportunity for creating and circulating global/local representations.¹

In the dynamic relation between colonial and indigenous societies, colonialism is revealed as a complex, incomplete process. Since one aspect of colonialism is the figuration of the natives as lacking something—legitimate science, or civilized sexuality, or a proper work ethic, or the light of god—which the colonizers conveniently believe themselves to possess, anticolonial struggles are always already positioned, by their opponents, as speaking from the lesser place, the receiving place, the place that stands in need of what the colonizer offers. Yet relations in colonized places move in multiple directions at once, with feedback loops making simple one-way articulations of cause-and-effect impossible. Christian conversion projects, patriarchal gender arrangements, and the discourse of “civilization” interdigitate with persistent indigenous practices. Colonialism is permanently incomplete because its participants keep thinking, acting, talking, struggling, and affecting one another in ongoing interactions. Colonial relationships combine violence and resistance, move in many directions, and often contain surprises.

Cultural Translations

As feminist ideas travel around the world, they require translation. Translation of terms like “gender” or “gay” is problematic because representations of sex and gender are seldom simple or straightforward. Instead, they are laden with many meanings, heavy with grammatical connections to other loaded terms, historical links to particular family structures and reproductive patterns, and evolving connotations in labor and law. When these representations travel, they do not just plop down, unchanged, in a new place; instead, they interact with the practices of naming and thinking already going on there. The connections thus made often have unintended consequences, making feminist translations and travels both promising and problematic.

In these planetary interactions, the dominant representation often fancies it-

self the “global” one, while the less powerful is often called “local.” This association with power is sometimes overt and other times subtle and unintended. Sometimes the global flows are initiated from a more powerful place and received by a less powerful one, as the term “gender” travels in Min’s essay from the United States to China, or the global gay moves in Puri’s essay from the United States and Europe to India. Or the flows can be initiated in a less powerful place, one not considered fully “modern” yet nonetheless with some resources to put into circulation, as, for example, Pacific Island rhythms make their way to the U.S. music scene, Argentinian tango blossoms in Japan, or falafel becomes popular in New York City. Either way, the less powerful language or society is often considered “the local,” while the more powerful is recognized as “the global.”

The only way to figure out how these complex global flows actually work is to look at them closely on local levels. To do a careful analysis of how ideas and categories travel, how they make their way into one society from another, the researcher has to be there. This requires careful fieldwork by scholars who can speak more than one language, interact with people from diverse places, and take part in multiple cultures. Puri watches the western producers of the idea of the global gay interpret local sexualities in India and also situates herself within India to analyze the concept’s reception. Min watches western feminist ideas of gender come into China and also studies the various meanings of gender within western feminist academic institutions. The location of points of view becomes evident in good field work: Puri shows how ideas of the global gay are challenged from the points of view of sexual minorities in India; Min shows how the concept of gender is defined and put to work differently by women who require specific discursive resources in their particular institutional settings. Puri and Min are both insiders and outsiders to their inquiries, and they use that doubleness to their advantage. Women in the party-linked All-China Women’s Federation (ACWF) receive the term “gender” differently than women in NGOs or universities; the first group needs to relate this largely American idea to official Marxist or Maoist language about women and to largely misogynistic state practices relying on gender neutral language; the second needs to relate to American and European universities and foundations. All of them need to talk to each other and other women in China, particularly rural women, who are partially or wholly outside both groups. Sophisticated feminist translators in China know these contexts and struggle to bring gender into Chinese language practices in ways useful to them. Bland questions about the accuracy of translations are reconfigured as intense political contests over the utility of competing articulations for particular agendas.

Puri shows how the discourse of global gay ironically strengthens the very thing it criticizes, which is U.S. hegemony in sexual politics. Puri performs the clas-

sic deconstructive move, showing how thinkers can become dependent on the very idea they oppose. Representations of gay men's sexuality that are recognizably urban and hip are welcomed by western thinkers as part of the global gay, while nonconforming indigenous sexualities lack intelligibility within this frame. The unspoken logic of the global gay gaze is something like, "That must be global, it's kind of like me." While advocates of global gay identities agree with Puri that the particular local context shapes the expression of queer identities, they nonetheless look at India in ways that recognize some sexual minorities as fellow global gays and fail to connect with other potential candidates for this recognition.

Concepts travel and translate within both the concrete, material circumstances and the discursive practices by which the travel takes place and the translations are articulated. Material structures of travel and translation include: technologies (books, journals, newspapers, magazines, television, radio, internet); organizations (governments, NGOs, universities, activist groups, businesses, foundations, international organizations, professional groups, retail outlets, bars, cafés); systems of transfer (academic scholarships and exchanges, international business opportunities, conferences, workshops, tours, demonstrations, advertising, consumer habits); government and international policies (regulating travel, trade, immigration, finance, crime, conflict, and development aid); and patterns of immigration (legal and illegal, sought and coerced). Discursive practices include the ways that ideas or events can be articulated and imagined, the ways they are put into or kept out of circulation so that the speakers and writers of a language can make use of them. The practices for making meaning that are available in a culture include modes of address, processes of recognition, patterns of naming, grammatical standards, rhetorical styles, and other practices of intelligibility. The means of enunciation that can operate in a place, the desires that can be legitimately articulated, the people who have standing to speak with authority—all these are aspects of discursive practices.

The key figures of "global" and "local" become complex figures of speech set within unequal power relations. Global and local are ways of making meaning, not actual stable physical places. They are interpretive frames, not transhistoric essences or fixed traits of places. They require discursive categories and material arrangements that people have invented to stabilize and make sense of the flows of stuff around the world. Every global is somebody's local, but not everybody's local is equally authoritative or desired. Explorations of cultural translation helps explain why globalization often looks a lot like colonialism. The colonial gaze actively, selectively recognizes some sexual subjects and not others; colonial institutions validate some domestic arrangements but not others. The concepts of global and local ride piggyback on prior colonizations, obscuring the inequalities they help create and hiding the unintended consequences of looking at the world largely from its more powerful sites.

Media

Of all the “stuff” that circulates globally, words and images are among the fastest and most nimble of travelers. Representation is a field of power in which meaning is enforced through repetition, and what counts as clarity is achieved through insistence. The institutions of media—internet, television, radio, newspapers, cell phones, and theaters, among others—move pictures and ideas at remarkable speeds in many directions. These words and images produce as well as represent the world; the people or institutions with the most power to control these circulations are able to exercise the most influence over the stories that can be told. Increasing concentration of media ownership in the hands of a few global conglomerates limits diversity and restricts access to markets. At the same time, access to some aspects of the local and global apparatus producing and circulating images and ideas is increasingly available via the internet to nonelites, who usually bring different interests to their production and consumption of media products.

Media Gaze

Media products allow us to see and hear the world and in the process they help produce the world that we are able to see and hear. The gazes of media are many-sided, including both the production and the reception of images and ideas. There are the practices by which people are represented by others—usually powerful others who own and control media outlets, including film studios, cable companies, and news outlets. In this case the gaze generally moves from the more powerful to the less powerful, telling stories that tend to support hegemonic arrangements. There are also practices by which people represent themselves; these practices may reproduce the dominant relations or may contest them and often do both at the same time. There are also complex practices of reception by which people receive, sort, translate, and engage the representations that come their way.

The essays by Yano and Yau Ching on Japanese girls are “book ends” for exploring the globalized production and circulation of representations, including both good girls, who confirm established racial/national/gender arrangements, and bad girls, who interrupt them. Yano’s account of the popular Japanese soap opera *Sakura* analyzes the making and viewing of officially sanctioned stories about what it means to be properly Japanese. The young female lead character is a world traveler who nonetheless comes to represent the “real” Japan, becoming a diaspora source for object lessons in docile, “cute,” innocent but alluring Japanese femininity. In contrast, Yau Ching’s journey into the world of incarcerated Japanese girls invites us to see these girls talking back to *Sakura*’s iconic pieties, longing for but also rebelling against approved national “cuteness.” The delinquent girls, perceived by authorities as sexually dangerous, use visual media to represent themselves and to ne-

gotiate with dominant media practices to become authors and performers of their representations rather than simply acted-upon by the representations of others.

A third essay shifts our attention from the production to the consumption of globally circulating images. Derné's analysis of the film-viewing practices of young, locally rooted middle-class men in India highlights their selective encounters with western images of sexuality and gender. Consumption of Hollywood films offers these men new images of masculinity, which they often embrace, and new images of femininity, which they generally disdain. They approve of globalizing representations of gender and sexuality that enhance their traditional privileges over women, while dismissing the images that might reduce men's control over women's sexuality. Consuming images, like making them, is a thoroughly active, interpretive, temporal process and not a passive incorporation of the "already there."

Visual media offer opportunities to examine representations of bodies and to track the relations of bodily images to national, corporate, and family agendas. Girls and women are typically placed differently than boys and men. Females are often utilized as repositories of tradition: the young and eager Sakura, like the absent women in Indian movie theatres, can be taken by audiences to represent proper Japanese and Indian gender traditions (thus relieving men of that obligation), while the disobedient girls in Japanese correctional facilities or the brazen, exposed women in Hollywood films represent the limitless dangers of "fallen" women. Bad girls, it turns out, are useful to producing good girls; the bad girls are the necessary outside, the needed violation of virtue that confirms its value. Audiences come to know what good girls are by learning what they are not: not overtly sexual, not assertive, not cheeky, not "out of control," not present in public life. Bad girls make good girls look good.

Representations of bodies are accompanied by compelling emotional connotations that make the images attractive or repulsive (or both). Media images produce and reflect emotional economies of desire, nostalgia, and shame. The shame associated with an improper Japanese female body out of control, or an Indian female body not properly covered, help create moral panic about violations of approved sexuality and nationality. Nostalgia for an officially endorsed past in which women and girls allegedly behaved themselves reinforces national agendas concerning proper domestic order. These economies of affect echo missionary representations of failing Native Hawaiian bodies, Samoan girls' struggles to find livable images of femininity, and clashes among feminists over global sexual labor. Consumable images of desirable people and objects can be both instruments for controlling people and also, ironically, vehicles by which marginalized people gain some power by making themselves desirable objects of consumption. Global and local are again seen to be figures of speech allowing us to talk about relationships, not literal places or fixed ways of life.

Labor, Migration, and Families

Women's laboring bodies are prominent in global flows. Women move around the world looking for work, learning new work, adapting to new places, working, sending money home, organizing relationships in their new workplaces, maintaining family and kin networks, working, working, working. In addition to the labor women traditionally do in agriculture, these essays show women producing industrial goods, providing caregiving and domestic services, and working in construction. Global women workers organize production, reproduction, domestic labor, and childcare, both their own and others'.

Delving deeply into the concrete circumstances of specific global women workers shows them neither as pitiful victims nor as heroic immigrants but as resourceful women utilizing the opportunities at hand, under conditions of global inequalities, to meet their obligations and construct their lives. Filipina and Mexican women move across national boundaries to locate and perform domestic labor in other women's homes. Indian and Chinese women move from rural to urban areas to find and perform factory or construction work. Adequate accounts of their lives must look at both the material circumstances of women's global labor—the technologies, organizations, and institutional structures—and the semiotic expressions—the prevailing images, values, emotions, points of view, and language practices within which global women workers view themselves and are viewed by others.

Some patterns emerge in these complex movements and activities. First, relations among local and global sites, between “the west” and “the rest,” or between the global north and the global south are complex and multilayered. Price and Riley investigate important movements *within* the global south, studying global labor migration taking place within state borders while involving multinational corporations, global financial institutions, and international consumer markets. The Dalian Economic Zone in northeastern China is particularly interesting in this regard because it hosts corporations from Japan and Korea, not just the United States and Europe. Filipina workers move not only to western nations but also to Japan, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other societies having enough wealthy families to generate demand for international domestic labor. Ibarra's analysis of Mexican women moving to the U.S. mainland and Hawai'i shows not a steady stream of movement to “the west” from “the rest” but a complicated cyclical movement combined with a longing to return. These multidirectional movements complicate easy dichotomies between local and global, east and west, or north and south. These terms still can be useful, marking crucial differences in the distribution of world resources, but they morph, when pushed, into metaphors marking shifting, unequal relations rather than actual physical places.

Second, despite common allegations that globalization weakens states, gov-

ernments actually play a central role in organizing women's global labor. State enforcement of boundaries and criteria for crossing borders shape what is possible and available for global women workers. In the Philippines the government puts women in a contradictory position by pursuing economic policies that encourage women to leave the country in search of work while simultaneously enacting family policies that insist on women's presence in the home. To be a good worker and good citizen is to be a bad mother, creating a no-win situation generating considerable stress and requiring extensive emotional labor on the part of globally working women. In China, on the other hand, while the state's residency policy penalizes peasants for seeking urban lives, it does not explicitly single out women as "bad mothers" for leaving their families in search of work. On the contrary, rural women laboring in the Dalian Economic Zone in northeast China view themselves as good mothers because they are providing their children with resources and opportunities unavailable otherwise. Arguably, it is China's attenuated socialist heritage, which stresses the value of public (as opposed to household) labor for women as well as men, compared to the strong, gender-conservative Catholic traditions in the Philippines, that could account for such differences in state policies. In the case of India, the state's embrace of neoliberal economic reforms converts the manual occupations upon which women construction workers depend into either mechanized occupations for which women are considered ineligible or into casual, low-wage jobs with little security. Further, the Indian government's reluctance to enforce labor reforms originating under earlier, more socialist states, and now discouraged by the international bodies enforcing neoliberal policies, coerces women into the uncertain world of casual, unskilled laborers. Governments enforcing neoliberal labor policies presume a "free market" yet regulate numerous boundaries, including those between states and between rural and urban areas, complicating neoliberal trends.

Third, women who leave their homes to work elsewhere do not generally leave their families and kin networks behind. On the contrary, they continue to be tied to and reliant upon networks of family and community connections. A common recuperative story about globalization is that it frees the traveling worker from the obligations and confinements of kin relations at home.² Yet women participating successfully in global labor markets call on kin and community relations to move to new places, establish new lives while maintaining families at home, secure and learn occupations, and negotiate the demands of jobs. Successful global workers must recruit kin selectively, using those relations that can sustain their circumstances while avoiding or reconfiguring other kin demands.

Fourth, women's participation in global paid labor does not produce a commensurate participation by men in unpaid family labor. Derné's essay shows Indian men recruiting selectively those global images that expand masculine pre-

rogative, while screening out and dismissing those that might challenge it. Parreñas demonstrates a parallel selectivity on the part of fathers in transnational Filipino families, where absent mothers, even though they contribute essential financial support to their families, must depend on other female kin to take up the labor of child-rearing that fathers decline to assume. In both instances, shifts in global arrangements are selectively adapted by men to support local patriarchies. Women, then, must balance the long-range demands of domestic labor and care of the young, sick, and elderly with the requirements of global labor. They do this by developing long-distance communication strategies (including text messaging, regular phone calls, e-mail, and care packages) and by organizing the labor of other women to substitute for absent mothers.

Fifth, the vast preponderance of women who move in the global flows of laboring bodies are poor. They do physically and often emotionally demanding labor under difficult circumstances for uncertain remuneration and few assured benefits. Their circumstances make them both materially available and ideologically suitable for filling global labor shortages. Recent immigrants from Mexico to the United States, or from the Philippines to the United States, Europe, and the Middle East, are usually economically vulnerable; if they are illegal immigrants, they are legally and politically vulnerable as well. Indian women construction workers are rendered vulnerable by the increasing casualization of their trades, making employment uncertain and conditions severe. Chinese women factory workers, newly arrived from the villages to the economic zones, are rendered vulnerable by internal state policies reserving legal residency and access to services for those with permits to live in cities. Prevailing images of laboring women conspire with their material circumstances: middle and upper class women looking for domestic help often see Filipina and Mexican women as “naturally” suited for caregiving work, while international factory managers look for “nimble” Asian fingers attached to “obedient” Asian women, and women carrying headloads in Indian construction sites are viewed by bosses, husbands, and fathers as naturally suited for backbreaking labor but inappropriate for skilled trades. The expansion of global capitalism has not led to a decrease in marginalized, exploited labor, because the conditions producing unfree labor have also expanded.

Sixth, serious attention to unfamiliar and perhaps unappealing points of view expressed by global women workers is critical to a robust account of globalizing circumstances of gendered labor. Why do women construction workers in India insist on preserving their unskilled, physically exhausting jobs? Why do they appeal to unions, NGOs, and the state to protect their jobs rather than mechanize them? Price’s essay requires us to question easy assumptions that mechanization of demanding physical labor counts as progress, or that training women in skilled trades will help them get better jobs. Why do women factory workers in the Dalian Eco-

conomic Zone in China embrace their polluted, crowded industrial wasteland as “paradise”? Why do women who are willing to contest gender inequality in employment accept it in their homes? Riley’s essay challenges us to put aside ready judgments about preferred life choices and look instead at the women’s complex negotiations, using whatever resources are at hand, to create successful lives. “Successful lives,” for the women Riley interviews, are “modern,” that is, urban. Perhaps the highly mobile relocations of global capital create “the shadow space of ‘the north’ in the territory of the south,”³ so that rural migrant workers can see “paradise” in an urban economic zone.

Trafficking

Globalism plus capitalism plus patriarchy produces global sex work. Global capitalism gives men and women incentive and opportunity to sell women’s bodies on an international market. Patriarchy devalues women as persons but values women’s bodies as sexual opportunities for men. In the fluid intersections of worldwide capitalist patriarchy, women’s bodies become global sexual commodities, exchanged through women’s migration for purposes of sexual labor.

Sex trafficking is a high-profile topic in academic, governmental, and activist contexts. Feminists frame international prostitution as a logical consequence of globalization, not an isolated “downside” or unique “side effect.” Peach sketches ideological disputes within feminist analyses of trafficking, while Caraway stresses the structural, material flow of women around the world in the global sex trade. Feminists differ over the conceptual anchor through which they center their analyses: is global sexual labor primarily about sex, or primarily about labor? “Abolitionist” voices center sex, seeing prostitution as inherently demeaning to women who are victimized by criminal traffickers. Their solution is to rescue women, return victims to their homes, and arrest traffickers, not to decriminalize sex work or ameliorate the conditions under which it is performed. “Reformist” voices center work, seeing prostitutes as migrant laborers and traffickers as their transportation. The reformist solution is to change immigration policies, decriminalize sex work, and improve workers’ conditions of labor. At stake are critical ideological differences, substantial budgets, and vastly different structural implications for relating global sexual labor to other dimensions of globalization.

The differences between “abolitionists” and “reformists” are amplified by the sorts of political coalitions they entertain. Abolitionist agendas tend to segue into the world of Christian evangelicals and the more conservative wing of the Republican Party in the United States. If sex work is primarily about sex, then controlling sex becomes important and moral panic over uncontrolled sexuality readily ensues. Like missionaries panicked over unrestrained Hawaiian bodies, abolitionists

marshal states, churches, and NGOs to regulate the global sex trade and save or punish its participants. Reformist agendas, in contrast, tend to overlap with those of labor organizers and mass antiglobalization movements such as the regular protestors at IMF and WTO meetings. Rather than inciting moral panic over illicit and degrading sexuality, this constellation of actors expresses heightened political objections to all unfree labor. In their effort to position sexual labor as *work*, not sex, they tend to skirt prostitution's particular degradations.

As with other sorts of labor and community organizing, NGOs are big players in trafficking struggles: they produce knowledge about trafficking, lobby for policy changes at state and international levels, organize conferences and workshops, provide direct services to sex workers, and help sex workers organize. Global NGOs move ideas, ideologies, policies, and personnel around the world, making selective alliances with other players, including states, international organizations, churches, militias, political parties, interest groups, universities, and unions. The philosophical and material struggles among NGOs constitute an explosive field for international feminist politics. Peach and Caraway agree on both the limitations of human rights discourse as a response to trafficking and the crucial need for the resources of human rights to be available to sex workers. While rights talk is a flawed tool in that it may impose individualistic and property-based ideas of human worth onto situations calling for more collective approaches, it is a crucial tool nonetheless. Both authors urge us to put migrant women themselves in the center of our analyses, privileging their complex and contradictory stories about global sex work in our own understandings. Since migrant sexual laborers' own stories thoroughly mix "the sex story" with "the work story," the dualistic opposition of sex *versus* work will have to give way to a more integrated and contextualized understanding.

Global Militarization

Militarism often seems to stand outside of globalization because wars and armies are generally activities of states (although nonstate terrorism complicates this understanding) and because violence seems to separate people and places, while global flows connect them. Yet global flows of violence, arms, soldiers, mercenaries, contractors, strategies, environmental destruction, and bellicose gendered imaginaries are part and parcel of globalization. Militarization, and by implication demilitarization, is a complex process with a long history and many layers. Militarization happens step by step, through dense networks of microdecisions about how we live, work, and think as well as through obvious public policies, violent colonial histories, and visible macrodecisions through which elites organize the world and use its resources. Militarization also marks sites of struggle, contests over not just how to militarize but whether to do so.

Global economic inequalities are created and enforced by militarized means on many levels. First, the enormous human suffering created by neoliberal economic policies is a form of structural violence. Second, security forces, as Enloe explains, break strikes, discipline workers, quell union organizing, and make the global south safe for capital investment. Third, the legal and illicit production, distribution, and trade in weapons mark a global flow of enormous proportions. The arms trade is not “outside” of globalization, not a strange perversion or unfortunate side effect of global trade. Like the trade in women’s bodies, trade in weapons is the predictable consequence of combining global flows with willingness to sell anything to anybody. Fourth, there are enormous opportunity costs to global militarization. As Kirk shows, governments allow environmental destruction in exchange for membership in global systems of military bases, training, and recruitment. Governments erode or abandon health, education, and welfare services to invest their resources in war. Colonial relations are reinforced by global militarization, as the land and oceans of indigenous people are used for weapons testing, military bases, training facilities, toxic dumps, and “sacrifice zones.”

Fifth, expectations about properly masculine and properly feminine identities recruit some men and women into warrior roles while sidelining others. Images of warlike men and dependent women shape available understandings of masculinity and femininity; these floating signifiers also segue into colonial contexts, as Teaiwa shows, marking colonizers as properly strong and masculine while the colonized are written as receptively feminine and needing help. Not surprisingly, colonized people may respond defensively, claiming their men and their governments are just as manly and warlike as the next man or state. Sixth, sexual violence circulates with the movement of militaries. Just as global prostitution is the logical consequence of globalism + capitalism + patriarchy, rape, domestic violence, and sexual abuse are the predictable companions of global militarism. Armies use sex to torture prisoners; militias use rape as a kind of ethnic cleansing; civilian women and girls around military bases are sexual prey, while military men are consumers of sexual services. Rape and sexual abuse also take place within militaries, not just between them, confusing definitions of “the enemy” for women who are soldiers.

Lastly, hierarchical, bellicose cultural imaginaries are hot commodities in militarized global communications. Far from representing a breakdown of communications, militarization works through intensified communication flows that naturalize top-down authority and interpret differences in terms of absolute “otherness.” Militarized societies neglect the possibilities of diplomacy or other strategies to resolve conflict, and become accustomed to solving (or pretending to solve) problems with violence; violence becomes routine, ordinary, “just the way things are.” Yet demilitarization struggles are also global, recruiting counterflows of language and material to imagine a different world.

Reflecting on the State

While globalization is often blamed or praised for weakening state sovereignty, states' actions and nonactions are central to women's globalizing lives. The term "the state" comes apart, showing states to be sites of conflict rather than unified centers of power. Contradictory gender projects emerge within neoliberal states: the government of the Philippines urges women both to go abroad to make money and stay home to raise children, and leaves women, rather than men or governments, to sort out the ensuing difficulties. The government of China embraces neoliberal economic reforms, creating conditions that pull peasants to the urban economic zones, yet regulates rural-to-urban labor flows, leaving the penalized workers to figure out how to live with the problems thus created. The Chinese government officially declares equality between men and women, while allowing privatization to create greater gender inequalities. Women's organizations aligned with the ruling Communist Party turn to the discursive resources of "gender" analysis to negotiate the conflict between official declarations of equality and circumstances of inequality in times of rapid change. Yet the inequalities that the concept of gender helps them name are unlikely to get much attention in state policies because neoliberal economic reforms move the state out of the business of intervening to ensure public goods, such as equality between men and women, and into the business of privatizing production of goods and services.

Most governments face some version of the contradictions entailed by combining extreme commodification of women's bodies with efforts to control women's sexuality. Girls and women are taught, with regard to their bodies, to advertise but not to sell. Those who "go too far," who sell their sexual services, may be incarcerated to be taught proper domestic virtues. Or they may be caught in the crossfire between the categories of "trafficking victim" and "global prostitute." In either case, geographic and social borders are sites of intense state activity around gender, sexuality, and labor management. The image of the vulnerable young woman forced into prostitution has become an icon for strengthening border controls, while states pushing neoliberal reforms are uninterested in addressing the economic misery that recruits women into global labor flows in the first place. The "war on terror" intensifies militarization of borders, making migrant workers' lives harder; immigrants continue to be "pulled" to the greater economic opportunities available in industrialized states or urban areas, but "pushed back" by intensified scrutiny and heightened danger attendant to border crossings. One might speculate that the war on terror mostly terrorizes illegal immigrants and their families.

States police borders ideologically as well as militarily. The Japanese melodrama Yano analyzes is produced by the Japanese Public Broadcasting Corporation, a government-supported station with a strong mandate to promote traditional

cultural values. *Sakura* can be seen as a containment site for imagining proper gender and racial membership in the nation. It can also serve as a marker of the ironies of border policing in a global context, since the ideal young Japanese woman is found not in Japan but in Hawai'i. The containment process can work in the opposite direction as well: small, struggling Pacific Island nations may selectively let in ideologies and institutions from "outside," including missionaries, medicine, law, investment, and militaries, in an attempt to secure their precarious sovereignty among larger, predatory states. Oceanic governments' tragic strategy of allowing border porosity, within the relentless context of global inequality, lets in the stuff that kills as well as the stuff that may help survive the killing.⁴

If borders are sites of magnified state actions, other political spaces may be just the opposite: sites where states fail to act, often with significant gender consequences. The neoliberal state in India declines to enforce labor legislation while facilitating the mechanization of labor that displaces women workers. Governments in the Philippines, South Korea, and Okinawa resist enforcing minimal environmental protections while making land and water available for U.S. military uses. Where states decline to act, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) often step in, organizing at community levels, tapping foundation funding, and articulating agendas to which states and international organizations must respond. The "NGOization" of global feminism can be seen as a response to, among other things, the void created by the atrophy of state programs addressing women's health, education, job training, welfare, or sheer survival.

Feminist Methods

To investigate how feminist globalization research does its work, we borrow Sandra Harding's useful distinctions between method, methodology, and epistemology. Harding describes research methods as "techniques for gathering evidence," methodology as "a theory and analysis of how research should proceed," and epistemology as "issues about an adequate theory of knowledge or justificatory strategy" (1987: 2). At the level of *method*, researchers are concerned with what counts as data; where do we look for our evidence and how do we recognize it? At the level of *methodology*, we ask how we analyze our data and what theoretical arguments provide the context for that analysis. At the level of *epistemology*, we focus on the (usually hidden) assumptions about what counts as knowledge and who count as knowers. It is tempting to think of these as building blocks, with method as the most basic, methodology as intermediate, and epistemology as the larger meta-question. However, such a linear arrangement evades the necessary link of epistemology back to method, since identification of something that can be called data is itself reflective of epistemological assumptions about knowing.⁵

Data can be seen, following Donna Haraway's brilliant metaphor in her essay "Teddy Bear Patriarchy" (1989), as organized into dioramas, that is, framed spaces of relevant statements, observations, and relationships within which researchers look for patterns. Dioramas, Haraway shows, are made, not found. Research projects take shape around researchers' implicit assumptions and explicit choices about what stays "inside" and what falls "outside" the frame of relevant questioning. There is no formula for deciding what is in and what is out. Instead, data dioramas take their shape through sustained, meticulous questioning about what there is to know, who is best positioned to know, and how knowing takes place. An intriguing diorama follows unexpected leads and cultivates nonobvious links. Some threads of connection between available facts, some relationships among actors, will inevitably be privileged as researchers construct their frames; others will be backgrounded, as researchers "connect the dots" by following some possible trails and leaving others undeveloped.

Method: Selection of Data

While none of these essays is directly about research methods, the authors in this volume are explicit (within space constraints) about how they conducted their work. They have immersed themselves in the rich geographic, historical, and conceptual material they have studied, paying careful attention to the identification and selection of data. Nine out of the sixteen essays utilized interviews and were entrepreneurial in seeking access to interview subjects. Often, repetition of interviews and long-term relations with their research communities blurred the distinction between interviews and ethnographies. Ibarra explains her "snowball" method of contacting Mexicanas in California, where one would expect scholars to study Mexican immigrants, and in Hawai'i, where no one has thought to do that before. Yau Ching gives a similarly detailed account of gaining access to incarcerated girls in Japan and constructing a research setting in which the girls represent *themselves* outside the constraints of official channels. Both researchers illuminated the challenge of creating relationships with research subjects who are in highly constrained situations (illegal immigrants or institutionalized teenagers) and have reasons to be suspicious of authorities. Interviews concerning migrant mothers investigated their relations from many directions: while Ibarra interviewed women migrants in the receiving country, Parreñas conducted interviews with the children left behind in the sending countries. Riley conducted sustained, often repeated interviews with migrant women factory workers in their places of employment, their homes, her home, and available public spaces in the enterprise zone. Derné and Riley solicited interviewees in public places, while Kirk, Puri, Min, and Price tapped activist and academic networks.

Several writers combined their intellectual research with their political activ-

ism and personal involvement in the communities they studied. Their analyses are, in Nancy Naples's words, analyses "constructed through interactions between researchers and the persons researched in ever-changing social and political environments" (2003: 198). Their perspectives were "*achieved in community*" and intended to contribute to the further development of communities (ibid., emphasis in original). Kirk's extensive connections with anti-bases activists across the Pacific and Asia gave her access to politicized communities already hard at work collecting information and creating communications about U.S. military use of their communities. Her research both relied on and helped to create the East Asia-U.S.-Puerto Rico Women's Network Against Militarism, a collection of feminist individuals and organizations struggling against militarization. Enloe's global work as a scholar and activist connects her with worldwide networks of grassroots political struggles.⁶ Several of the other feminist scholars she cites are or were her students in the innovative Women's Studies doctoral program at Clark University, which cultivates "the academic-practitioner model in which theory, practice and social action are integrated."⁷ Price's interviews with activists and construction laborers in India were framed by her own history working in construction and organizing workplaces. She participated in workshops held by the Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA) and in labor actions organized by women workers and organizers in India. Teaiwa's analysis of militarism in the Pacific took shape in the context of her poetry, writing, and performance in and with Pacific communities as well as her participation in Pacific women's and antinuclear groups.⁸ Puri's links to gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender activists in India were both a vehicle for enabling her research and a self-reflective aspect of the research. Min's involvement in a development project in China gave her personal experience with the travels of the concept of "gender" among activists. Caraway and Peach organize and participate in conferences, workshops, and publications from the field of trafficking activism in U.N. and regional contexts. Yau Ching combined her study of media and her production of media projects with her activism with and on behalf of incarcerated teenagers in East Asia. These scholars added layers to their interview material by placing themselves within the struggles they were studying. They negotiated the shifting boundaries of being an "insider" and an "outsider" at the same time.⁹

In addition to interviews and participant observation, other data identified in these essays include government documents (both historical documents such as missionary records, and contemporary legal and constitutional documents, including family law); films, TV shows, poetry, and novels; and amateur multimedia projects. Data are identified on multiple levels: Derné looked at films and at men viewing films; Yano examined central tropes and themes in the soap opera as well as the state and commercial operations producing the show; Raiskin examined the textual practices of Figiel's novel as well as the novelist's published statements and the

colonial educational process framing both the fictional story and the indigenous readers' relations to the story. The multiplication of levels of analysis is particularly striking in Yau Ching's work: using multiple visual and auditory recording devices, she studied the girls while enabling the girls to study themselves.

Methodology: What Do They Do with Their Data?

Scholars assemble their data to look for patterns, analyze relationships, and find the stories that reside in, or can be imagined through, the material. Feminist scholars invite women and gender into the center of their analyses, using the analytic energies of feminist theory, postcolonial theory, queer theory, and other variations on contemporary critical theory to explore power relations. They presume that women are significant actors who are central to the workings of institutions and that gender relations, intersecting with racial, class, sexual and colonial relations, always already shape men and women's lives. Theorizing power from least advantaged positions, they sustain analytic curiosity about the activities and ideas of women and the working of gender.

Some of the essays in this book concentrate on identifying relations of cause and effect, as Enloe encourages us to do, to understand the multiple causes of globalization and militarization. Others focus primarily on meaning, articulating contending interpretations of data or asking what the material can mean, especially from less privileged points of view. Price, Ibarra, and Riley invite us to hear immigrant Indian, Mexican, and Chinese women's accounts of their global work, to take seriously the interpretations these women offer of their lives. While feminist research is generally premised on a commitment to listen respectfully to those we study, researchers still need to make informed judgments on the validity of our subjects' views. Respecting the views of those we interview does not mean always accepting their claims to truth; researchers may instead interrogate the points of view they encounter for the ways such perspectives reinforce patriarchal or colonial power. Derné enters the perspective of Indian male filmgoers, not to persuade us that the men are right about what they see, but rather to explain the ways in which the men respond to gender anxieties by selectively embracing global media to enhance their power over women. Riley introduces us to women who see the dismal urbanscapes of economic zones as "paradise," not because she agrees with them but because she is curious about the process that produces their enthusiasm. Peach and Caraway intervene in the contending interpretations of global sexual labor currently dominating international discussions, unraveling their logic and tracing their implications in order to find a way out of the current impasse between those who see sexual labor as primarily about sex and those who see it as primarily about work.

A significant methodological element of these essays is their attention to genre. Soap operas, historical archives, novels, NGO literature, films, legal documents,

poems, and interviews are kinds of texts requiring specific attention. Genres employ characteristic tropes, put into circulation particular rhetorical gestures, tap or produce relevant emotional economies. Reading these diverse texts, and positioning the researcher and the reader in relation to the texts, segues from the methodological to the epistemological dimension of inquiry.

Epistemology: How Do We Know What We Know?

Selection of research data always circles back around to epistemological questions because the appearance of claims that can count as facts, and facts that can count as relevant, is always already shaped by prior understandings of how we know what we know. While these essays are steeped in empirical data, they are not positivist; that is, they do not assume a one-to-one correspondence between words and things. Rather, they locate the practices of interpretation within the heart of their analyses; the relation of words to things is always mediated by the location of the speakers, the points of view shaping knowledge claims, and the realm of intelligibility within which statements can be recognized as legitimate. Empirical work that understands itself to be “selective, partial, positioned” (Lather 1991: 78) can provide nuanced descriptions and explanations without assuming that the world is a stable site of fixed meanings. Reflections on the relationship of the researcher with her/his material help locate the research gaze and articulate the practices of creating, not simply finding, meanings.

Many of these essays develop a feminist hermeneutic: that is, they articulate and privilege a neglected and devalued point of view, pull it to the center of the analysis, and use it to generate a critique of the power relations that produced the neglect and devaluation in the first place. Feminist hermeneutics allow readers to enter the lifeworlds of the research subjects, imagine previously unknown worlds, and understand unfamiliar others as creatures of reason. Feminist hermeneutics allow us to articulate submerged discourses and tell neglected stories. Metaxas’s essay honors the subaltern discourse of Native Hawaiian healers, suppressed but not destroyed by missionary hegemonies. Her hermeneutic is suspicious of the missionary’s accounts of Native Hawaiians because she locates the missionaries’ points of view within the structural context of colonial power inequalities. Raiskin uncovers indigenous stories hidden in or coopted by colonial accounts of Samoa. She takes readers into Pacific Island stories in order to apprehend the gaze of colonized people back onto the anthropologists, missionaries, developers, and educators who are usually empowered to speak authoritatively about “natives.” While both writers are in the complex position of nonindigenous scholars doing research on indigenous topics, they position themselves not as *speaking for* native people but as *speaking with* them and others about colonial encounters.¹⁰ Ibarra and Price employ a similar tool of hermeneutics when they include lengthy

quotations from the Mexican and Indian migrant women workers they interview. These writers frame extensive quotations within a context that recovers the sense of their interviewees' words and renders their worlds intelligible. Yau Ching, Derné, Riley, and Kirk exemplify a comparable hermeneutic tool—active, patient listening, over a considerable period of time, to bring the lifeworlds of delinquent girls, film-viewing men, migrant women, and political activists into focus for readers residing outside those worlds. At the same time, readers may find overlap between their lives and the worlds these essays portray, since girls and women in all parts of the world, including college classrooms, may have experience with laboring under extremely difficult conditions, or leaving their children to find work, or selling their sexuality, or injuring themselves. In some cases a powerful hermeneutic can create empathy for an unfamiliar life, while in other cases it can clarify shared struggles.

While feminist hermeneutics asks, "What do things mean?" feminist genealogy asks, "*How* do things mean?" At the genealogical level, authors are hyperaware of, and reflective on, the meaning-making practices they employ. At this level, scholars interrogate prior hermeneutics by questioning the questions; we ask, "Why are we asking these questions?" in order to make space for other questions to be posed. Genealogy looks behind hermeneutics to see the conditions of possibility for telling particular stories and articulates the unspoken discursive context within which some stories are considered intelligible while others cannot be heard.¹¹

Puri's essay does a great deal of its work at the genealogical level, since her task is to show how an ostensibly liberatory discourse, that of the global gay, unintentionally reproduces the oppressions and exclusions it arose to combat. The discourse of the global gay, she argues, is dependent on the very universalizing move it seeks to contest. Puri pushes her readers to ask how the claims of the global gay are produced in discourse and how some nonnormative sexual identities get to be the "real" global gays while others are not candidates for that position. By calling attention to other nonconforming sexualities not included in the "global gaze," she shows how one manifestation of a phenomenon is taken to be the *proper* one.

Yau Ching's essay also does a great deal of its work at the genealogical level. Her deconstructive move shows how mainstream Japanese society becomes dependent on what it claims to oppose. The society constructs a self-contradictory sexual economy based on childhood innocence and reproductive sexuality within marriage, along with a political economy of unrestrained consumerism, including commodification of female bodies for sale or trade. If girls are defined as innocent, then when they are not innocent, they are not proper girls. Girls who find entrepreneurial opportunities to enhance their power by selling their innocence are the logical but condemned outcomes of these contradictions. They become scapegoats for the incompatibilities of the larger social order. Yau Ching asks

how childhood is produced in discourse and shows how incarcerated girls talk back to discourses of shame.

Genealogical thinking looks for ways in which stories may be told otherwise. Essays that do their work largely at the genealogical level pay close attention to the details of their material because they are looking for the things that do not quite fit, the material that, if taken seriously, undermines the conventional interpretations. Data that “escape, exceed, and complicate” (Lather 1991: 125) the prevailing stories provide openings to shift the direction of interpretation. Yano’s analysis of the Japanese soap opera *Sakura* makes genealogical moves by showing how a form of identity seen as *natural* is actually the artifact of a dense network of discursive and material conditions of production. Parreñas similarly maps contradictory state policies to show how the good worker/failed mother is produced within the available subject positions of the Philippines’ discursive economies. Parreñas and Caraway trace the ironic process by which NGOs working with unconventional families (transnational mothers or sex workers) develop a stake in their subjects’ oppression since it is the alleged severity of the problem that legitimized the NGOs in the first place. Raiskin makes genealogical moves when she looks at the conditions under which certain stories about Pacific Islands can be told, and the changing material and linguistic circumstances that allow different stories to be told. Genealogical analysis proceeds by looking for the tensions within texts, the sites of contradiction where competing agendas or naming practices contend with one another and where people, often under hard-pressed circumstances, negotiate those spaces of contradiction. Genealogical inquiry insists that facts never speak for themselves, that clarity is always ideological, thus bringing epistemology back around to investigate the status and selection of what can count as data.

A final question haunts feminist research: who benefits from our work? Feminist researchers struggle with the challenge of studying others without contributing to their oppression. How can we “give back” to the communities we study, sharing the benefits of our research with our research subjects? How can we include ourselves in the research gaze, so that we, too, are learners, and those we study are recognized as teachers? Sometimes those we study benefit from our literacy skills, as Puri recounts, or our access to academic resources, as Min indicates. Hawaiians and Samoans may benefit from insights into colonizer’s reasoning and gain allies in their struggles to resist colonialism, as Raiskin’s and Metaxas’s essays suggest. Teaiwa’s analysis of the relations producing and contesting militarism in Samoa can support activists working to reconfigure the relations between manliness, postcolonial struggles, and war. Similarly, Enloe’s insights can guide feminist analyses of global militarization just as anti-bases organizers in South Korea, Okinawa, and the Philippines benefit from Kirk’s careful listening, meticulous gathering of details, and assistance in writing counterhistories of their communities’ demilitariza-

tion struggles. Women construction workers organizing in India can benefit from Price's analysis of their strategies and tactics. Incarcerated teenagers get an opportunity to narrate themselves in Yau Ching's workshops. Women struggling to reconfigure their relationships with men may benefit from insights, such as those Derné and Parreñas offer, into the ways some men have found to turn global changes to the service of traditional male privilege. With the help of Ibarra and Riley, immigrant women get an opportunity to tell their rich stories and be received with dignity. Consumers of global media reading Yano's analysis harvest critical insight into the production and circulation of hegemonic images of nation, race, and gender. Critical observers of the dense machinations around trafficking reap insights into current controversies from Caraway and Peach, as well as resources to approach the issue in a fresh way. Women and men contending with globalizations' numerous insults and burdens get help in publicizing their struggles to a broader audience. While it is prudent to be modest about the effects that one book can produce, these essays nonetheless strive to make contributions to social change. They respond to the challenge we set out in our introduction—to think outside of “us” and “them” dichotomies, to do the hard work of cultivating feminist imaginaries that enact (rather than just call for) multidimensional analysis. Out of these essays may come intellectual and political resources for imagining a better world, along with the humility to attend critically to the echoes of our opponents in ourselves.

Notes

1. This paragraph was written in conjunction with Judith Raiskin. For an overview of Pacific Island literature and writers, see Lal and Fortune (2000: 516–538).

2. Our thanks to S. Charusheela for her insights into relations between women's global labor and their kin networks.

3. Our thanks to Jungmin Seo for this felicitous phrase (personal communication, January 2, 2006) and for his insights into labor migration within the global south.

4. For analysis of the “letting in/keeping out” strategy among Hawaiian governments and sovereignty activists in the context of struggles over “gay marriage,” see Goldberg-Hiller (2004).

5. For a more sustained analysis of empirical, hermeneutic, and genealogical work in feminism, see DiPalma and Ferguson (2006).

6. See Enloe's extensive footnotes in *Maneuvers* (2000) for documentation of women's worldwide demilitarization activism.

7. See Clark University's Women's Studies homepage for their global/local focus of feminist doctoral work. <http://www.clarku.edu>.

8. “Terensia, Amplified Poetry and Songs” is a poetry and music CD of Teresia Teaiwa and Sia Figiel. <http://home.hawaii.rr.com/dougwords/terensia/>.

9. For a discussion of the discursive construction of insider and outsider research positions, and the power imbalance between researcher and researched, see Naples (2003: 49–66).

10. For reflections on the relation between indigenous research material and nonindigenous researchers, see L. Smith (1999).

11. For a more extensive analysis of hermeneutics and genealogy in feminism, see Ferguson (1993) chapter one.