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WOMEN’S MOVEMENTS AND FEMINISM IN A TRANSNATIONAL WORLD

Florence E. Babb
When most of us in this country think about feminism and women’s movements, our thoughts turn to the last few decades in the United States and Europe. Upon further reflection, we recall the emergence of the first wave of Western women’s movements and the struggles for women’s rights during the last century. But how many are aware of the early development of non-Western feminist movements or of the vital women’s movements that are now found throughout the world? As a feminist anthropologist who has followed the second and third waves of feminism in the United States since the early 1970s, and who has taught and carried out research on issues related to international feminism for over thirty years, I want to suggest that our understanding of feminism must be informed by an awareness of the histories as well as present mobilizations of women around the globe. What we learn about the political, economic, and social questions these women are addressing can serve to challenge Western thinking and broaden our feminist perspectives.

I begin by noting the deep roots of feminism in some non-Western parts of the world, then discuss some critiques offered by Third World women of color both within and outside the United States that have paved the way toward a more inclusive and cross-cultural feminism. Drawing from my own experiences and those of others in Latin America, I move on to consider how women in that region have struggled with differences of class, race, and ethnicity to build a continental feminist movement. Finally, I use the example of Nicaragua to illustrate how one small country has seen the growth of a host of women’s organizations and feminist activities in recent times.

“THIRD WORLD FEMINISM”
AND THE POLITICS OF DIFFERENCE

It is difficult to engage in any discussion of feminism, or more accurately feminisms in the plural, without first asking what we mean by “feminism.” Yet it is just the point of recent critiques that we need to go beyond narrow definitions based on the experiences of particular groups of women in one or a few societies. If we can resist the impulse to pin down a “universal” concept of feminism, we may begin to see the many ways that it is expressed cross-culturally. While feminists tend to agree that the world is gendered, that women and men are positioned differently in societies, and that cul-
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tures generally assign less value to women, their conclusions about the causes of gender inequality and what to do about it vary widely. Some are concerned about household and family dynamics and argue that the gender division of labor must change if women are to gain equality with men. Others look at the multiple ways that gender intersects with class and race, viewing it as necessary for women to establish alliances with men in struggles at the national level. For now, it will be useful to keep in mind that feminism takes no single form and that we need to ground our understanding of specific women’s movements in the social and historical contexts in which they have emerged.

Feminism is not a uniquely Western development that has only recently been exported to other areas of the world; women’s movements developed in non-Western societies as long ago as the nineteenth century. For example, in parts of Asia and the Middle East, women struggled on their own behalf as well as alongside men in nationalist movements for more than a century. For example, in parts of Asia and the Middle East, women struggled on their own behalf as well as alongside men in nationalist movements for more than a century. Forms of foreign domination under colonialism were the setting for some of the first movements for women’s rights in areas of Asia. In China and Vietnam, women peasants and workers engaging in resistance movements sought to transform their societies and better the condition of women. In India, such practices as child marriage and widow-burning were challenged by reform movements during that time. In Islamic societies in the Middle East, women also began to challenge the social restrictions placed on women through the institutions of marriage and family. In Iraq, some women rejected the traditional use of the veil, as symbolic of women’s oppression and seclusion, in acts of bold defiance.

Similarly, in Latin America there is ample evidence that women activists were organizing in the nineteenth century around a number of issues. They may have been inspired by earlier women, such as the seventeenth century Mexican intellectual and social critic Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, who was the poet laureate of the viceregal court under Spanish rule but was denied entry to the university because she was a woman. Today, she is recognized as one of the first Latin American feminists. In Argentina, women’s access to education and the rights of working women were addressed by enlightened leaders and reform groups during the last century. By the early twentieth century, women’s civil rights and suffrage had become the focus of organized activity, at the same time that other women were involved with men in the socialist and anarchist movements. In Peru, the feminist philosopher Flora Tristan was the pioneering mili-
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tant whose nineteenth century writing helped inspire the current wave of feminism in the country. Her outspoken views on marriage law and the inferior status of women (and her own struggle to end her marriage and retain custody of her children, while living in France) were joined with her indignation as a socialist over the appalling condition of the poor in Peru and elsewhere. The early efforts of these women have contributed to particular forms of contemporary Latin American feminism that will be discussed shortly.

Before turning our attention in that direction it may be instructive to return briefly to the U.S. setting. Here, feminism grew strong during the 1970s, after decades of inactivity following the granting of the vote to women in 1920. For women who had been involved in the civil rights and anti-war movements, this period was characterized by an insistence upon challenging women’s subordination on its own terms—not just as a part of more general struggles against oppression of all kinds. Many women broke away from male/female groups and formed autonomous women’s organizations to support a growing feminist consciousness and to work for social change on behalf of women. While this strategy led to a highly visible women’s movement in this country, it has been rightly criticized for attracting mostly white as well as mostly middle-class women, and for ignoring issues of concern to other women (for example, women of color, and working class women). This may have weakened the movement and may have contributed to a rather quiescent period during the 1980s, when feminist activity declined.

The 1980s were significant for feminism, however, insofar as debate within the movement challenged us to be more inclusive in our thinking and political practice. The primary challenge came from women of color and “Third World women” (a somewhat problematic term referring generally to women of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East). Calling on feminists to build a non-racist, non-classist, and anti-imperialist movement, they proposed a politics that would recognize and respect difference while opposing all forms of social injustice. Ultimately, feminist theory and practice would grow much stronger as the concerns of less privileged women moved “from margin to center.” The 1990s saw the florescence of a more fully developed transnational feminism that recognizes the global forces that draw us together and keep us apart. In addition, as we enter the new millenium, the vitality of gay and lesbian movements has drawn increasing attention to heterosexism as another form of oppression that must be challenged.
Dissatisfied with a feminism that does not attend to women’s multiple identities and experiences, women of color have been a major force in breaking through narrow Western conceptions that
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limit our vision of women’s mobilization in various cultural contexts. First, it is no longer acceptable to refer to “women’s experience” as though there were some universal feminine existence quite apart from men’s existence. Second, we are now far more aware of the differences that may sometimes divide women but may also allow them to come together in more diverse alliances. We also recognize why women may strategize to work along with men, or not to act publicly at all, under particular historical circumstances. Moreover, we have become highly critical of representations of “Western women” and “Third World women,” which carry essentialist (and racialized) assumptions about what is the “norm” and what is “other.” Indeed, today it is more common to hear references to women of the global north and south, as an effort to avoid bias in language and thinking.

FEMINIST ORGANIZING ACROSS DIFFERENCES AND ACROSS CONTINENTS

Given the vast differences in women’s situations within societies as well as across societies, why expect them to come together at all? The concerns of Western or First World feminists have often been called irrelevant to Third World women. As Chandra Mohanty writes, “The term feminism is itself questioned by many third world women. Feminist movements have been challenged on the grounds of cultural imperialism, and of shortsightedness in defining the meaning of gender in terms of middle-class white experiences, and in terms of internal racism, classism, and homophobia.” Nonetheless, she goes on to say that “third world women have always engaged with feminism, even if the label has been rejected in a number of instances.”

Even so, efforts to learn from differences and to work in coalition have often been fraught with difficulties. Since the mid-1970s there have been many international gatherings of women that have sparked debate among feminists from very distinct backgrounds. In 1975, the UN declared “International Women’s Year” and a major conference was held in Mexico City. In 1980 another conference was held in Copenhagen, and in 1985 in Nairobi, to mark the close of the “UN Decade for Women.” As historian Cheryl Johnson-Odim observed, “The battle lines were often drawn between First and
Third World feminists over what constituted a feminist issue, and therefore what were legitimate feminist foci and goals.” Controversial issues included whether food, shelter, and economic development were “women’s interests” or simply male agendas designed to sideline feminist questions, and whether Western women should or should not intervene in such practices as female circumcision in Africa. It is notable that fewer tensions were expressed at the final meeting, when the largest number of women of color participated and called for a more inclusive coverage of topics affecting women’s lives. These women “sought to broaden the agenda and treat feminism as a fundamentally political movement connected as much to the struggle of their communities for liberation and autonomy as to the work against gender discrimination.”

It would be a mistake to conclude that women from First and Third World countries were always on opposite sides in the debates. Often the differences were exaggerated by the media, as in the 1980 coverage of a discussion raised by Palestinian women concerning politics in the Middle East. Some women objected that such “political” debate was taking time from consideration of key “women’s issues,” but not everyone agreed. Long-time feminist activist Charlotte Bunch, from the United States, commented that the problem was not that the international conference should not have taken up a political topic, but that a feminist political perspective was lacking in the debate. She and others worked in solidarity with coalitions of Third World women to open up feminist debate and to define feminism “across regional and cultural lines.” As she prepared to attend the 1985 conference in Nairobi, she wrote, “As a white feminist from the United States, I go to the world conference on women … committed to the idea that global feminism is not a luxury activity for an elite but a necessity for effective action.” She continued by saying that “we Americans, who are often limited in our understanding of other parts of the world, can open ourselves to change and look beyond the assumptions of our ethnocentric culture.”

Turning to the Latin American region, we may see some parallel developments through this period. My own work took me to Mexico and Peru during the mid-1970s, where I had a first-hand view of the early stirrings of feminism in the region. I recall conversations that I had in Mexico in 1976, just a year after the UN conference was held in Mexico City. The presence of thousands of women addressing women’s interests had clearly made a difference in the country, as a number of women’s centers and women’s publications had sprung up. Yet many women who were otherwise politicized expressed the
view that feminism was a product of Western imperialism and would not catch on in a significant way in their country. Similarly, in Peru a year later when I was carrying out my doctoral research, the attitude was widespread that, while women’s centers to promote research and social assistance were opening in the capital city of Lima, feminism was unlikely to grow as a political movement. Again, the perception that feminism was only associated with white middle-class Western women often prevented activist women from seeing how they might build local or regional feminisms based on their needs and interests.

All this was to change in a few short years, however. Mexico and Peru, as well as other Latin American countries, began to see ever-growing numbers of self-identified feminists organizing and women’s movements forming. In some areas, like Brazil, this was in evidence as early as the 1970s, and other countries were soon to follow. Sonia Alvarez, who has studied women’s movements in Brazil and elsewhere in Latin America, asks the important question: “How could such movements formulate and advance gender-based political claims in a region where machismo is sanctioned by the State and sanctioned by the Catholic church? Why, after decades of dormancy, would feminism resurface during one of the most politically repressive and economically regressive periods in Latin America’s history, a time when most countries in the region lived under the yoke of military rule?”

Yet it was precisely during the decade of the 1980s that Latin American feminism took off (years when the U.S. women’s movement was also becoming more attentive to differences among women). Alvarez and others suggest that, somewhat ironically, the breakdown of political structures and deepening economic crisis in the region presented feminists with the space in which to construct a social movement. Where nationalist movements called for “democracy in the country” (especially in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay), women began calling for “democracy in the home” as well. Where economic conditions made it essential for more women to seek work outside the home, many developed a consciousness of their exploitation and formed women’s groups, a sort of “popular” or grassroots feminism, to confront the situation.

The feminist momentum was great enough by this time that the first encuentro, or gathering, of women throughout the Latin American and Caribbean region was held in Bogotá, Colombia, in 1981. This was followed by gatherings in Peru (1983), Brazil (1985), Mexico (1987), Argentina (1990), El Salvador (1993), and so on. Drawing thousands of women of diverse backgrounds, these encuentros
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provided forums for discussion of shared theoretical and practical concerns. They have come to be viewed as a sort of barometer for feminism in Latin America, charting developments in the region, but also as staging grounds for future efforts to challenge gender inequalities and create change.13 In the next section, we ask what social and political issues have incited Latin American women to take action and how they have done so.

WOMEN’S MOVEMENTS OR FEMINIST MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA?

In the same way that international gatherings have produced debates on what makes an issue “feminist,” the Latin American encuentros have raised discussion over what actions and what movements are “feminist.” Some have drawn a distinction between what they call “women’s movements” (movimientos de mujeres) and “feminist movements” (movimientos feministas). The former are found among working class and low-income women struggling for rights and services in a number of Latin American cities, while the latter are self-conscious feminists, typically from more middle-class urban sectors, who are embracing issues ranging from the economy to sexuality and reproductive rights. To a degree, these differences are identified with struggles over “practical gender interests” on the one hand and “strategic gender interests” on the other.14 What distinguishes the two is whether women are pressing for immediate needs or whether they are challenging structures of gender inequality. Such issues are not entirely separable and there is much disagreement about the politics of social movements in Latin America.

Let’s consider briefly a couple of these movements. Perhaps best known is the long-time activism of the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo in Argentina, a group of women protesting the political disappearances of their children and grandchildren and calling on the state to be accountable. The solemn presence of these women marching weekly since 1977 in a central plaza in Buenos Aires has sparked discussion about gender and politics. While the Mothers (Madres) have utilized their traditional roles as moral guardians of the family in their plea for human rights, they have also transgressed notions of
motherhood as they enter the public arena and clamor to be seen and heard. Defying convention, they have laid claim to social and political space and have challenged assumptions about women’s “proper” roles. As María del Carmen Feijoó, an Argentine feminist, states, “In practice, the Madres became another movement of women who, without trying to change patriarchal ideology or abandon their femininity, produced a transformation of the traditional feminine conscience and its political role.”

Also well known are the thousands of communal kitchens that have been organized among low-income women in Lima, Peru, and other cities as a response to harsh economic conditions and inadequate state assistance. Now recognized as social movements, these kitchens are located in marginal settlements where women work together to provide low-cost and nourishing meals, and sometimes to demand basic services, such as access to water, from the government. In Lima, the past twenty-five years have seen the development of at least three thousand communal kitchens, some independent and some state-sponsored (in some cases the government has co-opted kitchens that formed independently). Though they began as a self-help survival strategy drawing on women’s traditional skills and responsibilities, communal kitchens have given women the opportunity to work collectively, acquire organizational skills, and build self-confidence. María-Elena Mujica, a Peruvian analyst, maintains that for some women this has resulted in empowerment and improved gender relations in their homes and beyond.

It should be clear that while these women of Argentina and Peru might not call themselves feminists, their practical gender interests have led them to a growing consciousness of gender and of the structural inequalities faced by women. A number of writers have shown that Latin American women in urban housewives’ and self-employed associations, as well as in class-based trade union movements and peasant movements, have developed such a consciousness and acted in strategic ways to confront oppressive structures. While the emphasis in this chapter is on self-identified feminists, it is important to note that the numerous grassroots women’s movements in the region have brought together women whose efforts to bring about change in their lives have led a number of them to question existing gender arrangements—and some have participated in feminist gatherings where they have enriched debate. Although they are rarely viewed as part of the feminist vanguard, women in the popular movements have begun to express their own concern with such classic feminist concerns as sexuality, domestic violence, and
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women’s health, and to insist on attention to inequalities of social class and ethnicity.

In what follows, I consider the recent development of broad-based women’s and feminist movements in one country, Nicaragua, to illustrate further the vitality of these movements in Latin America.

NICARAGUAN FEMINISM
IN A TIME OF TRANSITION

What can a small Central American country of five million people—about the same size and population as the state of Wisconsin—tell us about women’s mobilization and feminist politics? Nicaragua’s unique history makes it a particularly interesting country in which to consider the growth of a women’s movement. In 1979, after more than forty years of dictatorship under the Somoza family, a revolutionary movement led by the Sandinistas (named after a national hero) was successful in gaining and holding power for the next decade. The Nicaraguan revolution was the first revolution in Latin America to have occurred since the emergence of feminist movements around the world. This may account in part for the significant involvement of women (estimated at 30 percent) in the insurrectionary movement, and for the attention to women’s concerns that was later shown by the Sandinista government. Women of different ages and social classes were among those who took up arms against Somoza and his National Guard, and following victory some of these women were appointed to high-level offices in several ministries. One of the first reforms to be carried out by the Sandinista government was the agrarian reform, and this government was the first in Latin America to grant women legal rights as beneficiaries of land reform. The government also carried out an ideological campaign to challenge sexism, including the prohibition of sexism in the media.18

Social and economic reconstruction were an immense prospect for the severely underdeveloped country. An economy based on both socialist and free market structures was established, but sustainable development was hindered when the Contras (anti-Sandinista rebels) gained force in the mid-1980s. With so much of the national budget going to defense, reconstruction efforts saw a great setback. Nevertheless, the mass mobilization of women that
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was supported by the Sandinistas contributed to progressive legislation passed under their leadership during this time. Laws were passed that declared equality for all and prohibited sex discrimination, and ended the official status of men as heads of households.

Through these difficult years, social and political participation had grown to include all sectors of society. A women’s organization that was formed in 1977 by the Sandinistas to draw more women into the struggle against Somoza became AMNLAE (named for the first woman said to have fallen in the revolution) in 1979, the presently existing women’s affiliate of the Sandinista party. Women’s social position is now a central concern, but the agenda of AMNLAE still corresponds to goals set forth by the party, which influences its leadership. As such, AMNLAE has been particularly active in working with such traditional constituencies as the Mothers of Heroes and Martyrs (women who lost family members in the revolution), market sellers, and housewives. Their women’s centers offer women training in such areas as sewing and hairdressing, but more recently they have provided more services to women needing legal counselling, relief from domestic violence, and so on. By mobilizing women of the popular sectors, AMNLAE has played a significant role in the growth of the women’s movement in Nicaragua.

The Sandinista (FSLN) government rapidly introduced broad social, political, and economic reforms during the 1980s, but many of these were turned back following the 1990 election of an opposition (UNO) government. Despite the gains they had made during the 1980s, many Nicaraguans were tired of prolonged political conflict and economic hardship. While U.S. opposition to the FSLN government was a key factor in the Sandinistas’ loss, their government also suffered from internal weaknesses that were only examined following the election. A national-level critique has suggested that the leadership needed to become more democratic and inclusive of different interests in the country. As part of this critique, women have organized to talk about their common interests, often across political differences.

While the years following the 1990 election marked an abrupt political and economic transition as the country turned toward a Western development model, the period also presented certain openings for autonomous social movements to emerge. In this setting, environmentalists, gays and lesbians, and feminists, among others, have found spaces in which to organize. AMNLAE continues to be recognized as the mass women’s association, but since 1990 a number of feminist and women’s organizations formed—some of
them parting ways with AMNLAE—that need to be considered part of a growing movement.

When the electoral loss led to the erosion of government support for women’s initiatives, a number of nongovernmental organizations began taking up work in such areas as women’s health and sexuality, popular education, and so on. Other organizations focused attention on specific groups such as younger women, rural women, abused women, or women in particular economic sectors. Still other groups established centers for research and action; one of the largest publishes a feminist bulletin and offers a highly successful course in gender and development. These projects complement activity at the Central American University in Managua, which has one of the first women’s studies programs in the region.

In 1991, when I was beginning a three-year research project in Nicaragua, I was interested to see the diversity of activity around International Women’s Day, March 8. That weekend, AMNLAE held its national congress to discuss its political direction and to choose new leadership. It became clear, however, that rather than being open and democratic, the process for selecting the leadership would again be controlled by the party (indeed, one highly-placed party militant was replaced with another). Furthermore, it was expected that discussion of more sensitive feminist issues would be discouraged in favor of party concerns. As a result, although hundreds of women did attend the AMNLAE congress, many others boycotted it and instead participated in a weekend-long “Festival of the 52 Percent” (for the percentage of women in the country) held in a popular fairground in Managua. At the festival were booths for many of the feminist groups I mentioned (even AMNLAE had a booth), and also for several women’s cooperatives to display their products, and for bookstores to sell their books. A series of workshops were held, videos were shown, and there were dramatic and musical performances. On the last evening there was a concert of several well-known singers that drew a large and diverse crowd. Alongside the tent where the concert was held, members of Managua’s Lesbian Feminist Collective had a booth where they were selling slices of lemon merangue pie to a long line of eager Nicaraguans. At the close of the event, people danced spontaneously, men and women, women and women, all together.

The organizers of the festival claimed that they did not seek to compete with the AMNLAE congress, but rather to offer another alternative. What the event did demonstrate was the diversity and richness of the growing women’s movement and of feminism in Nicaragua. It also showed that many Nicaraguan women were
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ready to part ways with political parties that were not addressing the issues that concerned them. The festival has since been regarded as a sort of watershed, marking the emergence of newly independent feminist organizations in the country.

About a year later, in January 1992, these independent groups organized a national-level encuentro of Nicaraguan women, which I was able to attend. It was the first ever to bring women together from all over the country, without regard to party or organizational affiliation, to discuss a wide range of issues. About 250 participants were expected, but more than 800 women registered, and the encuentro was moved to Managua’s largest convention center. The theme of the three-day meeting was “Unity in Diversity,” and this truly characterized the event. Well-known activists and writers mixed with campesinas, women from the countryside who had never before been to the city or attended such a gathering. We divided into six working groups, with the most popular ones devoted to the economy and environment, sexuality, and violence against women—demonstrating again that women in the global south are deeply concerned about a range of issues, from survival strategies to classic feminist questions relating to the body and self-determination.

Coming out of a decade of revolutionary practice, it is not surprising that these women took a long historical view of their current situation. Whether examining the effects of the economic crisis on their lives or the increasing reports of domestic abuse, they traced the problems over the last decade or more and sought to find connections among many apparently disparate questions. In the economy group, for example, women spoke about the psychological cost of the economic crisis, especially for women and children. And then, at a plenary session, the group considering violence against women was called on to expand their notion of violence to include the mental violence experienced by the Mothers of Heroes and Martyrs. There was also debate about how broad a definition of sexuality to support, when the working group proposed that sexuality was an aspect of all human relationships; some appeared uneasy about extending the notion to children and to same-sex relations.

The encuentro concluded with assessments from the working groups and concrete proposals for action. The first of these was a march against hunger on International Women’s Day. A campaign opposing violence against women was also launched, and another against the high rate of maternal mortality. Women’s access to the media was promoted, among other actions. Networks formed from
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the working groups (which continued to meet) and the mood was hopeful. Despite the occasional tensions of working in coalition and the disappointment of some who would have liked a more unified movement to emerge, most participants viewed the encuentro as a success.

As Nicaraguan women expanded the scope of their organizing, they also forged stronger ties with women’s groups and feminists throughout the Central American region. In March of the same year, they hosted a gathering of some five hundred women from five neighboring countries for the First Central American Women’s Encuentro. There, they urged discussion of the need for women’s autonomy in political organizing and for a “new way of doing politics”—a new political culture—based on feminist principles and methods. The experience they shared in that gathering came from years of political struggle within a revolutionary movement that had not gone far enough to confront gender oppression, and from their solidarity in overcoming traditional barriers faced by women.

Nicaraguan women were facing a political shift to the right, an austere economic program, and an ideological campaign for traditional family values in which women activists and feminists were represented as unnatural and marginal. A politics of strategic gender interests would face a long road ahead. Nevertheless, these women had never before had so strong a presence, with a National Feminist Committee bringing together representatives from over twenty women’s organizations. In 1993 they held another national encuentro, this time to prepare for the Sixth Encuentro of Latin American and Caribbean Feminists, which was held late that year in El Salvador. The decision to hold this continental encuentro in a small Central American country marked a major step forward for a region often viewed as a cultural backwater. The participation of Nicaraguan women was high, with many more who wanted to attend. Reports from the gathering suggested that feminism was growing still further and reaching more women of all social sectors in Latin America.

Since that time, feminist mobilization has continued in Nicaragua, sometimes revealing the social class and political differences of the broader society. When the Sandinista party leadership made several bids to regain the presidency, feminists and women more generally were divided in their support of the effort. In 2006, when Sandinista Daniel Ortega was reelected and recovered his former position as president, he had lost much of the support of women that he earlier enjoyed. His compromises with the political and religious right, notably banning therapeutic abortion even in cases of rape and incest,
Feminism and women’s movements have taken a number of different forms in our transnational world. A recognition of these forms as they have emerged historically in many parts of the globe.
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can enable us to enlarge our perspective on feminism in our own society. We may come to look at women’s movements as following no single pattern but rather as embedded in and responding to specific cultural and political settings—from the local to the transnational.

To conclude this discussion of women’s movements and feminism in transnational perspective, it is important to note that feminism includes more than organized activities and movements. It also offers a way of viewing the world through a gendered lens, this way gaining a new understanding of just about anything we turn our attention to—not just women’s lives but men’s too; not just political actions in which women are engaged but the whole arena of global politics; not just public activities but the private everyday activities and relationships in which we all participate. As political scientist Cynthia Enloe puts it, we need to “start making sense of those gendered politics.” The feminist sense we can make will be the first step in naming and challenging cultural meanings and social structures that continue to limit our human potential for self-realization.
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